

CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
 REGULAR MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING
 MINUTES
 DRAFT

6 Date: Wednesday, March 16, 2016
 7 Time: 6:00 p.m.
 8 Place: 110 W. Canal Street; Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404
 9 Present: Bolton: Joss Besse Buels Gore: Absent
 10 Burlington: Andy Montroll Charlotte: Jim Donovan
 11 Colchester: Marc Landry Essex: Jeff Carr
 12 Essex Junction: Dan Kerin Hinesburg: Andrea Morgante
 13 Huntington: Absent Jericho: Absent
 14 Milton: Lou Mossey Richmond: Absent
 15 St. George: Jeff Pillsbury Shelburne: John Zicconi
 16 So. Burlington: Chris Shaw (6:22) Underhill: Brian Bigelow
 17 Westford: Dave Tilton Williston: Chris Roy
 18 Winooski: Mike O'Brien VTrans: Matthew Langham
 19 Business/Industry: Tim Baechle Cons/Env: Absent
 20 Socio/Econ/Housing: Justin Dextrateur
 21 Ex-officio: FHWA: Absent BIA: Absent
 22 CCTA: Absent
 23 Staff: Charlie Baker, Exec. Director Eleni Churchill, Trans. Program Manager
 24 Bryan Davis, Sr. Trans. Planner Marshall Distel: Transportation Planner
 25 Regina Mahony, Plan. Prog. Mgr. Melanie Needle, Senior Planner
 26 Emily Nosse-Leirer, Planner Emma Vaughn, Communications Mgr.
 27 Bernie Ferenc, Trans. Business Mgr.
 28 Others: Scott Moody, CCTV Seth Leonard, Mayor of Winooski

- 30 1. Call to order; Changes to the agenda: The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by the Chair,
 31 Andy Montroll. He thanked Emma Vaughn for the training session on the public participation plan
 32 and CCRPC's new website launched last week. There were no changes to the agenda.
 33
- 34 2. Public Comment Period on Items not on the agenda. There were none.
 35
- 36 3. Action on Consent Agenda. There were no items on the consent agenda.
 37
- 38 4. Approve Minutes of February board minutes. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MARC
 39 LANDRY, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 17, 2016 WITH CORRECTIONS, IF ANY. MOTION
 40 CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
 41
- 42 5. Public Hearing on Draft ECOS Plan Updates. Regina noted there were comments in the board
 43 packet, but she distributed a new spreadsheet that includes additional comments. She feels most
 44 comments can be incorporated pretty easily. Others were some recommendations for the next full
 45 update. Andy opened the public hearing at 6:02 p.m. No members of the public were present, so
 46 we left the public hearing open for the meeting duration. Regina noted that the LRPC will be
 47 meeting again on April 13th. We need to set up a second public hearing for May tonight since we
 48 don't have 30 days between the April and May board meetings. We can then take action in June.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
6. Essex Town Plan Approval. Regina said Essex did a major rewrite and they did a great job. The PAC reviewed it and the Town voters approved it at Town Meeting this year. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY DAN KERIN, TO APPROVE THE ESSEX TOWN PLAN, AS WELL AS CONFIRMING THE PLANNING PROCESS. Jeff noted that the town plan includes the area outside the Village of Essex Junction. He recommended that when Essex Junction renews their plan that they incorporate the Essex Town Plan so it becomes one plan, since they are moving in that direction. There was a brief discussion. VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH ONLY MUNICIPALITIES VOTING.
 7. Warn 2nd Public Hearing on ECOS Plan Update for May 18, 2016. MARC LANDRY MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JIM DONOVAN, TO WARN THE SECOND ECOS PLAN UPDATE PUBLIC HEARING FOR MAY 18, 2016. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
 8. Warn Public Hearing for FY17 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) for May 18, 2016. JOSS BESSE MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JIM DONOVAN, TO WARN A PUBLIC HEARING ON THE FY17 UPWP AND BUDGET FOR MAY 18, 2016. Charlie said we will have a presentation on the draft work program at our April board meeting. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
 9. Tech Jobs and Young Families white paper. Andy noted that this is something we've been working on this year. Regina said we are working on a rough draft of this white paper. We were asked to look at young families and technology to see what CCRPC could be doing (if anything) to help keep young families in Chittenden County & Vermont and grow the tech industry. Melanie and Emily did the data collection and wrote the paper. Emily gave a presentation on their findings. Why STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering & Mathematics) and young professionals: The Chittenden County and Vermont CEDS identify STEM sectors as some of the target sectors for economic development. They are highly paid positions and there is a growing concentration and number of companies. The region needs young professionals to fill those jobs – our workforce is aging, so attracting and retaining young professionals is key. Emily reviewed current conditions. We have a high concentration of STEM jobs and our region ranks #2 in the USA for patents per capita. STEM jobs pay well and she showed a chart comparing average salaries in Albany, Burlington and Boston metro areas for STEM jobs vs. non-STEM jobs. We have relatively low unemployment. Employers express concerns about finding skilled employees; and, employees express concern about finding the right job – there is a perception that there is not enough STEM companies for job mobility and not enough job opportunities for partners of employees. She noted that the quality of life here is good, but Chittenden County has a high cost of living, but wages do not reflect this. When Joss Besse asked if the high cost of living is only housing, Emily said it includes housing and transportation. Jeff Carr said housing and energy are a big part of that. Emily then talked about workforce readiness and said STEM education happens at all levels – elementary & high school programs, college and university courses and professional development for workers. UVM is completing their new STEM building. The report includes a chart of local colleges with the number of STEM degrees vs. total degrees. Some STEM initiatives include: Vermont Center for Emerging Technologies; BTV ignite; and the Vermont Technology Council. The City of Burlington was named a White House Tech Hire City. Regarding infrastructure, the Chittenden County area is generally well-served by high-speed internet (BTV Ignite is bringing internet 2.0 gigabit internet to Burlington); many communities will likely be affected by TMDL; there is a steady demand for all forms of transportation; every day

1 32,960 people who live outside of Chittenden County commute to jobs here. A lengthy discussion
2 continued on housing and cost.

3 Conclusions: To grow the STEM economy, Chittenden County must:

- 4 • Educate, attract and retain STEM professionals, especially young professionals.
- 5 • Make housing available for all incomes, ages and household types.
- 6 • Provide and maintain appropriate infrastructure.
- 7 • Continue to provide opportunities and incentives for businesses to begin and grow.

8 CCRPC's role:

- 9 • Promote investment in all modes of transportation, especially between areas with high
10 planned housing density and employment centers, and prioritize those investments in order
11 to best grow the economy.
- 12 • Collaborate with partners like the Chamber of Commerce to enhance the Vermont brand
13 and promote Chittenden County as a burgeoning tech center.
- 14 • Promote housing development for all income levels in areas planned for growth by
15 providing assistance to municipalities.
- 16 • Lead a regional housing conversation. CCRPC will work in collaboration with regional
17 partners to identify the number of units needed for residents in all stages of life and to
18 identify how that increased housing can be built.

19 Tim Baechle asked where do you begin the education – elementary, high school or college? Charlie
20 noted that there is a lot of efforts going on out there and we may not need to do much more.

21 Discussion of housing for those 65 and over. Andy suggested that perhaps we need to organize all
22 the entities working on STEM issues to get it more focused. Andrea asked how people are defining
23 quality of life and what folks are looking for? Andy said as the planners we're the ones who can
24 really bring these things together as a whole. Justin Dextrateur suggested that because we are
25 land use and transportation planners we should really focus on those roles, and housing is a good
26 topic for us to focus on. Discussion continued about housing. Andy thanked Emily for the report.
27

28 10. Charge to Board Development Committee for FY17 Officers. The Board Development Committee is
29 chaired by Lou Mossey and includes Sandy Dooley, Catherine McMains and Jeff Carr. If anyone
30 wishes to serve in those capacities, let Lou know. They will need to develop a slate of officers for
31 FY17 by the May board meeting for elections in June.
32

33 11. H. 249 status and potential next steps. The bill is now known as the Intermunicipal Services Act. It
34 was voted out of the House the day after our February meeting. Senate Govt. Ops committee will
35 be holding hearings on this. The question it raised for us was if yes, then how soon should we
36 update our bylaws to be consistent with that. The Regional Stormwater Education Program (RSEP)
37 and Stream Team have had MOUs in place for 10 years with 9-10 municipalities that have MS4
38 stormwater projects and those committees are now at the Clean Water Advisory Committee table
39 and they're looking at combining those two MOUs into one for RPC to provide staff and fiscal
40 management for RSEP and Stream Team. Should we use that opportunity as a service that we
41 provide shared services and then address this in the bylaws? Chris Roy said it's probably best to
42 move forward in parallel so that we don't hold up the stormwater work. The MOU should have a
43 provision that it can be viewed as a municipal services agreement when the bylaws allow it. He
44 doesn't want their agreement to be held up by bylaws. Andrea wondered what they'd do with non-
45 MS4 communities. Charlie said right now RSEP is \$5,000 per year; and Stream Team \$1,800 per year
46 and if the non-MS4 communities want to pay, they can be added on. Andrea feels there are
47 different issues in the rural areas. Charlie noted that any of these services will be a pay to play

1 arrangement. It was noted that the board development committee handles bylaw changes. Justin
2 asked if the legislature will allow us to continue services we're already doing. We'll keep this on
3 parallel track and get the MOU completed and deal with bylaws separately.
4

5 12. Executive Director Update.

- 6 a. UPWP Update. The last meeting of the committee will be Tuesday, March 29th and we
7 should have a pretty good draft for them that night. We'll review the draft document at the
8 April Board meeting and have the hearing at the May board meeting. There were about 70
9 project applications. We're working on staff hours to determine how many of those
10 projects we can include.
11 b. Agreement with VTrans. We're discussing one final paragraph. Chris Cole will be here in
12 April to execute that agreement. We'll have it for the April EC meeting.
13 c. Water/wastewater priorities. We've been asked by ANR to work with them to determine
14 which municipalities need help with sewer and wastewater needs. We may be bringing that
15 work to the board in April after the TAC meeting. They're looking for priority towns to work
16 with. We have a lot of needs all over the County.
17 d. Monthly report. The Executive Director's report was emailed yesterday.
18

19 13. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports. Committee minutes were included in the packet.
20

21 14. Members' Items, Other business. There was no other business.
22

23 15. Adjourn. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JIM DONOVAN, TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC
24 HEARING ON THE ECOS PLAN UPDATE AT 7:30 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
25

26 JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JIM DONOVAN, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:31
27 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
28

29 Respectfully submitted,
30 Bernadette Ferenc