

1 **CENTRAL VERMONT REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION**

2 **Executive Committee**

3 **DRAFT MINUTES**

4 **April 20, 2020 Special Meeting**

5 Present:

☒ Julie Potter

☒ Laura Hill-Eubanks

☒ Michael Gray

☒ Dara Torre

☒ Steve Lotspeich

☒ Janet Shatney

☒ Jerry D'Amico

6  
7 Staff: Bonnie Waninger, Nancy Chartrand

8  
9 **CALL TO ORDER**

10 Chair L. Hill-Eubanks called the meeting to order at 3:03 pm. Quorum was present to conduct business.

11  
12 **ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA**

13 None.

14  
15 **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

16 None.

17  
18 **CNB ACCOUNT SIGNATORY RESOLUTION**

19 Chartrand provided an overview of the need for the resolution in order to update the signatories on the  
20 checking account due to the recent Bylaw change. Three officers need to sign the resolution once  
21 approved. Lotspeich agreed to the the third signature in addition to Torre and Hill-Eubanks.

22  
23 *S Lotspeich moved to pass the resolution with Community National Bank and approve the signatories. M*  
24 *Gray seconded. Motion carried.*

25  
26 **CLEAN WATER ADVISORY COMMITTEE LETTER OF CONCERN**

27 Waninger advised this is the Clean Water Advisory Committee's revised letter as per request of the  
28 Board. If Executive Committee is comfortable with moving this letter to the Board, it will be put on the  
29 next Board agenda. Discussion ensued with regard to suggested amendments to the letter: ensure all  
30 acronyms are spelled out (i.e. on 2<sup>nd</sup> page - PFAs and PFOA); first sentence on 1<sup>st</sup> page – add "for"  
31 before "which"; and it was suggested to use a colon instead of a comma in the last sentence of the 2<sup>nd</sup>  
32 paragraph to indicate a list of items. Additional discussion ensued regarding what the word  
33 'effectiveness' refers to on Page 2 – Policies and regulation (Recommendation). It was concurred that  
34 this needs to be clarified by the CWAC. Waninger noted she would request the discussed edits be made  
35 before the letter goes before the Board and that CWAC would need to discuss the effectiveness  
36 question at their next meeting, therefore the letter will go before the June Board meeting.

37  
38 *G D'Amico made a motion to move the letter to the Board; a point of clarification was requested*  
39 *regarding the final adjustments that are being requested and should the motion be contingent on those*

1 *adjustments being made. D'Amico amended the motion to move the letter to the Board following*  
2 *clarification of the statement on effectiveness under Policies and Regulations – Point 1; S Lotspecih*  
3 *seconded. Motion carried.*  
4

#### 5 **FISCAL SPONSOR REQUEST**

6 Waninger advised that the East Calais Community Trust (ECCT) currently uses Preservation Trust of  
7 Vermont as their fiscal sponsor as they do not have their Federal 501(3) designation yet; but would like  
8 to be able to receive donations which are tax deductible. Since both the ECCT and the Preservation  
9 Trust are applying for a Northern Borders Grant, ECCT has been requested to find a new fiscal sponsor.  
10 Waninger noted that other RPCs have been fiscal sponsors for such purposes. Also noted was that a  
11 key challenge is the Northern Borders Grant appears to require that grantees own their structure for life  
12 or until fully depreciated (27.5 or 39 years). She is confirming with Northern Borders that applies to us  
13 as a fiscal sponsor; and expects the answer will be affirmative.  
14

