

REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

Wednesday, February 17, 2016 - 6:00 p.m.
CCRPC Offices; 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202
Winooski, VT 05404



5:30 BOARD TRAINING – Water Quality, Energy and Brownfields –Melanie, Dan & Pam

CONSENT AGENDA – NONE

DELIBERATIVE AGENDA

1. Call to Order; Changes to the Agenda
2. Public Comment Period on Items NOT on the Agenda
3. Action on Consent Agenda (MPO Business) (Action; 2 minutes)
4. Approve Minutes January 20, 2016 CCRPC Board Meeting* (Action; 5 minutes)
5. UPWP Amendment: Chittenden Opiate Burden Reduction Alliance* (Action; 30 minutes)
6. South Burlington Comprehensive Plan* (Action; 5 minutes)
7. Changes to Sidewalk Grant Program* (Discussion; 10 minutes)
8. Draft ECOS Plan Updates (public hearing version to be sent on Friday, 2/12) (Discussion; 20 minutes)
9. H.249 Council of Governments bill* (Discussion; 30 minutes)
10. Executive Director's Updates (Information; 5 minutes)
 - a. MOU with VTrans and CCTA
 - b. ECOS Annual Report
 - c. UPWP Update
 - d. Monthly report (to be sent separately)
11. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports * (Information; 5 minutes)
 - a. Executive Committee (draft minutes: (Draft minutes Feb. 3, 2016)
 - ii. Act 250/Sec 248 letters*
 - b. Transportation Advisory Committee (draft minutes February 2 2016)*
 - c. Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) (draft minutes January 13, 2016)*
12. Members' Items, Other Business (Information, 5 minutes)
13. Adjourn

The February 17th Chittenden County RPC meeting will air on Thursday, March 3, 2016 at 8:00 p.m. and repeat on Friday, March 4th at 1 and 7 a.m. and be available online at: <http://www.cctv.org/watch-tv/programs/chittenden-county-regional-planning-commission-56>

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

- Transportation Advisory Committee – Wednesday, March 2, 2016 9:00 a.m.
- Clean Water Advisory Committee – Wednesday, March 2, 2016, 10:45 a.m. (tentative)
- Executive Committee, Wednesday, March 2, 2016; 5:45 p.m.
- UPWP Committee, Thursday, March 3, 2016; 5:30 p.m.
- Planning Advisory Committee, Wednesday, March 9, 2016, 2:30 p.m.
- CCRPC Board Training - Wednesday, March 16, 2016; 5:30 p.m.
- CCRPC Board Meeting – Wednesday, March 16, 2016; 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 Vaughn, CCRPC Title VI Coordinator, at 802-846-4490 ext. *21 or evaughn@ccrpcvt.org, no later than 3 business days prior to the meeting for which services are requested.*

Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
Regular Meeting & Public Forum
Minutes
DRAFT

Date: Wednesday, January 20, 2016
Time: 6:00 p.m.
Place: CCRPC Offices, 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404
Present: Bolton: Joss Besse Buels Gore: David Scherr
Burlington: Andy Montroll Charlotte: Marty Illick (6:22)
Colchester: Marc Landry Essex: Jeff Carr
Essex Junction: Dan Kerin Hinesburg: Andrea Morgante
Huntington: Barbara Elliott Jericho: Catherine McMains
Milton: Lou Mossey Richmond: Absent
St. George: Jeff Pillsbury Shelburne: John Zicconi
So. Burlington: Chris Shaw Underhill: Brian Bigelow
Westford: David Tilton Williston: Chris Roy
Winooski: Mike O'Brien VTrans: Amy Bell
Bus/Industry: Absent Socio/Econ/Housing: Justin Dextrateur
Cons/Environ: Don Meals
Ex-Officio: BIA: Amanda Hanaway-Corriente CCTA: Absent
FHWA: Absent
Others: Scott Moody, CCTV Serrill Flash, Burlington resident
Diane Carminati
Staff: Charlie Baker, Executive director Dan Albrecht, Senior Planner
Pam Brangan, GIS/Data/IT Manager Eleni Churchill, Trans. Program Manager
Forest Cohen, Business Manager Bryan Davis, Senior Trans. Planner
Chris Dubin, Transportation Planner Bernie Ferenc, Trans. Business Manager
Christine Forde, Sr. Trans. Planner Peter Keating, Sr. Trans. Planner
Lee Krohn, Senior Planner Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
Melanie Needle, Senior Planner Sai Sarepalli, Trans. Planning Engineer
Emma Vaughn, Communication Manager

1. Call to order; changes to the agenda. The meeting was called to order at 6:03 p.m. by the Chair, Andy Montroll. He thanked Lee Krohn and Dan Albrecht for the board training on Emergency Management and Mitigation that was held at 5:30 p.m.
2. Public Comment Period for item NOT on the Agenda. Mr. Serrill Flash is a Burlington resident who is interested in transportation in the county. He has developed a fantasy over the past couple of years that it is possible for people to drive the speed limit or less. He wondered if there are any infrastructure changes or plans toward making his fantasy come true. Members said law enforcement. He has a selfish point of view because he is a year-round bicyclist. He knows Burlington has a 25-mile-per-hour speed limit, but he commutes to all areas of the county, even on Route 15 and Susie Wilson Road to Essex and that is very difficult route for pedestrians. He works with Local Motion and Burlington on bike issues and is concerned about the number of accidents in the region, especially at either end of the Winooski River Bridge. He feels this issue is more than education or law enforcement. He's sure infrastructure plays a big part of it, but he doesn't know all the parts and he's here to see what else might be done. We should put our money where our mouth is and work on safety concerns. Charlie said we provide services to our municipalities by

1 doing speed studies where we recommend appropriate speed and where signage might be installed.
2 We also consider safety when we perform scoping studies to develop a project. Mr. Flash said he
3 spoke to a couple of our interns two years ago who verified that the average speed on East Avenue
4 was 35-40 mph. He is wondering if we can work on a miracle to solve this. Andy thanked him for
5 bringing us his concerns. Bryan Davis gave his contact information so we could work with him.
6 Andrea Morgante thanked Mr. Flash for his comments and said it was appropriate for him to come
7 here and for us to advocate for safe roads. We are in charge of the safety for bikes and pedestrians;
8 and it's our job to consider all of this in our discussions and policies.
9

10 3. Action of Consent Agenda. There was nothing on the consent agenda.

11
12 4. Approve Minutes of November 18, 2015 CCRPC Board Meeting. MIKE O'BRIEN MADE A MOTION,
13 SECONDED BY JEFF CARR TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 18, 2015 WITH CHANGES. Jeff
14 has a question about the minutes and offered some changes to clarify:

15
16 Page 2—Beginning at the start of Line 21 through Line 29. “scoping study does not guarantee
17 project advancement. VTrans reserves the right to advance an alternative **that is** different from the
18 municipally-preferred alternative. Jeff Carr wondered why we would include language **in the MOU**
19 that **said** VTrans can do what **ever** they please **with respect to the preferred alternative.** Amy said
20 this doesn't have to be in the MOU because after scoping is done, the project development process
21 continues at VTrans and things are taken to the public and choices are made. Charlie said the
22 process has been that VTrans presents their **ir preferred** alternative to the municipality. Jeff Carr
23 would like to have **VTrans include** an explanation of why they **were implementing** ~~want to do~~ a
24 different alternative **if it was not the preferred alternative of the municipality. He was hopeful**
25 **that the host community would be considered more of a partner in any public outreach**
26 **process—versus just being considered a stakeholder in any VTrans outreach effort for a project.** “
27 Discussion continued about communication to the municipality with the rationale for the change.

28 Page 3 Beginning at the start of Line 15 through Line 21:

29 Dan Kerin said Essex and Essex Junction are looking to share services. They're looking to merge the
30 highway departments; they've consolidated tax billings and unified **the** manager **position**; and all
31 departments are working together. They're also looking into having employees from the town and
32 village to be paid under one payroll system. The village plan will be incorporated as part of the
33 town plan. Jeff noted they did **the effort included** a 2½ year study **evaluating the delivery of**
34 **services department-by-department** . ~~When they did a bond issue, they did a huge public~~
35 ~~information effort to show savings.~~ **Essex and Essex Junction** also recently merged the two school
36 districts along with Westford.

37 Catherine noted a change on page 3, line 25, to verify that this is the “Riverside village center”, as
38 they have three village centers.

39 VOTE: MOTION CARRIED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS CORRECTED WITH ABSTENTIONS FROM
40 JOHN ZICCONI, DON MEALS, AND DAVID SCHERR.

41
42 5. Public Forum for FY17 UPWP. Bryan Davis explained that this begins the planning of the work
43 program and budget for the next fiscal year. We hold the forum to let folks have a say. He
44 explained the public outreach effort we make with formal applications due on January 22, 2016. He
45 has received applications for half of the communities already. The UPWP committee will meet three
46 times between January 28th and the end of March to develop the work program. There were no
47 members of the public present, but at Andrea's suggestion we will leave this open until the end of
48 the meeting.

1
2 6. Approval of 2016 Jericho Town Plan. Regina reported that the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC)
3 reviewed the plan and held a public hearing. The Town has approved the plan. Catherine McMains
4 said they began the review of the town plan with an on-line survey and had 335 comments on it.
5 Charlie noted there is a resolution in the board packet. JOSS BESSE MADE A MOTION, SECONDED
6 BY CATHERINE MCMAINS, TO APPROVE THE JERICHO TOWN PLAN AND CONFIRM THE TOWN OF
7 JERICHO'S PLANNING PROCESS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE RESOLUTION IN THE PACKET. Charlie
8 noted that only municipalities can vote on this. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

9
10 7. Warn a Public Hearing for ECOS Plan Update. Regina noted that the Long Range Planning
11 Committee (LRPC) has been working on the update of the ECOS Plan. The updates are just the
12 items that we are required to do to be in compliance with ACCD/VAPDA's regional plan review. We
13 need to warn a public hearing for March tonight because if wait until the February meeting, we
14 won't meet the 30-day warning period. After the public hearing we will incorporate any comments
15 received during the 30-day comment period. They will make changes and hold a second public
16 hearing. CHRIS SHAW, MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MARC LANDRY, TO WARN THE FIRST
17 PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE ECOS PLAN AMENDMENTS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 16, 2016 AT 6:00
18 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

19
20 8. FY16 Mid-Year Adjustment Approval. Charlie noted that we will be voting on this in two parts. One
21 for the transportation portion, which is an MPO vote; and the full board on the entire UPWP and
22 budget. Charlie explained changes in the UPWP which are highlighted in yellow. Changes include
23 additions or deletions to descriptions and deliverables or in the consultant dollars needed for a
24 given task – either correcting the amount carried forward from FY15 or reduction in consultant
25 dollars that will get spent by June 30th; or additional funds to complete the project. The last two
26 columns give the original budget by task and the difference between that and the Mid-year. Many
27 of the tasks have changes because we have had staff adjust the hours they had budgeted to reflect
28 what projects they are actually working on. If the entire row is yellow, it is either a new project we
29 hadn't anticipated or it was a task from FY15 we had thought would be completed by last June 30th
30 and it wasn't. When Andrea asked if changes in staff hours will affect municipal match, Charlie
31 clarified that if staff is doing work such as zoning bylaws, and we estimated more than budgeted
32 we probably wouldn't ask, unless there is a large change in scope. Jeff Carr noted that we often
33 have left over match so we would use that for changes. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION THAT WE
34 APPROVE THE MID-YEAR ADJUSTMENT FOR THE NON-TRANSPORTATION PORTION AS PROPOSED.
35 MARC LANDRY SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

36
37 JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION THAT WE APPROVE THE TRANSPORTATION PORTION OF THE MID-
38 YEAR ADJUSTMENT AS PROPOSED. MARC LANDRY SECONDED. VOTE:

39	Bolton	Yes	Burlington	Yes (4)	Charlotte	Yes
40	Colchester	Yes (2)	Essex	Yes	Essex Junction	Yes
41	Hinesburg	Yes	Huntington	Yes	Jericho	Yes
42	Milton	Yes	Richmond	Absent	St. George	Yes
43	Shelburne	Yes	So. Burlington	Yes (2)	Underhill:	Yes
44	Westford	Yes	Williston	Yes	Winooski	Yes
45	VTrans	Yes				

46 THE MOTION CARRIED WITH 23 OF 24 VOTES; AND 17 OF 18 MUNICIPALITIES. Jeff Carr asked if
47 consultants were not moving projects along because they were using us to fill in their open time, as
48 had happened in the past. Charlie said some projects were delayed in starting while we re-

1 organized the management on the transportation side and Eleni was just coming on board and it
2 was not the fault of the consultants.

- 3 9. ITS Plan Update Presentation and Approval. Eleni Churchill noted that Sai Sarepalli is the project
4 manager for the 2016 ITS plan update. The last time we updated the ITS plan was in 2005. One of
5 the reasons we need to update the ITS Architecture Plan is to get federal funding for any regional ITS
6 projects in our area; and we have some significant projects proposed for the region. The plan looks
7 at all the new technology out there and how to use it to get more efficient highways in our region.
8

9 Sai gave a PowerPoint presentation starting with what is ITS (Intelligent Transportation Systems),
10 what the ITS plan is, why we need it, objectives and outcomes and why it's important. ITS promotes
11 the use of advance technology in an integrated manner to make travel safer, faster and more
12 efficient. It can be used for Freeway Management; Emergency Services; Traveler Information;
13 Traffic Control; Control Centers; and Automatic Vehicle Locators. Sai explained how ITS works in
14 each of those instances. For example, intelligent traffic control systems help reduce time spent
15 stopped at red lights by signal phase and timing based on real-time traffic information, optimization
16 and coordination of signals; reliable vehicle detection system; adaptive signal control and transit
17 signal priority. A lengthy discussion ensued about Google app that can give travelers this
18 information right now. Justin pointed out that Google is good for major routes and trip planning but
19 the local information can give updates on when to change signals and adapt to current conditions on
20 a local basis. Sai then reviewed the plan process and noted that it includes Strategic Deployment
21 Plans for things we can do short term (0-3 years); medium term (4-7 years); and long term ((8+
22 years). There was a question and answer period. CCRPC and VTrans applied for a federal grant last
23 year to work on Real Time Traffic monitoring using Bluetooth in five corridors in the region. We are
24 currently developing an RFP to hire a consultant. Sai showed the study corridor and gave the
25 benefits of real-time traffic monitoring. Charlie noted that one of the benefits from this is to get
26 these corridors connected to each other and VTrans' system. We are also looking at Adaptive Signal
27 Control feasibility for Williston Road to Hinesburg Road and Dorset Street and Sai reviewed the
28 benefits, which include: continuously distribute green light time equitably for all traffic movements;
29 improve travel time reliability by progressively moving vehicles through green lights and reduce
30 congestion by creating smoother flow.

31
32 ITS next steps include incorporating short-term, high priority projects into the TIP; incorporate
33 ITS/Operations into Long Range Plan; consider incorporation of Operational/ITS strategies into
34 capital projects; provide input to VTrans ITS Architecture and Plan; update ITS architecture when
35 new projects are implemented. Don Meals said another question we need to ask is "Are there
36 services that already exist on smartphone apps? Jeff Carr said some of these were discussed in the
37 Circ alternatives process. It was noted that this technology allows us to upgrade our controls, etc.
38 We're also getting more data point in these corridors. Andrea said the focus seems to be on vehicle
39 and transit – what are we doing for pedestrians. Who's holding the data and who's sharing it. Sai
40 said each project will consider bike/pedestrians, etc. in the development process. When Andrea
41 asked if there is timing for pedestrians wait time, Sai said yes, they will be considered. Discussion
42 continued about data, and privacy issues using vehicle licenses, cameras, etc. Justin said EZ Pay is
43 the only system that can send automatic tickets. It was noted that prioritization of projects will
44 consider how easy the project is to implement and if it's low cost; and will happen in the TIP
45 process. Charlie said there may be a generic project line for ITS projects, so specific projects might
46 not show up. We are trying to avoid any capacity expansion projects by making ITS improvements.
47 JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CHRIS SHAW, TO ADOPT THE RESOLUTION FOR THE
48 ITS PLAN. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

1
2 10. Approve District Leveling recommendations. Christine Forde noted that we've done this for the
3 past couple of years to provide information to VTrans. Leveling is a thin coat of pavement to give
4 roads a bandaid until more extensive paving can be done. She described the process. There are two
5 projects in Chittenden County: VT2A in St. George-Williston – Ayer Road to Hurricane Lane (3.8
6 miles); and VT 15 in Westford-Cambridge – Cowie Road north to Blanchard Road (3.5 miles).
7 Discussion ensued about whether a leveling project would change the road condition to move it
8 higher or lower on the list. Amy said it would certainly improve the condition, but it would remain
9 on the list in its place. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O'BRIEN, THAT WE
10 APPROVE THE PRIORITIZED DISTRICT LEVELING PROJECT LIST AND FORWARD OUR 20% AS LISTED.
11 MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY, WITH JEFF PILLSBURY ABSTAINING.
12

13 11. Executive Director's Updates:

- 14 a. Legislative Breakfast. – discussed later.
- 15 b. ECOS Annual Report. Charlie noted that this is the time of year that Melanie does a ton of work
16 on updating the ECOS scorecard. Melanie gave a brief demonstration of the ECOS scorecard. It
17 can be viewed at www.ECOSproject.com, then click on Annual Report and then follow the link to
18 the ECOS scorecard. The indicators are based on the four broad goals and sub-goals of the ECOS
19 plan. The slider bar is important because its position gives varying amounts of data. The time
20 period shows the year of the most current data we have. The majority of the data is updated
21 annually, others less frequently. She described what the arrows indicate: red is negative trend;
22 green is positive trend and black means no judgement. When Melanie talked about the rental
23 property vacancy rates and said the rate for Burlington & Winooski is 3.7% is the highest since
24 1993, Justin said this a point in time snapshot on projects built, but not yet leased so he
25 wouldn't rely too much on that because new units tend to take one to two months to rent. You
26 have to look at the long-term trends. Melanie said they collect the data in June and December.
27 When someone suggested maybe we want to add other indicator, Charlie noted that we started
28 with about 80 in 2012 when the plan was adopted and now we have about 100, so we are
29 reviewing this each year. A lengthy discussion continued about being careful how we use the
30 data if we don't know where it came from. We need to put caveats on some of the indicators so
31 folks can correctly interpret the data. Charlie said we're working with the partners and trying to
32 get the story. We're at the early stages of this and we haven't tried to drive policy yet. Perhaps
33 when the plan is updated, we'll need this level of detail. The ECOS Annual Report from partners
34 will be out next week and this is very much a shared process with the Chamber, GBIC, Medical
35 Center, UVM, United Way, municipalities, and state agencies. Melanie will add a note on each
36 indicator to show where data came from, as the Health Department does.
- 37 c. MOU with VTrans/CCTA. Charlie noted we are down to 2-3 sentences for review. We're hoping
38 this is on the February board agenda. Amy said this is at FHWA to get their feedback.
- 39 d. CCRPC 50th Anniversary. Charlie said Emma is working on a communication plan and we will
40 have the celebration at our June annual meeting.
- 41 e. Monthly Report. This will be sent out next week.
- 42 a. Legislative Breakfast. Charlie noted there were close to 60 people there. We got favorable
43 responses verbally, but we did not get much feedback to our electronic survey. Jeff Carr
44 suggested we not ask for things from the legislators, but lend some support to them. Justin
45 Dextrateur suggested we offer staff as resources, as well as the ECOS Indicators. Jeff Carr said
46 the gubernatorial candidates should be encouraged to attend in election years.
- 47 f. Legislative update. Charlie noted the COG bill is having a hearing in front of Govt. Operations
48 Committee tomorrow. We have towns in Chittenden County on both sides of the issue. He had

