

Act 171 Forest Integrity Study Committee Draft Summary of Potential Changes Presented on Oct. 18, 2016				Notes from November 18, 2016 Meeting			
Potential Changes to Act 250				Questions, Clarifications, and Potential Impacts to Changes to Act 250			
#	Contributor / Organization Name	Potential Change	Notes	Contributor	Clarifications, Questions	Contributor	Potential Impacts
Potential changes to Criteria within Act 250				Potential changes to Criteria within Act 250			
1.1	Bonnie Waninger VAPDA	Utilize Criterion 9(C) to affect protection of forest integrity and habitat connectivity by refining the definition of "productive forest soils".	Add a "productive forest soils" to online mapping resources.	B. Waninger	This will help clarify the location of productive forests.	J. Wood	Defintions of "productive" will affect the outcome and impacts. There may be unintended consequences of a poorly defined product. Pending suitable definitions the negative impact of 1.1 (above) will be remedied in 1.2. The potential change would require legislative change.
1.2	Bonnie Waninger VAPDA	Alternative of 1.1 (above): Modify Criterion 9(C) to focus on protection of forest blocks and their connectivity, rather than on forest soils.		B. Waninger	This will encourage wildlife habitat.	Study Committee	Regarding 1.1 -1.5: Promotes forest health and integrity.
1.3	Diane Snelling NRB	Modernize Criterion 9(C) to better protect defined "forest blocks" and minimize the impacts of posposed development projects on forest blocks.	Make changes in a manner similar to those applied to Criterion 9(L) two years ago.			B. Waninger	Regarding 1.1 - 1.5: Without clear defintions, effective protection or maintenance of forest blocks and other discussed natural resources will be difficult and unclear.
1.4	Jamey Fidel VNRC	Develop guidance for the effective implementation of Criterion 9(C), including the development of a statewide map of productive soils for forestry.	Based on a review of case law relevant to Act 250, VNRC does not believe Criterion 9(C) is effectively maintaining soils for commercial forestry as it is supposed to.			B. Waninger	Regarding 1.1 -1.5: This language provide a new criteria for property owners to address while addressing others.
1.5	Agency of Natural Resources	Amend Criterion 9(C) to focus on forest blocks instead of soils.				J. Wood	Regarding 1.1 - 1.5: Landowners who have kept forestland as forest would now face restrictions for future use. This is mostly encompassed in the 'forest block' concept.
						S. Smith	Regarding 1.1 -1.5: This may conflict with already protected prime ag soils.
1.6	Agency of Natural Resources	Authorize off-site mitigation for impacts under Criterion 9(C).		P. Gill	Couple this potential change with 1.11 (below).	Study Committee	Promotes forest health and integrity.
1.7	Agency of Natural Resources	Enhance criterion 8(A) to include explicit consideration of significant forest blocks and connecting habitat.		B. Coster	This change could allow Criterion 9(C) to remain the same while adding conditions to Criterion 8. Definitions are needed. Under 8(A), the burden is on others to show that the applicant is impacting natural resources.	Study Committee	Regarding 1.7 - 1.8: Promotes forest health and integrity.
				J. Wood	Clarify defintions of 'critical wildlife habitat' and 'connecting wildlfie habitat'.	D. Snelling	Regarding 1.7 - 1.8: Changes to Act 250 are far reaching.
				S. Smith	Would including habitat affect conduct of forestry operations?	P. Gill	Regarding 1.7 - 1.8: We need parity between Act 250 and municipal land use.

Act 171 Forest Integrity Study Committee Draft Summary of Potential Changes Presented on Oct. 18, 2016				Notes from November 18, 2016 Meeting			
Potential Changes to Act 250				Questions, Clarifications, and Potential Impacts to Changes to Act 250			
#	Contributor / Organization Name	Potential Change	Notes	Contributor	Clarifications, Questions	Contributor	Potential Impacts
				M. Snyder	No, no effect on conduct of forestry operations.		
1.8	Agency of Natural Resources	Add definitions to 10 V.S.A. § 6001 for 'significant forest blocks' and 'significant connecting habitat', so that those features of forest integrity can be addressed specifically in Act 250.					As in 1.7 above.
1.9	Jamey Fidel VNRC	Expand Criterion 8 10 V.S.A. § 6601 to include definitions for "Forest blocks"; "Forest fragmentation"; "Habitat fragmentation"; "Habitat connectivity" or "habitat connector".		L. Leriche	Needs definitions, particularly because they might change in legislature.	Study Committee	Promotes forest health and integrity.
				M. Snyder	We do have definitions in the law.		
				J. Wood	Do any changes extend any exemption for 'forestry operations' consistent with definition for municipal regulation?		
1.10	Jamey Fidel VNRC	Change Criterion 8 10 V.S.A. § 6086. (a) (8) Issuance of permit; conditions and criteria. Will not have an undue adverse effect on the scenic or natural beauty of the area, aesthetics, historic sites, rare and irreplaceable natural areas, <u>forest blocks, or habitat connectivity.</u>		J. Fidel	This could be coupled with 1.7 (above).	Study Committee	Promotes forest health and integrity.
1.11	Jamey Fidel VNRC	Expand Criterion 8 10 V.S.A. § 6086. (a) (8) to include (B) <u>Forest blocks. A permit will not be granted unless it is demonstrated by the applicant that a development or subdivision will not have an undue adverse impact on forest blocks as defined in § 6001 of this section. Undue adverse impacts to forest blocks may be reduced or eliminated through project design that minimizes forest fragmentation, or through mitigation according to 10 V.S.A. § 6094.</u>	Methods for avoiding such adverse impacts may include the following: i) Locating buildings and associated development envelopes to reduce incursion into forest blocks. ii) Designing roads, driveways and utilities to avoid and/or minimize the fragmentation of forest blocks. This could be accomplished by following or sharing features such as existing roads, tree lines, stonewalls and fence lines. iv) Clustering buildings and associated building envelopes to avoid and/or minimize the fragmentation of forest blocks.	J. Fidel	This change can build in more options as to how to address forest connectivity, for example, how to avoid and minimize impacts of development while not leading to an interpretation of no development unless the applicant failed entirely to address it.	Study Committee	Promotes forest health and integrity.

Act 171 Forest Integrity Study Committee Draft Summary of Potential Changes Presented on Oct. 18, 2016				Notes from November 18, 2016 Meeting			
Potential Changes to Act 250				Questions, Clarifications, and Potential Impacts to Changes to Act 250			
#	Contributor / Organization Name	Potential Change	Notes	Contributor	Clarifications, Questions	Contributor	Potential Impacts
1.12	Jamey Fidel VNRC	Expand Criterion 8 10 V.S.A. § 6086. (a) (8) to include <u>(C) Habitat connectivity. A permit will not be granted unless it is demonstrated by the applicant that a development or subdivision will not have an undue adverse impact on habitat connectivity as defined in § 6001 of this section. Undue adverse impacts to habitat connectivity may be reduced through project design that minimizes habitat fragmentation, or through mitigation according to 10 V.S.A. § 6094.</u>	Methods for avoiding such adverse impacts may include the following: i) Locating development as far away from the center of a habitat connectivity area as possible when a practical development site is available (e.g., when there is an option for development to be located towards the middle of the corridor, versus at the edge, development must be placed toward the edge) unless the less disruptive option involves locating development in close proximity to other existing development in the connectivity area. Similarly, locating development to leave the greatest contiguous land areas as undisturbed habitat to facilitate wildlife travel through the area. ii) In the event that there is no land that is practical for development outside of the connectivity area, design the development to minimize impacts on the continued viability and use of the area by wildlife.			Study Committee	Promotes forest health and integrity.
