

Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission  
Regular Meeting & Public Forum  
Minutes

**DRAFT**

DATE: Wednesday, February 15, 2017

TIME: 6:00 p.m.

PLACE: CCRPC Offices; 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404

PRESENT: Bolton: Joss Besse (via phone) Buels Gore: Absent  
Burlington: Andy Montroll Charlotte: Jim Donovan (via phone)  
Colchester: Absent Essex: Jeff Carr  
Essex Jct: Jeff Carr, Alt. Hinesburg: Andrea Morgante  
Huntington: Barbara Elliott Jericho: Catherine McMains (via phone)  
Milton: Henry Bonges, Alt. Richmond: Bard Hill  
St. George: Absent Shelburne: John Zicconi  
So. Burlington: Chris Shaw Underhill: Brian Bigelow  
Westford: Dave Tilton (left at 8:04) Williston: Chris Roy  
Winooski: Mike O'Brien VTrans: Amy Bell (via phone)  
Business/Industry: Tim Baechle (via phone)  
Conservation/Environment: Don Meals (left at 7:45)  
Socio/Econ/Housing: Justin Dextrateur

Ex-Officio: CCTA: Absent FHWA: Absent  
BIA: Absent FTA: Absent

Others : Matthew Langham, VTrans (via phone) Scott Moody, CCTV cameraman  
Erin Lewis, VTrans John Dellipriscoli, EPR  
Jonathan Slason, RSG Unidentified resident

Staff: Charlie Baker, Executive Director Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager  
Eleni Churchill, Trans. Program Mgr. Dan Albrecht, Senior Planner  
Melanie Needle, Senior Planner Christine Forde, Sr. Transportation Planner  
Jason Charest, Sr. Transportation Engineer

1. Call or Order/Changes to the Agenda: The meeting was called to order at 6:05 p.m. by the Chair, Chris Roy. There were no changes to the agenda.
2. Public Comment Period for items not on the agenda. There were none.
3. Action on Consent Agenda. There were no items on the consent agenda.
4. Approve Minutes of January 18, 2017 Meeting. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CHRIS SHAW, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 18, 2017, WITH CORRECTIONS IF ANY. Catherine suggested a change on page 2, line 25 – idle (not idles), page 3, line 24 – will adopt (not already adopted). MOTION CARRIED.
5. Public Hearing and Approval of Major TIP Amendments. CHRIS SHAW MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JOHN ZICCONI, TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING. No one from the public spoke, but the hearing was left open.

1 Christine Forde explained that there are four proposed TIP amendments – two major because they  
2 have cost increases in excess of 25 percent; and two minor. The Public Participation Plan requires a  
3 30-day public comment period for Major TIP amendments; this was warned by the Executive  
4 Committee on January 4th. The Major TIP amendments include: The VT2A/US7/Creek Road/Bay  
5 Road Intersection project in Colchester, and the Exit 16 Park and Ride in Colchester. The  
6 VT2A/US7/Creek Road/Bay Road Intersection project requires an increase in federal funds for  
7 construction from \$2,378,880 to \$3,765,000. Add \$480,000 in FY17 and \$906,120 in FY18. This is a  
8 58.3 percent increase in construction cost. The original cost estimate was really just a place holder.  
9 The State updated the project cost after ROW and since we don't update our costs until capital  
10 planning our cost fell behind. The Exit 16 Park & Ride in Colchester is a similar situation. This  
11 project requires an increase in construction cost from \$250,000 to \$800,000. Add \$330,000 in FY17  
12 and \$220,000 in FY18. This is a 42 percent increase in project cost. The original estimate was based  
13 on minimal construction costs for converting an existing parking lot; however other items were  
14 desirable or necessary. The increase is not a huge amount for this type of project.

15  
16 When we increase these costs, we need to reduce the FY17 costs elsewhere. The two minor  
17 amendments include the Railyard Enterprise Project and the Champlain Parkway. Railyard  
18 enterprise for design – this project isn't ready to go to design so we reduced from \$960,000 to  
19 \$150,000. That smaller amount might not be needed either in FY17. Champlain Parkway has money  
20 in every year for the next 3 years. So we are taking \$1,015,000 in federal construction funds out of  
21 FY17 and moving it out to 2021, because there is already money already in 2018, 2019 and 2020.  
22 This will essentially make the funding line up with the project schedule.

23  
24 Jeff Carr stated that the overage on the Park & Ride seems really excessive. Christine Forde  
25 indicated that the original cost estimate was just a place holder, and wasn't very accurate. Andrea  
26 Morgante asked if it was fair to say that the minor amendments are in place to fund the major  
27 amendments. Christine Forde confirmed.

28  
29 Erin Lewis from VTrans provided a presentation on the VT2A/US7/Creek Road/Bay Road Intersection  
30 project in Colchester. Creek Road and Route 7 intersection will be signalized and made a four way  
31 intersection; they will lower the profile down Rt. 7 to Bay Road; will do some access management on  
32 Rte. 127 intersection and add a signal; and they are adding a shared use path on Rte. 2A. Erin Lewis  
33 described a history of the project. Chris Roy pointed out the ROW acquisition process took 14 years.  
34 Erin Lewis explained that the property owner negotiation including appraisals process can take a  
35 while, especially since they try to avoid condemnation; and then they need to incorporate changes  
36 that come out of negotiations. Over this amount of time project managers at VTrans will change as  
37 well. Christine Forde added that this particular project was effected by a change in stormwater  
38 regulations also. Chris Roy suggested that it would be a good idea for VTrans to check in with the  
39 municipal legislative bodies to help explain what is holding up the process. Andrea Morgante added  
40 that there could be better communication on who is responsible for what when the municipalities  
41 are sharing the responsibility of the ROW acquisition.

42  
43 Erin Lewis indicated that the contract was awarded a few weeks ago to G.W. Tatro who came in as  
44 the lowest bid at \$3.6 million. There is a water line replacement associated with the project as well,  
45 but those costs are not included in the TIP. Erin Lewis described the traffic control plan for 47 days  
46 in order to lower the profile on Route 7. The schedule is from June 19<sup>th</sup> to August 4<sup>th</sup> and there are  
47 financial incentives to do it more quickly. Erin Lewis provided the project url, and suggested that  
48 anyone can sign up for the weekly construction updates. Andrea Morgante asked if the stormwater

1 management for the project includes impervious surface on private land, all of the impervious  
2 coverage on the highway, or only the additional impervious surface. Erin Lewis indicated that this  
3 took place before her time, and she isn't sure. John Zicconi asked if they worked with Clausen's to  
4 see if they can navigate the detour. Erin Lewis indicated that they did work with Chris Conant and  
5 they've set up so that he will always have two accesses and he is happy about that. Justin  
6 Dextrateur asked about the cost estimate increase over the 15 years? Erin Lewis explained that  
7 there was another estimate done in 2009, so we are probably only looking at the increase since then  
8 as opposed to the very beginning. Justin Dextrateur stated that this is a good example project for  
9 cost increases as a result of drawn out ROW acquisition.

10  
11 JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O'BRIEN, TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING. CHRIS  
12 ROY ASKED IF THERE WAS ANYONE FROM THE PUBLIC WHO WANTED TO COMMENT. HEARING  
13 NONE, THE VOTE WAS CALLED. MOTION PASSED.

14  
15 JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO APPROVE BOTH THE MAJOR AND  
16 MINOR TIP AMENDMENTS, WITH CORRECTIONS IF ANY. (MPO VOTE ONLY)

17	Bolton	Yes	Burlington	Yes (4)	Charlotte	Yes
18	Colchester	Absent	Essex	Yes	Essex Jct	Yes
19	Hinesburg	Yes	Huntington	Yes	Jericho	Yes
20	Milton	Yes	Richmond	Yes	St. George	Absent
21	Shelburne	Yes	So. Burlington	Yes (2)	Underhill	Yes
22	Westford	Yes	Williston	Yes	Winooski	Yes
23	VTrans	Yes				

24 MOTION PASSES WITH 21 OF 24 VOTES AND 16 OUT OF 18 COMMUNITIES VOTING IN FAVOR.  
25

- 26 6. Multi-Jurisdictional All Hazard Mitigation Plan adoption. Dan Albrecht ran through the All Hazard  
27 Mitigation Plan hazards and strategies again. He explained the process so far, and stated that we  
28 have now received "Approval Pending Adoption" from FEMA for the Multi-Jurisdictional Plan and  
29 the Richmond plan. We are finalizing the other plans and getting them out to FEMA.  
30

31 MIKE O'BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO APPROVE THE MULTI-  
32 JURISDICTIONAL ALL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN, AND AUTHORIZE CHRIS ROY AND CHARLIE BAKER  
33 TO SIGN THE RESOLUTION. MOTION PASSED.  
34

35 Barbara Elliott added that she really appreciates the staff assistance with this work, the  
36 municipalities would not be able to do this on their own.  
37

- 38 7. Water Quality Funding Recommendations. Charlie Baker explained that we developed these  
39 comments in response to the State Treasurer's Clean Water Report which provides options for  
40 raising the necessary revenue to meet the water quality standards in Act 64 of 2015. The comments  
41 were developed by an ad hoc Committee (which included Board members Don Meals and Brian  
42 Bigelow; and municipal staff Jim Jutras, James Sherrard and Megan Moir), and reviewed by the  
43 Clean Water Advisory Committee and the Executive Committee. If the Board approves the  
44 comments, Charlie Baker will start sharing these with a Legislative Committee as early as tomorrow  
45 afternoon. Charlie provided an overview of the comments. It is important to raise the funding  
46 statewide as there are water quality needs beyond Lake Champlain and other regions may not feel  
47 compelled to raise money for Lake Champlain. The recommendations include bonding for the next  
48 two years to bridge the gap until there is a more realistic long term revenue source. The Committee

1 believes that a parcel fee is the right way to address this. #11 starts to get into the administration of  
2 the funds. There needs to be money put into project development. It still sounds like they are  
3 leaning towards a municipal collection system, which we are opposed to (#18). VLCT is likely to  
4 weigh in on this. Other comments include a question about fees associated with road runoff.  
5 Currently, VTrans has to pay a percentage of the stormwater utility fee to the municipalities for their  
6 roads; will the municipalities need to pay for their roads?

7  
8 Justin Dextrauder suggested that the comments regarding current municipal stormwater utilities  
9 seem contradictory. Charlie Baker noted that we didn't resolve the issue between not collecting  
10 more from current utilities and making state revenue available to those municipalities. Don Meals  
11 stated that this was discussed at length.

12  
13 Jeff Carr stated that he hasn't had a chance to review the document yet and he has concerns. We  
14 identified the gap of where we are and where we want to be, but have we identified what we need  
15 to do? He is worried about telling someone in Bennington that they need to pay for Lake  
16 Champlain. Don Meals stated that this revenue is not just for Lake Champlain. The TMDL says how  
17 much phosphorus we have to reduce, and the baseline of where we are now is based on best  
18 available data. The distance we have to go has been divided up by sector (ag, roads, existing  
19 development, etc.), and there are cost estimates associated with the BMPs to reduce the  
20 phosphorus from the various sectors.

21  
22 There was quite a bit of discussion and concern expressed over what isn't yet known about how  
23 exactly the revenue will be collected and administered. We know from the stormwater utilities that  
24 60% of their costs are operating costs and the State is only trying to raise revenue to address half of  
25 the capital costs; and we need funding for design and planning. There is still quite a lot of work to  
26 do, but the Legislature is now considering the recommendations from the State Treasurer's report.

27  
28 Joss Besse asked about the implications of a state storm water utility on a small town like Bolton.  
29 Charlie Baker stated that it doesn't have direct applicability to our rural towns, other than having  
30 direct access to the funds. The concern in Bolton is that they don't have any capacity for more  
31 overhead or administrative costs, when they know they need to do some additional work on their  
32 steeper roads. The Bolton Selectboard is certainly overwhelmed by a lot of things coming down  
33 from the state level; they'd prefer that the money come as a pass through rather than having to go  
34 through the process of applying for grants; and they are concerned about having to raise 20% to  
35 match the 80%.

36  
37 Andrea Morgante suggested that if there are good projects that go above and beyond the regulatory  
38 programs to keep waters out of an impaired status we should do them now. Charlie Baker stated  
39 that he isn't sure about that because the State funds are proposed to be raised to address the  
40 regulatory obligations which are significant. Don Meals added that the comments have been  
41 discussed at length by the ad hoc committee, CWAC and Executive Committee. Time is of the  
42 essence and he would suggest that we add our voice; and at the same time ask municipalities to  
43 really look at this and maybe we can have a second round of comments if needed.

44  
45 DON MEALS MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDREA MORGANTE, TO SHARE THESE  
46 RECOMMENDATIONS WITH THE LEGISLATURE BOTH IN WRITTEN FORM AND THROUGH  
47 TESTIMONY. FURTHER DISCUSSION INCLUDED JEFF CARR'S SUGGESTION THAT CHARLIE BAKER

1 EXPRESS THE BOARD'S CONCERN ABOUT HOW OVERWHELMING THIS TOPIC IS GIVEN THE SHORT  
2 TIMEFRAME. NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

3  
4 Jeff Carr asked that Staff keep the Town's informed, especially if there are any challenges along the  
5 way.  
6

- 7 8. Demographic Forecasts Presentation. Melanie Needle is leading this. Jeff Carr stated that his firm  
8 has worked on these forecasts, but he has not worked on it personally, he has given some informal  
9 thoughts, but has not charged any time to it. He will leave the room if any Board member would like  
10 him to, but he may be able to add value to the discussion. [No one asked that he leave.]  
11

12 Melanie Needle provided an overview of the forecasts we have received from EPR: revised County-  
13 wide forecast, age cohorts at the County level, municipal population forecasts, employment  
14 forecasts and household forecasts. Melanie Needle explained the purpose of the forecasts as a  
15 planning tool, and how we will use them in the transportation and energy models. With previous  
16 forecasts the Board agreed that they should describe the future as we expect it to be, not as we  
17 want it to be. Staff recommends the same approach this time around. Melanie Needle provided  
18 information on historic rates of growth and previous population and employment forecasts, in  
19 relation to this new lower growth forecast. Jeff Carr added that the forecast done in 2001 included  
20 huge growth plans for IDX, Husky and IBM – none of which came to fruition.  
21

22 John Dellipriscoli, from EPR, explained that the population forecast was derived from the June 2016  
23 Vermont Statewide Population Consensus Forecast. That was done for the Legislative Joint Fiscal  
24 Office and the Shumlin Administration. It was utilized in the most recent VTrans Long-Range  
25 Transportation Plan update. It was adjusted based on survival rates, birth rates, migration  
26 information and other factors. The County forecast is based on the County's historical share of the  
27 State population and factors that we anticipate will increase Chittenden County's share in the future  
28 (county-to-county migration, relative increase in housing, etc.). Jeff Carr summarized this method as  
29 a single age cohort model for the State. They made additional adjustments to the Consensus  
30 forecast based on comments from CCRPC. The original forecast included a 0.20% avg. annual  
31 growth rate, and the revised forecast has gone up to 0.35% avg. annual growth. They kept the  
32 growth for the rest of the State constant. We have seen Chittenden County grow faster than the  
33 rest of the State.  
34

35 John Dellipriscoli explained the components of VT population change – natural increase,  
36 international migration and domestic migration. The domestic migration out of the state has been  
37 increasing based on census mid-year estimates. The July 2016 estimate is very low – a loss of 2,865  
38 residents. The thing that is going to drive population growth is economic based in-migration,  
39 because there isn't a lot of difference between births and deaths so we aren't growing much from  
40 natural increase. The census numbers show an overall decrease over the last 5 years – even though  
41 this isn't great data in terms of accuracy, five years of a downward trend is likely a real trend. The  
42 2010 through 2015 actuals are estimates based off of IRS data on where people file their tax returns  
43 from one year to the next. Jeff Carr added that from a State perspective we'll have to rethink the  
44 whole population forecast if we get another low year. The consensus forecast is used to figure out  
45 the number of pupils for the education fund; and thankfully we've been relatively accurate on the  
46 actual school enrollment. But we don't know how to interpret this data yet. Domestic migration  
47 will need to turn around in order for this to change. John Zicconi asked if this is being impacted by  
48 the larger number of 65+ that are leaving the state for 6 months out of the year. Jeff Carr stated

1 that while we have the third largest seasonal population, that is no different than what we've seen  
2 for the last 30 years. Just as many people move into VT, for those aged 65 and over that move out.

3  
4 Jonathan Slason transitioned back to the County forecast. RSG projected the EPR's 2040 forecast  
5 out to 2050 to get to the end date needed for the Energy Planning model. They looked at birth  
6 rates, death rates and migration. They projected a linear projection from 2040 (176,179) to 2050  
7 (183,129).

8  
9 John Dellipriscoli then provided the municipal share of the county population forecast. John Zicconi  
10 asked about the historical rates of growth. Jeff Carr stated that the rate of growth in this forecast  
11 (0.35%) is about a 1/3 of the rate of growth that we experienced in the 1990's.

12  
13 John Dellipriscoli explained the household forecast methodology; and the data. The number of  
14 households are rising at a faster rate than the population – largely due to smaller family sizes,  
15 decreasing birth rate, and a rise in 45 – 64 age cohorts share of the total population in the County.  
16 The 2020 household population drop is a result of smoothing the data. Households are defined as  
17 everything except group quarters, so it could be two students. Justin Dextradeur asked about the  
18 2010 to 2015 actual dip in households in Burlington and Winooski? Andy Montroll thought that it  
19 might be a result of the Census, because it isn't a real dip.

20  
21 John Dellipriscoli explained that the job forecast almost looks like there is a job for every single  
22 worker in the County, but a lot of employees come from outside of the County. The municipal-level  
23 forecast consists of only "covered" jobs; while the County level forecast for total jobs take historical  
24 data on both salary, wage jobs and proprietor jobs (and other non-covered employment). Then the  
25 shares of municipal covered employment as a percent of county payroll jobs for each municipality is  
26 applied to the County-level forecast in order to reconcile the two. They decided to go beyond  
27 covered employment as it is important to the transportation model. Any variation in total jobs will  
28 be captured at the County level. EPR forecasted to 2040 (169,671); and RSG projected that to 2050  
29 (182,688). Charlie Baker asked how can employment grow so much faster than population? There  
30 was discussion about the effect of employees coming in from outside of the County and part-time  
31 jobs.

32  
33 There was further discussion on efforts to grow the population like the VT Futures Project. Bard Hill  
34 asked for the presentations from tonight as they were more informative than what was in the  
35 packet. He explained that they are trying to plan for future facilities in Richmond and this  
36 information will be helpful. Charlie Baker explained why we are trying to get on the same page with  
37 our municipalities so that our planning tools are not misaligned with local planning efforts. Jeff Carr  
38 explained that the State has been trying to get all of the agencies to use the same forecast as well.

39  
40 Andrea Morgante asked what we should do if there is some discrepancy between a municipality and  
41 the County and State forecast. Andy Montroll stated that we can look at these to see if this is the  
42 future that we want or do we want to be on a different course, and what do we need to do to  
43 achieve a different future. Jeff Carr added that more housing will impact population growth. Justin  
44 Dextradeur added that we need housing to keep up with the shrinking household size; and it may  
45 help the school enrollment numbers as well.

46  
47 Chris Roy stated that we will look at this again next month with a recommendation from the Long-  
48 Range Planning Committee.

1  
2 9. Regional Dispatch Report. Charlie Baker provided an overview of this work. The final report was  
3 presented on Jan. 31<sup>st</sup> to municipal personnel including elected officials, fire, rescue, managers, etc.  
4 The work has now been divided among two groups: a governance/administration group (Town  
5 Managers) and a Technical Advisory Committee (Chiefs). The plan is to govern this via a Union  
6 Municipal District, that municipalities would vote for on Town Meeting Day in 2018. Charlie Baker  
7 has been having meetings with Selectboards to keep them posted, these have been positive so far.  
8 We are currently both under and over staffed - most operations typically only have one dispatcher  
9 on duty (outside of Burlington); yet we are over staffed if you look at the numbers county-wide. The  
10 current systems aren't integrated. The report identifies 47 steps to put a coordinated dispatch  
11 service into place. This includes developing draft budget numbers for municipalities by the Fall and  
12 figuring out how to change dispatcher's role in police departments because they currently do a lot  
13 beyond dispatching. A communication strategy is needed between the Fall and March so residents  
14 will know what they are voting on.

15  
16 Bard Hill suggested that it would be helpful to see some of the metrics – current response time and  
17 target response time, or whatever the metrics should be, so we know whether there is success in  
18 the future. Charlie Baker's understanding is that some of this is not easy to obtain as each  
19 department identifies these things differently. But we will definitely do what we can. Justin  
20 Dextrateur added that cost metrics will be important as well. There is a potential of the Police  
21 Departments needing to add staff if part of the role the current dispatchers play will need to be  
22 back-filled. Charlie Baker stated that it is his understanding that re-defining those roles is one of the  
23 reasons why we haven't had success with this in the past. Charlie Baker added that there may be a  
24 role for CCRPC to play for the back-office support, and potentially hiring an Executive Director in the  
25 transitional period leading up to July 2018.

26  
27 Andrea Morgante asked about voting, and which Towns would participate. Charlie Baker explained  
28 the current thinking is around two different levels - owners and customers much like it works now.  
29 The owners would be at the governance table. Both keep the system more honest, as the  
30 customers have the ability to walk away to another service option. The owners of the system will  
31 have higher upfront costs. The assumption is that the customers wouldn't be able to afford much  
32 higher upfront costs than their existing costs. There will be many more conversations about this in  
33 the Fall. Charlie Baker will continue visiting all of the Selectboards to discuss.

34  
35 10. Chair/Executive Director's Updates.  
36 a. ECOS Annual Report. In front of you you'll find a copy of the 2016 Annual Report that went out  
37 this week.  
38 b. Municipal Roads General Permits. There is a draft framework that was sent out a week ago by  
39 DEC. We'll be reviewing this with the TAC and CWAC for their input to DEC. They'll keep this  
40 open for comments before final rule-making. Comments are due to DEC by April 1, we will be  
41 asking the Board to vote on the comments in March. Jim Donovan asked that Staff provide a  
42 link to the draft general permit.  
43 c. Executive Directors' Report. Charlie will send this out soon.

44  
45 11. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports. These were all included in the meeting packet.

46  
47 12. Members' Items. Jim Donovan stated yesterday the Vermont Planners Association, Vermont  
48 Chapter of the American Institute of Architects and VT Urban & Community Forestry program

1 awarded the Public Places Awards at the Statehouse. There were 15 awards in total. 5 out of 9  
2 honor awards were in Chittenden County; and 3 out of 6 merit awards were in Chittenden County.  
3 Including bike rest areas that CCRPC helped fund and manage through the Byway program.  
4

5 13. Adjournment. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O'BRIEN, TO ADJOURN THE  
6 MEETING AT 8:44 P.M. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

7  
8 Respectfully submitted,

9  
10 Regina Mahony