1 a difficult discussion in Milton on Monday regarding this issue. They have concerns that RPC
2 would tell the towns what to do. The bill submitted by VTrans on stormwater utilities is in
3 committee.
4

5 12 Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports. Andrea had a question on the Executive Committee
6 minutes regarding Exit 1. Members explained.
7

8 13. Members Items: Other business. There was none.
9

10 14. Adjourn. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MARC LANDRY TO ADJOURN AT 8:00 P.M.
11 MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
12

13 Respectfully submitted,
14

15 Bernadette Ferenc
16 Transportation Business Manager
17

DRAFT

Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission

February 17, 2016

Agenda Item 5: UPWP Amendment: Chittenden Opiate Burden Reduction Alliance

Issues:

CCRPC has been asked to serve as the backbone organization of a collective impact effort to reduce the burden of opiate disorders in Chittenden County. The Alliance steering committee includes the leaders of UVM-Medical Center, United Way of Chittenden County, Chittenden County State's Attorney, Howard Center, City of Burlington, Green Mountain Care Board, Agency of Human Services, including the Departments of Health, Corrections, Children & Families, and Mental Health. The Alliance is obtaining \$300,000/year for the next three years to accomplish this work.

CCRPC was asked to be the backbone organization because we have no advocacy position or service role in this work. Therefore, we can be a neutral facilitator, data analyst, and fiscal agent which are the roles of a backbone organization. It is anticipated that we will have to hire a project manager/facilitator and a data manager/analyst for this work. There will be minimal impact to the rest of our operation as this work will be separate, including the staff. It is likely that the two staff may be located in one of the steering committee member's offices, but that has not yet been determined. If we had to, we could fit them in our office.

The proposed amendment to the FY16 UPWP is as follows:

Task # - 5.3.4

Title – Chittenden Opiate Burden Reduction Alliance (COBRA)

Description - COBRA's purpose is to "Reduce the burden of opiate use disorders in Chittenden County using a Collective Impact approach that will improve public health and public safety outcomes." The principles of COBRA are: timely and accurate information and data to inform effective strategies using aligned and, when necessary, rapid deployment of resources combined with relentless follow-up and assessment. CCRPC will serve as the fiscal agent and hire and manage two staff to support this project: a project manager/facilitator and a data manager/analyst.

Deliverables – Successfully facilitate the Alliance steering committee to 1. Gain the authority to request information, 2. Address systems issues involved in data sharing and confidentiality, 3. Direct information sharing or analysis, 4. Identify shared metrics, 5. Develop a collective process for prioritizing strategies, 6. Ensure accountability for strategy implementation and evaluation.

End Date – June, 2019

Budget - \$300,000 from other grant sources.

Executive Committee Recommendation: Staff Recommendation:

The Executive Committee recommends that the CCRPC amend the FY16 UPWP as described above.

Staff recommends that the CCRPC amend the FY16 UPWP as described above.

Staff Contact:

Contact Charlie Baker with any questions: cbaker@ccrpcvt.org, 846-4490 ext. *23.

Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission

February 17, 2016

Agenda Item 6: South Burlington Comprehensive Plan Approval and Confirmation

Issues: The City of South Burlington has requested, per Title 24 V.S.A §4350, that the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (1) approve its 2016 Comprehensive Plan; and (2) confirm its planning process.

Attached is the proposed Resolution of approval and the staff report to the Planning Advisory Committee. The Planning Advisory Committee met on January 13, 2016 and recommended that the Plan, and the municipal planning process, should be forwarded to the CCRPC Board for approval. This meeting served as the public hearing for the Plan and was warned as such.

The Plan has been adopted by the City of South Burlington City Council on February 1, 2016 without changes. 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 and reviewed the Plan on Wednesday, January 13, 2016 at the CCRPC Offices and made the following motion:

The PAC finds that the draft 2016 South Burlington Comprehensive 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 South Burlington's Comprehensive Plan and confirm the City of South Burlington's planning process in accordance with the attached resolution.

For more information contact:

Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
802-846-4490 x28; rmahony@ccrpcvt.org

CCRPC Formal Staff & PAC Review – 2016 South Burlington Comprehensive Plan
January 13, 2016 PAC Meeting

Staff Review of the 2016 South Burlington Comprehensive Plan
Emily Nosse-Leirer, CCRPC Planner
January 13, 2016

The City of South Burlington has requested, per 24 V.S.A §4350, that the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (1) approve its 2016 Comprehensive Plan; and (2) confirm its planning process.

This draft 2016 Comprehensive Plan is a major rewrite of the 2011 Comprehensive Plan. Information from community engagement and studies and work completed by City committees and boards, regional entities and private organizations is incorporated. The first part of the plan, the community assessment, is based on discussion of four “colors” of infrastructure: social, grey (transportation infrastructure and energy), blue (water and wastewater) and green (environmental, recreational and agricultural). The second part is a land use plan addressing five distinct land use planning areas.

Discussion of quality of life, housing affordability, economic policy and long-term sustainability has been strengthened, as have linkages between this plan and policy presented in other studies and adopted plans.

CCRPC staff completed an informal review of a draft of the 2016 South Burlington Comprehensive Plan in June 2015, and the PAC offered comments at the July 8, 2015 meeting. The South Burlington Planning Commission held formal public hearings on October 20 and 27, 2015. The Planning Commission voted on November 3rd to send the draft plan to the City South Burlington City Council. The City Council held its first public hearing on December 15 and will hold its second public hearing on February 1.

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 2016 South Burlington Comprehensive 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 2016 South Burlington Comprehensive Plan is consistent with all of the general goals of §4302. See the attached Appendix A submittal that describes how the Plan is consistent with these goals.
2. The 2016 South Burlington Comprehensive Plan is consistent with the specific goals of §4302. See the attached Appendix A submittal that describes how the Plan is consistent with these goals.
3. The 2016 South Burlington Comprehensive Plan contains the required elements of §4382. See the attached Appendix A submittal that describes compliance with these required elements.

CCRPC Formal Staff & PAC Review – 2016 South Burlington Comprehensive Plan
January 13, 2016 PAC Meeting

4. The 2016 South Burlington Comprehensive 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 2016 South Burlington Comprehensive Plan is compatible with the municipal plans for Shelburne, Williston, Burlington, Colchester, Essex, Essex Junction and Winooski.
6. South Burlington has a planning process in place that is sufficient for an approved plan. In addition South Burlington has provided information about their planning budget (attached) and CCRPC finds that South Burlington is maintaining its efforts to provide local funds for municipal and regional planning.

Additional Comments/Questions:

In the initial review completed in June 2015, CCRPC staff made a number of suggestions. An updated memo is provided as an attachment, which shows the way the suggestions were incorporated. Specifically, staff brought up two issues related to whether the June draft met statutory requirements. Both issues were resolved, described below.

- Flood Resilience: In June, staff expressed concern over whether the plan addressed flood resilience adequately.
 - In the current draft, Section 2.4, “Blue Infrastructure,” contains narrative about flood resilience as well as associated objectives and strategies. The plan also references the South Burlington All Hazard Mitigation Plan.
- Water Quality: In June, staff expressed concern over whether the plan met new statutory requirements established by the Clean Water Act, specifically the addition of a planning goal related to water quality (24 V.S.A. Section 117 § 4302 Goal 6 (B): Vermont’s water quality should be maintained and improved according to the policies and actions developed in the basin plans established by the Secretary of Natural Resources under 10 V.S.A. § 1253).
 - Though the plan does not directly mention the Winooski River Basin Water Quality Management Plan, it does describe the extensive actions taken by the City to improve and maintain water quality, including adopting low impact development stormwater standards and creating a stormwater utility. The plan is clearly consistent with the goals of the Winooski Basin Plan.

CCRPC Staff have no other recommendations, however we would like to commend the City on this Plan for the following reasons:

1. The plan clearly draws on the extensive relevant work being completed by City agencies, committees, staff, the school district, and volunteers. For example, very clear links are drawn between the work of the Affordable Housing Committee and the objectives and strategies described in the Housing section (Section 2.2 B).
2. Overall, this is an extremely well-written and comprehensive plan.

