

REGULAR MEETING AGENDA



Wednesday, April 16, 2014, 6:00 pm

CCRPC Offices

110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT

CONSENT AGENDA

C.1 Minor TIP Amendments*

DELIBERATIVE AGENDA

1. Call to Order; Changes to the Agenda
2. Public Comment Period on Items NOT on the Agenda
3. Approve Minutes of March 19, 2014 Meeting* (Action; 5 min)
4. Approve Consent Agenda (MPO Business) * (Action; 5 min)
5. Town Plan Approvals
 - a. Burlington Municipal Development Plan Amendments (Action: 10 min.)
 - b. Colchester 2014 Town Plan (Action: 10 min.)
6. Board Development Committee - Nominating Charge (Chair Action: 5 min.)
7. Climate Action Guide Review and Approval (Action; 20 min)
8. Warn a public hearing for the FY15 Unified Planning Work Program & Budget (Action: 30 min)
9. Executive and MPO Directors' Updates (Information; 20 min)
 - a. Public Participation Plan
 - b. Legislative Update
10. Committee Reports, as needed, otherwise see attached (Information; 5 min)
 - a. Transportation Advisory Committee*
 - b. Finance Committee*
 - c. Executive Committee*
 - i. Act 250 Letters*
11. Members' Items, Other Business (Information; 5 min)
12. Adjourn

*Attachment

The April 16th Chittenden County RPC meeting will air on Saturday, May 3, 2014 at 8 p.m. and repeat on May 4, 2014 at 1am and 7am and available on the web at: <http://www.cctv.org/watch-tv/programs/chittenden-county-regional-planning-commission-39>

Upcoming Meetings - Unless otherwise noted, all meetings are held at our offices:

- Finance Committee, Wednesday, April 30, 2014; 5:45 p.m.
- Transportation Advisory Committee – Tuesday, May 6, 2014; 9:00 a.m.
- Executive Committee, Wednesday, May 7, 2014; 5:45 p.m.
- Public Participation Plan Committee – TBD
- Planning Advisory Committee (PAC), Wednesday, May 21, 2014; 2:30-4:30 p.m.
- CCRPC Board Meeting & Public Hearings - Wednesday, May 21, 2014; 6:00 p.m.

In accordance with provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, the CCRPC will ensure public meeting sites are accessible to all people. Requests for free interpretive or translation services, assistive devices, or other requested accommodations, should be made to Emma Long, CCRPC Title VI Coordinator, at 802-846-4490 ext 21 or elong@ccrpcvt.org, no later than 3 business days prior to the meeting for which services are requested.

Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission

April 16, 2014

Agenda Item C.1: Consent Item

FY2014 Transportation Improvement Minor Amendments

Issues:

Make the following change to the FY14 TIP:

Burlington Wayfinding Improvements (Project BP064, Amendment FY14-17).

- **Description of Change:** Advance \$300,000 in federal funds from FY13 to FY14.
- **Reason for Change:** Burlington received a Transportation, Community, and System Preservation (TCSP) grant for wayfinding improvements. The project did not advance in FY13. Burlington proposes to advance this project in FY14.

Pearl Street Improvements, Essex Junction (Project HP111, Amendment FY14-18).

- **Description of Change:** Increase preliminary engineering funding in FY14 from \$150,000 to \$200,000 in federal funds.
- **Reason for Change:** Inadequate funding was listed in the TIP for this Phase II Circ Alternative project. This project is not subject to CCRPC's fiscal constraint limit.

TAC

Recommendation:

Recommend that the Commission approve the proposed TIP amendments.

Staff

Recommendation:

Recommend that the TAC approve the proposed TIP amendments.

**For more
information
contact:**

Christine Forde
cforde@ccrpevt.org or 846-4490 ext. 13

1 **Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission**
2 **Regular Meeting Minutes**
3 **DRAFT**

4 **Date:** Wednesday, March 19, 2014

5 **Time:** 6:00 p.m.

6 **Place:** CCRPC Offices; 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT 05404

7 **Members:**

8 Bolton, Joss Besse	20 St. George, Debra Kobus
9 Buels Gore, Absent	21 Shelburne, John Zicconi
10 Burlington, Andy Montroll	22 S. Burlington, Sandy Dooley
11 Charlotte, Jim Donovan	23 Underhill, Brian Bigelow
12 Colchester, Marc Landry	24 Westford, Dave Tilton
13 Essex, Irene Wrenner, Alternate	25 Williston, Chris Roy
14 Essex Junction, Dan Kerin	26 Winooski, Mike O'Brien
15 Hinesburg, Andrea Morgante	27 VTrans, Amy Bell
16 Huntington, Barbara Elliott	28 Socio/Econ/Housing, Absent
17 Jericho, Catherine McMains	29 Conservation/Environment, Don Meals
18 Milton, Lou Mossey	30 Industrial/Business, Tim Baechle
19 Richmond, Absent	31 Agriculture, No Representative

32
33 **Ex-Officio (non-voting):**

34 Burlington Int'l Airport, Absent	37 FTA, Absent
35 CCTA, Absent	38 Railroad Industry, Absent
36 FHWA, Chris Jolly	

39 **Others:**

40 Jim Dumont, Strathmore Homeowners	44 Diane Meyerhoff, Third Sector Assoc.
41 Tom Papp, Strathmore Homeowners	45 Scott Moody, CCTV
42 Miles White, Stormwater	46 Infinite Culcleasure, Burl. Alternate
43 Matthew Langham, VTrans (policy& Plan.)	

47 **Staff:**

48 Charlie Baker, Executive Director	53 Christine Forde, Senior Trans. Planner
49 Michele Boomhower, Asst/MPO Director	54 Emma Long, Communication Manager
50 Jason Charest, Sr. Trans. Planning Engineer	55 Regina Mahony, Senior Planner
51 Chris Dubin, Transportation Planner	56 Sai Sarepalli, Trans. Planning Engineer
52 Bernadette Ferenc, Trans. Business Mgr.	

57
58 **1. Call to Order & Changes to the Agenda**

59 The meeting was called to order at 6:03PM by the Chair, Lou Mossey.

60
61 **2. Public Comment Period on Items NOT on the Agenda**

62 Tom Papp, President of the Strathmore Homeowners Association in Burlington, spoke regarding a
63 Section 248 application expected to be heard before the Public Service Board (PSB). South 40 Solar LLC
64 is proposing a solar generating facility on a 40 acre site on Sunset Cliff Road. The Strathmore
65 Homeowners Association represents residents that are downstream of the proposed development.
66 The Association has petitioned the PSB for additional information regarding stormwater impacts
67 because their requests have gone unanswered by the developer. The Association urged the CCRPC to
68 oppose the project until more information is forthcoming. Lou Mossey thanked Mr. Papp for bringing
69 their concerns to our attention and responded that the CCRPC Executive Committee will review the
70 proposal when it is submitted and will take the Association's comments under advisement.

1 Don Meals is reviewing the solar farm project as a member of the Burlington Conservation Board. He
2 requested that the Executive Committee hear from the applicant as well as the opposition before they
3 make a decision.
4

5 **3. Approve Minutes of January 15, 2014 Meeting**

6 ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION, DULY SECONDED BY JIM DONOVAN, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES
7 OF JANUARY 15, 2014. During discussion, Jim Donovan noted that the budget approval at the last
8 meeting included a reduction in funding for one of his projects. The reduction would have been greater
9 if there had been an increase in the fee; he voted to increase the fee. He is willing to change his vote to
10 an abstention if that is appropriate. Lou Mossey suggested that this possible conflict be noted in the
11 meeting current minutes. Andrea Morgante suggested that in the future VTrans personnel be
12 identified by the division in which they work. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH FIVE
13 ABSTENTIONS FROM DAVE TILTON, DON MEALS, CATHERINE MCMAINS, DAN KERIN, AND DEBRA
14 KOBUS.
15

16 **4. Approve Consent Agenda (MPO Business)**

17 JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, DULY SECONDED BY JIM DONOVAN, TO APPROVE THE CONSENT
18 AGENDA FOR MINOR AMENDMENTS TO THE FY2014 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.
19 THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
20

21 **5. Appointment of Business/Industry Alternate Representative to CCRPC Board**

22 JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, DULY SECONDED BY TIM BAECHLE, TO APPOINT KATIE TAYLOR AS
23 THE ALTERNATE FOR THE BUSINESS/INDUSTRY SEAT ON THE BOARD. THE MOTION CARRIED
24 UNANIMOUSLY.
25

26 **6. Approve Amended Urbanized Area Boundary (MPO Business)**

27 Jason Charest of the CCRPC staff explained that the urbanized area boundary should be approved by
28 the CCRPC Board after the 2010 Census. Staff has undertaken a Federal Highway Administration
29 (FHWA) process to classify roadways as either urban or rural. Jason presented the new map and staff
30 recommendations. The changes will not affect eligibility for roads on the Federal Aid System and may
31 allow the county to take advantage of future funding opportunities. Jason explained that VTrans has
32 been working with Northwest Regional Planning regarding adding Georgia to the Milton cluster. The
33 Board is not being asked to approve this change. ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION, DULY SECONDED
34 BY JIM DONOVAN, TO APPROVE THE DRAFT ADJUSTED URBAN AREA BOUNDARY MAP. THE MOTION
35 CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
36

37 **7. Project Prioritization (MPO Business)**

38 Christine Forde made a presentation about project prioritization for the FY2016 Capital Program.
39 Projects need to be included in both the Capital Plan and the Transportation Improvement Program
40 (TIP) in order to spend transportation funds in the County. The Capital Program includes the following
41 project phases: Candidate List, Development & Evaluation, and "Front of the Book" projects. The
42 prioritization methodology is developed cooperatively by VTrans and the Regional Planning
43 Commissions. The rating system includes both asset management factors and the functional
44 importance of the improvement.
45

46 Andrea Morgante asked if the bridge methodology includes things like fluvial erosion and aquatic
47 organism passage. Christine responded that these are considered as part of the bridge sufficiency

1 rating. Lou Mossey asked if Tax Increment Finance (TIF) districts are given consideration in the rating
2 system; Christine doesn't believe so.

3
4 JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, DULY SECONDED BY CATHERINE MCMAINS, TO ACCEPT THE 2016
5 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIZATION SCORES AS PRESENTED BY STAFF. THE MOTION CARRIED
6 UNANIMOUSLY.

7 8 **8. Climate Action Guide Presentation**

9 Melanie Needle of the CCRPC staff made a presentation about the Climate Action Guide. Catherine
10 McMains congratulated staff for completing the draft guide. Melanie explained the purpose of the
11 Guide is to establish a common understanding of the potential regional impacts of climate change,
12 identify priority strategies and actions that the CCRPC can do to mitigate or adapt to climate change,
13 and provide guidance to individuals, employers, and municipalities.

14
15 The Guide reflects the efforts of two advisory committees; each committee included local and state
16 experts on climate change, adaptation, transportation, land use, government, public health, business,
17 and energy. The work on this document began in early 2012 and was ongoing during the development
18 of the ECOS Plan. The Guide includes a greenhouse gas inventory which contains available emissions
19 data from heating, wastewater, electricity, transportation, solid waste, and their emission profile.
20 Additional guidance is provided for individuals, municipalities, and employers for climate action. The
21 Vermontivate ("a game of change") is part of the promotional events for the plan.

22
23 Chris Roy asked that the data be as current as possible in the Guide. John Zicconi believes that the "no
24 net loss" of the vegetative landscape is impossible and is a no growth statement. This was discussed
25 extensively as part of the ECOS project. He would also like to see the document discuss technology as a
26 means to address climate change.

27
28 Charlie Baker reminded members that the Guide is a product of the advisory committee, not CCRPC
29 staff. He suggested that members provide comments and feedback to Melanie by April 4th. She will
30 provide a new draft with track changes and a list of items that need further discussion at the April
31 Board meeting. The Board can accept the document at a future meeting.

32 33 **9. Proposed CCRPC Bylaw Amendments**

34 The proposed Bylaw Amendments have been reviewed by the Executive and Board Development
35 Committees. They recommend the Board warn a public hearing on May 21, 2014, to include notice to
36 all municipalities for at least 30 days.

37
38 MARC LANDRY MADE A MOTION, DULY SECONDED BY CATHERINE MCMAINS, TO WARN PUBLIC
39 HEARING ON MAY 21, 2014 TO DISCUSS PROPOSED BYLAW AMENDMENTS. During discussion, Marc
40 Landry explained that the committee addressed three areas of the bylaws: housekeeping items,
41 representation, and hiring of the Executive Director by the Board. THE MOTION CARRIED
42 UNANIMOUSLY.

43 **10. Executive and MPO Directors' Updates**

44 *10a) Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)* – Michele Boomhower reported that recommendations
45 for work program activities and a proposed budget is expected next month. Most of the work program
46 requests will be accommodated.

1 10b) *Public Participation Plan* – Debbie Ingram continues to chair this committee and a draft is being
2 prepared.

3
4 10c) *Act 250 Letters* - 1) City of Burlington Dept. of Parks & Recreation, Waterfront Park; 2) Waldorf
5 School Expansion, Shelburne; 3) Green Mountain Power Corp./Vermont Electric Power Company, Inc.
6 Transmission Line, Milton, Georgia, E. Fairfax (Included in the Board Packet)

7
8 10d) *Legislative Update* – Charlie reported that the Shoreline bill is going to conference committee.
9 There are two growth center bills and a transportation proportional share bill under consideration. The
10 energy siting bill is not likely to move forward. A water quality bill is moving through the House, but the
11 Administration is reluctant to move forward without EPA approval of the TMDL. Charlie suggested we
12 invite DEC Commissioner Mears to discuss this at a future meeting. Charlie would like to see better
13 coordination between state watershed basin plans and regional and municipal plans. The CIRC
14 Alternatives projects are included in the House’s Capital Program. Andrea Morgante suggested that the
15 Board should consider discussion about the legislation sunseting on cell tower siting being solely a
16 Public Service Board decision, exempt from municipal permitting.

17
18 **11. Committee Reports.** These were included in the meeting packet.

19
20 **12. Members Items & Other Business.** There were none.

21
22 **13. Adjourn**

23 JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, DULY SECONDED BY DON MEALS, TO ADJOURN AT 7:55PM. THE
24 MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

25
26 Respectfully submitted,
27 Diane Meyerhoff
28

Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission

April 16, 2014

Agenda Item 5a: Burlington Municipal Development Plan Amendment
Approval and Confirmation

Issues: The Town of Burlington has requested, per Title 24 V.S.A §4350, that the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (1) approve its Municipal Development Plan amendment; and (2) confirm its planning process. This amendment includes five updated chapters (Introduction, Land Use, Energy, Natural Environment, and Relationship to Other Plans), as well as two separate supplements that will be adopted by reference into the Plan (2013 Climate Action Plan, and 2013 Open Space Protection Plan). Attached is the proposed Resolution of approval and the staff report to the Planning Advisory Committee. The City Council adopted this Municipal Development Plan amendment on March 31, 2014. The final version adopted by the City Council is the exact same version that the PAC reviewed and recommended for approval.

Please note that municipal planning process confirmation and plan approval decisions shall be made by majority vote of the commissioners representing municipalities, in accordance with the bylaws of the CCRPC and Title 24 V.S.A. § 4350(f).

**Planning Advisory
Committee
Recommendation:**

The Planning Advisory Committee held a public hearing on November 20, 2013 at 3:10 pm at the CCRPC Offices and made the following motion: “to recommend that the CCRPC Board approve the City of Burlington’s Plan Amendments and supplements, and overall Municipal Development Plan, as currently presented (last approved by the CCRPC on March 20, 2013); and reconfirm the City of Burlington’s planning process. Upon the City informing CCRPC Staff that the adoption process has been completed, Staff will review any changes in the Plan Amendments and supplements to determine if they should be reviewed by the PAC a second time, or if appropriate, submit these documents to the CCRPC Board for approval and confirmation.”

**Executive
Committee
Recommendation:**

NA

**Staff
Recommendation:**

Staff recommends that the CCRPC Board approve Burlington’s Municipal Development Plan and confirm the Town of Burlington’s planning process in accordance with the attached resolution.

**For more
information
contact:**

Lee Krohn, Senior Planner
802-846-4490 x30; lkrohn@ccrpcvt.org

Regina Mahony, Senior Planner
802-846-4490 x28; rmahony@ccrpcvt.org

**Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC)
Resolution**

Burlington Municipal Development Plan Amendment & Planning Process

WHEREAS, Title 24, V.S.A. § 4350 in part requires that CCRPC shall review the municipal planning process of our member municipalities including review of plans; that each review shall include a public hearing which is noticed as provided in 24 V.S.A. § 4350(b); and that before approving a plan the Commission shall find that it:

1. is consistent with the goals established in Section 4302 of this title;
2. is compatible with its Regional Plan;
3. is compatible with approved plans of other municipalities in the region;
4. contains all the elements included in § 4382(a)(1)-(11) of this Title.

WHEREAS, the CCRPC at its May 22, 2013 meeting approved the *Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans* dealing with local plans and CCRPC action; and

WHEREAS, The City of Burlington, Vermont is a member municipality of this Commission; and

WHEREAS, The City of Burlington formally requested CCRPC to approve the *2014 Municipal Development Plan (MDP)* and confirm its planning process; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Advisory Committee reviewed the amendments to the *MDP* and planning process; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Advisory Committee held a warned public hearing at the CCRPC, located at 101 W. Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, Vermont on November 20, 2013 at 3:10 PM, reviewed the records and recommends that the Commission approve Burlington's *MDP* as meeting the requirements of 24 V.S.A. § 4350, the *Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans*, and confirms the community's planning process as consistent with Title 24, Chapter 117; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Advisory Committee further motioned that upon the municipality informing CCRPC Staff that the Selectboard has completed their adoption process, Staff will review any changes in the Plan amendment, determine if the Plan amendment should be reviewed by the Planning Advisory Committee a second time, or if appropriate submit the Plan amendment to the CCRPC Board for approval and confirmation; and

WHEREAS, The City of Burlington's City Council adopted the *2014 Municipal Development Plan (MDP)* on March 31, 2014 with no revisions.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION, that, in compliance with 24 V.S.A. § 4350 and the *Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans*, CCRPC approves Burlington's *MDP* and the Commission finds that said *MDP*:

1. is consistent with the goals established in Section 4302 of Title 24;
2. is compatible with the *2013 Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the ECOS Plan*, adopted June 19, 2013;
3. is compatible with the approved plans from other adjacent Chittenden County municipalities; and
4. contains all the elements included in § 4382(a)(1)-(11) and/or is making substantial progress toward attainment of the elements of this subsection;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION, that, in compliance with 24 V.S.A. § 4350 and the *Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans*, CCRPC confirms the City of Burlington's municipal planning process.

Dated at Winooski, this 16th day of April, 2014.

CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

Lou Mossey, Chair

Staff Review of Burlington Municipal Development Plan Amendments

Lee Krohn, AICP, CCRPC Senior Planner

October 31, 2013

The City of Burlington has requested, per 24 V.S.A §4350, that the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission reapprove its Municipal Development Plan in its entirety, including five updated chapters (Introduction, Land Use, Energy, Natural Environment, and Relationship to Other Plans), as well as two separate supplements that will be adopted by reference into the Plan (2013 Climate Action Plan, and 2013 Open Space Protection Plan). As a part of this comprehensive submittal, the City has also included a summary of financial resources it has committed to local and regional planning over the past five years, as well as a spreadsheet demonstrating how this Plan satisfies state planning goals and statutory requirements. This is all part of the City's new approach to continuously updating sections of its Plan or supplements, rather than seeking to do it all at once on the statutory five year cycle. The Plan adoption process is underway, with a Planning Commission hearing tentatively slated for late fall of this year.

Following the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission's (CCRPC's) *Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans (2013)* and the statutory requirements of 24 V.S.A. Chapter 117, I have reviewed these proposed Plan Amendments and supplements to determine whether they are:

- Consistent with the general goals of §4302;
- Consistent with the specific goals of §4302;
- Contains the required elements of §4382;
- Compatible with the 2013 Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the *2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan* (per §4350); and
- Compatible with approved plans of other municipalities (per §4350).

Additionally, I have reviewed the planning process requirements of §4350.

Staff Review Findings and Comments

1. As previously approved and updated here, Burlington's Plan Amendments and supplements are consistent with all of the general goals of §4302. See the completed Appendix A submittal that describes how the proposed amendments are consistent with these goals.
2. As previously approved and updated here, Burlington's Plan Amendments and supplements are consistent with the specific goals of §4302. See the completed Appendix A submittal that describes how the proposed amendments are consistent with these goals.
3. As previously approved and updated here, Burlington's Plan Amendments and supplements include the required elements of §4382. See the completed Appendix A submittal that describes the location of the elements associated with the proposed amendments.
4. Burlington's Plan Amendments and supplements are generally compatible with the planning areas, goals and strategies of the 2013 Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the *2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan*.

CCRPC Staff & PAC Review – City of Burlington Municipal Development Plan Amendments
November 20, 2013 PAC Meeting

5. Burlington's Plan Amendments and supplements are compatible with the municipal plans for South Burlington, Colchester, and Winooski. Indeed, Burlington's amendments specifically reference its adjoining communities, and the need to collaborate on issues of shared concern such as traffic and transportation.
6. Burlington clearly has a planning process in place that is likely to result in an approved plan. The approach chosen is perhaps unique in Vermont, but likely useful and productive for the state's largest city... the concept being one of continuous review and improvement of individual chapters or related supplements, rather than tackling the entire Plan in one gigantic exercise. In this request, the City seeks both approval of the specific updated sections, as well as reapproval of the Plan as a whole. If CCRPC approved Burlington's overall Plan before, then there should be no reason not to do so again. The new sections all demonstrate a clear, comprehensive, and exhaustive planning process and outcomes looking forward as planning tools. Further, as shown in its cover letter, Burlington has provided consistent and significant funding for municipal and regional planning for the past five years.
7. Additional Comments/Questions:

We note that Chapter II, Natural Environment, includes new sections on Floodplains and Fluvial Erosion Hazard Areas. That said, these are primarily factual statements, and it is likely that these sections will need to be expanded and amplified in the future in order to satisfy the new statutory requirement to address flood resiliency (statute becomes effective on July 1, 2014).

With these comments above, staff does not find that any amendments are needed at this time for approval and confirmation of the process by the CCRPC. However, the following minor edits are recommended:

Climate Action Plan:

- P. 12, top section/goal, last point: change "predicable" to predictable
- P. 14, last paragraph, third line: change "expansive" to expensive
- P. 16, first paragraph, first line: change "it's" to its
- P. 17, box @ bottom of page: finish the statement "Optimize the Joseph C. McNeil..."

Land Use Plan:

- P. I-9, first paragraph under Open Space Protection, last sentence... closes awkwardly. Perhaps change to "This is a fact that Burlington clearly recognizes, and from which it has long benefited."

Natural Environment:

- P. II-11: Third paragraph, last line about flood hazard areas: should this sentence be moved to the paragraph above, or be its own separate paragraph along with the last line on the page? It doesn't seem to fit in the paragraph about floodways, when the paragraph above talks about flood hazard areas...

Energy Plan:

- Page VIII-2: Third paragraph, third line: change "hearing" to heating
- Page VIII-5, et al: should references to BED, GMCW, and Winooski One all be updated to be current? Georgia Wind is online; did BED buy Winooski One; did the VEPP contract get renewed or extended? Same question with reference to AMI deployment on page VIII-6.

Relationship to Other Plans:

**CCRPC Staff & PAC Review – City of Burlington Municipal Development Plan Amendments
November 20, 2013 PAC Meeting**

Page 3, first paragraph: change “complimentary” to complementary

Proposed Motion & Next Steps:

PROPOSED MOTION: The PAC recommends that the CCRPC Board approve the City of Burlington’s Plan Amendments and supplements, and overall Municipal Development Plan, as currently presented; and reconfirm the City of Burlington’s planning process.

Upon the City informing CCRPC Staff that the adoption process has been completed, Staff will review any changes in the Plan Amendments and supplements to determine if they should be reviewed by the PAC a second time, or if appropriate, submit these documents to the CCRPC Board for approval and confirmation.

Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission April 16, 2014

Agenda Item 5b: Colchester Town Plan Update Approval and Confirmation

Issues: The Town of Colchester has requested, per Title 24 V.S.A §4350, that the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (1) approve its Town Plan update; and (2) confirm its planning process. This is a complete update of the Town Plan. Attached is the proposed Resolution of approval and the staff report to the Planning Advisory Committee. The Town of Colchester Selectboard adopted this Town Plan update on April 8, 2014. The final version adopted by the Selectboard has a few changes from the version that the PAC reviewed and recommended for approval, including:

1. Recommendations listed in the PAC memo have been made.
2. The vision statement and goals of the Heritage Plan were added to the Town Plan's prologue. Previously the Heritage Plan was referenced, therefore this is not new information just a clarification.
3. Residential uses were identified as a potential long-term consideration in the Exit 16 area, however the version of the Plan that the PAC reviewed included a limiter that residential would not be considered within the Plan's timeframe. This limiter has been removed in the final Plan, though the long-term intent is no different. The intent is for Water Tower Hill, which is designated as a Metro Planning Area in the ECOS Plan and is appropriate for mixed-use residential.
4. The Plan clarifies some challenges the Town is having regarding protection of sandplain habitats (the Town does not necessarily support the State's protection of these areas), however the policy statement remains the same: "The Town will continue to work with State agencies to determine suitable alternatives for sandplain areas."
5. The actual student enrollments for 2013-14 was added.
6. Several other minor word changes were made including references to the circ alternatives project, construction of the Severance Corners intersection in 2015, the pedestrian crossing on Route 15, Fletcher Allen at Fanny Allen's campus, removal of the reference to circ highway right of way acquisition in the Bean Road area, the amount of land area restricted by natural resources was added to the Natural Resources chapter, the year for Brookside and reference to Winchester Place was added to the Housing Chapter, reference to the Exit 17 rebuild and a public transportation link to the growth center designation was added to the Transportation Chapter, clarifications were made in the Utilities and Facilities chapter, and Appendix A was corrected to read "accept" instead of "approved".

Considering the relatively minor nature of these edits, and none that would result in a different PAC recommendation, Staff is recommending approval by the CCRPC Board at this time.

Please note that municipal planning process confirmation and plan approval decisions shall be made by majority vote of the commissioners representing

municipalities, in accordance with the bylaws of the CCRPC and Title 24 V.S.A. § 4350(f).

**Planning Advisory
Committee
Recommendation:**

The Planning Advisory Committee held a public hearing on January 8, 2014 at 3:40 pm at the CCRPC Offices and made the following motion: “The PAC finds that the draft 2014 Colchester Town Plan, as submitted, meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC approval, and that the municipality's planning process meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC confirmation. Upon notification that the Plan has been adopted by the municipality, CCRPC staff will review the plan, and any information relevant to the confirmation process, for changes. If staff determines that changes are substantive, those changes will be forwarded to the PAC for review. Otherwise the PAC recommends that the Plan, and the municipal planning process, should be forwarded to the CCRPC Board for approval.”

**Executive
Committee
Recommendation:**

NA

**Staff
Recommendation:**

Staff recommends that the CCRPC Board approve Colchester’s Town Plan and confirm the Town of Colchester’s planning process in accordance with the attached resolution.

**For more
information
contact:**

Regina Mahony, Senior Planner
802-846-4490 x28; rmahony@ccrpcvt.org

Staff Review of the 2014 Colchester Town Plan
Regina Mahony, CCRPC Senior Planner
January 8, 2014

The Town of Colchester has requested, per 24 V.S.A §4350, that the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (1) approve its 2014 Town Plan; and (2) confirm its planning process.

This draft 2014 Town Plan is a complete update of the Colchester Town Plan. The CCRPC re-approved Colchester's 2007 Plan on June 20, 2012 as a temporary measure until this Plan update could be completed. At that time most of this Plan update was complete, however the Economic Development Action Plan – now incorporated by reference as the Economic Development Element – was not. The Colchester Planning Commission will hold their first public hearing on this new Plan on January 7, 2014. CCRPC Staff provided the Planning Commission comments for their hearing.

Following the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission's (CCRPC's) *Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans (2013)* and the statutory requirements of 24 V.S.A. Chapter 117, I have reviewed the draft 2014 Colchester Town Plan to determine whether it is:

- Consistent with the general goals of §4302;
- Consistent with the specific goals of §4302;
- Contains the required elements of §4382;
- Compatible with the 2013 Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the *2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan* (per §4350); and
- Compatible with approved plans of other municipalities (per §4350).

Additionally, I have reviewed the planning process requirements of §4350.

Staff Review Findings and Comments

1. The 2014 Colchester Town Plan is consistent with all of the general goals of §4302. See the attached Appendix A, completed by Colchester Staff and reviewed by CCRPC Staff, which describes how the Plan is consistent with these goals.
2. The 2014 Colchester Town Plan is consistent with the specific goals of §4302. See the attached Appendix A, completed by Colchester Staff and reviewed by CCRPC Staff, which describes how the Plan is consistent with these goals.
 - a. While childcare facilities are mapped on Map 14, and described as a weakness in the Economic Development Action Plan (incorporated by reference into the Town Plan), there is little other information or discussion about childcare in the Plan. It is recommended that the Plan include further discussion – in particular how the Town intends to address a lack of child care services. However, child care is a goal and not an element. CCRPC is responsible for determining if the Plan is consistent with the child care goal, as opposed to determining if the Plan contains a certain element. CCRPC Staff finds that the proposed Town Plan is not in-consistent with this goal, however the next Plan update should contain further information.

CCRPC Formal Staff & PAC Review – 2014 Colchester Town Plan

January 15, 2014 PAC Meeting

- b. While the Flood Resiliency goal is not effective until July 1, 2014, CCRPC Staff finds that this new Town Plan includes a flood resiliency element that is consistent with the new flood resiliency goal.
3. The 2014 Colchester Town Plan contains the required elements of §4382. See the attached Appendix A, completed by Colchester Staff and reviewed by CCRPC Staff, which describes compliance with these required elements. While the Flood Resiliency element is not a requirement until July 1, 2014, CCRPC Staff finds that this new Town Plan includes a flood resiliency element. Map 12 has been updated to include both the stream buffer and the Fluvial Erosion Hazard areas, which helps satisfy this new element.
4. The 2014 Colchester Town Plan is generally compatible with the planning areas, goals and strategies of the 2013 Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the *2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan*.
5. The 2014 Colchester Town Plan is compatible with the municipal plans for South Hero, Milton, Westford, Essex Town, South Burlington, Winooski and Burlington.
6. Colchester has a planning process in place that is likely to result in an approved plan. In addition Colchester has provided information about their planning budget and CCRPC finds that Colchester is maintaining its efforts to provide local funds for municipal and regional planning.

Additional Comments/Questions:

While, Staff does not find that any amendments are necessary for approval and confirmation of the process by the CCRPC, the following minor edits are recommended at this time:

1. While the Circumferential Highway has been updated in most places there are a few locations where minor edits are recommended:
 - a. Page 10, paragraph 2 – remove Circumferential Highway from sentence 1, and future interchange from sentence 2.
 - b. Page 19, paragraph 1 – remove Circumferential Highway.
 - c. Page 19, Policy #1 – consider editing current state of Circumferential Highway as described in Policy #5 on page 18.
 - d. Page 97, last paragraph – consider replacing “Circumferential Highway” with “CIRC Alternatives”.
 - e. with similar language describing
2. Page 41 & 42 – The streambank buffer is described differently in the Flood Resiliency section and the Watercourse section. I’m not sure if this is indeed referring to two different regulations or if an inconsistency should be corrected.
3. Page 77, paragraph 1 – Consider updating with a sentence about the new bus service – a sentence could be copied from discussion on page 82.
4. The following minor typos were found:
 - a. Table of Contents – Chapter 4 should read “Natural” instead of “New”.
 - b. Page 9 – Format of Business Use title should be addressed.
 - c. Page 12, Policy #3 – Change MPO to RPC.
 - d. Page 19 – There is no map for the Town Services Center.
 - e. Page 29, paragraph 1 – the font of the word “potable” should be addressed.
 - f. Page 39, paragraph 2 – Is the date associated with microbial source tracking investigation correct?
 - g. Page 62, paragraph 2 – I believe an edit is needed to describe the number of births and number of students enrolled.

CCRPC Formal Staff & PAC Review – 2014 Colchester Town Plan

January 15, 2014 PAC Meeting

- h. Page 76, paragraph 3 – describe Route 2 with numeral.
- i. Page 77, paragraph 2 – the sentence that begins with “This Task Force...” and the sentence after it both have some typos that need correcting.
- j. Page 82, paragraph 2 – remove extra space.
- k. Page 84, Policy 27 – consider spelling out “ITS”.
- l. Page 90, paragraph 2 – there are a number of typos in the discussion of the Integrated Water Resources Management Plan.
- m. Page 96, paragraph 2 – change MPO to RPC (in two places).

Proposed Motion & Next Steps:

PROPOSED MOTION: The PAC finds that the draft 2014 Colchester Town Plan, as submitted, meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC approval, and that the municipality's planning process meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC confirmation.

Upon notification that the Plan has been adopted by the municipality, CCRPC staff will review the plan, and any information relevant to the confirmation process, for changes. If staff determines that changes are substantive, those changes will be forwarded to the PAC for review. Otherwise the PAC recommends that the Plan, and the municipal planning process, should be forwarded to the CCRPC Board for approval.

**Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC)
Resolution**

Colchester's Town Plan Amendment & Planning Process

WHEREAS, Title 24, V.S.A. § 4350 in part requires that CCRPC shall review the municipal planning process of our member municipalities including review of plans; that each review shall include a public hearing which is noticed as provided in 24 V.S.A. § 4350(b); and that before approving a plan the Commission shall find that it:

1. is consistent with the goals established in Section 4302 of this title;
2. is compatible with its Regional Plan;
3. is compatible with approved plans of other municipalities in the region;
4. contains all the elements included in § 4382(a)(1)(10) of this Title.

WHEREAS, the CCRPC at its May 22, 2013 meeting approved the *CCRPC Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans* dealing with local plans and CCRPC action; and

WHEREAS, The Town of Colchester, Vermont is a member municipality of this Commission; and

WHEREAS, The Town of Colchester formally requested CCRPC to approve its Town Plan amendment and confirm its planning process; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Advisory Committee reviewed the Town Plan amendment and planning process; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Advisory Committee held a warned public hearing at the CCRPC, located at 101 W. Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, Vermont on January 15, 2014 at 3:40 PM, reviewed the records and recommended that, upon Selectboard adoption, the Commission approve Colchester's Town Plan amendment as meeting the requirements of 24 V.S.A. § 4350 and the *Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans* and confirms the community's planning process as consistent with Title 24, Chapter 117; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Advisory Committee further motioned that upon the municipality informing CCRPC Staff that the Selectboard has completed their adoption process, Staff will review any changes in the Plan amendment, determine if the Plan amendment should be reviewed by the Planning Advisory Committee a second time, or if appropriate submit the Plan amendment to the CCRPC Board for approval and confirmation; and

WHEREAS, The Town of Colchester's Selectboard adopted the 2014 Town Plan on April 8, 2014 with minor revisions.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION, that, in compliance with 24 V.S.A. § 4350 and the *Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans*, CCRPC approves Colchester's Town Plan amendment and the Commission finds that said Town Plan:

1. is consistent with the goals established in Section 4302 of Title 24;
2. is compatible with the 2013 *Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the ECOS Plan*, adopted June 19, 2013;
3. is compatible with the approved plans from other Chittenden County municipalities; and
4. contains all the elements included in § 4382(a)(1)-(12) and/or is making substantial progress toward attainment of the elements of this subsection;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION, that, in compliance with 24 V.S.A. § 4350 and the *Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans*, CCRPC confirms the Town of Colchester's municipal planning process.

Dated at Winooski, this 16th day of April, 2014.

CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

Lou Mossey, Chair

Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission

April 16, 2014

Agenda Item 7

Draft Climate Action Guide Comments

Issues:

The following edits and comments have been made on the draft Climate Action Guide since the January 2014 version that was provided to you in your March 19th meeting packet:

1. Pg. i- deleted the sentence saying that snow amounts are decreasing and rain is increasing, replaced it with a statement that conditions this as a situation projected to happen over the next century.
2. Pg. ii- provided background information on supporting the claim that agricultural lands do sequester carbon.
3. Pg.ii-expanded Priority strategy 6.1 to include the health impacts of extreme weather events
4. Pg. 1- added a sentence describing that the guide is not intended to be used in development review
5. Pg. 2-more current data for Figure 3 was not found.
6. Pg.2- updated The United Nation's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate observation about climate change
7. Pg. 4 – a few typos were fixed
8. Pg.3-added a citation for the source of the data on projected number of days over 90F.
<http://www.climatechoices.org/assets/documents/climatechoices/confronting-climate-change-in-the-u-s-northeast.pdf>
9. Pg.3-update Figure 4 with the most current data available
10. Pg. 9 – deleted reference to the uncertainty of Vermont Yankee
11. Pg.9-provided a comment about how the ECOS Plan supports maintaining vegetated land for carbon sequestration purposes
12. Pg.9-added a statement about the high sequestration rate of wetlands and the importance of protection
13. Pg. 10- added “fuel efficiency of our vehicles” to the paragraph describing priority strategy 1
14. Pg-14-deleted “consider re-establishing passenger rail service” under action 1.1 and added reference the ECOS Plan when the Metropolitan Plan is discussed
15. Pg. 14- clarified that a municipality can encourage an employer to participate in a transportation demand management program and that it is not something a town can require an employer to do.
16. Pg. 15- added a statement about future rail passenger service
17. Pg.17- deleted form-based code from the list of tools a municipality can implement to reduce energy use from land-use/transportation.
18. Pg.18- emphasized that the protection of wetlands, forest, and agricultural lands is an important part of enhancing natural sinks of ghg emissions.
19. Pg.18 -typo fixed
20. Pg. 20- expanded discussion of health impacts of more frequent and severe storm events
21. Pg.22- clarified that we do monitor VMT per capita
22. Pg. B-3 footnote moved from text to table
23. Pg. C-8 added language about the benefit of biomass heating
24. Pg.E-9 added language about variable frequency drive pumps for wastewater treatment plants to install as an energy efficiency action

Staff Recommendation: Please [click here](#) to review the draft Climate Action Guide. The version with tracked changes shows the comments received as of April 4th, 2014 and the proposed changes made to address these comments.

For more information contact:

Melanie Needle, Senior Planner 802-846-4490 x 27 mneedle@ccrpcvt.org



CCRPC Board Meeting

April 16, 2014

Agenda Item 8: Action Item: Warn a Public Hearing for May 21, 2014

Item: FY15 Unified Planning Work Program & Budget

Each year the CCRPC undertakes the development and implementation of a Unified Planning Work Program.

The Board of Directors of the CCRPC has established a Committee process for the development of the UPWP. The Committee members appointed by the Chair consisted of the following members:

Board Representation

Andy Montroll, Chair
John Zicconi
Andrea Morgante
Barbara Elliott
Joss Besse (PAC)
Amy Bell - VTrans

TAC & PAC Representation

Ken Beliveau (PAC)
Roger Hunt (TAC)
Justin Rabidoux (TAC)
Ex-Officio
Chris Jolly – USDOT, FHWA
Meredith Birkett – CCTA

UPWP Committee meetings were held on the following dates: January 30th, February 20th, March 25th. The Committee voted on March 25th to advance the draft document and budget to the Executive Committee for consideration and advancement to the Board.

The Finance Committee met on March 26th to review the budget assumptions. The TAC reviewed the transportation elements of the UPWP on March 11th, and the Executive Committee reviewed the UPWP Work Program and Budget on April 1st and voted to advance the UPWP to the Board for review and notice of Public Hearing.

The new projects which have been added to the program are listed below. The full budget document (enclosed) describes staff general activities, new projects and project which commenced in FY14 that have not been completed yet.

Recommendation:

Approve Draft FY15 UPWP Work Plan and Budget and warn the document for a public hearing on May 21st 2014; the anticipated date of adoption of the work program and budget by the CCRPC Board is May 21st following the public hearing.

For Additional Information Contact:

Michele Boomhower, Assistant/MPO Director
mboomhower@ccrpcvt.org or 846-4490 ext. 15

New Projects:

Locational Efficiency Project, VEIC – Deferred for mid-year consideration

2.1.3.6 Hinesburg Planning Technical Assistance – Staff time \$15,757

2.2.4 Dept. of Public Service Energy Siting Plan– Staff time \$48,566

2.3.1.2.1 Act 250 Transportation Mitigation Database – Intern & Staff Time \$14,788

2.3.2.3.1 Transportation Improvement District Coordination - Staff Time \$12,162

2.3.2.3.2 Local Transportation Impact Fee Development Pilot –Staff Time \$9,535

2.3.3.3 Bike Commuter Training & Bike Parking Planning - Local Motion \$50,000

2.3.4.16 Neighbor Rides Pilot Volunteer Driver Program for Elderly and Disabled –Consultant & Staff Time \$47,000

2.3.4.17 So. Burlington Chamberlin Neighborhood & BTV land use and transportation master plan – Phase I - Consultant \$100,000

2.3.4.18 So. Burlington Traffic Overlay District Ordinance Update - Consultant \$30,000

2.3.4.19 Colchester Lakeshore Dr. and town services neighborhood build-out analysis and transportation circulation study –Staff Time \$17,975

2.3.4.20 Shelburne transportation and land use implications analysis in an expanded sewer service area - Consultant \$34,000

2.3.7.2 Bike Ped Technical Assistance – Local Motion \$55,500

2.3.8.7 Charlotte Ferry Road U S 7 to Village Center sidewalk scoping study - Consultant \$10,000

2.3.8.8 So. Burlington connecting the gaps sidewalk scoping study – Phase I - Consultant \$40,000

2.3.11.1 Scoping of Electric Vehicles charging stations – Phase III - VEIC \$45,000

2.3.12.4 Regional Corridor Plan Advancement coordination (US 7 Shelburne Rd, US 2 Burlington, So. Burlington & Williston and Rt. 15 – Essex to Burlington) - Staff Time \$9,331

2.3.12.5 Western Corridor Plan advancement coordination - Staff Time \$6,612

2.3.13.3 North and South Winooski Ave. in Burlington corridor study - Consultant \$84,000

2.3.15.1 Barrett Street/Colchester Ave/Riverside Ave/Mill St. Intersection Scoping Study Phase 1 - Consultant \$20,000

2.4.2 Underhill sidewalk grant project management – Staff Time 14,663

3.1.4 Colchester FEMA community rating system pilot – Staff Time \$769

3.1.5 604(B) Water quality project – Staff Time \$5,557

3.1.6 FEMA regional pre-disaster mitigation (PDM), All Hazards mitigation plan update – Phase 1 – Staff Time \$9,850

3.1.7 Statewide River and Transportation Corridor risk analysis and hazard mitigation prioritization tool pilot – Staff Time \$14,570

3.2.1.4 Hinesburg Village Transportation and land use stormwater assessment – Consultant \$24,000

3.2.1.5 So. Burlington Transportation facilities stormwater impacts scoping – Consultant \$75,000

5.3.3 Community Assessment and Education to Promote (CAPE) behavioral health planning and education – Staff Time \$10,510

7.1.1.5 Bolton Town Plan Maps/Data – Staff Time \$3,727

7.1.1.6 LIDAR data acquisition for Chittenden County – Consultant \$150,000

1 CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
2 TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE - MINUTES
3

4 DATE: Tuesday, April 1, 2014
5 TIME: 9:00 a.m.
6 PLACE: CCRPC Office, 110 West Canal St. Winooski, VT
7

8 **Members Present**

9 Bruce Hoar, Williston
10 Nicole Losch, Burlington
11 Roger Hunt, Milton
12 Amy Bell, VTrans
13 Bob Henneberger, Seniors
14 Bryan Osborne, Colchester
15 Matt Langham, VTrans
16 Sandy Thibault, CATMA
17 Jon Moore, CCTA
18 Dean Bloch, Charlotte
19 Dean Pierce, Shelburne
20 Maryann Michaels, Rail
21 Justin Rabidou, South Burlington
22 Brian Bigelow, Underhill
23 Peter Wernsdorfer, Winooski
24

Robin Pierce, Essex Junction
Jennifer Murray, Jericho
Rachel Beauregard, VTrans District 5

25 **Staff**

Christine Forde, Senior Transportation Planner
Peter Keating, Senior Transportation Planner
Michele Boomhower, Assistant/MPO Director
Bryan Davis, Senior Transportation Planner
Eleni Churchill, Senior Transportation Planning Engineer
Regina Mahoney, Senior Planner
Chris Dubin, Transportation Planner
Sai Sarepalli, Transportation Planning Engineer
Jason Charest, Senior Transportation Planning Engineer

26 **1. Consent Agenda**

27 A minor TIP amendment to move funding from FY13 to FY14 for Burlington Wayfinding was described in a
28 meeting memo. DEAN PIERCE MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE, SECONDED BY ROBIN PIERCE
29 AND UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.
30

31 **2. Approval of Minutes**

32 A MOTION WAS MADE TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MARCH 11TH BY BRUCE HOAR AND
33 SECONDED BY ROGER HUNT. THE MOTION PASSED WITH BRYAN OSBORNE ABSTAINING.
34

35 **3. Public Comments**

36 No members of the public were present.
37

38 **3a. TIP Amendment**

39 This item was added to the agenda at the meeting. Christine distributed a memo explaining a TIP amendment
40 regarding an increase in PE funding for Pearl Street improvements in Essex Junction that had no impact on our
41 fiscal constraint level. BRYAN OSBORNE MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE, SECONDED BY JUSTIN
42 RABIDOUX. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
43

44 **4. Burlington Parking Management Consultant Selection**

45 Peter Keating distributed a memo on this explaining that the review committee had only recently met on
46 March 27th to evaluate the three proposals submitted from the following firms:

- 47 1) Walker Parking Consultants with Fitzgerald & Halliday
- 48 2) Desman Associates with Stantec, Donald Shoup and others
- 49 3) RSG with Nelson Nygaard

50 The evaluation committee consisted of Burlington staff and volunteers and following discussions over the
51 technical proposal comparison and then the cost proposals, made a recommendation to go with Desman.
52 BRYAN OSBORNE MADE A MOTION THE TAC APPROVE THE HIRING OF DESMAN ASSOCIATES
53 FOR THE DOWNTOWN BURLINGTON PARKING & TRAVEL MANAGEMENT PLAN. THE MOTION
54 WAS SECONDED BY ROBIN PIERCE AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. ITS Plan Consultant Selection

Sai Sarepalli explained some background on this project and then went over recent efforts to solicit interested consultants. CCRPC advertised the project on January 31, 2014 and requested proposals from interested firms and individuals. The due date for submitting the proposal was February 26, 2014. We received proposals from the following four consulting firms:

- 1) IBI Group with Trafinfo
- 2) ConSysTec with RSG and Third Sector Associates
- 3) Gannett Fleming
- 4) Cambridge Systematics

Technical proposals were reviewed by the review committee members and scored. The committee met on March 20th to discuss and review technical and cost proposals. Following this review, the committee invited two respondents (IBI Group and Cambridge Systematics) for an interview and presentation on Friday, March 28th, 2014. Following these interviews, the review committee recommended we hire Cambridge contingent on asking them about their allocation of hours. Staff discussed this issue with Cambridge and feel satisfied that they can do the work within the allotted budget and time allocation. Michele also noted that the project will kick off at the end of April and partner organizations will soon be notified. BRIAN BIGELOW MADE A MOTION THE CCRPC HIRE CAMBRIDGE SYSTEMATICS TO UPDATE THE ITS PLAN. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY AMY BELL AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

6. Winooski Form Based Code Consultant Selection

Regina Mahoney began by describing Form Based Code and then the process to find a consultant for the City: A Request for Qualifications/Proposals (RFP) was released on February 4, 2014 for *Form-Based Code Consultant Services for the City of Winooski*. This RFP was previously issued on November 7, 2013, and only one proposal was received. The RFP was re-issued with amendments to the scope and budget. The project will commence in April 2014 and extend through August 30, 2015. Proposals for the more recent round were due on February 26, 2014. CCRPC received six proposals in response to this RFP. On March 6th a selection committee consisting of Winooski staff, Winooski Planning Commission members and CCRPC met to evaluate the proposals. On March 6th the consultants were narrowed down to two; and conference call interviews were conducted with the two on March 20th. One consultant was selected, contingent on a few follow-up questions. These questions were answered affirmatively on March 21st. The committee selected the following firm to recommend for TAC approval: Ferrell Madden with Dreher Design Associates, Inc. and Urban Advantage. DEAN PIERCE MADE A MOTION WE HIRE FERREL MADDEN AND THEIR TEAM FOR THE WINOOSKI FORM BASED CODE PROJECT. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY BRIAN BIGELOW AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

7. Colchester Sidewalk Funding

Michele went over detail from the memo in the meeting packet: The Town of Colchester was awarded three Chittenden County Sidewalk Grant Awards (2006, 2009, 2012) to develop sidewalks in the Exit 16 area, implementing the 2003 Colchester Exit 16 Pedestrian & Landscape Enhancement Project Feasibility Report. A portion of Phase I of the sidewalk improvements for which these grants were awarded was recently completed and are identified on the attached map. The remaining portion of the phase I project will be completed by VTrans as part of the Exit 16 Interchange project. As a result, Colchester now has approximately \$180,000 remaining of the \$250,000 awarded for the project. The Town would like to apply the remaining funds to Phase 2 of the Colchester Exit 16 Pedestrian & Landscape Enhancement Project. Michele went on noting that the Sidewalk Grant Program guidelines are silent regarding the use of funding for alternate phases of projects. Staff was recommending that the TAC deliberate regarding Colchester's request to apply the Sidewalk Grant Award funds to Phase 2 of the Exit 16 Pedestrian plan and make a recommendation to the Board to consider Colchester's request at their April 16th Board meeting. Bryan Osborne noted how the sidewalks in the Exit 16 area are contiguous, only separated by project phase. Amy Bell reported however that VTrans was not approving the application of previous VTrans grant awards for this purpose. Following discussion, JUSTIN RABIDOUX MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE USING THE FUNDS FOR PHASE II OF THE PROJECT AND RECOMMENDED THE BOARD APPROVE THIS

1 REQUEST AT THEIR NEXT MEETING. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY BRUCE HOAR AND
2 PASSED WITH VTRANS ABSTAINING.
3

4 **8. CCRPC FY15 Sidewalk Program**

5 Peter reported that the next round of sidewalk grant applications will go out this coming Friday, April 4th and
6 their due date three weeks later on April 25th.
7

8 **9. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports**

9 Michele mentioned that she had heard quite a few complements regarding the Walk Bike Summit held the
10 previous Saturday at the Hilton Hotel in Burlington. She also noted the July TRB conference coming up in
11 Burlington with a focus on small urbanized area transportation planning. The FY15 UPWP is wrapping up and
12 the Board will warn a public hearing for May.
13

14 **10. CCRPC March Board Meeting Report**

15 Peter noted the Board, in March. Discussed/and/or took action on project prioritization and the Urbanized Area
16 Boundary Map.
17

18 **11. Chairman's/Members' Items**

19 Peter Wernsdorfer spoke briefly about Winooski's experiences with electric vehicles. Rachel reported on
20 FEMA ice storm funding and that the deadline for town grants had passed and decisions will be made next
21 week. Michele asked her to get us grant info for our upcoming newsletter. Michele also reported again on the
22 need for the TAC to have one of its members act as committee Chair and asked Brian Osborne to fill this
23 position. Brian agreed and AMY BELL MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE BRYAN OSBORNE AS TAC
24 CHAIR. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY ROBIN PIERCE AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY. Bryan
25 asked about CIRC alternatives project status and Michele reported on setting up meetings with VTrans to
26 discuss. Bryan also noted the serious damages to pavement from the winter and wondered if VTrans yet
27 knows the scope of the damage.
28

29 The meeting adjourned at 10:00 a.m.
30

31 Respectfully submitted, Peter Keating

1 Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
2 Finance Committee
3 Meeting Minutes

4 **DRAFT**

5 Date: Wednesday, March 26, 2014
6 Time: 5:45 p.m.
7 Place: CCRPC Offices; 110 W. Canal Street; Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404
8 Present: Debra Kobus, Secretary Treasurer Andy Montroll, Vice Chair
9 Michele Boomhower, Asst/MPO Director Forest Cohen, Business Manager
10 Bernie Ferenc, Transportation Business Manager
11

12 The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by committee chair, Debra Kobus.
13

- 14 1. Approve the minutes of January 29, 2014 Finance Committee Meeting. ANDY MONTROLL MADE A
15 MOTION, SECONDED BY DEBRA KOBUS TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 29, 2014 WITH
16 CORRECTIONS. Debra noted on Page 1, Paragraph b. line 4 – correct sentence to say “We will
17 contact the City “to” take care of this. MOTION CARRIED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS
18 CORRECTED.
19
- 20 2. Review of Financial Reports – FY14 through February. Forest reviewed his memo.
21
- 22 a. The balance sheet shows that our operating cash standing is \$404,233 in checking, savings and
23 petty cash. There is cash in reserve (money market and CD’s) totaling \$149,342. Current assets
24 over liabilities \$508,533; and deferred income communities is at \$167,300 (total available for
25 match).
 - 26 b. On the Income side, the HUD (ECOS) grant has closed. We expended the entire grant over the
27 last 3 years. The transportation staff is billing slightly under budget at 60.3% Michele believe it
28 may be because she had less billable time while working on the UPWP preparation as well as th
29 mid-year adjustment. Byways are coming in dribs and drabs. The Brownfields grants will be
30 wrapping up in the fall. Emergency Management grants have come back online. A discussion
31 ensued when Debra questioned rate on projects where we can’t collect indirect costs. There
32 may be jobs we can’t take in the future if they don’t cover indirect costs. There may be ways to
33 work around this, such as having the state be the applicant for these grants and we can then
34 charge indirect costs to them.
 - 35 c. On the Expense side salaries and benefits are under budget through February. We had a
36 positive month and the year to date is now \$1,393 in the black. We are covering our costs.
37 Expenses to date are at 61% which is below budget. When Andy asked what “ineligible” costs
38 are, Forest explained these are things like meals that may not be charged as indirect costs or
39 portions of dues to VAPDA, AMPO and chamber that are used for lobbying activities.
 - 40 d. Cash Flow. Forest asked for the committee’s approval to move \$50,000 into the money market
41 to keep in reserve. It was noted that the interest rate is very low, but at least it’s not going
42 down.
43
- 44 3. Draft FY15 UPWP Budget and Indirect Rate. Forest noted that this budget is very much a draft
45 because it has a 64% indirect rate, which we believe will be the worst-case scenario – which would
46 leave us with a deficit of \$133,995 for FY15. Michele explained that if we use a higher indirect rate
47 once we work it out with VTrans, there will be higher staff costs and therefore less money available
48 for consultants. The bulk of our revenue comes from VTrans. As briefly discussed before the

1 meeting started, VTrans audit wants us to develop an indirect rate that will true up over time. In
2 other words, if we collect more indirect expenses in a given year, we must deduct those in the
3 following year (basically two year lag – FY14 looking back to FY12.) On the other hand, if we collect
4 less indirect expenses, we can add it to the rate in a future year. We had also discussed that in
5 order to have a reserve as recommended by our auditors we'd have to use either local dues or ACCD
6 funds. Discussion ensued how you then deal with it in later years. It was decided we'll have to
7 keep close tabs on our expenses over the next couple of years; as well as keep track of where folks
8 are spending their time and make sure if they estimate time spent on administration, that they
9 spend it there. Forest noted that we should be able to negotiate a higher indirect rate and reduce
10 the prospective deficit. Everyone agreed that VTrans doesn't want us to lose money, and we may be
11 able to adjust the indirect rate over a few years, rather than all in one year. We're hoping to get this
12 resolved amicably. We have not included carry forward dollars in this budget yet. We are finishing
13 up some Brownfields grants. The items shaded in brown indicate grants that are pending. The
14 FEMA grant caps management costs at 5%. The Water Quality grants will continue.

15
16 Forest then reviewed the expense side. There is a significant increase in Communication/PR
17 because we want to revamp our website. We need to work the back end so that it'll be compatible
18 with WordPress. We then reviewed other expense items. When Debra asked if we looked at other
19 revenue sources, Forest said this budget is really the worst case scenario. When Michele asked if we
20 had a meeting set up with Terry yet, Forest noted that we are still trying to come up with a rate.
21 We'll try to have the rate in the next week, so we can present it to the Executive Committee. Forest
22 said we should be talking about the arrangements we get into if they can't pay indirect costs, or
23 make better deals going forward.

- 24
25 4. UPWP Update. Andy Montroll said the process went fairly smoothly because of the amount of
26 requests were more or less in line with funding available. There were a few policy questions raised
27 about the kind of things we want to fund. Michele said we're in pretty good shape. We were able
28 to work with VTrans and Federal Highway to review eligibility issues early on. There are a lot of
29 projects, but not big projects. Andy said one thing that helped was we required more details at the
30 beginning to know what they were requesting and making sure it matched our goals. Michele has
31 been working with new municipal employees to discuss projects the town applied for.

- 32
33 5. Next Finance Committee Meeting. Forest noted that the next scheduled Finance committee
34 meeting is April 23rd. but that is school vacation week and Charlie and Michele will both be out. It
35 was agreed to move the meeting back to April 30th.

- 36
37 6. There being no further business, ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN AT 7:10 P.M.
38 DEBRA KOBUS SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED.

39
40 Respectfully submitted,

41
42
43 Bernadette Ferenc

1 CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
2 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
3 MEETING MINUTES
4 DRAFT

5
6 Date: Wednesday, April 2, 2014
7 Time: 4:45 p.m.
8 Place: CCRPC Offices, 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT 05404
9 Present: Louis H. Mossey, III, Chair Andy Montroll, Vice-Chair
10 Debra Kobus, Secretary-Treasurer Andrea Morgante, At-Large – Small Town
11 Chris Roy, At-Large – Large Town Marc Landry, Immediate Past Chair
12 Charlie Baker, Executive Director Michele Boomhower, Asst/MPO Director
13 Forest Cohen, Business Manager Regina Mahony, Senior Planner
14 Bernadette Ferenc, Transportation Business Manager
15

16 The meeting was called to order at 5:47 p.m. by the chair, Lou Mossey.
17

- 18 1. Changes to the Agenda. Regina Mahony noted that we have an additional Act 250 letter.
19
20 2. Approval of March 5, 2014 Executive Committee Minutes. ANDREA MORGANTE MADE A MOTION,
21 SECONDED BY DEBRA KOBUS, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MARCH 5, 2014 WITH CORRECTIONS.
22 MOTION CARRIED WITH CHRIS ROY ABSTAINING.
23
24 3. Act 250/Section 248 Applications.
25 a. 4C1264 - 4 Pearl Street Investments, LLC. This is the site of the old Chittenden Bank at the Five
26 Corners in Essex Junction. They will tear down the existing building and construct a 4-story
27 mixed use building with parking below and at the rear of the building. The project consists of
28 15,000 square feet of commercial area on the first floor and 51 dwelling units on the top three
29 floors. It has local approval from the planning commission. We have added a third paragraph
30 and recommended bike parking on the site. When asked about traffic impacts, Regina said that
31 Eleni Churchill has answered questions for Peter Keibel. It was noted that our district
32 environmental commission has been piloting the effort for the proportional share. MARC
33 LANDRY MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO APPROVE THE LETTER TO THE
34 DEC. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
35 b. Discussion of Keystone Corp. South Forty Solar Project (PSB petition). Regina said there was no
36 letter because this project is not at the stage where we'd write a letter. PSB works differently.
37 This is the 45-day pre-notice so the application is not fully ready. The folks who came to the
38 meeting are concerned about stormwater issues. She noted that they have existing stormwater
39 problems and the developer has offered to potentially mitigate them for the neighbors. They
40 now have a stormwater management plan and have sent copies to the City, us, and other
41 statutory parties. Neighbors have been consistently against any development on this property.
42 The developer is willing to come and talk to our board or the EC. Otherwise, we can see how it'll
43 play out in the process. Regina did note that we do not typically address stormwater in our
44 review and would just give comments on planning areas and traffic. After a brief discussion,
45 members agreed that our review should be consistent with what we do for every other
46 application. They felt we should let the neighbors and the developer know that stormwater is
47 not something we normally look at in our review. If the project goes to hearing, we will do our
48 normal review. We can direct them to the appropriate state agency that deals with stormwater.

1 c. #4CVO989-2 Mt. Mansfield Union High School sign replacement, Jericho. They would like to
2 replace the existing sign with an LED sign. This was originally warned as a minor amendment,
3 but a resident has requested a hearing and challenged the development review board's
4 approval. Members briefly discussed lighted signs at other area schools. ANDY MONTROLL
5 MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CHRIS ROY, TO APPROVE THE LETTER TO THE DEC. MOTION
6 CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

7
8 4. FY15 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Update. Michele thanked Andy for chairing the
9 committee and Andrea for serving on it. The UPWP committee met 3 times and we received many
10 good complete applications. The request for funding came in close to dollars available. She then
11 reviewed the project list and described the color coding.

- 12 • White rows are things that we continue to do each year.
- 13 • Pink rows are projects the committee debated.
- 14 • Orange rows are projects that were started in FY14, but will have funding carried over into
15 FY15.
- 16 • Yellow rows are new activities that include the total funding requested.
- 17 • Purple rows are CCTA projects.
- 18 • Blue rows are projects related to transportation, but not funded with PL funds, but other
19 grants.

20 We will add the key to the version that gets sent to the membership. New projects include:

21
22 Efficiency Vermont requested funds to work with realtors, banks, etc. to let homeowners consider
23 the costs of what it'll take to live in North Underhill and work in Burlington, even though housing
24 might be less expensive in rural areas. The committee would like to see how this fits into our
25 mission and we'll put it off to the mid-year. Charlie said the Agency of Commerce is looking into
26 supporting that.

27 2.1.3.6 Hinesburg wants part-time help with planning

28 2.2.4 Dept. of Public Service Energy Siting Plan is a placeholder pending DPS funding.

29 2.3.1.2.1 Local transportation permit conditions data base - to allow us to track conditions focusing
30 on transportation to see when triggers are happening and whether the conditions are met.

31 2.3.2.3 Transportation Policy Planning.

32 2.3.2.3.1 Transportation Improvement Districts – dealing with proportional funding on state
33 projects.

34 2.3.2.3.2 Local Transportation Impact Fees – to train our staff to prepare impact fees for
35 municipalities.

36 2.3.4.16 NeighborRides Service – this is a 3 year program started with ECOS funding where they
37 are successfully deploying volunteer drivers to use less of the available funding to get to a
38 sustainable place.

39 2.3.4.17 So. Burlington Chamberlin Neighborhood & BTV Airport land use and transportation
40 master plan

41 2.3.4.18 So. Burlington traffic overlay district ordinance update

42 2.3.4.19 Colchester Lakeshore Dr. and town services neighborhood build-out analysis and
43 transportation circulation study.

44 2.3.4.20 Shelburne transportation and land use implications analysis in an expanded sewer service
45 area.

1 2.3.7.2 Bike Ped Technical Assistance for Local Motion -\$55,500 and in combination with another
2 task (2.3.3.3 -\$50,000) for a total of \$100,000. The committee felt a third task they applied for was
3 more in line with their mission than ours.

4 2.3.8.7 Charlotte Ferry Road U S 7 to Village Center sidewalk scoping study

5 2.3.8.8 So. Burlington connecting the gaps sidewalk scoping study – Phase I. We told them we
6 could do this only if we break it into two phases.

7 2.3.11.1 Scoping of Electric Vehicles charging stations – Phase III for working with local plans and
8 ordinances to allow these charging stations – we knocked \$5,000 off of VEIC’s request, leaving
9 \$45,000.

10 2.3.12.4 Regional Corridor Plan Advancement coordination (US 7 Shelburne Rd, US 2 Burlington,
11 So. Burlington & Williston and Rt. 15 – Essex to Burlington.) We need to review mitigation plans for
12 these corridors and see if we’re on target.

13 2.3.12.5 Western Corridor Plan advancement coordination.

14 2.3.13.3 North and South Winooski Ave. in Burlington corridor study

15 2.3.15.1 Barrett Street/Colchester Ave/Riverside Ave/Mill St. Phase 1. This will be a two-year
16 project and will consider the Ireland proposal.

17 Michele then reviewed the Blue rows which include separate grants for Signal Optimization;
18 transportation project management (Underhill); TCSP Grant – final year of 3 year project; and Circ
19 Alt II for TDM work – which was included in the FY14 Mid-Year Adjustment.

20
21 Charlie then reviewed other new non-MPO projects:

22 3.1.4 FEMA community rating system pilot in Colchester

23 3.1.5 604(B) Water quality project

24 3.1.6 FEMA regional pre-disaster mitigation (PDM), All Hazards mitigation plan update – Phase 1

25 3.1.7 Statewide River and Transportation Corridor risk analysis and hazard mitigation prioritization
26 tool pilot

27 3.2.1.4 Hinesburg Village center Transportation and land use stormwater assessment

28 3.2.1.5 So. Burlington Transportation facilities stormwater impacts scoping

29 5.3.3 Community Assessment and Education to Promote (CAPE) behavioral health planning and
30 education

31 7.1.1.5 Bolton Town Plan Maps/Data

32 7.1.1.6 LIDAR data acquisition for Chittenden County – 3D imaging which will be useful for all kinds
33 of things. This will update runs we did ten years ago, but this will be a statewide LIDAR project.
34 (LIDAR flights are done when the leaves are off in the fall; Orthos are flown in the spring when
35 things are just beginning to turn color.)

36
37 Andy asked that we add a column showing funding requested vs. what was provided. Since there
38 are only a couple of projects that did not get fully funded, we will spell those out in a memo. Staff
39 is afraid that if we add another column it could screw up the formulas. It was also suggested that in
40 addition to the spreadsheet for the whole program that we prepare one showing only the new
41 projects.

42
43 Charlie then reviewed the overall budget. He noted that the lines shaded brown are for pending
44 funds. There is a bill in the legislature to increase funding for RPCs by 6%. We have applied for a
45 Brownfields grant, but the application is pending. The DPS is proposing to provide funds for energy
46 planning and siting. There is a FEMA grant pending for All Hazard Mitigation Plan Update.

47

1 On the expense side we have included an 8% increase for benefits because of the uncertainty of
2 health care costs for 2015. Line 116 Communication/PR includes a significant increase to update
3 our website to make it easier to update. Marc suggested we remind members the savings we
4 gained with the merger and the move to Winooski. Debra asked how we got the deficit down to
5 \$55,000 from \$133,000. Charlie brought the Executive Committee up to date on the indirect cost
6 negotiation. In FY13 our indirect rate was 99% based on the audited rate from FY11. As it turns
7 out our actual indirect costs were 82% of direct costs. We now have a new audit chief at VTrans
8 who is trying to get all the RPCs using the same formula to develop an indirect rate which includes
9 a carry forward adjustment. So because we overcharged for our indirect rate for FY13 we need to
10 reduce the FY15 rate. In the version the Finance Committee saw we used 64% as the worst case
11 scenario. We are now up to 71%, which is why the deficit is smaller. Last year our revenues
12 exceeded expenses by \$83,000. This year we're looking at \$55,000 more expense than revenue.
13 We don't want to reduce our operating expenses just to balance the budget, because it would
14 reduce the indirect rate even more and it wouldn't help us in the long run. We only have to look at
15 the income from grants where we charged indirect rates. Michele noted that the year the rate
16 arrived at 99% was when we had many more chargeable hours than normal due to Irene work.
17 FY13 is based on FY11, which is pre-merger. Marc said ideally we should have a reserve of 15%.
18 Charlie noted that we had talked about budgeting a reserve using municipal dues in order to
19 protect the municipalities in the long term. We will not be able to add to the reserve in FY15 and
20 may even lose some. The good news is we don't have to send funds back. Lengthy discussion
21 continued. Reserve fund is taken out of the equation for any indirect calculation. Lou asked if we'd
22 be in a level place in three years. Michele said we'll have to track hours spent on direct tasks vs.
23 administration, and also track expenses.

24
25 5. Chair/Executive Director/Asst/MPO Director Reports.

- 26 a. Administrative Updates. Nothing further.
- 27 b. Public Participation Plan Update. Michele said this has been a good and challenging efforts to
28 try to engage underserved populations. We brought some of these folks in and had a hard time
29 to get them to committee meetings, but we had a good meeting today to come up with a plan.
30 We're trying to get this wrapped up in the next couple of months.
- 31 c. Legislative Update. There is potential for a 6% increase in ACCD funds; transportation funds are
32 formula driven. He suggested members contact their Senators to get behind the increase for
33 RPC funding because we're being asked to do much more.
- 34 • Shoreland bill is in conference committee to decide on amount of detail the bill should
35 include.
 - 36 • TMDL - ANR submitted a plan to the feds. Charlie will send a link to board members and let
37 them know which pieces to pay attention to. There are still significant issues for
38 municipalities.
 - 39 • Growth Center Bill. There are two bills 809 & 823 and both are in the Senate and seem to
40 be going well. There are definite benefits for downtowns, growth centers and
41 neighborhood development areas.
 - 42 • Proportional Share Bill. They were able to get every constituency behind it and get it
43 through the Senate even though it missed crossover. Chris Cole, Michele, and Colchester
44 staff met with Senator Mazza. The length of time to get projects build was reduced from 15
45 years to 10.
 - 46 • Energy Siting bill. Is not likely to pass in the Senate or the House.

- 1 • When asked about the statewide stormwater fee, Charlie said they're probably looking at it
2 for action in FY15.
3

4 6. Agenda Review for April 16, 2014 Board Meeting. Members reviewed the proposed agenda for the
5 April board meeting. Charlie noted that there will be two public hearings in May – one for the bylaw
6 amendments and the other for the UPWP/budget.
7

8 7. Climate Action Guide Status Update. We are waiting for comments from board members.
9

10 8. Other Business.

11 a. The annual meeting is coming up in June and Charlie asked members if he should invite David
12 Mears (Commissioner of Dept. of Environmental Conservation), to come and talk about the
13 TMDL. We could invite members and alternates, managers, and public works directors.
14 Andrea wondered if the state Tactical Basin Action Plan for our area is done. Lengthy
15 discussion ensued about the disconnect between the current tactical basin plan and the local
16 plans. Members agreed to ask Commissioner Mears to speak at our annual meeting. Members
17 then suggested various venues to hold the meeting: Monitor barn in Richmond; ECHO;
18 Williston PD community room; or Elley-Long Music Center at the fort. Staff will look into these
19 options.

20 b. Chris Roy said he represents an applicant of a large project in a different region. There is a
21 transportation study and two regional planning commissions want to have party status. He has
22 recommended that they not have party status since they are not adjacent to the community.
23 There was a brief discussion.
24

25 9. Executive Session. MARC LANDRY MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDREA MORGANTE TO GO
26 INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION AT 7:27 P.M. FOR THE PURPOSE OF DISCUSSING THE EXECUTIVE
27 DIRECTOR'S EVALUATION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
28

29 MARC LANDRY MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDREA MORGANTE TO COME OUT OF EXECUTIVE
30 SESSION AT 7:45 P.M. NOTING THAT THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S EVALUATION WAS APPROVED.
31

32 Respectfully submitted,
33

34 Bernadette Ferenc

April 3, 2014

Stephanie H. Monaghan
District #4 Coordinator
111 West Street
Essex Junction, VT 05452

RE: 4 Pearl Street Investments, LLC, Essex Junction, Application #4C1264

Dear Ms. Monaghan:

The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission's Staff and Executive Committee have reviewed the Act 250 application for the Project described as the demolition of an existing bank and construction of a four-story, mixed use building with parking below and at the rear of the building. The Project consists of 15,000 sqft. of commercial area on the first floor, and 51 dwelling units on the top three floors. The Project is located at 4 Pearl Street in Essex Junction, VT. The project has received local approval from the Planning Commission. **We offer the following comments:**

The project is located in the Center Planning Area as defined in the Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the *2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan* (the Plan). Specifically the Plan states that Center Planning Areas "are intended to be regional centers or traditional downtowns that serve the County and beyond and contain a mix of jobs, housing, and community facilities. Center Planning Areas also contain the County's highest density and largest-scale developments... land uses are locally planned and managed to coexist successfully with neighborhoods and natural areas. Places within Center Planning Areas are served by wastewater facilities, other infrastructure, and offer a variety of transportation options, including non-motorized modes." We find that the proposed project is consistent with this planning area. In addition the project area is served by municipal sewer, CCTA bus lines and is in the heart of Village with ample pedestrian access. Therefore, we find this project to be in conformance with the 2013 Chittenden County Regional Plan.

However, the proposed site plans do not appear to include bicycle parking. The CCRPC strongly encourages the developers to include both short-term bicycle parking (e.g. U racks) on the street sides and parking lot sides of the building, and also long-term parking (e.g. lockers, cage) for residents. This could be included as part of the parking garage or inside the building.

Also, the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, as included in the *2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan*, includes the following action, under Strategy 3.2.2, to reduce single occupancy vehicle trips through increased Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures. A regional TDM program was launched in October 2012 under the brand "[Go! Chittenden County](#)." This program provides tools and resources for employers/property managers to reduce parking needs and address traffic issues, and connects individuals to the range of transportation options in our region. The effort is being coordinated by the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission in partnership with service providers and advocates. As this project is within an area of concentrated housing and employment, we strongly encourage the property manager to coordinate with CCRPC on possible TDM measures.

Due to the detailed level of development review in most Chittenden County municipalities and the environmental permit reviews at the Department of Environmental Conservation, CCRPC will give specific attention in its Act 250 reviews to the type of use and the Planning Areas section of the *2013 Chittenden County*

ECOS Plan. While there are many other topics covered in the *2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan*, there has been significant analysis at the Regional level regarding transportation impacts. The CCRPC will also focus its attention on transportation, where appropriate, in accordance with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, which is within the *2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan*.

These comments are based on information currently available; we may have additional comments as the process continues. Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Charlie Baker
Executive Director

Cc: CCRPC Board
Certificate of Service

April 3, 2014

Peter Keibel
District #4 Coordinator
111 West Street
Essex Junction, VT 05452

RE: Mount Mansfield Union High School, Sign Replacement, Jericho, Application #4C0989-2

Dear Mr. Keibel:

The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission's Staff and Executive Committee have reviewed this Act 250 application for the replacement of an existing sign with new digital sign at Mount Mansfield Union High School. The Project is located on Browns Trace Road in Jericho, VT. The project has received local approval from the Zoning Administrator, and Development Review Board (they upheld the Zoning Administrator's approval on appeal). The Development Review Board decision has been appealed to Environmental Court and is pending. **We offer the following comments:**

The project is located within the Rural Planning Areas as defined in the Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the *2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan* (the Plan). Specifically the Plan states that Rural Planning Areas "are areas where regional and town plans promote the preservation of Vermont's traditional working landscape and natural area features. The Rural Planning Area also provides for low density commercial, industrial, and residential development (generally 1 dwelling unit per acre or less) that is compatible with working lands and natural areas so that these places may continue to highlight the rural character and self-sustaining natural area systems. Development in the rural planning areas is typically outside the sewer service area." The Plan is not intended to prescribe specificity, including signage design, and we find that this project – which includes the replacement of an existing sign and does not change the use of the land - is not inconsistent with this planning area. Therefore, we find this project to be in conformance with the 2013 Chittenden County Regional Plan.

Due to the detailed level of development review in most Chittenden County municipalities and the environmental permit reviews at the Department of Environmental Conservation, CCRPC will give specific attention in its Act 250 reviews to the type of use and the Planning Areas section of the *2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan*. While there are many other topics covered in the *2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan*, there has been significant analysis at the Regional level regarding transportation impacts. The CCRPC will also focus its attention on transportation, where appropriate, in accordance with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, which is within the *2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan*.

These comments are based on information currently available; we may have additional comments as the process continues. Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Charlie Baker
Executive Director

Cc: CCRPC Board
Certificate of Service