

Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
Regular Meeting & Public Hearing
Minutes

DATE: Wednesday, March 22, 2017
TIME: 6:00 p.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices; 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404
PRESENT: Bolton: Absent Buels Gore: Absent
Burlington: Andy Montroll Charlotte: Jim Donovan
Colchester: Marc Landry Essex: Jeff Carr
Essex Jct: Dan Kerin Hinesburg: Andrea Morgante (arrived 6:17)
Huntington: Barbara Elliott Jericho: Absent
Milton: Absent Richmond: Bard Hill (arrived 6:19)
St. George: Absent Shelburne: George Schiavone
So. Burlington: Chris Shaw Underhill: Brian Bigelow
Westford: Dave Tilton Williston: Chris Roy
Winooski: Mike O'Brien VTrans: Amy Bell
Business/Industry: Tim Baechle Conservation/Environment: Absent
Socio/Econ/Housing: Absent
Ex-Officio: CCTA: Absent FHWA: Absent
BIA: Absent FTA: Absent
Others: Alex Lavin, CCTV cameraman
Staff: Charlie Baker, Executive Director Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
Eleni Churchill, Trans. Program Mgr. Marshall Distel, Transportation Planner
Melanie Needle, Senior Planner Christine Forde, Sr. Transportation Planner
Jason Charest, Sr. Trans, Engineer Chris Dubin, Transportation Planner

1. Call or Order/Changes to the Agenda: The meeting was called to order at 6:02 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 February 15, 2017 Meeting. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JIM DONOVAN TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 15, 2017, WITH CORRECTIONS IF ANY. HEARING NO CHANGES, THE VOTE WAS CALLED. MOTION PASSED. Dave Tilton abstained.
5. Public Hearing on Bylaw Amendments. Chris Roy opened the public hearing. Charlie Baker passed around a new version of the bylaws, because we received some comments from Milton after they reviewed it at their SLB meeting last week. The comments received from Milton are:

Page 10 – not clear that a municipal service agreement is with CCRPC. Charlie Baker suggested an amendment to clarify this.

Page 17 – Regarding the Clean Water Advisory Committee (CWAC), Milton asked if the Champlain Water District (CWD) should be added as a member of this Committee. This deserves further discussion.

1 Paragraph 1c, within this same section – concern that the language is suggesting that this committee
2 would oversee the adoption of municipal regulations. This is certainly not the intent; the purpose is
3 to coordinate assistance at the option of the municipalities. Charlie Baker suggested an amendment
4 to clarify this.

5 There was discussion regarding the second comment. There was a question about whether CWD
6 has any interest in joining the CWAC. Marc Landry stated that they don't serve the entire region.
7 Chris Roy asked for the CWAC to consider this recommendation. Jeff Carr, adding to the comment
8 that they don't serve the entire County, asked if we would then expand the Committee to other
9 water utilities. Charlie Baker added that there are other partners that might be considered as well
10 (Winooski Natural Resources Conservation District, watershed non-profits, etc.). Jeff Carr suggested
11 that we ask the CWAC first, and the Board will consider their recommendation at the next meeting.
12

13 No other comment from the public.

14
15 JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MARC LANDRY, TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING. CHRIS
16 ROY ASKED IF THERE WAS ANYONE FROM THE PUBLIC WHO WANTED TO COMMENT. HEARING
17 NONE, THE VOTE WAS CALLED. MOTION PASSED.
18

19 6. Warn FY18 UPWP for Public Hearing in May (MPO Business). Charlie Baker explained that the UPWP
20 Committee is continuing their work on development of the FY18 work program and budget. They
21 will meet for a final time tomorrow night. We need to warn the hearing for May now as there won't
22 be enough days from the April meeting.
23

24 MIKE O'BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO WARN THE PUBLIC HEARING
25 FOR THE FY18 UPWP FOR MAY 17TH AT 6PM. (MPO VOTE ONLY)

26	Bolton	Absent	Burlington	Yes (4)	Charlotte	Yes
27	Colchester	Yes	Essex	Yes	Essex Jct	Yes
28	Hinesburg	Absent	Huntington	Yes	Jericho	Absent
29	Milton	Absent	Richmond	Absent	St. George	Absent
30	Shelburne	Yes	So. Burlington	Yes (2)	Underhill	Yes
31	Westford	Yes	Williston	Yes	Winooski	Yes
32	VTrans	Yes				

33 MOTION PASSES WITH 17 OF 24 VOTES AND 12 OUT OF 18 COMMUNITIES VOTING IN FAVOR.
34

35 MIKE O'BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO WARN THE PUBLIC HEARING
36 FOR THE FY18 UPWP FOR MAY 17TH AT 6PM. NO FURTHER DISCUSSION, THE VOTE WAS CALLED.
37 MOTION PASSED.
38

39 7. Proposed Functional Class Changes (MPO Business). Marshall Distel and Jason Charest presented
40 the proposed changes to the County's functional classification system. They explained the three
41 main classifications and the intended purpose of each: arterials, collectors, local roads.
42

43 Andrea Morgante arrived at 6:17pm.
44

45 They provided an overview of FHWA's quantitative measures and overlapping metrics that are
46 intended to help better tailor the system based on local characteristics. Jason Charest explained
47 why functional class matters – it is essential for database and statistics reporting.
48

1 Bard Hill arrived at 6:19pm.
2

3 FHWA recommends that you review the classifications every ten years, and as far as we can tell, it
4 has been since 1968 that we've done a comprehensive evaluation of the classes, but some have
5 been changed on an ad hoc basis. Marshall Distel explained the process that they went through to
6 complete a comprehensive review of the functional classification. There was some discussion
7 regarding the guidance on why you'd avoid similar classifications for parallel roads and whether the
8 traffic volumes should take precedence. That is just a guideline and you can make a
9 recommendation on what makes the most sense. They also worked with municipalities, VTrans, and
10 other RPCs so that the classification doesn't change at a Town or Regional border. If the Board
11 approves the recommendation classifications, they are recommending these changes to VTrans, and
12 then VTrans would need to recommend the changes to FHWA.
13

14 Jeff Carr asked about the criteria for changing the classifications. Jason Charest indicated that the
15 recommended changes are a reflection of the existing conditions. George Schiavone asked what is
16 the impact of changing the classification from principal to minor arterial? There is essentially no
17 effect in the immediate future; there could be a potential future funding consideration if there is a
18 pot of money in the future for highways that makes this distinction although we think it unlikely.
19 Jeff Carr asked is there any negative ramifications? Nothing negative unless it is going to be
20 removed from the federal aid system (rural major collector to a rural minor collector). Jeff Carr
21 asked if we have done anything that will make it harder for our core City to compete? No, they are
22 still going to be on the federal aid system. Marshall Distel added that we are actually adding more
23 roadway mileage to the federal aid system. Andrea Morgante asked if the classification has
24 anything to do with how a municipality would classify a truck route? And will the re-classifications
25 require any improvements once the classifications are changed? Jason Charest said no, the
26 functional class has nothing to do with the locally designated truck routes; and no improvements
27 will be needed since we are simply matching the classification to the current conditions on the road.
28 Jeff Carr stated, to be clear, I'm not concerned about implications today, but what could potentially
29 be coming around the corner. Chris Shaw added that ITS may be an example for a future
30 ramification. Staff indicated that there are no negative ramifications that we can anticipate. Jason
31 Charest added that we'd be diluting the purpose of classification if we classified all roads as principal
32 arterials; the intent is really to accurately classify a road based on its current conditions. The TAC
33 did not alter the Staff recommendation, the municipalities were okay with the recommendation
34 before it was brought to the TAC. George Schiavone asked what is the purpose of the
35 classifications? Jason Charest stated that it will allow us to better report on our roadways.
36

37 JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDREA MORGANTE, TO ACCEPT THE PROPOSED
38 FUNCTIONAL CLASS CHANGES, REQUEST THAT VTRANS CONSIDERS THESE CHANGES AS PRESENTED
39 FOR SUBMITTAL TO FHWA, AND AUTHORIZE THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO SEND A MEMO TO
40 VTRANS DOCUMENTING THIS REQUEST. Further discussion ensued. Jim Donovan asked about the
41 online map. He couldn't find what the existing classifications are on the website. Jim Donovan
42 stated that it may make sense to change Hinesburg Road to Charlotte Road to a collector. Marshal
43 Distel stated that it is now. Jim Donovan added that Dean Bloch and Daryl Benoit also reviewed the
44 map. Dave Tilton referred to the spreadsheet and asked about the question in the comments from
45 VTrans regarding Old Stage Road in Westford. The question was a recommendation from VTrans
46 and the change was made on the map, so it is no longer a question. If the Board recommends these
47 changes they go to VTrans, and if VTrans approves them they will forward them to FHWA. George
48 Schiavone again asked about the purpose of all of this. It will allow us to better report on our

1 roadways; and Andrea Morgante added that it is essentially going to correct bad data and prevent
2 us from having to make ad hoc changes. Tim Baechle asked about the implications on data.
3 Particularly data regarding crash locations – we wouldn’t want someone to think that we’ve made
4 great improvements if the reality is that we’ve simply shifted data from one road classification to
5 another. Jason Charest stated that shouldn’t be a problem. Chris Roy added that we haven’t done
6 this comprehensive reclassification before so we’ll need to stay aware of that possibility. George
7 Schiavone asked if VTrans will have to update the classifications for the rest of the State? VTrans
8 will be working with the rest of the RPCs to update them throughout the State.

9 NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. THE VOTE WAS CALLED. (MPO VOTE ONLY)

10	Bolton	Absent	Burlington	Yes (4)	Charlotte	Yes
11	Colchester	Yes	Essex	Yes	Essex Jct	Yes
12	Hinesburg	Yes	Huntington	Yes	Jericho	Absent
13	Milton	Absent	Richmond	Yes	St. George	Absent
14	Shelburne	Yes	So. Burlington	Yes (2)	Underhill	Yes
15	Westford	Yes	Williston	Yes	Winooski	Yes
16	VTrans	Yes				

17 MOTION PASSES WITH 19 OF 24 VOTES AND 14 OUT OF 18 COMMUNITIES VOTING IN FAVOR.

- 18
- 19 8. Demographic Forecasts. Melanie Needle provided an update on this work. PAC and LRPC
20 recommend approving the forecast, but they did have some clarifying questions. One of the
21 questions was regarding the persons in household which was on a previous slide prepared by RSG.
22 We were understanding it to mean household size, however it means family households (not group
23 quarters) and the point of the slide was to show that the change in non-student population is
24 changing at a slower rate than households. Another clarifying question was the increasing
25 household size in Burlington. The Consultants indicated that Burlington’s household size is
26 increasing despite the type of development occurring because the population is forecasted to grow
27 at a faster rate than households and therefore the derived household size is going to increase. In
28 addition, the household size reflects the recent growth in household size in Burlington. Jeff Carr
29 added that is likely a reflection of the housing costs. Melanie Needed stated that we’ve had
30 extensive conversations with the PAC members that had questions and they are now satisfied with
31 the explanation. Andy Montroll asked if the students are accommodated in the forecast. They are
32 looked at in the population forecast; but the dorms are not included in households as they are
33 considered group quarters. Andy Montroll stated the impact of the student population that live in
34 homes (not dorms) is huge in Burlington so he wants to make sure this is being counted. Melanie
35 Needle and Jeff Carr assured him that it is being counted.

36

37 The forecast shows that the County is expected to be a leader in growth in the State. It is important
38 to keep in mind there is a level of confidence at the County level, but higher margins of error with
39 the municipal level forecasts. Melanie Needle provided an overview of the changes between the
40 last forecast and this final version. The changes described herein are from last month’s forecast.
41 The population forecast has the following changes:

- 42 • The 2010 and 2015 population estimates correspond to the U.S. Census estimate and not the
43 adjusted estimates.
- 44 • Decline in Bolton, Colchester, Hinesburg, Jericho, Richmond, St. George, and Underhill.
45 Charlotte remained steady
- 46 • Reallocation accounted for some of the scale issues that we faced in the initial forecast, namely
47 that Williston was increasing at levels that might have been unrealistic especially when
48 compared to other areas like Burlington and South Burlington

1
2 The 2045 and 2050 households were handed out this evening, because these weren't in the packet.
3 The revisions to the household forecast from the last version include:
4 • Change in households in Burlington, given the residential development plans
5 • Corrections were made to account for the population forecast revision for Huntington,
6 Richmond, St. George, Underhill, and Westford. The rest of the forecasted municipality
7 households we left unchanged.
8 • Change in 2040-2050 in all towns because of methodology
9

10 The revisions to the employment forecast from the last version include:
11 • In the initial forecast, Essex's share of employment was decreasing and not consistent with a
12 recent GBIC study we fixed the share of Essex's employment at its 2015 level through 2050. This
13 resulted in an increase of nearly 13,000 jobs from 2015 through 2050 for Essex when compared
14 to the initial forecast.
15 • Bolton, Charlotte, Colchester, Milton, Richmond, St. George, Underhill, Westford, and Williston
16 decreased; Hinesburg, Huntington, Jericho, and Winooski, remained steady.
17 • Increase: Essex, Burlington, Shelburne, and South Burlington.
18

19 Charlie Baker asked what the total forecasted population growth number is. It is 183,172 in 2050
20 (compared to 161,382 in 2015). Total household population is lower than the total population due
21 to group quarters as discussed earlier. There was further discussion regarding the student
22 population and how the transportation modeling is dependent on households. The total
23 employment forecast is 182,688 in 2050 (compared to 135,511 in 2015). There is more employment
24 growth than population growth because this is where we have the infrastructure, and this figure
25 reflects the number of workers that work here not necessarily live here. Andrea Morgante asked if
26 we'll use the forecasts for other planning decisions – like health-related issues including how many
27 nursing homes that we might need. Charlie Baker stated that the forecast will be used for more
28 than just transportation planning; and we will redo it every five years. Jeff Carr reminded the Board
29 that in 2001 we let a lot more judgement influence our forecast; this time we let the data drive with
30 some logical judgement adjustments on the back-end. Charlie Baker added that this started with
31 the Legislative Joint Fiscal Office forecast which kept growth even throughout the state, and that
32 isn't true because we are growing more than the rest of the State. This forecast was adjusted for
33 that reality. Over the last five years we haven't been working with similar forecasts that the
34 municipalities were using, so we hope this will now put us all on the same page.
35

36 DAN KERIN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JIM DONOVAN, TO APPROVE THE 2050 POPULATION,
37 HOUSEHOLD AND EMPLOYMENT FORECASTS FOR USE IN DEVELOPMENT OF THE 2018 ECOS PLAN
38 UPDATE. NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. THE VOTE WAS CALLED. MOTION PASSED. Jeff Carr
39 abstained.
40

41 9. Comments on Initial Draft of the Municipal Roads General Permit. Charlie Baker provided an
42 overview of this work. The State is seeking comments by April 1st. These comments have been
43 vetted through the TAC, CWAC and Executive Committee. There was one additional comment from
44 staff right before the meeting. The initial draft framework of the permit states that whoever does
45 the road erosion inventory should verify that the road is hydrologically connected. We'd like them
46 to rely on the GIS data; or provide a lot more guidance on how we would field verify that. Andrea
47 Morgante asked about comment #5 – to do effective ditching we may have to go outside of the road
48 right of way. We need to begin the conversation on how we are going to increase road ROWs, or

1 change road standards to decrease the road width. Andrea Morgante stated that we should at least
2 ask how we can start to address this on a statewide basis. Charlie Baker stated that the comment
3 covers the general problem with lack of site control, and we imagine the solutions will evolve.
4 Andrea Morgante added that it is a burden for the municipalities to deal with this, and maybe the
5 legislature should take this up. Chris Roy stated that this starts to raise a whole host of takings
6 issues. Jeff Carr supports adding a request to begin policy discussions on dealing with the issue. Jim
7 Donovan asked about the public road - private road interface. Charlie Baker indicated that this is
8 addressed a bit in the culvert question; but we'll add a question on public road - private road
9 interface.

10
11 MARC LANDRY MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDREA MORGANTE, TO APPROVE SUBMITTAL OF
12 THE COMMENTS IN THE PACKET AND AS REVISED ON THE INITIAL DRAFT OF THE MUNICIPAL ROADS
13 GENERAL PERMIT TO THE LEGISLATURE. HEARING NO FURTHER DISCUSSION, THE VOTE WAS
14 CALLED. MOTION PASSED.

15
16 10. Public Participation Plan Amendment & Warn Public Hearing. Chris Roy explained that this agenda
17 item is simply to notice a public hearing for changes to the Public Participation Plan. Chris Roy
18 explained the purpose of the proposed amendment is to address the unworkability of 30 day notice.
19 The amendments clarify that public hearings need a 15 day notification period unless otherwise
20 required by law. This will help prevent the Board from having to warn a hearing on documents that
21 are not yet complete.

22
23 ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CHRIS SHAW, TO WARN A PUBLIC HEARING FOR
24 THE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN AMENDMENTS FOR MAY 17TH AT 6PM. HEARING NO FURTHER
25 DISCUSSION, THE VOTE WAS CALLED. MOTION PASSED.

26
27 11. Town Highway Bridge Pre-Candidate Prioritization (MPO Business). Christine Forde explained that
28 each year VTrans asks all RPCs to prioritize projects in their capital program. The capital program
29 includes three categories of projects: Front of the Book (construction to begin within the next four
30 years), Development & Evaluation (in development), and Candidate list (next in line to be worked
31 on). VTrans also asks RPCs to prioritize bridges in a pre-candidate list, these are for projects that will
32 be fixed much further down the line. The packet includes VTrans ranking as well as ours. Our
33 bridges are doing pretty well for the most part. Our highest ranked bridge is #117. Our top ten
34 worst will be submitted to VTrans. Andrea Morgante asked if the hydrological conditions are
35 considered? Christine Forde stated the factor is included in VTrans' scoring. Jim Donovan asked
36 where the sufficiency ratings come from, because there was a question about a lower efficiency
37 rating from a local assessment. Christine Forde stated that the ratings come from VTrans' bridge
38 inspection reports.

39
40 CHRIS SHAW MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDREA MORGANTE, TO APPROVE THE TOWN
41 HIGHWAY BRIDGE PRE-CANDIDATE PRIORITIZATION FOR SUBMISSION TO VTRANS. NO FURTHER
42 DISCUSSION. THE VOTE WAS CALLED. (MPO VOTE ONLY)

43	Bolton	Absent	Burlington	Yes (4)	Charlotte	Yes
44	Colchester	Yes	Essex	Yes	Essex Jct	Yes
45	Hinesburg	Yes	Huntington	Yes	Jericho	Absent
46	Milton	Absent	Richmond	Yes	St. George	Absent
47	Shelburne	Yes	So. Burlington	Yes (2)	Underhill	Yes
48	Westford	Yes	Williston	Yes	Winooski	Yes

1 VTrans Yes

2 MOTION PASSES WITH 19 OF 24 VOTES AND 14 OUT OF 18 COMMUNITIES VOTING IN FAVOR.

3

4 12. Chair/Executive Director's Updates.

5 a. Regional Dispatch Update. Charlie Baker is going to each of the SLBs to give a dispatch update.
6 He has been to all of the municipalities with dispatch, and each of these municipalities have
7 appointed someone to the Joint Fiscal Committee (with an exception of Essex). He is getting to
8 the rest of the SLBs over the coming weeks. Good conversations so far.

9 b. Water Quality Implementation Role. Charlie Baker wanted to make the board aware that the
10 legislature asked the Treasurer to figure out how to fund water quality improvements in the
11 long run. There were 30 recommendations at the wall; and we aren't sure where those stand
12 right now. On the other side, they are figuring out how to distribute funds. There has been
13 some discussion about RPCs playing a role in project management. We haven't done much of
14 this kind of work, but the RPCs that experienced Irene damage have. Chris Shaw asked if that
15 would dovetail with the road erosion inventory work we are doing now? Charlie Baker stated
16 that it does, as well as the tactical basin planning work. The state is really trying to get a lot of
17 implementation dollars on the ground starting on July 1.

18 c. FY18 Capital Program. Christine handed out a list of Chittenden County projects that are in the
19 front of the book. We just wanted to make you aware of what VTrans provided to the
20 legislature. This is a four-year program and this list shows what is funded in the current year.

21 d. Executive Directors' Report. Charlie Baker will send this out sometime between next week and
22 the next meeting.

23

24 13. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports. These were all included in the meeting packet.

25

26 14. Members' Items. Jeff Carr asked the reason for the delay in Route 117 paving by another year as
27 that road is in rough shape. Christine Forde will make a request for that reasoning.

28

29 15. Adjournment. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY DAN KERIN, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING
30 AT 7:46 P.M. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

31

32 Respectfully submitted,

33

34 Regina Mahony