Proposed Motion & Next Steps:

PROPOSED MOTION: The PAC finds that the draft 2016 South Burlington Comprehensive 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

February 17, 2016

Agenda Item 7: Changes to Sidewalk Grant Program

Issues: VTrans has proposed the deletion of the Chittenden County Sidewalk Program from the FY17 budget. This program has been funded at \$300,000 the past two years and \$250,000 in previous years.

Attached is a one page overview of the proposed bike/ped program funding for FY17 that VTrans developed for the legislature. Following that page are two pages prepared by VTrans which provide more detail and background on the change and available funding programs.

This was reviewed and discussed at the TAC and Executive Committee. Individual TAC members were digesting the changes and trying to determine if they had strong opinions. One concern that came up was the increase in local match required for federally-funded construction projects from 10% local match to 20%.

This is a discussion item as there are no recommendations from the TAC or Executive Committee to the CCRPC board.

TAC Recommendation: The TAC reviewed the information and took no position. Individual municipalities may follow-up with their legislators.

Executive Committee Recommendation: The Executive Committee has asked the Director to communicate concerns about the loss of the program to VTrans and Chittenden County legislators on the Transportation Committees.

Staff Recommendation: NA

Staff Contact: Contact Charlie Baker with any questions: cbaker@ccrpevt.org, 846-4490 ext. *23.

WHAT'S NEW FOR THE BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PROGRAM IN SFY17?

Following a 7-year hiatus which began in SFY05, the Agency began funding new projects within the Bicycle & Pedestrian (B/P) Program through a competitive grant program in SFY12. In SFY12, approximately \$2,000,000 in federal funds were allocated for new projects; in subsequent years that amount has risen to \$4,000,000.

Funding Ratios

The Agency currently has two programs that fund bicycle and pedestrian improvements, the Transportation Alternatives (TA) Program and the B/P Program. Parameters for the TA Program are in state statute (Title 19, Chapter 1 §38); state statute requires that grant recipients pay the full matching share required for the projects. Furthermore, the Transportation Alternatives Grant Committee decided that scoping studies would be funded at the ratio of 50% federal funds and 50% local funds. The SFY17 budget proposal is predicated on projects within the B/P Program being funded at the same ratio as the TA Program. Furthermore, it proposes that funding for state funded projects be in line with transportation projects funded through the Downtown Program administered by the Agency of Commerce and Community Development.

	Funding Ratio in SFY16 Program	Funding Ratio in SFY17 Program
Scoping Studies	90% Fed/ State + 10% Local	50% Federal + 50% Local
State Funded Construction Projects	80% State + 20% Local	50% State + 50% Local
Federally Funded Construction Projects	90% Fed/ State + 10% Local	80% Federal + 20% Local

New and/ or Increased Funding Levels

New Awards for State Aid Construction Projects: SFY16 was the first year that the state proposed a line item for new awards for state aid construction projects – targeted for small scale improvements. The amount in SFY16 was \$150,000; the proposal in SFY17 increasing this to \$300,000 which will leverage \$300,000 in local funds for a \$600,000 investment in state only funded projects. Please see section above for pro rata share changes.

Local Motion ST BP16() – Ferry Operation: The Island Line Trail utilizes a bike ferry to make the connection across the Lake Champlain causeway from Colchester to South Hero. Local Motion stepped up to the plate and secured funding, and took all responsibility for the ferry and necessary improvements for its operation. In addition to purchase of a ferry, their efforts included improvements to the ramps and docks, turnarounds on each side of the cut, installation of viewing/ fishing platforms, repairs to the causeway, and installation of wave attenuators to ensure safe and dependable operation of the ferry. They also agreed to providing the day to day operational responsibilities of this ferry. The \$60,000 included in the SFY17 budget is approximately ½ of the cost to operate the ferry. VTrans recognizes the regional importance of this facility and thus would like to support Local Motion in sharing the cost of operation. VTrans supports Local Motion recognizing Local Motion's long history of supporting efforts in the region and the setbacks they have faced over the years from natural events. By financially supporting Local Motion, it will also allow them to focus their efforts on enhancing their membership and finances to ensure they can continue supporting this regional bike ferry connection for the foreseeable future.

Statewide ST BP16() – VYCC: VTrans has supported the operations of the Vermont Youth Conservation Corps (VYCC) for many years through federal transportation enhancement (TE) funding. Changes in the eligibility of the program and the difficulties meeting all the federal requirements have put this in jeopardy. The SFY17 budget proposal includes \$100,000 of state funds, approximately one-half of the former commitment of TE funds, so that this program can continue through a three-way partnership of VTrans, VYCC and the Department of Forest Parks & Recreation.

Discontinued Funding

Chittenden County STP SDWK() – The SFY17 proposal does not include new projects funded through this line item as Chittenden County project needs can be funded through the TA and B/P competitive grant programs. This funding had been at 80% Federal and 20% Local with annual award amounts of \$300,000 in federal funds.

CCRPC Sidewalk Grant Program

Program History

After many years of awarding bicycle and pedestrian grants, the VTrans Bicycle and Pedestrian Program took a long hiatus, starting in SFY05. The CCRPC Sidewalk Grant Program was committed to by then Secretary McDonald shortly after the Circumferential Highway was stopped from going to construction through legal measures; the program was agreed to in order to meet some of the area needs. Funding for the program was first shown in the Capital Program in the SFY06 budget proposal. The only other funding opportunity for these types of projects at that time was the Transportation Enhancement Program (TE).

Since SFY12 VTrans has had an annual solicitation for new bicycle and pedestrian related projects through the TE Program and subsequently the Transportation Alternatives (TA) Program. In SFY12, approximately \$2,000,000 in federal funds were allocated for new projects; in subsequent years that amount has risen to \$4,000,000.

Statewide resources available to CCRPC municipalities for bike/ped projects include the following; these figures represent the total resources awarded, including any federal, state, and local share (see prior funding ratios for details):

- ~ \$ 5.0 M – Federally Funded Bike/Ped Program
- ~ \$ 1.4 M – *Transportation Alternatives Program
- ~ \$ 850 K – *Vermont Downtown Transportation Program
- ~ \$ 600 K – State Funded Bike/Ped Program

Moving Forward

In the SFY17 budget VTrans is recommending the discontinuance of funding for the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC) Sidewalk Grant Program. It is the position of the Agency that there are adequate resources available to the communities of Chittenden County through the statewide bicycle and pedestrian funding programs. Due to the federal planning funding provided to the CCRPC as a federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization, communities of the region have unique access to project planning resources and technical assistance to plan for projects and develop highly competitive grant applications. Many communities in the region have received state designations as Growth Centers, Downtowns, Neighborhood Development Areas and Village Centers. The density of residents and businesses and the ubiquitous accessibility to transit in the region all contribute to the high level of bike/ped trip generation. The chart below summarizes the success of the region historically in obtaining grant awards through the statewide program.

In SFY16 the Agency shifted its focus to determining how to more expeditiously advance sidewalk and pedestrian infrastructure projects by creating a state funded only program. VTrans sees this program as a better mechanism to advance the implementation of projects which had previously been awarded through the federally funded CCRPC Sidewalk Grant Program. By using state only funds, more linear feet of sidewalk are able to be constructed and the permitting and administrative burden to the state and communities is greatly reduced. In SFY17 VTrans is proposing a doubling of the state resources available for this program which would total \$300,000 and which will leverage \$300,000 in local funds for a \$600,000 investment in state only funded projects.

VTrans is committed to bringing resources to communities to enhance their bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure needs. This proposal advances the magnitude of those investments and provides equitable access on a statewide basis while still recognizing through the funding criteria that there are areas of the

state in which these resources are more critically needed. The evolution of these programs will continue to support the mobility and safety needs of Vermonters.

Below is a summary of funding received for bicycle and pedestrian projects within Chittenden County for the last 5 years, excluding funding through the CCRPC Sidewalk Grant Program:

2011-2015 BIKE-PED MUNICIPAL AWARDS								
PROGRAM	YEAR	AWARDED STATEWIDE		AWARDED CHITTENDEN COUNTY			UNFUNDED CHITT COUNTY	
		NO OF PROJ ¹	AMOUNT ²	NO OF PROJ ¹	AMOUNT ²	% TOTAL	NO OF PROJ ¹	AMOUNT ²
TE	2011	16	\$2,745,432.83	1	\$208,805.83	7.61%	2	\$148,000.00
	2012	18	\$3,355,000.00	2	\$469,000.00	13.98%	3	\$530,095.00
TA	2013	20	\$2,076,593.00	3	\$750,000.00	36.12%	3	\$678,027.00
	2014	15	\$2,142,250.00	1	\$203,000.00	9.48%	0 ³	\$0.00
BIKE-PED	2015	9	\$1,998,205.60	5	\$1,154,531.60	57.78%	1	\$300,000.00
	2011	0	\$0.00	0	\$0.00			
BIKE-PED	2012	14	\$2,245,500.00	2	\$342,000.00	15.23%	3	\$1,397,165.00
	2013	24	\$4,200,660.00	6	\$1,381,950.00	32.90%	0	\$0.00
BIKE-PED	2014	23	\$4,146,570.00	7	\$782,100.00	18.86%	1	\$770,484.00
	2015	28	\$4,579,500.00	9	\$1,161,200.00	25.36%	3	\$1,481,603.00
TOTAL	2011 - 2015	167	\$27,489,711.43	36	\$6,452,587.43	23.47%	16	\$5,305,374.00
^{1,2} INCLUDES "SCOPING" & "SMALL SCALE" PROJECTS, NON BIKE-PED TE & TA PROJECTS HAVE BEEN REMOVED.								
² FEDERAL AND STATE FUNDS, DOES NOT INCLUDE "LOCAL" SHARE.								
³ A 2014 MILTON SCOPING REQUEST (\$10,000) WAS FUNDED THROUGH THE CCMPO AND WITHDRAWN FROM THE PROGRAM.								

