

CONFIDENTIAL
LEGISLATIVE BILL REVIEW FORM: 2016

Bill Number: H.367 Name of Bill: An act relating to miscellaneous revisions to the municipal plan adoption, amendment, and update process

Agency/ Dept: VTrans Author of Bill Review: Joe Segale, Policy-Planning-Research Bureau Director

Date of Bill Review: 5/3/16 Related Bills and Key Players

Status of Bill: (check one): ☐ Upon Introduction ☐ As passed by 1st body ☒ As passed by both

Recommended Position:

☒ Support ☐ Oppose ☐ Remain Neutral ☐ Support with modifications identified in #8 below

Analysis of Bill

1. Summary of bill and issue it addresses. *Describe what the bill is intended to accomplish and why.*

The major provisions of the bill are:

1. It provides specific items a Regional Planning Commission must consider when confirming a municipality's planning process. The specifics are reasonable and do not affect VTrans in any way.
2. Changes the time that a municipal plan and any amendment expires from five years to eight years.
3. Specifies the type of information a municipality shall consider when updating and readopting a municipal plan. The requirements are reasonable, consistent with current practices and will not affect VTrans in any way.

2. Is there a need for this bill? *Please explain why or why not.*

The additional specificity should help improve consistency in the way RPCs confirm municipal planning process. Similarly, providing more guidance to municipalities on the items that must be considered when a plan is updated and readopted should improve the planning process around the state. Increasing the expiration duration from five to eight years is reasonable given the amount of time it takes to prepare plans, especially since most local planning commissions are volunteers without much if any staff support.

3. What are likely to be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for this Department?

None.

4. What might be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for other departments in state government, and what is likely to be their perspective on it?

Please return this bill review as a Microsoft Word document to Jahala.Dudley@vermont.gov & Jessica.Mishaan@vermont.gov

No apparent fiscal implications of the bill for Vermont state government.

- 5. What might be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for others, and what is likely to be their perspective on it?** *(for example, public, municipalities, organizations, business, regulated entities, etc)*

It does not appear to add any burdens.

6. Other Stakeholders:

6.1 Who else is likely to support the proposal and why? Municipalities and RPCs

6.2 Who else is likely to oppose the proposal and why? Not sure.

- 7. Rationale for recommendation:** *Justify recommendation stated above.*

The changes proposed in the Bill are reasonable, add value but will have little if any effect on VTrans' roles and responsibilities.

- 8. Specific modifications that would be needed to recommend support of this bill:** *Not meant to rewrite bill, but rather, an opportunity to identify simple modifications that would change recommended position.*

None

- 9. Will this bill create a new board or commission AND/OR add or remove appointees to an existing one? If so, which one and how many?** No.

Secretary/Commissioner has reviewed this document: _____ **Date:** _____