15 Considerable discussion ensued and several concerns were raised. It was confirmed the RPC would be  
16 responsible for maintenance, but could sign an operation and maintenance agreement with ECCT  
17 assigning that responsibility to ECCT. It was confirmed the grant recipient would be the RPC not ECCT.  
18 There was question as to what this would mean in terms of supporting other towns; could we be a fiscal  
19 sponsor for multiple towns? It was confirmed we could, but would not want to be fiscal sponsor for the  
20 same grant in the same year for different towns. It was also noted that a fiscal sponsor is different than  
21 fiscal agent which is why there was significant research included in the packet regarding the two roles.  
22 Concern was raised with regard to being a property owner, not necessarily being a fiscal sponsor.  
23 Question was raised as to whether the RPCE could be an interim fiscal sponsor, and upon project  
24 completion do a quick claim deed to the Town of Calais and pass ownership on; Waninger noted that  
25 according to grant guidance she believes we must maintain ownership/control, however, expects  
26 clarification on the control question in the next couple of days. The Committee concurred that the  
27 ownership/control question needs to be clarified before they can vote whether or not to approve. It  
28 was noted they are supportive of being ECCT's sponsor if there were different forms of ownership;  
29 however, concern was also raised that if other towns wanted to pursue this type of sponsorship in the  
30 future, we could have a lot of buildings under our ownership and this could be difficult. There was also  
31 question about what type of administration costs would be involved; it was confirmed this would be  
32 built into the project costs for reimbursement to the RPC.  
33

34 It was concurred to put the item on the May 4<sup>th</sup> agenda. Waninger will follow-up with ECCT regarding  
35 this and noted that would give them time to pursue other options in the meantime. She was requested  
36 to communicate with the Trust where the Committee's concerns vs. support are with regard to this type  
37 of sponsorship.  
38

#### 39 **OFFICE UPDATES**

40 Waninger followed up on Accounting Services contract. She confirmed she has spoken (video  
41 conferenced) with both the Project Manager and the Accountant and she is comfortable moving  
42 forward with working with them. They are currently reviewing our QuickBooks system and have  
43 emailed Nicole today to set up an appointment to review. They believe they can get us current  
44 (through March 31<sup>st</sup>) by mid-May.

1  
2 Waninger discussed the impact of COVID on current and future budgets. Currently RPC funding is not  
3 part of the COVID package; it may go on the table in the future, and this is being watched closely.  
4 Impact to FY21 budget is more about construction projects that can't move forward yet, and may not  
5 move forward in the future, so would therefore drop out of the FY20 and FY21 budgets – i.e. Grants in  
6 Aid. The Agency of Natural Resources has clearly stated if you are not currently under contract with a  
7 grant award (i.e. construction project in Berlin with SWRPC) the contract will be rescinded. Therefore it  
8 is likely this will not go to contract. Staff is pursuing needs in municipalities for other funding  
9 opportunities. However, there is a concern that municipalities will not have funds to match some of the  
10 grants that are currently out there related to COVID.

11  
12 The RPC has been requested by a number of communities to hold a Selectboard, Town Manager/Town  
13 Administrator roundtable to share and discuss what towns are currently doing and how they are going  
14 to move forward; She expects this will be organized in the next 7-10 days and that we will likely hold  
15 both a daytime and evening session.

16  
17 Waninger noted that two staff members have requested a reduction in hours (32 to 24 hours; and 40 to  
18 32 hours); and this will likely be put into place in the next week; however, we may need to request  
19 additional furloughs. With furloughs we will still pay for benefits; however, staff will be eligible for  
20 unemployment in conjunction with the reduced hours. Waninger will provide additional updates at a  
21 future date. Furloughs initially will be through May 15<sup>th</sup>, however, that also needs to be confirmed.

22  
23 Question was raised regarding exploration of new space. It is in somewhat of a hold pattern at this  
24 time. Current landlord is exploring whether or not we would be willing to provide a lump sum towards  
25 construction and whether we would be willing to invest in a 10 year lease vs. a 5 year lease. With regard  
26 to where our financials are to support this, we will not have information til at least May 31<sup>st</sup> (from new  
27 accountant).

28  
29 **ADJOURN**

30 *S Lotspeich moved to adjourn at 3:52 pm; G D'Amico seconded. Motion carried.*

31  
32 Respectfully submitted,

33  
34 Nancy Chartrand  
35 Office Manager  
36