In addition to there being more funding opportunities now than in SFY06, the selection criteria used in the program(s) currently favor projects within Chittenden County being funded. This is in part due to the availability of professional staff, scoping assistance through the CCRPC, high volume of pedestrians and cyclists, etc. Projects are selected based on the following:

- Describe how the project addresses a pedestrian or bicyclist need identified in local or regional planning documents. Describe how the project contributes to a system of pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities
- Describe how the area being studied is one which would provide access to likely generators of pedestrian and/or bicyclist activity
- Is the project located within a Designated Downtown or Village Center recognized by the VT Department of Economic, Housing and Community Development?
- Describe how the project budget was developed
- Please describe how the proposed project addresses unsafe conditions. Be as specific as possible and provide data/documentation in support
- To what degree has the project advanced to date?
- Does the proposed project appear to have potentially significant permitting issues? (E.g. Act 250, stormwater, wetlands, 401 water quality, Section 4f) If so, how have those issues been considered?
- Does the proposed project require complex right of way acquisition? Right of way includes any temporary easements that might be needed to construct the project.
- Does the proposed project appear to include complex design issues (e.g. extensive retaining walls, bridges, railroad involvement?) If so, how have those issues been addressed?
- Is the application complete, well-written, internally consistent, and realistic; does it describe a single, clearly defined project.

Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission

February 17, 2016

Agenda Item 9: H.249 Council of Governments bill

Issues:

There is a pending bill (H.249) in the Legislature that would enable RPCs to provide inter-municipal services upon a vote of 67% of the municipalities. The most recent version is attached (dated 2/10/16). This bill is getting discussed currently and may change by the time of the CCRPC meeting.

There are municipalities in Chittenden County that are very supportive of this and others that are very opposed. Please review the Executive Committee minutes for a more detailed discussion of some of the major issues.

We will review the most recent version of the bill so that CCRPC board members have a good understanding of the background and details of the bill. This may be voted upon on the House floor before our meeting. If it passes out of the House, it will be heard in the Senate Government Operations Committee.

Executive Committee

The Executive Committee added this to the CCRPC agenda to make sure the full board is aware of this bill.

Recommendation:

Staff

NA

Recommendation:

Staff Contact:

Contact Charlie Baker with any questions: cbaker@ccrpcvt.org, 846-4490 ext. *23.

1 TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

2 The Committee on Government Operations to which was referred House
3 Bill No. 249 entitled “An act relating to intermunicipal services and the
4 authority to create a regional council of governments” respectfully reports that
5 it has considered the same and recommends that the bill be amended by
6 striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the
7 following:

8 Sec. 1. 24 V.S.A. § 4345b is added to read:

9 § 4345b. INTERMUNICIPAL SERVICE AGREEMENTS

10 (a) A regional planning commission may exercise the authority under this
11 section only after an affirmative vote of at least 67 percent of both:

12 (1) the board of commissioners of the regional planning
13 commission; and

14 (2) the legislative branches of the regional planning commission’s
15 member municipalities.

16 (b) Prior to a vote under subsection (a) of this section, a regional planning
17 commission shall:

18 (1) draft updated bylaws to specify the process for entering into, method
19 of withdrawal from, and method of terminating service agreements with
20 member municipalities; and

1 (2) present the draft bylaws to each member municipality’s legislative
2 body.

3 (c) Upon an affirmative vote under subsection (a) of this section, a regional
4 planning commission may:

5 (1) promote cooperative arrangements and coordinate action among its
6 member municipalities, including arrangements and action with respect to
7 planning, community development, joint purchasing, intermunicipal services,
8 and infrastructure; and

9 (2) exercise any power, privilege, or authority, as defined within a
10 services agreement under subsection (d) of this section, capable of exercise by
11 a member municipality as necessary or desirable for dealing with problems of
12 local or regional concern.

13 (d)(1) In exercising the powers set forth in subsection (c) of this section, a
14 regional planning commission shall enter into a service agreement with one or
15 more member municipalities. Participation by a member municipality shall be
16 voluntary and only valid upon appropriate action by the legislative body of the
17 member municipality.

18 (2) A service agreement shall describe the services to be provided and
19 the amount of funds payable by each member municipality that is a party to the
20 service agreement. Service of personnel, use of equipment and office space,

1 and other necessary services may be accepted from member municipalities as
2 part of their financial support.

3 (e) A regional planning commission shall not have the following powers
4 under this section:

5 (1) essential legislative functions;

6 (2) taxing authority; or

7 (3) eminent domain.

8 (f)(1) Funds provided for regional planning under section 4341a or 4346 of
9 this chapter shall not be used to provide services under a service agreement
10 without prior written authorization from the state agency or other entity
11 providing the funds.

12 (2) A commission shall not use municipal funds or grants provided for
13 regional planning services under this chapter to cover the costs associated with
14 any service agreement under this section

15
16 (Committee vote: _____)

17 _____

18 Representative _____

19 FOR THE COMMITTEE

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

5 Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2016
6 Time: 5:55 p.m.
7 Place: CCRPC Offices; 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202; Winooski VT 05404
8 Present: Andy Montroll, Chair Chris Roy, Vice-Chair
9 Mike O'Brien, Secretary-Treasurer John Zicconi, At-Large
10 Brian Bigelow, At-Large Lou Mossey, Immediate Past Chair
11 Staff: Charlie Baker, Executive Director Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
12 Eleni Churchill, Trans. Program Manager
13 Forest Cohen, Business Manager Bernie Ferenc, Trans. Business Manager
14 Others: Martha Maksym, Executive Director, United Way of Chittenden County
15

- 16 1. Changes to the Agenda/Members' Items. Charlie noted that there will be no discussion on the
17 MOU as VTrans attorneys are now reviewing it.
18
19 2. Review of Dr. Brumsted's Op-Ed and Chittenden Opiate Burden Reduction Alliance (COBRA)
20 grant applications including CCRPC serving as backbone organization. Charlie said that a lot of
21 this is rooted in the ECOS Plan health section which was developed with our partners at United
22 Way and the Medical Center. One of the issues regarding health that was new in our plan was
23 the opiate issue. We have connections with the CAPE project where UVM got a grant and we
24 helped with data on health and crime issues primarily in Burlington. We have another grant
25 "Partnership for Success" where we are the fiscal agent for a \$300,000 grant. Most of the
26 recipients are working on prevention measures with youth. Some of the indicators involve the
27 partners who help with the data. Charlie has been careful to note that we don't have a role in
28 health care and don't want to, but we are providing data. The medical center invited him to
29 serve on the Community Health Investment Committee where \$750,000 is invested each year.
30 The idea in Dr. Brumsted's Op Ed piece is to work towards a future where they help people stay
31 healthy rather than just treating symptoms to get healthy. There been a lot of conversations
32 about how to deal with the opiate issue. Last week we were asked to become the backbone
33 organization to coordinate meetings, be the fiscal agent, etc. This is a \$100,000 grant
34 application which is part of a \$300,000/yr three-year effort where we would hire staff to
35 facilitate a steering committee of the involved parties and work on data integration and analysis.
36 They have come to us as a neutral third party that does both of these things in our current work.
37

38 Martha Maksym is Executive Director of the United Way of Chittenden County and has been
39 there over 22 years. They have been a part of this since 1996 when they started the Champlain
40 Initiative, which she described. They ran the Champlain Initiative until approached by the
41 CCRPC to participate in the new ECOS regional plan. This was unique for Champlain Initiative
42 because ECOS involved the municipalities which CI did not. She noted that Collective Impact is a
43 systematic approach to address a really complex societal issues. There are five components to
44 the opiate crisis: a. education; b. treatment; c. recovery; d. safety; and e. public education.
45 When you deal with all of these areas, you end up with a lot of organizations that should be
46 involved. She further described calls she's been getting on the issue and what they want to do.
47 She started to see a lot of work at cross purposes. The medical center has a Collective Impact

1 Grant Opportunity and she thought we could use this approach to organize the players to
2 answer these questions:

- 3 • Shared goals
- 4 • Shared measurement. How are we going to know we got there?
- 5 • How do we make sure there are mutually beneficial activities?
- 6 • Continuous communication
- 7 • Backbone organization – a neutral organization that will be behind the scenes to make
8 sure data is collected, organize meetings, etc.

