

1. Is there any value in requiring the District Commission to reconsider its own decision before allowing a party to appeal the matter? If so, what is the value? If not, why not?
2. Does the current process allow for enough public participation at the district commission level? At the Court level (on appeal)? If so, why? If not, why not? Do you have any recommended changes?
3. Does the current process allow for too much public participation at the district commission level? At the Court level (on appeal)? If so, why? If not, why not? Do you have any recommended changes?
4. Do you think the Act 250 appeals process that's in place now promotes the goals of Act 250 (as you see them)? Why or why not?
5. Do you believe Act 250 accommodates the public's participation sufficiently, or do you believe it should be easier or more difficult to participate before the District Commissions? What changes do you propose?
6. Do you think Vermont — thinking specifically about Act 250 — has become too burdensome in regulating development, or has become easier to obtain the necessary permits, over the past several years? Why and how would you address regulatory review
7. If a party (one that either supports or opposes a project) at the district commission is not pleased with a portion or the entire decision, what should the appeal process look like?
8. If you were involved in an Act 250 proceeding before a District Commission, and you disagreed with the ruling(s), would you favor an appeals process that went from the District Commission to a Court or an appeals process that went to an administrative tribunal? Why?
9. What is more important in the appeals process: consistency/predictability or a local control/case-by-case approach?
10. Who should have the right to weigh in on permit hearings/decisions, and at what stage of the process (initial permit decision, reconsideration, appeal)?
11. Have you been involved in an appeal of an Act 250 permit (or permit denial)?
 - If so, what was your role? What was the cost (in time and \$) to participate?
 - How did the appeal change the outcome (permit conditions added, deleted, modified; other changes to project)?

12. Do you believe Act 250 accommodates the public's participation sufficiently, or do you believe it should it be easier or more difficult to participate before the District Commissions? What changes would you propose?
13. Do you think it's too difficult to receive party status before an Act 250 Commission? Why?
14. If you were involved in an Act 250 proceeding before a District Commission, and you disagreed with the ruling(s), would you favor an appeals process that went from the District Commission to a Court or an appeals process that went to an administrative tribunal? Why?
15. Has Vermont outgrown Act 250? Have the rules and projects become so complicated that citizen commissions no longer can effectively regulate projects? Explain.
16. Do you favor having professionals from state agencies in charge of regulating all land development issues (as opposed to citizen commissions)? If so, what state agency(ies) should oversee development and should it/their decisions be subject to judicial review or be final without judicial review? Explain.
17. Do you think the Legislature should look more closely at regulating conflicts of interest of members of regulatory panels (both local and state)? How?
18. Do you think municipalities generally have the capability to replace Act 250 in regulating large-scale development within their municipality or are they influenced too much by tax revenues, local lobbying and conflicts of interest? Explain.