

The South Burlington Chamberlin/Airport Study Committee held a meeting on Thursday, 13 January 2016, at 7 p.m., in the Conference Room, City Hall, 575 Dorset Street.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** C. Sargent, Chair; G. Severance, P. Clemins, K. Robison, D. Hartnett, J. Simson, B. Keogh, G. Maille, W. Rooney, P. Nowak, L. Larock

**ALSO PRESENT:** P. Conner, Director of Planning & Zoning; L. Krohn, C. Forde, CCRPC; T. Chittenden, B. Nowak, M. Emery

**1. Agenda: Additions, deletions or changes in order of agenda items:**

No changes were made to the agenda.

**2. Open to the Public for items not related to the agenda:**

There were no public comments.

**3. Minutes of 9 November 2015:**

Mr. Simson moved to approve the Minutes of 19 November as written. Ms. Rock seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

**4. Current events, review consultant scope of work, funding sources for scope of work and how they relate to the Committee's City Council charge:**

Ms. Sargent advised that in a meeting this week, a number of things had been made clear to her. Mr. Krohn explained that there is a difference in "scope of work" between the committee's charge and the work that the RPC consultants can do. He asked Mr. Conner to further explain this.

Mr. Conner said that the City Council's charge to the Committee is the build a working relationship with the neighborhood and Airport and to develop a long-term strategy for co-existence. This includes addressing such issues as noise, land use, transportation, and street scapes/parks. What has been unclear has been the issue of noise. From the perspective of the city, noise is a "fair game" topic in whatever form the committee chooses.

CHAMBERLIN AIRPORT STUDY COMMITTEE

13 JANUARY 2016

PAGE 2

Mr. Krohn then explained that the Regional Planning Commission (RPC) gets projects that mainly relate to transportation projects and land use projects that relate to transportation. He noted that in total \$100,000 has been allocated for this project. The RPC chose a consultant and worked out a scope of work. Many of the RPC goals are the same as the city's goals (i.e. land use vision for acquired lands and transportation issues); however, RPC's funding cannot support any kind of noise study, except as land use might affect noise (e.g., landscaping). Any monitoring of noise is outside of RPC's funding.

Ms. Forde directed attention to written information of "who we are." She noted that RPC's funding comes through the Federal Highway Administration for surface transportation issues; land use is also relevant when there is a transportation nexus.

Mr. Conner stressed that if the Committee determines that it wants to address noise (possibly hosting community meetings regarding noise), there is no funding for that. There is, however staff time to assist with that.

Mr. Maille said that the lands acquired by the Airport were related to noise. The Airport has a master plan for both inside and outside the fence that includes those lands where houses were removed. Plans also show a "transportation highway." He asked if that is where RPC's interest lies and when RPC speaks of "noise mitigation," is it a land or air noise. Ms. Forde said the answers are "yes" and "yes," as it would affect transportation. Mr. Conner added that the focus is not on a specific road; it is transportation in general, which is what makes a neighborhood plan fall under this umbrella. Mr. Krohn said they could look at whether a road is a good idea or not...but not recommendations for a specific road. Ms. Forde added that RPC's interest would be the taking of traffic off other roads.

Mr. Maille noted the lands where homes were demolished are in "land use limbo." What is the process for making those lands such that there is a transportation issue? Mr. Conner said that in order to spend those funds, there has to be a relation to transportation, though transportation does not have to be the principal issue.

Mr. Simson suggested that Mr. Krohn and Ms. Forde tell the Committee specifically what they can and can't help the Committee with. Mr. Krohn said any and all of the items in the Committee's charge are do-able within the scope of RPC's work. They cannot do a "noise

CHAMBERLIN NEIGHBORHOOD AIRPORT STUDY COMMITTEE

13 JANUARY 2016

PAGE 3

study." Noise abatement strategies could be within their purview (e.g., landscaping or berms). Ms. Sargent said RPC can address noise from roads because that is a transportation issue.

(Ms. Nowak noted the presence of three City Council members in the room.)

Ms. Robison said what is hard for her to understand is what the consultants are doing and what is being paid for. The Committee hasn't discussed anything that involves spending money, but half of the grant has been spent. Ms. Forde noted there was a report from the consultants regarding the background work they performed. Mr. Krohn said one of RPC's roles is to be sure the consultants are doing what they agreed to do within the budgeted amount. He added that if they do work with the Airport's land use program, that would be beyond the original scope.

Mr. Conner suggested Mr. Krohn and Ms. Forde share the scope of work over the next few months; the Committee can then modify this if it chooses.

Mr. Krohn said the Airport is currently doing its "land re-use plan." He felt this is a one-time opportunity to create synergy. If the Committee focuses exclusively on noise, it may foreclose that opportunity.

Mr. Maille said that if the Airport is aiming to come in with a plan at the same time, it would be nice if Gene Richards shared where they are going.

Mr. Conner then distributed a draft of a potential meeting schedule prepared by Bob Chamberlain. Mr. Krohn noted it includes 2 meetings with both consultants. He felt that looking at 2 meetings a month might be too much.

Mr. Conner noted there are three themes in the proposed schedule: transportation, neighborhood land use, and civic enhancement (including noise). Ms. Nowak asked if there are enough funds to cover this schedule. Mr. Krohn said not in the current budget. \$40,000 more will be needed (this is an 80-20 match). Mr. Conner said the City can handle its match. Mr. Krohn said RPC can find the money.

Mr. Maille stressed the need to be in a proactive position regarding noise.

CHAMBERLIN NEIGHBORHOOD AIRPORT STUDY COMMITTEE

13 JANUARY 2015

PAGE 4

Mr. Simson suggested a "divide and conquer" approach: have a special noise sub-committee and have the whole group deal with the other scope of work. Other members felt this would be a good way to go.

Mr. Clemins noted that the noise issue won't go away when the Committee is finished with its work. He suggested a longer term committee/advisory board to address noise into the future should be part of the Committee's recommendations. Mr. Severance agreed that noise is a big issue but felt it shouldn't overpower this committee. Mr. Krohn noted that is part of the March schedule recommendation.

Mr. Simson then moved to pursue the scope of work on the distributed sheet, modified to meet less often, and to consider a sub-committee to begin a constructive approach to the noise issue. Mr. Maille seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Members then discussed who would serve on the sub-committee and what that sub-committee's scope of work would be.

Mr. Maille then moved to form a noise sub-committee comprised of Mr. Maille, Mr. Companion, Mr. Hartnett, Ms. Robison, and Ms. Sargent and that the scope of work of that sub-committee will be noise assessment/analysis, mitigations, Airport noise planning, and land use and communications as related to noise. Ms. Robison seconded. With a friendly amendment to delete land use and communications from this sub-committee's scope of work, the motion passed unanimously.

Members agreed that this committee would report to the full committee during regular committee meetings. The end date of the sub-committee would be 6 June 2016.

Members then agreed to meet again on 28 January. Mr. Krohn will get in touch with the consultants regarding presence at that meeting. Mr. Conner will work out a schedule of meetings/topics through May/June.

As there was no further business to come before the Committee, Mr. Rooney moved to adjourn. Ms. Nowak seconded. Motion passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

---

1914

1. The first part of the report is a general statement of the work done during the year.

2. The second part is a detailed account of the work done in each of the various departments.

3. The third part is a summary of the results of the work done during the year.

4. The fourth part is a list of the names of the persons who have been employed during the year.

5. The fifth part is a list of the names of the persons who have been employed during the year.

6. The sixth part is a list of the names of the persons who have been employed during the year.

7. The seventh part is a list of the names of the persons who have been employed during the year.

8. The eighth part is a list of the names of the persons who have been employed during the year.

9. The ninth part is a list of the names of the persons who have been employed during the year.

10. The tenth part is a list of the names of the persons who have been employed during the year.

11. The eleventh part is a list of the names of the persons who have been employed during the year.

12. The twelfth part is a list of the names of the persons who have been employed during the year.

13. The thirteenth part is a list of the names of the persons who have been employed during the year.

14. The fourteenth part is a list of the names of the persons who have been employed during the year.

15. The fifteenth part is a list of the names of the persons who have been employed during the year.

16. The sixteenth part is a list of the names of the persons who have been employed during the year.

17. The seventeenth part is a list of the names of the persons who have been employed during the year.

18. The eighteenth part is a list of the names of the persons who have been employed during the year.