9 As they tried to decide who would do that Martha said the United Way considered it, but did
10 not feel they would be neutral, so Penrose Jackson suggested that we do it under ECOS umbrella
11 because the partners are already committed to working together. We are looking for \$100,000
12 per year from medical center for three years; Stiller Family Foundation has committed \$100,000
13 per year for three years and we have a strong interest from SIM grant through Green Mountain
14 Care Board for \$100,000 per year for three years. The medical center committee is meeting
15 next week to review the grant applications. The whole purpose is to support the organization.
16 We would hire two staff – one for data gathering about the opiate crisis; and the second to be
17 project manager to be sure the alliance is doing what they say they're doing. Others would be
18 asked to provide seed money to put into programs, such as Boys & Girls Club to add activities to
19 keep children busy and off the streets. After discussion with Charlie, Martha did add our
20 organization as the tentative backbone organization on the application, but that could change if
21 the board didn't agree.

22
23 Charlie wanted to bring this to the Executive Committee to be sure you want us to take this on.
24 Andy asked Charlie if this is something feasible for our staff to do. Charlie said yes, we can do
25 this. The two employees would be working for this steering committee full-time. These are not
26 complicated grants to manage. Martha said there is only one opiate issue application. Other
27 proposals deal with other issues and the hospital committee will make the decision. Andy asked
28 members if they're open to this. Lou Mossey asked whether it would impact our work program.
29 Charlie said no and that it would be complimentary to the work we are already doing such as
30 Melanie's data collection for ECOS and the CAPE work. Charlie noted that back in the Challenges
31 for Change days, getting more involved with Health and Human Services was mentioned as
32 something to consider. John was concerned about the location of the staff. Martha said
33 Burlington Police Department and hospital each have some space, but she is concerned about
34 the perception of this and where those people would be housed. Mike O'Brien said when he
35 first read this he thought this was just treatment, but now he hears that it's prevention,
36 treatment, law enforcement, etc. Martha said this is about organizing everything. Mike feels it's
37 important and is something that we've been talking about. He knows the mayor's group is in
38 favor. Martha said their staff tried to decide who the chair should be, such as Dr. Chen,
39 Vermont Commissioner of Health. Mike O'Brien asked if this is going to work together with
40 what Rutland has been doing. Martha said yes and noted that the U.S. Attorney's office is at the
41 table. Mike asked if three years were a realistic timeframe. Martha said this is the organization
42 that will get everyone talking to each other and sharing data. Mike feels it's a long-term
43 problem and he hopes in three years there's a well-defined and organized group and that it
44 won't be gone in five years. Martha said being under ECOS umbrella would keep us all together.
45 Mike said if it's under ECOS, how will it affect the CCRPC long-term? Charlie said Martha is trying
46 to be sure all these organizations work together and share data. They're hoping that once you
47 get this all in place, you could have a system working that doesn't require extra staffing. She is
48 also having a collaborative of funders to talk because perhaps United Way would no longer

1 invest in treatment because the hospital and other agencies would cover it; and United Way
2 could switch support to, say recovery. Lengthy discussion continued. Martha feels the
3 leadership committee will be in charge and staff wouldn't be day-to-day managed by CCRPC.
4 When Mike asked if this effort just covers Burlington, Martha said all of Chittenden County.
5 MIKE O'BRIEN MADE A MOTION TO RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD THAT WE TAKE THIS
6 PROPOSAL ON. JOHN ZICCONI SECONDED. Members discussed whether the board should be
7 making the decision. Charlie said the clean way would be to amend the work program. Lou
8 suggested a look into how the ECOS plan might affect other things and how CCRPC can do more
9 of this type of thing. We are amenable to be planners and the backbone organization. Charlie
10 felt that we are fully "partnerized" and there aren't many more out there. THE MOTION WAS
11 THEN AMENDED TO READ "MIKE O'BRIEN MADE A MOTION TO RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD
12 THAT WE TAKE THIS PROPOSAL ON AND AMEND OUR WORK PROGRAM. JOHN ZICCONI
13 SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. John Zicconi does not support housing these
14 staff people with law enforcement because it sends the wrong message. Another location
15 would be better.

- 16
- 17 3. Approval of January 6, 2016 Executive Committee Minutes. CHRIS ROY MADE A MOTION TO
18 APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 6, 2016 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING. MIKE
19 O'BRIEN SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED WITH LOU MOSSEY ABSTAINING.
20
- 21 4. Act 250 & Section 248 Applications. There were none this month.
22
- 23 5. Draft MOU with VTrans and CCTA. The attorneys at VTrans are now engaged. They are asking
24 that it be a Memorandum of Agreement. We anticipate this being on the agenda for our March
25 meeting.
26
- 27 6. Sidewalk Grant. Charlie noted that VTrans is proposing to discontinue funding Chittenden
28 County STP Sidewalk program. The Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) reviewed this at
29 their meeting yesterday. The sense of the TAC was that it's not so bad because VTrans has been
30 increasing funding for Bike/Ped and transportation alternatives and the program has gotten
31 bigger. Eleni said the greater issue with them was the federal funded construction projects that
32 went from 80% fed/10%state/10% local funding to 80% federal and 20% local funding with no
33 state match. The state's argument is that if they don't fund federal projects, they'll have more
34 money to put into the State Funded Construction Projects, which is new this year. They are
35 proposing this pot go from 80% state funds with 20% local match to 50% state funds and 50%
36 local funds. VTrans suggests this is a better deal because there are less requirements for
37 construction projects using state funds only. Discussion ensued. John is concerned about
38 cutting the \$300,000 because even if they added more money to the bike/ped program
39 statewide, there is no guarantee our communities will get the same funding. Members hope
40 that VTrans wouldn't try to spread the money evenly all around the state when the densest
41 population is in Chittenden County. Some TAC members were going to take this issue back to
42 their communities to get feedback. Charlie noted that our towns are likely shifting some of the
43 funds that would have gone to bike/ped projects to water quality projects. John asked whether
44 the state thought we'd see less money over the next 3-5 years. Eleni feels that we are
45 positioned well to get these funds. In the past we've received 23.47% of the bike/ped municipal
46 awards. We can do this because our communities can use PL funds for the scoping portion.
47 She's sorry we're losing the sidewalk program and a letter might be prudent letting them know
48 that we have these real needs in Chittenden County. Chris Roy said if we have the funding we

1 can deal with this locally and not impose on the state. Mike suggested we let our feeling known
2 to the Chittenden County legislators who serve on the House and Senate transportation
3 committees. Andy gave Charlie the authority to communicate this to the state as appropriate.
4

- 5 7. 1st Rough Draft of Tech Industry/Young Families Summary Report. Regina Mahony said we have
6 a project in this year's work program to get a handle on the tech industry and young families to
7 see if we can do anything. She said this is a very rough draft that Melanie and Emily have been
8 working on. We're trying to get a handle on what issues there are in the tech area and whether
9 housing is an issue. They're bringing it here now to see if board members think this is heading in
10 the right direction. Their main conclusion is that we may undertake projects that support
11 healthy community development like the following:

- 12 • Continuing to promote investments in all modes of transportation, especially between areas
13 with high planned housing density and employment centers.
- 14 • Continuing to promote housing development for all income levels in area planned for
15 growth.
- 16 • Continuing a regional housing conversation to determine needs and opportunities for
17 housing development throughout the county.
- 18 • Collaborate with the Chamber of Commerce to enhance the Vermont Brand and promote
19 Chittenden County as a burgeoning tech center.

20 Andy feels it's on the right track and feels there are a lot of groups doing things but we need an
21 inventory of what's being done. This is on the right track to see where the challenges are.
22 Charlie would like to bring this to the board in March so if there are follow-up items, we have
23 time to add them to the FY17 UPWP. He feels the most important will be conversations about
24 transportation infrastructure and then housing conversations. We've been growing as a county,
25 but the workers are having to live outside the county. Andy feels we really want to have our
26 area be considered a tech center and put a framework on some of these things. John Zicconi
27 suggested that we spell out STEM in the beginning of the document. Lou Mossey noted there is
28 a push on the education side for more STEM training.
29

- 30 8. H.249 Council of Governments (COG) Legislation and FAQ. Charlie noted that we had included a
31 draft of the legislation in the packet, but there is a new version as of this afternoon. He did
32 testify this afternoon, but only to give information. The committee voted it out this afternoon.
33 Charlie said they ended up adding one sentence regarding voting that a COG "maintain an equal
34 number of representatives appointed from each member municipality." The other changes
35 were to increase percentage of towns voting in favor from 60 to 67%. They clarified that you
36 can't use a state grant given for one thing to pay for COG services. Charlie said that two weeks
37 ago he had his annual check-in with Milton. He said the Milton Selectboard is very opposed to
38 the notion of COGs and there was discussion about Charlie's & RPC's intent to take over the
39 towns. He was not very effective trying to dissuade them that this is not an intent of anyone
40 here. Lou thinks this goes back to a decade ago when there was discussion of regional or county
41 government. Lengthy discussion ensued. Members had concerns about some of the
42 requirement in the bill. Charlie noted that this conversation very much mirrored the
43 conversation in the House Government Operations Committee today. Those concerns included:
44 • How to have at least 50% be municipal elected officials, because they're already pulled in all
45 directions
46 • Some rural communities don't have staff so they rely on RPC for that. CCRPC is one of the
47 few in Vermont that really supports the municipalities and doesn't do a top down approach.

- 1 • Why does the process have to be so complicated? or Why don't we just change the duties of
2 the RPCs? The House Gov Ops committee decided that it's better to have a more
3 transparent process for each of the towns in a region to decide if they want to turn their
4 RPC into a COG. What if a town doesn't want to participate? The legislature looked at this
5 that if a town wants to do it they can, if they don't they don't have to.

6 Charlie said it did pass out of the House Government Operations Committee today so he thinks
7 it will go directly to the floor or possibly another committee. He feels there is another
8 opportunity to testify in the Senate committee. Andy said we really don't know how our
9 communities feel and he would hate for us to take a position one way or the other. It was noted
10 that this is only enabling legislation so we could stay as we are now. Members agreed Charlie
11 can continue to provide factual information on this topic. They also agreed that we need to let
12 the full board know what's going on. Perhaps we need to get feedback about what the
13 aversions are.

14

15 9. Chair's/Executive Director's Report.

- 16 • ECOS Annual Report. The report was emailed yesterday. Hard copies were distributed.
17 Charlie noted that information included came from discussions with ECOS partners.
18 Members briefly discussed the report and gave suggestions.
- 19 • Personnel Evaluations. Charlie noted that evaluations for all staff were completed on
20 Monday. It was a very positive process. Staff all got high marks on performance. There was
21 a lot of support for the new management structure.
- 22 • UPWP Update. Charlie noted we received 67 project suggestions for the FY17 UPWP with
23 the total amount twice as much as what we have budgeted, so we'll have to do some
24 cutting. The next committee meeting will be Thursday, March 3rd.
- 25 • Legislative Update. Besides the COG bill, Charlie has been following 4 others that have RPC
26 implications:
- 27 • A bill that passed house last year would change the municipal plan review from 5 years
28 to 10 years, but is still up in the air.
 - 29 • Solar Siting Task Force just came out with a report. Adam Lougee from Addison County
30 RPC represented VAPDA. It appears that a compromise may be developing where
31 individual municipalities would have less weight in the Public Service Board process, but
32 if the towns cooperated in developing a regional plan that would carry more weight.
33 This is connected to the energy planning that RPCs are involved in and he thinks the
34 energy planning in general is a good idea, but the actually siting criteria and/or mapping
35 could be challenging.
 - 36 • Senate bill 123 is ANR's permitting process bill. They have 83 processes and are trying
37 to get it down to five.
 - 38 • There's a bill the Agency of Commerce introduced that might take away our ability to
39 "negotiate" a contract annually with them. We are talking with them to make sure we
40 retain that ability.

41

42 10. Review of February 17, 2016 Board Agenda. Members reviewed and approved the agenda for
43 the February 17th board meeting.

44

45 11. Other Business. There was no other business.

46

1 12. Executive Session. JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY LOU MOSSEY, TO GO INTO
2 EXECUTIVE SESSION AT 8:05 P.M.TO DISCUSS PERSONNEL ITEMS. THE MOTION CARRIED
3 UNANIMOUSLY. JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY LOU MOSSEY, TO COME OUT
4 OF EXECUTIVE SESSION AT 8:35 P.M. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
5
6

7 There being no further business the Committee adjourned at 8:35.
8

9 Respectfully submitted,
10

11
12 Bernadette Ferenc

DRAFT

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

4 DATE: Tuesday, February 2, 2016
5 TIME: 9:00 a.m.
6 PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal St. Winooski, VT
7

8 **Members Present**

9 Bruce Hoar, Williston
10 Bryan Osborne, Colchester and TAC Chair
11 Barbara Elliot, Huntington
12 Amy Bell, VTrans
13 Justin Rabidoux, South Burlington
14 Katelin Brewer-Colie, Bicycle/Pedestrian
15 Bob Henneberger, Seniors
16 Chris Jolly, FHWA
17 Peter Wernsdorfer, Winooski
18 Robin Pierce, Essex Junction
19 Brian Bigelow, Underhill
20 Roger Hunt, Milton
21 Matt Langham, VTrans
22 Dave Armstrong, CCTA
23 Dennis Lutz, Essex
24 Katherine Sonnicks, Jericho
25 Jeanine McCrumb, Charlotte
26 Nicole Losch, Burlington
27 Sandy Thibault, CATMA
28

Staff Present

Eleni Churchill, Transportation Program Manager
Christine Forde, Senior Transportation Planner
Jason Charest, Senior Transportation Planning Engineer
Charlie Baker, Executive Director
Peter Keating, Senior Transportation Planner
Marshall Distel, Transportation Planner
Sai Sarepalli, Transportation Planning Engineer
Bryan Davis, Senior Transportation Planner

Others Present

Emily Boedecker, Local Motion
Alex Sampson, Winooski

29
30 **1. Consent Agenda**

31 N/A this month.
32

33 **2. Approval of Minutes**

34 A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 5, 2016 PASSED UNANIMOUSLY
35 AFTER ACCEPTING A REVISION ADDING JUSTIN RABIDOUX TO THE MEMBERS PRESENT
36 LIST.
37

38 **3. Public Comments**

39 There were none.
40

41 **4. CCRPC Sidewalk Program Changes**

42 Sue Scribner of VTrans attended the meeting via phone to provide more detail to the memo sent out in the
43 TAC packet. VTrans is proposing to the legislature changes in the programs that fund bicycle and
44 pedestrian projects. Changes include:

- 45 • Increasing state funds for the small scale state funded construction projects
- 46 • Increasing the local share for these projects
- 47 • Making scoping studies under this program a 50/50 split between state and local funds
- 48 • Providing operational funding for Local Motion's Lake Champlain Causeway bike ferry
- 49 • Eliminating the Chittenden County Sidewalk Program

1 Sue cited several factors behind these changes, including, making more funding available statewide to
2 advance projects, Chittenden County's favorable position in qualifying for the state programs given the
3 planning/scoping resources available to the MPO and urban friendly evaluation criteria in those programs.
4 She also mentioned that introducing more state only funding would result in more pedestrian
5 infrastructure getting built. Sue also mentioned that federal funding through both the Bicycle and
6 Pedestrian Program (BP) and Transportation Alternatives (TA) - over \$5M - is available state wide and
7 these program will have an 80/20 federal/local share for project construction. TAC member
8 comments/questions included:

- 9 • Towns will not likely use a 50/50 share program for construction projects
- 10 • Going from 80/20 or 90/10 programs to one that is 50/50 is a drastic change
- 11 • What's the big picture result of these proposed changes? (answer: Small increases in BP and TA
12 programs although TA has a set-aside for stormwater projects, and there's the new \$300K State
13 funds program)
- 14 • The table in the memo illustrates that Chittenden towns have, on average, received 20% of
15 statewide funds through these programs but it could be argued that Chittenden County needs are
16 higher.
- 17 • Is this proposal a "done deal?" Is it worth talking to the legislature about the changes, especially
18 the increase in local share?
- 19 • The legislative transportation committee will be reviewing this. Charlie Baker asked that if any
20 towns want to take this up with the legislative committees to let him know.

21 22 **5. Way to Go! Update**

23 Bryan Davis thanked the TAC for replying by email regarding the selection of Place Creative as the firm
24 to manage this program in the upcoming year. Bryan mentioned that when the program expanded
25 statewide in 2010 with state funding, the Vermont Energy Investment Corporation took the program on
26 but it now seemed more appropriate to let a marketing specialist assume management. Recent
27 performance showed flat individual/employer registrations although school participation was up. Bryan
28 reported that kick-off meeting took place last week and a decision was made to shift the two week event
29 from May to September. He also reported that there would be a search for media sponsor to help boost
30 participation.

31 32 **6. Burlington North Avenue Corridor Update**

33 Jason Charest gave an update of what was going on with this recently in-the-news project in Burlington.
34 He first provided some background information;
35 A CCRPC 2013/2014 Corridor Study which resulted in

- 36 – Short, medium, long term recommendations,
- 37 – City Council Resolution creating the
 - 38 • North Avenue Task Force, and a
 - 39 • Pilot Project (short term) for a 4 to 3 lane road diet

40 Jason then described the details of the road diet and its benefits – reducing speeding and crashes and
41 allowing the repurposing of the public space – in this case for a protected bike lane. He also noted other
42 road diet details and possible consequences:

- 43 • 20,000 AADT Rule of Thumb – if higher it may not be a good candidate
- 44 • Some increase in travel time is expected
- 45 • Retiming signals is critical to making it work
- 46 • Un-signalized side streets can see increased delay
- 47 • Potential to divert traffic

48 Staff has collected quite a bit of data for the before pilot project conditions, including travel times and
49 speeds, vehicle, pedestrian and bike counts and High Crash Locations (HCL) – two of these are on two
50 segments between Ethan Allen Parkway and Shore Road.

1 Jason then shifted to the project as a current news story due to a petition effort to roll back the pilot
2 project. City council has agreed to have an item on the Town Meeting day ballot asking the public if four
3 lanes should remain on the roadway through a specific stretch. While City Council approved the ballot
4 item, most are still on record of supporting the pilot project. The pilot schedule:

- 5 • Contracted with Stantec for striping and signal assistance
- 6 • Preparation of revised signal timing plans
- 7 • Spring/Summer 2016 implementation
- 8 • Monitor pilot and collect feedback throughout
- 9 • Make final decision Spring/Summer 2017 to make pilot permanent or not

10
11 **7. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports**

12 Bryan Osborne directed TAC members to the project list on the back of the agenda page and asked if
13 members had any questions.

14
15 **8. CCRPC January Board Meeting Report.**

16 Peter mentioned the FY17 UPWP public forum and approval of the regional ITS Plan, district leveling
17 priorities and the mid-year UPWP budget adjustment.

18
19 **9. Chairman's/Members' Items**

20 Justin Rabidou brought up the subject of shared services/staff among municipalities. He mentioned a
21 Bike/Ped staffing need in South Burlington and the inability to budget for Full Time Equivalents (FTE)
22 but thought that sharing positions between towns could make sense. He's looking for other interested
23 communities to discuss this further.

24
25
26 The meeting adjourned at 10:20 a.m.

27
28 Respectfully submitted,

29
30 Peter Keating

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

4 DATE: Wednesday, January 13, 2016
5 TIME: 2:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.
6 PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT

Members Present

Joss Besse, Bolton
Cathynn LaRose, South Burlington
Ken Belliveau, Williston
Dana Hanley, Essex
Alex Weinhagen, Hinesburg
Everett Marshall, Huntington
Paul Conner, South Burlington
Karen Purinton, Colchester

Dana Hanley, Essex
Jeff Castle, Milton
Clare Rock, Richmond

Staff

Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
Lee Krohn, Senior Planner
Emily Nosse-Leirer, Planner
Dan Albrecht, Senior Planner

7
8
9 **1. Welcome and Introductions**

10 Joss Besse called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.
11

12 **2. Approval of November 18, 2015 Minutes**

13
14 Cathynn LaRose made a motion, seconded by Ken Belliveau to approve the November 18, 2015 minutes. No
15 further discussion. MOTION PASSED.
16

17 **3. Community Rating System – Colchester Success**

18 Colchester has successfully obtained status as a Community Rating System Class 8 Community. Sarah Hadd
19 and Karen Purinton gave the PAC an overview of the Community Rating System process and benefits. This
20 program provides benefits based on having higher standards in your floodplain regulations. They explained
21 that this was a big paperwork exercise, however they were already regulating development in the floodplain,
22 and collecting all of the needed information. After managing recovery of the Spring 2011 lake flood damages
23 (were a lot of folks re-built and already have the elevation certificates), they thought it would be helpful to get
24 all of that information down on paper in case they need it again. They were accepted into program, effective
25 in May. There are a number of areas where you can get credit: outreach, stormwater management (and being
26 able to prove those calculations), how strict your regulations are, etc. Colchester essentially allows no new
27 building in the floodplain. Existing buildings can't expand footprint and can't add any other buildings, but
28 they can add height if they flood proof and elevate the structure 1' above the base flood elevation (BFE is 102'
29 along the lake).
30

31 Colchester received a rating of 8 – the best in VT. This rating provides landowners a 10% discount on flood
32 insurance; and is therefore an incentive for residents to get flood insurance. Insurance discounts are in 5%
33 blocks – so with every improved rating step (an improved score is a lower rating number) residents will get
34 another 5% discount on flood insurance. Sarah Hadd indicated that Colchester has about 100 structures in
35 floodplain, and only a small fraction have insurance. The Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of
36 2012, which was intended to require landowners to buy insurance more representative of the real cost of
37 potential losses, was pulled back except for second homes. It also provides the Town with the best match
38 scenario for FEMA disaster relief funds. Other benefits included education on other programs that the Town
39 could take advantage of such as the Building Safety rating. They may be able to get a better rating based on
40 their building codes, and this may ultimately help their ISO rating. They also analyzed their repetitive losses
41 which was an informative exercise. Also, Karen indicated that the FEMA training center in MD offers a
42 variety of courses, and the cost is covered (VT can send one person per year).
43

44 They found it challenging to be held to the same standards as a coastal community. There are a number of
45 points that you can get regarding development, and they weren't able to get those points because they don't
46 allow development at all. They were not able to provide all of the information for the public infrastructure

1 credits. While, it took a number of months to compile all of the documentation, they were already gathering
2 all of the information anyway. They don't anticipate the program taking too much effort to maintain: they'll
3 need to do a few outreach ads, and complete an annual report.
4

5 **4. New Municipal Plan Review Documents**

6 Regina explained that VAPDA has been working on a new set of municipal plan review documents (flood
7 resiliency checklist, initial plan review consultation and formal plan review) to ensure consistency in plan
8 reviews across the State. The PAC agreed that the new formal plan review document is a better alternative
9 than the current 'Appendix A' spreadsheet that we've been using; so we will start using that form. Cathyann
10 LaRose suggested that it would be helpful if the form asked for section numbers rather than page numbers so
11 you don't have to update them as things shift. Regina Mahony suggested that we hold off on any formal
12 changes to the CCRPC Plan Review Policy until we see if any legislative changes are made this year. Regina
13 Mahony stated that the flood resiliency checklist is 13 pages long, and addresses quite a bit more than just the
14 municipal plans. Regina Mahony will send the flood resiliency checklist out to the PAC. Dana Hanley
15 indicated that VPA is cautiously optimistic that their comprehensive plan bill will go through; and if it does it
16 will have some changes to the Regional Planning Commission's process. This led to the discussion about the
17 length of Plans considering everything that needs to be included in them. Dana indicated that they were able
18 to cut down the Plan by 88 pages, however with the pictures and design it added 25%. They re-wrote the plan
19 from scratch and were able to weed out things that were added over the years that were no longer necessary.
20

21 **5. South Burlington Comprehensive Plan Review and Public Hearing**

22 Joss Besse opened the public hearing. No one from the public was in attendance. The public comment period
23 was closed.
24

25 Emily Nosse-Leirer, summarized the Staff comments and explained that this is the second time that we are
26 reviewing this Plan. All previous Staff comments were incorporated, including water quality and flood
27 resiliency, which have been more than adequately addressed. Cathyann stated that they did try to cut things
28 out of the Plan and shorten it; however it was challenging to do that considering all of the things that people
29 wanted in the Plan. Things were added, rather than deleted. However, the first version had about 50 more
30 strategies, and they were able to narrow those down. There were a couple of topics that prolonged the process
31 including education issues and an east-west road. The City Council will hold their second hearing Feb. 1st.
32

33 Alex Weinhagen asked if they've given any thought to how to keep track of the strategies? They were not able
34 to prioritize the strategies and they were okay with that. The Planning Commission will now talk about their
35 priorities. They will likely work through the strategies in a similar fashion to the recommendations from the
36 interim zoning reports where they met on a monthly basis to ensure things were moving along. Or perhaps on
37 an annual basis as the sub-committees figure out their work plans. All of the committees were involved in
38 development of the Plan to begin as well, so none of the strategies will be a surprise.
39

40 Sarah Hadd made a motion, seconded by Alex Weinhagen, that the PAC finds the draft 2016 South Burlington
41 Comprehensive Plan, as submitted, meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC approval, and that the
42 municipality's planning process meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC confirmation. Upon notification
43 that the Plan has been adopted by the municipality, CCRPC staff will review the plan, and any information
44 relevant to the confirmation process, for changes. If staff determines that changes are substantive, those
45 changes will be forwarded to the PAC for review. Otherwise the PAC recommends that the Plan, and the
46 municipal planning process, should be forwarded to the CCRPC Board for approval. No discussion.
47 MOTION PASSED.
48

49 **6. Regional Act 250/Section 248 Projects in the Horizon**

- 50 • Hinesburg – nothing new
- 51 • Colchester – Solar project off of East Road towards Milton (All Earth Renewables). Alex asked if this
52 was in Green Mountain Power's area as they've already met their cap; and they are asking for an
53 increase. GMP and VELCO have both met their cap so they need to ask for an increase.

- 1 • South Burlington – there are likely projects on the horizon, but nothing that Cathy is aware of.
2 • Richmond – solar farm proposed off of Governor Peck Road.
3 • Essex – nothing that we don't know about already
4 • Williston – former Pine Ridge school property is looking for an amendment to change the use to a
5 church training program, and take down some buildings. There are a few things likely going to Act
6 250 in about 18 to 20 months: Finney Crossing amendment and Cottonwood Crossing.
7 • Huntington – 6 lot subdivision has been pending for quite some time on Camels Hump Road.
8 • Milton – Lamoille solar city project 4.9 (megawatts), municipal community solar project at the old
9 landfill (3.8 megawatts), and at the wastewater treatment plant (500 kilowatts). There are also pending
10 Act 250 projects in Catamount: NG Advantage office, Camp Precast Concrete 14,000 sq.ft. building
11 and 6,000 sq.ft. office, and R&D 13,000 sq.ft. expansion.
12

13 **7. Other Business**

- 14 a. PAC Topic Review for Future Meetings – Staff will sound out a list of topics and ask for feedback on
15 whether you'd find them useful or not, and if you have any other topics to add. Alex Weinhagen –
16 renewable energy facility siting may be worthy of discussion here. Even if it doesn't go anywhere in the
17 legislation, it would be helpful to know how everyone has handled this question in their Plans. Dana
18 suggested that it may be helpful to learn what the three RPCs who received the Department of Energy
19 grants have done to address siting issues within their regions. It would be helpful to have Adam Lougee
20 come up and present what they've done in Addison County to the PAC.
21 b. Form Based Code Panel Discussion in Burlington. **Wednesday, January 13, 2016 from 6:30pm to**
22 **8:00pm at Contois Auditorium, Burlington City Hall.** Featuring Burlington Form Based Code Meeting
23 with guest speaker Lee Einsweiler from Code Studio in Austin, TX.
24

25 **8. Adjourn**

26 The meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

27

28 Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony