

1 CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
2 MEETING MINUTES
3

4 Date: Wednesday, February 17, 2016
5 Time: 6:00 p.m.
6 Place: CCRPC Offices; 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404
7 Present: Bolton: Joss Besse Buel's Gore: Absent
8 Burlington: Andy Montroll Charlotte: Jim Donovan
9 Colchester: Absent Essex: Jeff Carr
10 Essex Jct: Dan Kerin Hinesburg: Andrea Morgante
11 Huntington: Barbara Elliott Jericho: Catherine McMains
12 Milton: Lou Mossey Richmond: Bard Hill
13 St. George: Jeff Pillsbury Shelburne: Absent
14 So. Burl: Justin Ravidoux, 2nd alt. Underhill: Brian Bigelow
15 Westford: Dave Tilton Williston: Chris Roy (6:03)
16 Winooski: Mike O'Brien (6:20) VTrans: Amy Bell
17 Cons/Env: Don Meals Socio/Econ/Housing: Justin Dextrateur (6:25)
18 Business: Absent
19 Ex-Officio: BIA: Absent CCTA: Karen Walton
20 Staff: Charlie Baker, Executive Director Regina Mahony, Planning Program Mgr.
21 Eleni Churchill; Trans. Program Mgr. Marshall Distel, Transportation Planner
22 Pam Brangan, GIS, IT & Data Mgr. Melanie Needle, Senior Planner
23 Dan Albrecht, Senior Planner Emma Vaughn, Communications Manager
24 Jason Charest, Sr. Trans. Planning Engineer
25 Sai Sarepalli, Trans. Planning Engineer
26 Bernie Ferenc, Trans. Business Manager
27 Others: Matthew Langham, VTrans Miles Waite, Cons/Env. Alternate
28 Jacob Hemmerick, Milton Martha Maksym, United Way
29

- 30 1. Call to order and changes to the agenda. The meeting was called to order at 6:02 p.m. by
31 the Chair. Andy Montroll. He thanked Melanie and Dan for the training on energy and
32 brownfields. We just barely touched on Water Quality, so that will be moved to another
33 day.
34
35 2. Public Comment Period for items not on the agenda. There were none.
36
37 3. Action on Consent Agenda. There were no items on the consent agenda.
38
39 4. Approve Minutes January 20, 2016 CCRPC Board Meeting. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION,
40 SECONDED BY DAN KERIN TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 20, 2016 WITH
41 CHANGES. The following changes were made:
42 a. Page 5, line 23 – delete “is” after 3.7%
43 b. Page 5, line 44 – add “just” after ...we not...

- 1 THE MOTION CARRIED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES WITH THOSE CHANGES. JIM DONOVAN
2 ABSTAINED.
3
- 4 5. UPWP Amendment: Chittenden Opiate Burden Reduction Alliance. Since Martha Maksym
5 was not here yet, we moved on with the agenda.
6
- 7 6. South Burlington Comprehensive Plan. Regina noted that there was a memo in the packet
8 with the PAC review and resolution. She said they did an awesome job. It was approved by
9 the City Council on February 1st. The Planning Commission incorporated all of the PAC
10 comments. JOSSE BESSE MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JIM DONOVAN, TO APPROVE THE
11 PLAN AND THE PLANNING PROCESS AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIR TO SIGN THE RESOLUTION.
12 MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. (Only municipal reps voted.)
13
- 14 7. Changes to the Sidewalk Grant Program. Charlie noted his memo in the packet reviewing
15 some changes to the sidewalk program. There was a specific line in the capital program for
16 Chittenden County sidewalks, which VTrans is proposing to remove. The TAC discussed this
17 and they did not recommend any specific action, but individual municipalities may want to
18 weigh in. The Executive Committee asked Charlie to send a letter to the State expressing
19 our concern over losing this funding for Chittenden County Projects. Charlie distributed
20 copies of his letter, which members reviewed. Charlie saw Chris Cole this afternoon and
21 Chris thanked him for the letter. Jeff Carr asked if that decision has already been made.
22 Charlie said for all intents and purposes it has. Jeff noted that the greatest percentage of
23 walking public is in Chittenden County. From our standpoint it's about making our
24 communities pedestrian friendly; and now we'll be put in a pot where we have a success
25 rate of less than 25%. He feels we'll lose the opportunity for the \$30, 40 or \$50,000
26 projects. Jim Donovan agrees, and with the additional change to state funded construction
27 projects to a 50/50 match, it'll make it more difficult for smaller communities to afford this.
28 He would prefer a stronger letter. Justin Rabidou said the TAC is not worried about the
29 \$30-50,000 projects, but the \$150,000 projects. By requiring a larger match there is a price
30 point that a community can't really afford. He has worked in a community where they
31 decided to not go after these federal funds because of all the strings attached and they get
32 projects done quicker with local funds. He noted that some of the smaller communities
33 have already stopped going for the \$10-15,000 projects and this will further it. It was
34 suggested that no community will do a sidewalk project again to federal standards because
35 of the cost. When Andrea questioned the state funded construction projects proposed to
36 go from 80/20 match to 50/50, Amy said the projects will be simpler because it'll be state
37 dollars. Discussion continued. Andrea feels the communities should be lobbying the
38 legislature to be sure these dollars are left in the budget. (Mike O'Brien arrived.)
39
- 40 8. Draft ECOS Plan Updates. Regina said the purpose of this tonight is to give a brief overview
41 of the ECOS plan update. The 30-day comment period is now open. Copies of the plan
42 updates have been sent to municipalities and to board members. We will hold a public
43 hearing on March 16. She explained the reason we are doing this update is because all the
44 regional plans were reviewed by a third party shortly after we adopted the ECOS plan and

1 we had a couple of deficiencies that need to be addressed by June 2016. We focused only
2 on the areas we needed to change and those changes are tracked in the document:

3 Childcare. Updates were made to sections 2.3.1 and 3.2.6. It was noted that: 1) costs
4 are high and availability is low; low salaries for child care providers; Vermont has
5 established a Blue Ribbon commission on Financing High Quality, Affordable Child Care.
6 The amendment references the Blue Ribbon study and suggest the CCRPC and
7 municipalities follow-up with any recommendations that are appropriate.

8 Capability & consistency with our surrounding regions. We updated section 4.1.3.

9 Housing is a big issue with the amount of housing we have vs. how many employees live
10 outside of Chittenden County. Charlie noted that 10-15 years ago we were housing
11 about 75% of our workforce, now it's much less. Justin Dextrateur said the other things
12 to consider is that there are other costs than just housing such as transportation.

13 Facilities. These involved a variety of sections but they looked at schools, libraries,
14 government facilities, and hospitals and health care facilities. The conversation then
15 moved to nursing homes to see if we are prepared for our aging population. While
16 those with the greatest needs appear to be covered, there are many that aren't. More
17 information is being gathered from the VNA and CVAAA. There will be more
18 information at the public hearing. Andrea said one thing we need to talk about is a
19 potential plan conflict between aging in place vs. turning over the housing to make more
20 units available. Single family detached homes vs. independent senior housing; and care
21 delivery to multi-family facilities. Bard Hill noted that people are living longer and
22 healthier and wealthier than in any previous period. When you talk about nursing
23 homes costing about \$80,000/year vs. home costing \$30-40,000/year where they want
24 to live and where they can afford to live and where the public can afford to keep them
25 so this affects people aging in place. He feels we need more small units as an option in
26 Village centers where services are nearby.

27 Earth Resource Extraction. We clarified some things in 2.4.3 and 3.2.4.

28 Flood Resiliency. This is a new element and because we opened the plan, we need to
29 address it. The All Hazards Mitigation Plan will feed into this. There are also more
30 references to the ECOS/CEDS project list. We asked municipalities to update this list.
31 We want to add waste treatment plants updates that are needed to address TMDL
32 requirements, if they're not already included.

33 Next Steps: We will review these changes with the TAC and PAC. The public hearing is
34 March 16th. The LRPC will meet again on April 13th to address any comments. We'll
35 have a second public hearing and will hopefully adopt the changes in May or June.

- 36
37 5. UPWP Amendment for COBRA (Chittenden Opiate Burden Reduction Alliance). Charlie said
38 this is before the board as an UPWP amendment. The basic premise is that we've been
39 asked to be the backbone organization for a collective impact project. The key element is a
40 neutral facilitator and data management. We were seen as that and asked to be the
41 backbone organization. Melanie has been helping police department and others with
42 mapping and GIS support. The actual formal amendment item is in the board packet.
43 Martha Maksym, Executive Director of the United Way of Chittenden County gave a little
44 background of this. We have a community problem around opiate addiction. In the past

1 eight months, there has been a lot of work being done with state attorney's office, federal
2 attorney's office, and police departments, which she described. There's been efforts to grow
3 treatment facilities. There's work going on in recovery efforts, but Howard Center can't
4 afford to hire 3-4 more clinicians. Some of these efforts have been working at cross
5 purposes. They feel there is a need for communication – what's going on –and organize it
6 under one umbrella. The State Health Department, Agency of Human Services, UVM
7 Medical Center, Chamber, Mayor's office, Burlington Police Department, United Way and
8 others are trying to see how we organize the committee responsible for this. She was
9 successful in obtaining a grant (\$100,000/year for three years) for this effort from the
10 Medical Center. We also have a commitment from the Stiller Family Foundation and a
11 strong interest from a SIM grant through Green Mountain Care Board to each provide
12 \$100,000/year for three years. The final component is that they need a neutral organization
13 behind the scenes to try to organize this. Many of the group sat at the ECOS table and feel
14 that this was the appropriate umbrella. The two staff would be paid for with these grants.
15 The Executive Committee said it sounds like a good idea but wanted it to come to the board.
16 There would be a steering committee with high level persons, such as Commissioner of
17 Health, Mayor, etc., who would run this. Backbone staff would support the steering
18 committee. There is a lot of data being collected, but right now not fully shared or
19 sometimes able to be shared. We need to understand the data. One staff person would be
20 the data person and the second would be project director and support work of the steering
21 committee. We believe we have solid funding for three years. Charlie said we're being
22 asked to hire the two staff and the money would flow to the staff and for whatever is
23 needed for the steering committee. We'd spend time with hiring but then we'll just pay the
24 staff. They may be housed at the medical center or elsewhere. Discussion ensued. Our
25 expectation is for three years and if it goes beyond that, she feels all parties would have to
26 kick in funding. Andy Montroll said this is consistent with the ECOS plan because 2 years ago
27 one of the issues was dealing with the opiate problem and we didn't really have an idea how
28 to do that. Justin Rabidoux said he's dealt with grant funded positions and he is concerned
29 that RPC will be asked to take over after three years. Charlie has been very clear with the
30 group that RPC does not have the capacity to fund this. Justin Dextrateur feels this is a
31 planning effort and would not be expected to go on forever. The data will need to be
32 continued and it's felt that it should be housed at the Vermont Department of Health long
33 term. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION THAT WE ACCEPT THE RECOMMENDATION AND AMEND
34 THE FY16 UPWP TO ADD THIS. JIM DONOVAN SECONDED. Jeff Carr would like the board to
35 review this periodically. VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

36

37 9. H. 249 - Council of Governments (COG) Bill. Charlie distributed the latest language in the
38 bill. The second reading of the bill was today with a final vote tomorrow. The whole idea of
39 COG has been struck. The bill as it stands now would add optional duties for the RPCs to be
40 able to provide municipal services with service agreements. To do this an RPC would have
41 to draft bylaws, hold a public hearing on the bylaws with 30 day notice and comment
42 period. He reviewed the bill section by section. This is just another tool for multi-municipal
43 services. When Andrea asked how it might be used, Charlie said he could conceive of hiring
44 a full-time zoning administrator that would work for 2-3 municipalities, each part-time.

1 Lengthy discussion continued. Mike O'Brien suggested that perhaps the RPC would be he
2 facilitator in trying to get 2-3 communities to work together. Charlie said this will open the
3 opportunity to go beyond planning. Lou confirmed that Milton is now okay with this
4 language. Justin Dextrateur wondered if this is going to preclude us from coordinating
5 services like the MS-4 support we currently provide. We'll need to check that out. There
6 are technical issues. We have to be sure it doesn't preclude us from providing services
7 we're doing now or we will have to move quickly on updating our bylaws.

8 10. Executive Director's Update.

- 9 a. MOU with VTrans and CCTA. Charlie was notified by VTrans that the MOU is in final
10 review. It is now an "agreement" and should be on the board agenda for March.
11 b. ECOS Annual Report. Melanie and Emma made the report look total different that it
12 did last year. It was sent out to municipalities, partners, etc., a couple of weeks ago.
13 c. UPWP update. We received about 65 applications for projects. There is a big
14 challenge for the committee to reduce that number; and it's good that the
15 municipalities prioritized their requests. The committee will meet again on March
16 3rd.
17 d. Monthly report was emailed yesterday.
18 e. CCRPC 50th Anniversary. March 1st is the official 50th anniversary. We're looking at a
19 year-long recognition of that.
20

21 11. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports. Minutes of the committee meetings are included
22 in the board packet. Amy noted a correction to page 3 of the February 3rd EC minutes to
23 change "Memorandum of Agreement" to "Agreement."
24

25 12. Members' Items:

- 26 a. Andrea Morgante reviewed our ECOS plan and what we say about railyards and
27 freight and with the questions on the salt shed in Shelburne, she wondered if on
28 some future agenda we might want to talk about whether the RPC should have a
29 role in siting these types of facilities which are important to all of our communities
30 and how it might affect legal proceedings.
31 b. Karen Walton noted that VTrans very generously approved 100% funding for GPS
32 locators for all the urban buses.
33

34 13. Adjournment. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JIM DONOVAN, TO ADJOURN
35 THE MEETING AT 7:36 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
36

37 Respectfully submitted,

38
39 Bernadette Ferenc