

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

4 DATE: Thursday, January 12, 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  
Alex Weinhalten, Hinesburg – PAC Rep  
Justin Rabidoux, So. Burlington – TAC REP  
Lisa Falcone - Socio/Econ/Housing Board Rep  
Heather Danis – ECOS Steering Committee Rep  
Edmund Booth – ECOS Steering Committee Rep  
Chris Shaw, South Burlington – Board Rep

**Staff**

Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager  
Melanie Needle, Senior Planner  
Charlie Baker, Executive Director  
Eleni Churchill, Transportation Program Manager

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

11 Chris Shaw called the meeting to order at 8:40 a.m.  
12

13 **2. Approve Minutes**

14  
15 Justin Rabidoux made a motion, seconded by Alex Weinhalten, to approve the minutes of November 10, 2016.  
16 No further discussion. MOTION PASSED. Edmund Booth abstain.  
17

18 **3. Plan Update Schedule**

19 Regina Mahony provided the Committee with two updated schedules – the big overall project schedule, and a  
20 month by month schedule for the LRPC specifically with information about what Staff and other Committees  
21 are working on. We remain focused on keeping the update and public outreach specifically focused on the  
22 topics of transportation, energy and economic development. Regina reported that we do think we can set up  
23 the ECOS website with a left-hand Table of Contents of sorts on the ECOS Plan page. We will need to use  
24 our internet consultant to help us build this, but it shouldn't be too difficult. Then we'll see how much time we  
25 have to transition Chapter 2 of the current plan into an online only format. At the very least we will host the  
26 indicators online as they are now, and ideally, we'd incorporate the key issues into that format as well.  
27

28 Chris Shaw asked about public engagement and emphasized that it would be helpful to give the public a heads  
29 up that we are working on this and that public input and feedback will be requested in the future; and we  
30 should set the public input comment period for a reasonable length of time for real input (certainly not two  
31 weeks). Staff explained the outreach and engagement timeline for each of the big pieces, but will certainly set  
32 the schedule for easily accessible, good length, public engagement efforts, likely in the Fall. Staff will also  
33 look into interactive, map based online engagement tools.  
34

35 **4. Updates in the Works**

36 Potential re-organization options:

- 37 1. Population Forecasts – Regina Mahony provided an update on the forecast schedule. The county wide  
38 population forecast that was presented to this Committee in November has been revised based on  
39 comments from this Committee, the PAC and Staff. The forecast is now closer to the mid-range of the  
40 forecasts we reviewed in the graphs at the last meeting. This acknowledges that Chittenden County  
41 may grow at a faster rate than the rest of the County. The consultant has also responded to a few  
42 questions that we had about the age cohorts. At the end of January, we are expecting the municipal  
43 level population forecasts, and the households and employment forecasts. This information will be  
44 presented to the Board in February, and we will also bring it to this Committee if we have it before  
45 your meeting. At the very least we will send it to you via email with a link to the Board presentation,  
46 and we will discuss it at your March meeting. This will then be on the March Board agenda for

- 1 approval. Keep in mind that this is a forecast for the future based on our past growth, it doesn't  
2 necessarily need to be the goal for the Plan. But we do need it to inform the modeling work.
- 3 2. Transportation Plan – Eleni Churchill described the work that we've been doing on the transportation  
4 plan, and our strategy for moving forward. We need the forecast first. This will be used to establish  
5 the baseline network for each of the 5 years – including committed TIP projects and all committed  
6 projects. Once we have the model in May we can run scenarios, but we will start thinking about them  
7 sooner. We haven't figured out the scenarios yet and will be looking to the TAC and LRPC to help  
8 with that. As an example, we may want to look at scenarios for connected vehicles and energy goals.  
9 Then we will run the scenarios once we have the model in May. Lots of analysis in summer, and  
10 public outreach in September. Justin Rabidoux asked how the population growth forecast will  
11 translate to VMT? RSG will be looking at current mode share splits and they will establish  
12 appropriate future mode share splits at the TAZ level (i.e. Burlington will look very different than  
13 Huntington). Justin Rabidoux explained that in So. Burlington they've had more success with ranges  
14 for project outcomes, rather than exact outcomes of one particular scenario. Charlie Baker indicated  
15 that we will likely end up with a hybrid scenario after weighing three scenarios and getting feedback  
16 on where we may want to land. The meat of the MTP is in the project list, and the scenario will help  
17 inform that but it will also be constrained by the fiscal reality of how much money we'll have to  
18 construct these projects. Currently the MTP project list is three to four times what we can fund, and it  
19 isn't fair to set those unrealistic expectations. Ken Belliveau indicated that we may see a more robust  
20 federal transportation funding. Charlie Baker concurred that we don't want to restrict ourselves  
21 unnecessarily, but maybe it isn't 3 to 4 times the number of projects. Alex Weinhausen asked about the  
22 staging process of the transportation model and whether we run the scenarios first and then introduce  
23 the projects or vice versa. There was quite a bit of discussion about this; we are still working this out  
24 and there will be further discussions. We will be figuring this out as we develop the scenarios and run  
25 them in the summer. Heather Danis asked whether we will incorporate or look at health costs and  
26 implications. Charlie Baker indicated that it isn't likely that the transportation model tool won't likely  
27 be able to answer all the questions that we'd like it to. Regina Mahony suggested that this exists a bit  
28 more in the project prioritization methodology through surrogates such as downtowns,  
29 walkable/bikable locations, etc. Charlie Baker indicated that we will bring the scenario building and  
30 project prioritization work to this table between June and August for feedback and input. We will also  
31 share the TIP prioritization methodology so you can see what that looks like. Heather asked if we  
32 include the equity criteria from the ECOS implementation grants into the transportation project  
33 prioritization.
- 34 3. Energy Planning – Melanie Needle provided an overview of the Energy Planning work. To date 14  
35 out of the 19 municipalities have received a presentation. We held the first Act 174 training on Dec.  
36 8<sup>th</sup>. This was largely the same presentation that was given to the PCs with a bit more info about the  
37 data analysis component. The training was well attended. We have received comments from  
38 municipalities on local constraints except Williston, Winooski, Charlotte & Huntington. We'll be  
39 adding those to the State resource and constraint area maps. The State level data was updated to be in  
40 line with the new criteria for energy certification. We just received the new energy map data at the  
41 end of December and may push the Energy sub-committee meeting back to Jan. 31<sup>st</sup> to give us a bit  
42 more time to set up the maps. The Energy sub-committee has also begun looking at the existing  
43 ECOS and Climate Action strategies and actions compared to the required pathways. The sub-  
44 committee is interested in developing actionable strategies that CCRPC and the municipalities can do.  
45 Melanie explained the three contracts we have for this work – two Dept. of Public Service grants (the  
46 first is for the regional energy plan, and the second is for outreach, municipal level data, and technical  
47 assistance for three municipalities); and our contract with VEIC that will help us develop an energy  
48 scenario for the transportation sector (likely lower VMT b/c the LEAP model assumes that this  
49 remains steady per capita). We've also had a discussion with VT Gas regarding the LEAP model  
50 assumptions that use of natural gas nearly zeros out to get to 90 by 2050. Ken Belliveau asked if  
51 should we be working with VEIC instead. Staff stated that we are working with VEIC as well, but we  
52 have spoken with all the major utilities and the natural gas issue seems to be one that we may not  
53 reach a solution on, but need to at least acknowledge the challenges associated with moving away

- 1 from this fuel source. While most of the energy goals are in legislation, the 90 by 2050 goal is not.  
2 We will look at a second LEAP analysis with some alternative VT Gas scenarios, and the population  
3 forecast from our consultants. Alex Weinhagen asked when we'll see the energy maps. Likely at your  
4 February meeting.
- 5 4. Education Strategy – Amy Fowler, Deputy Secretary of Education, went through ECOS Education  
6 strategy, and the associated sections in Chapter 2 to give us her opinion of whether the issues are still  
7 accurate and the whether the actions are still on track. This was a very helpful review, and most the  
8 content is still good as is.
  - 9 5. Health Strategy – United Way, UVM-MC and the Dept. of Health in Burlington will be meeting in  
10 early February to review the Health content. The UVM-MC has a community meeting in June that has  
11 been well attended and will be a great avenue for getting feedback on that content. Heather Danis  
12 added that it will provide an opportunity for those folks to engage more with ECOS.
  - 13 6. Online Capability of Plan Document – discussed earlier in the meeting.

14

15 **5. Next Meetings**

16 February 9, 2017 from 8:30am to 10:00am

17 **6. Adjourn**

18 The meeting adjourned at 9:50 a.m.

19

20 Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony