

TO: Senate Committee on Natural Resources and Energy
FROM: Catherine Dimitruk, Vermont Association of Planning and Development Agencies
DATE: 4/1/2025
RE: Comments on H. 481 as passed the House

Section 1

(d) (2) Impact fees require a capital plan and are something that new development pays for. To make more municipalities eligible for this option it would be better to just say "...a municipality may assess fees..." and then delete "impact" from all future references to fees.

Section 2

RPCs support repealing the sunset of PTT clean water surcharge expiration.

Section 6

RPCs support grants or financing for towns that take on these permits. If the CWSPs are not the manager of these grants, it is important to include language requiring coordination with the CWSPs.

Section 7

(C) The RPCs do not support an ongoing specific set aside for this purpose and think the existing budget development and grant prioritization process is sufficient. RPCs do support the recommendation for a one-time allocation in Section 8.

Section 10

- RPCs think it is important for us to have a seat on this study committee to bring a regional perspective to the study of forming regional stormwater utilities. Appointment could be done by the Speaker, or Committee on Committees.

- Suggest the report be provided by November 15, 2026 to give time for bill drafting.

- In addition to examining the option of a regional stormwater utility, the study committee should:
 - Examine how to expand opportunities for natural resource based approaches and solutions for permit compliance, including allowing offsite natural resource based solutions in the same watershed.
 - Examine the jurisdiction of the 3-acre permit and priorities for compliance, including whether to only include properties that are hydrologically connected. ¹

¹ This is the process used for [Municipal Roads General Permit jurisdiction](#).