1.13	Jamey Fidel VNRC	Expand Criterion 8 10 V.S.A. to include <u>§ 6094. Mitigation of forest blocks and habitat connectivity.</u> <u>(a) Mitigation for undue adverse impacts to forest blocks and habitat connectivity to satisfy subdivision §6086(a)(8)(B)-(C) of this title.</u> <u>(1) Project located outside a designated center. If the project is not located in a designated center as defined by 10 V.S.A. §6001(30), mitigation may be allowed if the applicant demonstrates the following:</u> <u>(A) The applicant has first avoided direct, indirect or other impacts by relocating, redesigning or making adjustments to the project so there is not forest or habitat fragmentation;</u> <u>(B) If avoidance of impacts is not possible, the applicant has minimized direct, indirect or other impacts by relocating, redesigning or making adjustments to the project to minimize forest or habitat fragmentation;</u>				Study Committee D. Snelling	Promotes forest health and integrity. These potential changes might require rulemaking.

Act 171 Forest Integrity Study Committee Draft Summary of Potential Changes Presented on Oct. 18, 2016				Notes from November 18, 2016 Meeting			
Potential Changes to Act 250				Questions, Clarifications, and Potential Impacts to Changes to Act 250			
#	Contributor / Organization Name	Potential Change	Notes	Contributor	Clarifications, Questions	Contributor	Potential Impacts
		<u>(C) If the applicant has taken all [practicable] measures to avoid and minimize undue adverse impacts of the development consistent with subcriteria (A) and (B) above, but there is still an undue adverse impact, the district commission may consider a proposal to mitigate the undue adverse impacts through compensation. Compensation may include the protection of areas of a similar quality and character, or other compensation measures outlined by the natural resources board in consultation with the agency of natural resources in rules, which could include a deposit into an offsite mitigation fee into the Vermont Housing and Conservation Trust Fund established under section 312 of this title for the purpose of preserving forest blocks and habitat connectivity [lands, or habitat connectors] of equal or greater value.</u>					
Review of jurisdictional triggers				Review of jurisdictional triggers			
1.14	Diane Snelling NRB	Adjust Act 250 triggers to include projects mapped within a "forest block" or those with specified size, location, or other characteristics that affect forest blocks.		J. Wood	Regarding 1.14 - 1.15: Clarify extent of "adjust triggers".	Study Committee	Regarding 1.14 - 1.15: Promotes forest health and integrity.
1.15	Diane Snelling NRB	Create a method for project development applicants, or any other interested party, to rebut determination of whether or not a parcel is in a "forest block"				J. Wood	Regarding 1.14 - 1.15: Significant reduction in land value for forestland owners, and potentially future investors.
1.16	Jamey Fidel VNRC	Adjust triggers that prompt the Cumulative Road Rule to include jurisdiction over a total of 1,200' of combined road and driveway on any parcel within a 10-year period.		J. Wood	Are forestry operations subject to this change?	Study Committee	Promotes forest health and integrity.
						D. Snelling	In past, it was difficult to administer and there were many unintended consequences.
						J. Wood	Unintended consequence on legitimate forest management roads.
						L. Leriche	Unintended consequence of landowners building an ill-advised short road that is poorly constructed regarding drainage, stormwater (e.g. landowner builds shortest road straight up a hill). VNRC should amend change so that forestry roads are not triggers.

Act 171 Forest Integrity Study Committee Draft Summary of Potential Changes Presented on Oct. 18, 2016				Notes from November 18, 2016 Meeting			
Potential Changes to Act 250				Questions, Clarifications, and Potential Impacts to Changes to Act 250			
#	Contributor / Organization Name	Potential Change	Notes	Contributor	Clarifications, Questions	Contributor	Potential Impacts
1.17	Jamey Fidel VNRC	Adjust triggers that prompt Setback rules to include jurisdiction over any development located 1,000' or greater from an existing state highway or class 1, 2 or 3 town highway.		D. Snelling	More study attributed to 1000' length. Would that length limit or prohibit development or would it promote smarter development?	Study Committee	Promotes forest health and integrity.
						B. Waninger	Potential negative consequences to existing developed areas.
						J. Wood	Unintended consequence of limiting subdivision of forested parcels during intergenerational land transfer, or any land transfer.
						J. Wood	Unintended consequence of set number (1000') may promote loopholes. Should be site-specific.
1.18	Jamey Fidel VNRC	Adjust triggers that prompt Rural Road Development rules to include jurisdiction over any development located on a class 4 road.		P. Gill	Amendment jurisdiction should be considered for any in "Review of Jurisdictional Triggers".	Study Committee	Promotes forest health and integrity.
				C. Cochran	Need to study each potential change to understand impacts more thoroughly – applies to any in "Review of Jurisdictional Triggers".	S. Webster	May enhance value of existing camps.
						L. Leriche	May anger hunters.
1.19	Jamey Fidel VNRC	Adjust triggers that prompt Location Relative to Habitat rules to include jurisdiction over development within an identified forest block or area of connectivity. This could be limited to expanding jurisdiction to just the highest ranking forest blocks or areas of connectivity. This could also include utilizing the various jurisdictional tools only in areas where ANR mapping indicates that there are forest blocks as defined by the Act. For example, in areas within or near forest blocks, Act 250 jurisdiction will be triggered by the building of roads over a certain size, extending utility lines or other infrastructure, developing a reduced number of residential lots, and commercial development on a small number of lots – more than ½ acre or acre – whether or not the municipality has subdivision and zoning bylaws.		J. Fidel	This change suggests that Act 250 is triggered only when parcel is in a highest forest ranking block. This is suggested as a concept without the details – what are the parcels and who decides this? Other processes might identify most critical habitat.	Study Committee	Promotes forest health and integrity.
				S. Smith	This could be municipally driven, not state driven.	L. Leriche	Impact cannot be addressed without more detail.
1.20	Jamey Fidel VNRC	Adjust triggers prompted by the Number of Lots/Units to reduce the jurisdictional trigger to 3/6 lots located outside of a designated center.				Study Committee	Promotes forest health and integrity.

Act 171 Forest Integrity Study Committee Draft Summary of Potential Changes Presented on Oct. 18, 2016				Notes from November 18, 2016 Meeting			
Potential Changes to Act 250				Questions, Clarifications, and Potential Impacts to Changes to Act 250			
#	Contributor / Organization Name	Potential Change	Notes	Contributor	Clarifications, Questions	Contributor	Potential Impacts
1.21	Jamey Fidel VNRC	Repeal the Act 250 Utility Line Exemption . Go back to the historical standard of reviewing both the direct impacts of utility lines that are long enough to trigger Act 250 review, and the secondary impacts of utility line extensions (meaning the impacts of growth associated with the utility line). As part of the policy, ensure that landowners are co-applicants in the Act 250 process to share in the responsibility of reviewing the impacts of development that could result from utility line extensions.		J. Fidel	Utility lines in this context are associated with landowner development; that is, utility lines for individual homes.	Study Committee	Promotes forest health and integrity.
1.22	Agency of Natural Resources	Change Act 250 jurisdictional trigger for the subdivision of parcels situated in high ranking habitat blocks.				Study Committee	Regarding 1.22 - 1.24: Promotes forest health and integrity.
1.23	Agency of Natural Resources	Change Act 250 jurisdictional triggers based on the proposed depth of intrusion into high ranking blocks to encourage landowners to locate lots on the periphery of the block rather than the interior.				J. Wood	Direct disincentive to subdivide land.
1.24	Agency of Natural Resources	Consider other jurisdictional changes to Act 250 that enable the state to protect critical forest blocks					
Other potential changes				Other potential changes			
1.25	Bonnie Waninger VAPDA	Update Act 250 Definitions and Section 6086 to incorporate 2016 Chapter 117 changes to address undue impacts to forest blocks.				Study Committee	Promotes forest health and integrity.
						B. Waninger	Aligning definitions would provide clarity and consistency.
1.26	Lucy Leriche ACCD	Create a new committee of stakeholders to perform a complete review and modernization of existing jurisdictional thresholds and Act 250.		L. Leriche	This potential change examines where Act 250 and Chapter 117 intersect.	Study Committee	Promotes forest health and integrity.
1.27	Bonnie Waninger VAPDA	Strengthen ANR participation in Act 250 participation in support of forest integrity and habitat connectivity.				M. Snyder	VT F&W is highly involved; county foresters used to be involved.
						B. Waninger	This potential change should be reviewed by foresters.
1.28	Sam Lincoln Lincoln AgriSource, LLC and Lincoln Farm Timber Harvesting	Ensure that Forestry Operations continue to remain exempt from Act 250 oversight.		J. Wood	Change 'silviculture' to 'forestry operations' to align terms between Act 250 and Chapter 117.	Study Committee	Promotes forest health and integrity.
				S. Webster	Working with ANR would be a less formal and quicker process for small operations than working through Act 250 and the NRB.	P. Gill	Criteria right now that are evaluated under Act 250 may potentially not be evaluated by FPR.

Act 171 Forest Integrity Study Committee Draft Summary of Potential Changes Presented on Oct. 18, 2016				Notes from November 18, 2016 Meeting			
Potential Changes to Act 250				Questions, Clarifications, and Potential Impacts to Changes to Act 250			
#	Contributor / Organization Name	Potential Change	Notes	Contributor	Clarifications, Questions	Contributor	Potential Impacts
1.29	Steve Webster for Put Blodgett	Remove Act 250 jurisdiction of forestry operations over 2500' and move jurisdiction to Vermont Department of Forests, Parks and Recreation.				P. Gill	Removing them from Act 250 review may reduce the ability to evaluate impacts and/or have the landowner participate in review.
						P. Gill	Public process of Act 250 review may omitted.
1.30	Agency of Natural Resources	Develop services to assist forest product processing enterprises with the state and local permitting required to establish and expand their operations.		M. Snyder	Relax some forestry enterprises that support forest integrity.	Study Committee	Promotes forest health and integrity.
1.31	Agency of Natural Resources	Create expedited permitting processes or other changes to state and local land use permitting that enable forest product processing enterprises to locate and operate in rural locations that may not be appropriate for certain commercial activity, but are key for forest product enterprises given proximity to managed forest land.		M. Snyder	This potential change would promote forest integrity by working with forests and supporting the forest economy.	Study Committee	Promotes forest health and integrity.
				S. Smith	These concepts parallel many efforts in the Agency of Agriculture. The two agencies could benefit from collaboration.	B. Waninger	Creates inherent conflict with siting rules.
						D. Snelling	Help foresters' businesses grow where they need to but could be "pre-approval"; that is, these industries must still be exposed to appropriate review.
1.32	Sam Lincoln Lincoln AgriSource, LLC and Lincoln Farm Timber Harvesting	VFPA recommends that Local land use planning and Act 250 and/or 248 offer conditional exemptions for small to moderate sized operations (firewood processors, chipping and screening operations for fuelwood chips, pellet mills, sawmills, community scale cogeneration plants for district power and heating, etc) that purchase, process and otherwise utilize raw forest products. Reasonable limits to noise levels, dust and truck traffic could be established that exempt businesses from Act 250/248 review.			Not reviewed during November 18, 2016 meeting.		
1.33	Vermont Woodlands Association	Do not make incremental changes to Act 250.	Changes to Act 250 could undermine criterion 9(L) that directs new development to settled areas and reduces development in greenfields and forested areas.			M. Snyder	Regarding 1.29 - 1.31: This may miss an opportunity to make easy and helpful change.
1.34	Lucy Leriche ACCD	Do not make incremental changes to criterion 9(C).		L. Leriche	This could be folded into 1.26 (above).		
1.35	Karen Horn Vermont League of Cities & Towns	Do not make adjustments to Act 250.	Towns are already challenged, both financially and logistically, to meet obligations presented by legislation passed in the last biennium, specifically Acts 64, 171 and 174.				