

1 CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
2 LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE - MINUTES
3

4 DATE: Thursday, September 14, 2017
5 TIME: 8:30 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.
6 PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT
7

Members Present

Ken Belliveau, Williston – PAC Rep
Heather Danis – ECOS Steering Committee Rep
Andrea Morgante, Hinesburg - Board Rep
Justin Rabidoux, South Burlington – TAC Rep
Lisa Falcone – Alt. Socio Economic Board Rep
Jim Donovan, Charlotte – Board Rep
Edmund Booth - ECOS Steering Committee Rep

Staff

Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
Melanie Needle, Senior Planner
Emily Nosse-Leirer, Planner
Eleni Churchill, Transportation Program Manager

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

11 Jim Donovan called the meeting to order at 8:36 a.m.

12
13 **2. Approve Minutes**

14 Jim Donovan made a motion, seconded by Ken Belliveau, to approve the minutes of July 13, 2017. MOTION
15 PASSED. Edmund Booth abstained.

16
17 **3. Outreach Strategy**

18 Regina Mahony provided a quick overview of the outreach strategy for the next few months. Regina Mahony
19 explained that we'll be trying to get feedback on the three big topics (energy, transportation and economy) of the
20 ECOS update over the next few months. Including meeting with the staff to discuss the MTP project list and CEDS
21 project list. We'll be meeting with the Managers, Planners and Public Works staff to review these lists and then
22 will meet with Selectboards as well. We know you'll be starting budget conversations soon and we are doing our
23 best to get these started as soon as possible. The LRPC suggested that Staff provide them and the Board with front
24 porch forum outreach posts so they can post directly. Also do a press release for the community newspaper.
25 Heather Danis found a helpful approach in the Essex Health Impact Assessment work was to present one page
26 of recommendations with community representatives (like focus groups - students, teachers, etc). Worked well
27 because didn't have to read the whole thing. There was a suggestion to present the information in this format:
28 "Here is the impact this would be if this plan were to go into effect."
29

30 **4. Energy Policies**

31 Melanie Needle provided an overview of the energy policy draft language. Questions/comments included:
32

- 33 • Members indicated that they like the basic concept, including that the constraint policies are for all
34 development, not just energy.
- 35 • Comment regarding repeat text in Strategy 3 & 4 and adding too much text when the original intent of
36 this plan was to keep it brief and to the point.
- 37 • Discussion around the 1,000' limit to existing infrastructure, and whether it is needed or not. There
38 was a suggestion to map all existing solar projects to show where these are happening. Three phase
39 power isn't necessarily a sprawl vehicle because you can have subdivisions without it. If we limit to
40 existing 3 phase power we are eliminating a lot of area. And would it feel like there are too many
41 within the 1,000'? It's important to include because its advisory, and not a requirement. We will
42 definitely still need to look at the targets with this in mind. While there was no consensus, ultimately
43 the distance stayed in because of the framework of this entire section. The suitability statements are
44 advisory, and the more you can meet the better, but you don't have to meet any of them. If you can
45 limit the expansion of infrastructure, why not?
46

1 We will circle back with the municipalities on the constraints in early October. Emily Nosse-Leirer went over
2 the methodology for the known and possible constraints. Comments included:

- 3 • Avoid “all” or “any” unless absolutely true and needed. Just say “development” or “very limited
4 development” because footpaths can probably still happen in wetlands.
- 5 • Reference to “capital” should be “capita”.

6 7 **5. Transportation Plan Update**

8 Eleni Churchill explained the difference between the previous maps and the maps in this packet. These maps
9 should better reflect the amount of congestion that a driver actually experiences. We know the interstate has
10 issues now. The LRPC also looked at the 2050 delay map with TIP projects. It has no improvements beyond
11 the 2025 TIP projects. This is essentially the “no build” beyond TIP for scenario A. Our next steps is to add
12 the crash history to this map, and choose MTP projects from the list that will address these issues that appear.
13 Scenario A (full MTP road project build-out) won’t shift any modes. Other scenarios include: bike/ped/transit
14 mode shifts; a technology scenario; and land use scenarios.

15
16 Comments/questions:

- 17 • Need to clean up the purple blip at the hospital. The red makes sense, but not the purple.
- 18 • We are doing the information a dis-service by showing different maps with slightly different terms
19 that no one understands. We need to show one map, that explains it all: capacity, delay and safety all
20 on one “transportation issues” map for the public to see. Also consider putting the technical maps in an
21 appendix. But it is important to explain to the public that adding lanes isn’t going to solve the issue.
- 22 • Do we have artificial capacity in road segments only because of the intersections? In other words if we
23 were to “open the dams” at the intersections what would that do to the segments? Do we show linear
24 congestion only, but the intersections are causing the problems?
- 25 • Have we done any work to try to quantify the shifting of goods to package delivery v. bricks and
26 mortar retail. Much more growth in freight, capacity trucks. We will consider some of this in the
27 technology scenario because we are likely to see more of the freight capacity go to autonomous
28 vehicles first. We are also going to look at the impact of the Quebec Autoroute 15. They are predicting
29 that they are going to have that done in 10 years (all the way to the border) and we are likely going to
30 see many more trucks on our highways.
- 31 • Would be interesting to see the 2025 maps to see what the TIP improvements do. We have these maps
32 and can make them available.
- 33 • What is driving the VMT per Capita going up so significantly? Doesn’t make any sense between 2025
34 and 2050? Staff will look into that.
- 35 • The transit, walking & biking mode split – it isn’t a very big difference and it is only likely a result of
36 population growth. Also the title is confusing as folks expect to see these broken out individually. If
37 we keep them grouped together, it should be titled “non-SUV” or something like that.
- 38 • Suggestion to add the basic population numbers for 2015, 2025 and 2050 so we can see what those are
39 in comparison to the transportation metrics.
- 40 • The map doesn’t reflect the Silver Street congestion issue in the morning, and traffic on 116 in the
41 evening isn’t as congested as it was a year ago.
- 42 • Titles on the maps – for reports titles are better at the bottom. But for a presentation the title is better at
43 the top. We should be consistent for all the maps in the plan – they should be at the bottom, with a
44 more minor title at the top.

45 46 **6. Next Meeting**

47 The next meeting will be on October 12, 2017 from 8:30am to 10:00am.

48 **10. Adjourn**

49 The meeting adjourned at 10:01 a.m. Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony