

# REGULAR MEETING AGENDA



**Wednesday, April 15, 2015 - 6:00 p.m.**  
**CCRPC Offices; 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202**  
**Winooski, VT 05404**

## CONSENT AGENDA –

C.1 Minor TIP Amendments:

## DELIBERATIVE AGENDA

1. Call to Order; Changes to the Agenda
2. Public Comment Period on Items NOT on the Agenda
3. Action on Consent Agenda (MPO Business) (Action; 5 min.)
4. Approve Minutes of March 18, 2015 Meeting\* (Action; 5 min.)
5. CCTA presentation – Karen Walton, General Manager (Information; 30 min.)
6. Warn Public Hearing on Major TIP Amendment\* (Action; 10 min.)
7. Warn Public Hearing on FY2016 UPWP\* (Action; 20 min.)
8. All Hazards Mitigation Plan (AHMP) Presentation – Dan Albrecht (Information; 20 min.)
9. Executive Director’s Updates (Information; 15 min.)
  - a. Legislature review
  - b. Monthly Project Status Report\* (sent separately)
10. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports \* (Information; 5 min.)
  - a. Executive Committee (draft minutes April 1, 2015)\*  
Act 250/Sec 248 letters
  - b. Planning Advisory Committee (draft minutes March 11, 2015)\*
  - c. Transportation Advisory Committee (draft minutes April 7, 2015)\*
  - d. UPWP Committee (draft minutes Mar. 19, 2015)\*
11. Members’ Items, Other Business (Information; 5 min.)
12. Adjourn

The April 15th Chittenden County RPC meeting will air on Wednesday, April 22, 2015 at 1p.m. and will be online for viewing at: <https://www.cctv.org/watch-tv/programs/chittenden-county-regional-planning-commission-48>

## Upcoming Meetings - Unless otherwise noted, all meetings are held at our offices:

- Transportation Advisory Committee – Tuesday, May 5, 2015; 9:00 a.m.
- Executive Committee, Wednesday, May 6, 2015; 5:45 p.m.
- Planning Advisory Committee – Wednesday, May 13, 2015; 2:30-4:30 p.m.
- CCRPC Meeting - Wednesday, May 20, 2015; 6:00 p.m.
- CCRPC Annual Meeting, Wednesday, June 17, 2015, 5:30 p.m. The Essex

*In accordance with provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, the CCRPC will ensure public meeting sites are accessible to all people. Requests for free interpretive or translation services, assistive devices, or other requested accommodations, should be made to Emma Long, CCRPC Title VI Coordinator, at 802-846-4490 ext 21 or [elong@ccrpcvt.org](mailto:elong@ccrpcvt.org), no later than 3 business days prior to the meeting for which services are requested.*

## Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission

**April 15, 2015**

Agenda Item C.1: Consent Item

### **FY2015 Transportation Improvement Program Minor Amendments**

**Issues:**

Add the following projects to the FY2015-2018 TIP:

**North Avenue Crosswalks, Burlington** (Project BP090, Amendment FY15-19)

- ▶ **Description of TIP Change:** Add \$22,000 in federal funds for design in FY15 and \$198,316 in federal funds for construction in FY16.
- ▶ **Reason for Change:** Burlington was awarded a Transportation Alternatives grant to construct new pedestrian crossings at the following locations: Ward Street, Burlington College, Killarney Drive/Village Green Drive, Gosse Court, Green Acres Drive/Cayuga Court.

**Browns Trace Multimodal Connection, Jericho** (Project BP065, Amendment FY15-20)

- ▶ **Description of TIP Change:** Add \$48,000 in federal funds for construction in FY15.
- ▶ **Reason for Change:** Jericho was awarded a Transportation Alternatives grant to construct a 1,620 foot-long sidewalk on the west side of Browns Trace north of Jericho Center Green.

**Meadow Run to Alliance Church Path, Williston** (Project BP072, Amendment FY15-21)

- ▶ **Description of TIP Change:** Add \$300,000 in federal funds for construction FY15.
- ▶ **Reason for Change:** Williston was awarded a Transportation Alternatives grant for their Meadow Run shared use path connector project.

**Pinecrest Drive Path - VT2A to Suffolk Lane, Essex** (Project BP091, Amendment FY15-22)

- ▶ **Description of TIP Change:** Add \$25,000 in federal funds for design in FY15 and \$261,216 for construction in FY16.
- ▶ **Reason for Change:** Essex was awarded a Transportation Alternatives grant to construct a concrete sidewalk with curbing.

**West Lakeshore Drive Path, Colchester** (Project BP070, Amendment FY15-23)

- ▶ **Description of TIP Change:** Add \$300,000 in federal funds for construction in FY17.
- ▶ **Reason for Change:** Colchester was awarded a Transportation Alternatives grant to construct 4,435 feet of 10 foot-wide separated multi-use path along West Lakeshore Drive.

**Advancements in Micro-Urban Metropolitan Corridor Monitoring: Real Time Traffic Information through Blue Tooth Deployment in Vermont**  
(Project OT024, Amendment FY15-27):

- › **Description of TIP Change:** Add a new grant award to the TIP in FY15. The total grant amount is \$1,227,225 and is funded at 80 percent federal funds and 20 percent state funds. Add \$981,780 in federal funds and \$245,445 in state funds to the TIP in FY15. This change qualifies as a minor amendment because it is a grant award.
- › **Reason for Change:** CCRPC was awarded a federal Accelerated Innovation Deployment (AID) demonstration grant to assist the region in advancing the adoption of real-time congestion and safety technologies, improve our region's transportation system efficiency, safety, mobility, reliability, and sustainability and provide the opportunity to deploy a new practice and tools to accelerate innovation in our state. The grant will be used to deploy blue tooth monitoring devices on up to five transportation corridors in four municipalities: I-89 Exit 14 in South Burlington; I-89 Exits 16 and 17 in Colchester; Route 289 in Essex; and Vermont 2/2A, or I-89, Exit 12, in Williston. Data collected through this project will enhance safety and reduce congestion by providing real time travel information and developing methodologies, such as through variable message signs, for communicating the information. CCRPC is partnering with VTrans for this project.

**Staff Recommendation:** Recommend approval of the proposed TIP amendments.

**TAC Recommendation:** Recommend approval of the proposed TIP Amendments.

**For more information contact:** Christine Forde  
cforde@ccrpcvt.org or 846-4490 ext. 13

1 **Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission**  
2 **Regular Meeting Minutes DRAFT**  
3  
4

5 **Date:** Wednesday, March 18, 2015

6 **Time:** 6:00 p.m.

7 **Place:** CCRPC Offices; 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT 05404

8 **Members:**

9 Bolton, Joss Besse	21 St. George, Barbara Young
10 Buels Gore, Garret Mott	22 Shelburne, Absent
11 Burlington, Andy Montroll	23 S. Burlington, Chris Shaw
12 Charlotte, Jim Donovan	24 Underhill, Brian Bigelow
13 Colchester, Marc Landry	25 Westford, Absent
14 Essex, Irene Wrenner	26 Williston, Chris Roy
15 Essex Junction, Dan Kerin	27 Winooski, Mike O'Brien
16 Hinesburg, Andrea Morgante	28 VTrans, Amy Bell
17 Huntington, Barbara Elliott	29 Socio/Econ/Housing, Justin Dextrateur
18 Jericho, Catherine McMains	30 Conservation/Environment, Don Meals
19 Milton, Lou Mossey	31 Industrial/Business, Tim Baechle (6:26PM)
20 Richmond, Brian Bigelow	

32  
33 **Ex-Officio (non-voting):**

34 Burlington Int'l Airport, Absent	37 FTA, Absent
35 CCTA, Absent	38 Railroad Industry, Absent
36 FHWA, Absent	

39 **Others:**

40 Matthew Langham, VTrans	42 Camera Person, CCTV
41 Diane Meyerhoff, Third Sector Assoc.	43 David Scherr, Buels Gore Alternate

45 **Staff:**

46 Charlie Baker, Executive Director	50 Christine Forde, Interim Trans. Prog. Co-Mgr.
47 Pam Brangan, Senior Planner	51 Lee Krohn, Senior Planner
48 Forest Cohen, Business Manager	52 Regina Mahony, Plng Prog Manager
49 Bryan Davis, Sr. Transportation Planner	

53  
54  
55 **1. Call to Order; Changes to the Agenda**

56 The meeting was called to order at 6:00PM by the Chair, Andy Montroll. There were no changes to the  
57 agenda. Garret Mott introduced the Buels Gore Alternate, David Scherr.  
58

59 **2. Public Comment Period on Items NOT on the Agenda.** There were none.  
60

61 **3. Approve Consent Agenda (MPO Business).** MARC LANDRY MADE A MOTION, DULY SECONDED BY  
62 JIM DONOVAN, TO ACCEPT THE CONSENT AGENDA FOR A FY2015 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT  
63 PROGRAM MINOR AMENDMENT TO ADVANCE \$1,000,000 IN FEDERAL FUNDS FOR CONSTRUCTION  
64 FROM FY14 TO FY15 AND \$8,550,000 IN FEDERAL FUNDS FOR CONSTRUCTION FUNDS FROM FY14 TO  
65 FY16. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.  
66  
67  
68

1 **4. Approve Minutes of February 18, 2015 Meeting**

2 JIM DONOVAN MADE A MOTION, DULY SECONDED BY JOSS BESSE, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF  
3 FEBRUARY 18, 2015. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH FIVE ABSTENTIONS BY DAN KERIN,  
4 JOSS BESSE, MIKE O'BRIEN, BRIAN BIGELOW, AND JUSTIN DEXTRADEUR.

5  
6 **5. Public Hearing on Major Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendments**

7 Christine Forde of the CCRPC staff briefly reviewed the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)  
8 amendments, which include Essex Junction paving, Williston Park and Ride, Burlington's Champlain  
9 Parkway, and Vermont 117 Paving in Essex-Richmond.

10  
11 **5a) Public Hearing**

12 Chair Andy Montroll opened the public hearing at 6:05PM. With no public present, the hearing was  
13 closed at 6:05PM.

14  
15 **5b) Approve Major Amendments**

16 MARC LANDRY MADE A MOTION, DULY SECONDED BY JIM DONOVAN, TO APPROVE THE MAJOR  
17 AMENDMENTS TO THE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP). During discussion Irene  
18 Wrenner of Essex Junction noted that Route 117 is the quickest route to Interstate 89 for Sand Hill  
19 Road businesses. The CIRC highway won't be built and therefore Route 117 is a priority for Essex  
20 Junction; she would not like to see it delayed further. VOTE (MPO BUSINESS):

21

Bolton (1)	Yes	Richmond (1)	Absent
Burlington (4)	Yes	St. George (1)	Yes
Charlotte (1)	Yes	Shelburne (1)	Absent
Colchester (2)	Yes	South Burlington (2)	Yes
Essex Junction (1)	Yes	Underhill (1)	Yes
Essex Town (1)	Yes	Westford (1)	Absent
Hinesburg (1)	Yes	Williston (1)	Yes
Huntington (1)	Yes	Winooski (1)	Abstain
Jericho (1)	Yes	VTrans (1)	Abstain
Milton (1)	Yes		

22  
23 THE MOTION CARRIED WITH 19 OF 24 VOTES AND 14 OF 18 MUNICIPALITIES VOTING IN THE  
24 AFFIRMATIVE WITH THREE ABSTENTIONS FROM MIKE O'BRIEN, JUSTIN DEXTRADEUR, AND AMY BELL.

25  
26 **6. CATMA Presentation**

27 Sandy Thibault, the Executive Director of CATMA, made a presentation about her organization. She  
28 announced a name change to the Chittenden Area Transportation Management Association. Charlie  
29 Baker noted that CATMA is now providing services to the entire county; this is a great resource for  
30 employers to reduce vehicle trips.

31  
32 **7. Shared Services Survey Results**

33 Lee Krohn of the CCRPC staff made a presentation regarding CCRPC's municipal survey for shared  
34 services. There was a 30 percent response rate from the 150 email surveys sent. Municipal  
35 representatives were most interested in shared services for public safety, coop purchasing, conflict  
36 management, and grant writing. There was discussion about county government and Councils of  
37 Government structures. Municipalities have considered, and in some cases, implemented  
38 consolidation in police, fire, and schools.

1 **8. 2017 Transportation Project Prioritization and Town Highway Bridge Pre-Candidate Prioritization**

2 Christine Forde of the CCRPC staff made a presentation. She explained that this project prioritization is  
3 for the State’s Capital Program. The Capital Program is a spending document, unlike the Transportation  
4 Improvement Program (TIP) which is a planning document (and will be under discussion in a few  
5 months).

6  
7 MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, DULY SECONDED BY DAN KERIN, TO APPROVE THE 2017 REGIONAL  
8 PROJECT SCORES AND 2017 TOWN HIGHWAY BRIDGE PRE-CANDIDATE SCORES AND FORWARD TO  
9 VTRANS. VOTE (MPO BUSINESS):

10

Bolton (1)	Yes	Richmond (1)	Absent
Burlington (4)	Yes	St. George (1)	Yes
Charlotte (1)	Yes	Shelburne (1)	Absent
Colchester (2)	Yes	South Burlington (2)	Yes
Essex Junction (1)	Yes	Underhill (1)	Yes
Essex Town (1)	Yes	Westford (1)	Absent
Hinesburg (1)	Yes	Williston (1)	Yes
Huntington (1)	Yes	Winooski (1)	Abstain
Jericho (1)	Yes	VTrans (1)	Abstain
Milton (1)	Yes		

11  
12 THE MOTION CARRIED WITH 20 OF 24 VOTES AND 15 OF 18 MUNICIPALITIES VOTING IN THE  
13 AFFIRMATIVE WITH ONE ABSTENTION FROM AMY BELL.

14  
15 **9. Charge to Board Development Committee for Nomination of FY16 Officers**

16 Lou Mossey is the Chair of the Board Development Committee and asked that prospective candidates  
17 contact him directly.

18  
19 **10. Executive Director’s Update**

20 **10a) Legislative Report:** Major bills pending include the council of governments and the water quality  
21 bill. Ways & Means is looking at revenue generation. There is discussion of municipalities and RPCs  
22 having more input into basin planning and prioritization of basin projects.

23  
24 **10b) Updates**

- 25
- Transportation Secretary Sue Minter will be the guest speaker at June’s Annual Meeting.
  - Charlie asked for volunteers for the Hazardous Mitigation Multijurisdictional Planning Committee.  
27 The plan is required for FEMA and state disaster damage reimbursement funding. The CCRPC may  
28 use the Planning Advisory Committee, under Chair Joss Besse, to undertake this work.
  - A new Byways brochure is available.
- 29

30  
31 **10c) Organizational Transition:** Charlie thanked John Zicconi for screening candidates for the  
32 Transportation Manager position. Andy Montroll will help with candidate interviews. It is hoped there  
33 will be a decision in early April. Interviews for the junior planner position begin next week.

34  
35 **10d) Monthly Project Status Report:** Distributed separately.

1 **11. Comments on Master Plan Revisions to Act 250 Rules**

2 Regina Mahony of the CCRPC staff explained the proposed procedural rule changes to Act 250. Master  
3 Plans have always been an option, but the Natural Resources Board is proposing to require some  
4 applicants to complete a master planning process. There are two recommendations before the Board;  
5 one is from the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) to retain item 3a) to read “the proposed  
6 development or subdivision involves multiple interdependent phases”; and item 3b) to read “the  
7 master plan process would avoid or limit piecemeal review of ~~known~~ development or subdivision  
8 planned for the reasonably foreseeable future.” (add underlined “interdependent”, remove ~~known~~  
9 “known”).

10  
11 The other recommendation is from the ad hoc Permit Review Committee which requested that item  
12 3a) be stricken and item 3b) include the word “known.”

13  
14 There was discussion about interpretation of these regulations and whether or not master planning  
15 should be required, especially when projects are phased and future phases are conceptual in nature.

16  
17 GARRET MOTT MADE A MOTION, DULY SECONDED BY JIM DONOVAN, TO PROVIDE COMMENTS TO  
18 THE NATURAL RESOURCES BOARD REGARDING THE PROPOSED REQUIREMENT OF MASTER PLANS  
19 WITHIN THE ACT 250 PROCESS. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY WITH ONE ABSTENTION FROM  
20 AMY BELL.

21  
22 GARRET MOTT MADE A MOTION, DULY SECONDED BY JIM DONOVAN, TO REMOVE ITEM 3A) AND TO  
23 REVISE ITEM 3B) TO REMOVE “KNOWN.” JOSS BESSE OFFERED AN AMENDMENT, DULY SECONDED BY  
24 BARBARA ELLIOT, TO THE MOTION TO ADD ITEM 3A) AND INCLUDE THE WORD “INTERDEPENDENT” TO  
25 READ “THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OR SUBDIVISION INVOLVES MULTIPLE INTERDEPENDENT  
26 PHASES.”

27  
28 THE ORIGINAL MOTION PASSED WITH 11 VOTES IN FAVOR AND 7 VOTES OPPOSED WITH ONE  
29 ABSTENTION FROM AMY BELL. THE MOTION, WITH AMENDMENT, PASSED WITH 12 IN FAVOR AND 6  
30 OPPOSED WITH ONE ABSTENTION FROM AMY BELL.

31  
32 **12. TDI New England Section 248 Project**

33 Regina Mahoney reported that the CCRPC has been granted “intervenor” status in this project. The  
34 group discussed the questions prepared by Marc Landry and other RPCs. MARC LANDRY MADE A  
35 MOTION, DULY SECONDED BY GARRET MOTT, TO INSTRUCT THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TO ENSURE  
36 THE PREPARED QUESTIONS ARE SUBMITTED AND TO CONTINUE TO MONITOR THE NEW ENGLAND  
37 POWER LINK PROJECT DISCUSSION. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY WITH ONE ABSTENTION  
38 FROM AMY BELL.

39  
40 **13. Committee Reports:** Included in the Board packet.

41  
42 **14. Members’ Items/Other Business:** There were none.

43  
44 **15. Adjourn**

45 GARRET MOTT MADE A MOTION, DULY SECONDED BY JIM DONOVAN, TO ADJOURN AT 7:40PM. THE  
46 MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

47  
Respectfully submitted, Diane Meyerhoff

## **Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission**

**April 15, 2015**

Agenda Item 6: Action Item

### **FY2015 Transportation Improvement Program Major Amendment**

**Issues:**

Add the project described below to the FY2015-2018 TIP. This qualifies as a Major amendment because it is a new project.

**VT128 Slope Stability System, Essex (Project HP125, Amendment FY15-24):**

- ▶ **Description of TIP Change:** Add a new project to the TIP for installation of a slope stability system along the northern embankment slope of VT128 beginning at mile marker 0.795 and extending northerly to mile marker 1.060 (east of Irene Avenue to west of Weed Road). Add \$307,000 in FY15 for construction.
- ▶ **Reason for Change:** This project arose from a VT128 paving project conducted in FY13. This project will construct a slope stability system in this flood prone area. Design of the project was funded by regional project HP115 Slopes and Slides.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Recommend warning a public hearing for the proposed TIP amendment and approval of the amendment.

**TAC Recommendation:**

Recommend that board warn a public hearing for the proposed TIP amendment, and approve the amendment.

**For more information contact:**

Christine Forde  
cforde@ccrvcvt.org or 846-4490 ext. 13





## **CCRPC Board Meeting**

**April 15, 2015**

**Agenda Item 8: Action Item: Warn a Public Hearing for May 20, 2015**

### **Item: FY16 Unified Planning Work Program & Budget**

Each year the CCRPC undertakes the development and implementation of a Unified Planning Work Program.

The Board of Directors of the CCRPC has established a Committee process for the development of the UPWP. The Committee members appointed by the Chair consisted of the following members:

Board Representation

Chris Roy, Chair  
John Zicconi  
Andrea Morgante  
Joss Besse (PAC)

TAC & PAC Representation

Ken Beliveau (PAC)  
Barbara Elliott (TAC)  
Justin Rabidoux (TAC)

Ex-Officio

Amy Bell - VTrans  
Chris Jolly – USDOT, FHWA  
Meredith Birkett – CCTA

UPWP Committee meetings were held on the following dates: January 30<sup>th</sup>, February 20<sup>th</sup>, March 25<sup>th</sup>. The Committee voted on March 25<sup>th</sup> to advance the draft document and budget to the Executive Committee for consideration and advancement to the Board.

The Finance Committee met on March 19<sup>th</sup> to review the budget assumptions. The TAC reviewed the transportation elements of the UPWP on April 7<sup>th</sup>, and the Executive Committee reviewed the UPWP Work Program and Budget on April 1<sup>st</sup> and voted to advance the UPWP to the Board for review and notice of Public Hearing.

The new projects which have been added to the program are shown with green or blue backgrounds. The full budget document is a separate attachment. This document does not yet include funds for projects started this year but will carry-over into FY16. We will hand this out at the April 15<sup>th</sup> meeting.

#### **Recommendation:**

Approve Draft FY16 UPWP Work Program and Budget to warn for a public hearing on May 20 2015; the anticipated date of adoption of the work program and budget by the CCRPC Board is May 20th following the public hearing.

#### **For Additional Information Contact:**

Charlie Baker, Executive Director; [cbaker@ccrpcvt.org](mailto:cbaker@ccrpcvt.org) or 846-4490 ext. 23 OR  
Bryan Davis, Senior Transportation Planner, [bdavis@ccrpcvt.org](mailto:bdavis@ccrpcvt.org) or 846-4490 ext. 17

1 CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
2 Joint Executive & Finance Committee  
3 Meeting Minutes  
4 **DRAFT**

5 Date: Wednesday, April 1, 2015  
6 Time: 5:45 p.m.  
7 Place: CCRPC Offices, 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404  
8 Present: Chris Roy, Vice-Chair Debra Kobus, Secretary-Treasurer  
9 Andrea Morgante, Comm. >5000 John Zicconi, Comm. <5000  
10 Lou Mossey, Immediate Past Chair  
11 Charlie Baker, Executive Director Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager  
12 Forest Cohen, Business Manager Bernie Ferenc, Trans. Business Manager  
13

14 The meeting was called to order at 5:45 p.m. by the Vice-Chair, Chris Roy.

- 15  
16 1. Changes to the Agenda, Members' Items. There were none.  
17  
18 2. Approval of March 4, 2015 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes. ANDREA MORGANTE MADE A  
19 MOTION, SECONDED BY DEBRA KOBUS, TO APPROVE THE EXEC. COMM. MINUTES FROM MARCH 4,  
20 2015. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.  
21  
22 3. Approval of January 28, 2015 Finance Committee Meeting Minutes. DEBRA KOBUS MADE A MOTION,  
23 SECONDED BY CHRIS ROY, TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 28, 2015 FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING  
24 MINUTES. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.  
25  
26 4. Review of Finance Reports – Year-to-Date through February. Forest distributed the financial reports  
27 and reviewed them. On the balance sheet, we show cash in savings/checking around \$500,000; as well  
28 as about \$60,000 in the CDs. Current assets over liabilities is okay. We show \$222,000 in deferred  
29 revenue communities, with a net income for February – a loss of \$96,229. On the income statement,  
30 we are a little more than half way through our penalty year and we're feeling the 10% loss on our  
31 indirect rate. We are allocating all of the ACCD funding. Our MPO income is low because of the loss of  
32 staff. He reviewed other grants which are all pretty small. We're at 60% of income at 67% of the year.  
33 On the expense side, we are doing okay. We are at 62.5% of expenses. Salaries and benefits are under  
34 budget with nothing way out of whack. When we look at FY13/14 we can see the penalty year concept  
35 coming into focus. We have to remember that we had \$230,000 surplus income over the last two  
36 years. One budget spot he pointed out is that we're only showing the local match used to date, but the  
37 auditors will record the remaining balance as income in this fiscal year, which will soften the blow. The  
38 local match isn't spending as much because of lack of staff/revenue. Forest then reviewed the Cash  
39 Flow spreadsheet. We may have to use as much as \$90,000 of our surplus funds to reduce the deficit.  
40 We'll still have close to \$200,000 in reserve funds but will have to use some. When asked if we have a  
41 range of what the reserve should be, Charlie said our goal is to have 2-3 months of expenses in reserve.  
42 A brief discussion ensued about how we end up with reserves, when we are a non-profit. Charlie noted  
43 that it basically comes from local dues; and that other RPCs typically have 2-3 months in reserve. It was  
44 noted that the FY16 indirect rate will only be 2% lower than our real expenses.  
45  
46 5. FY16 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) and Budget. Chris Roy reported that he chaired the  
47 UPWP committee and it was a good process. They reviewed applications from the municipalities and  
48 partners. They decided that there are two types of applications: one for municipalities for specific/

1 direct projects and the other for partners where we provide seed money and then each year are asked  
2 for additional funds to continue work and in some cases operation. The committee decided they want  
3 to revise our application in the future to cover different types of projects. We'll ask them to include  
4 budget information, how long a project has been worked on etc. They reviewed all applications and  
5 asked for more information on some. We were able to keep the budget in line with funds we anticipate  
6 receiving.

7  
8 Charlie said there will be edits, such as removing planning grants if we don't get them. He then  
9 reviewed the color coding in the draft UPWP. The pink lines will come out because either we don't have  
10 the capacity or expertise to do them. The red text means staff needs to add deliverables or description;  
11 green are new MPO PL funded projects; blue indicates new non-transportation funded projects. Chris  
12 noted that he and Andy would like to revise the ECOS update task to include some strategic planning for  
13 the RPC. This strategic planning is because it's been five years since our merger and the board and staff  
14 should discuss what the RPC should be in the future. This is shown on page 23, row 161, task #7.2.4.  
15 Charlie said for the strategic planning effort, he would try to find some dollars to hire a facilitator. John  
16 Zicconi wanted it noted for the record that although he is listed as a UPWP Committee member, he was  
17 only able to attend the first meeting.

18  
19 Charlie then reviewed the budget sheet. The Real Time Traffic grant did get approved for \$981,000 over  
20 3 years so we've estimated \$300,000 for FY16. Transportation staff costs will increase. This budget  
21 doesn't include any carryover funds for projects that will run into the new fiscal year. We have to work  
22 on that. Charlie reviewed other planning grants and the expense side. At the FY15 Mid-Year we showed  
23 a negative \$70,000, but by FY16 we show revenues over expenses of \$1,800. ANDREA MORGANTE  
24 MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE PASSING THE UPWP AND BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS WITH  
25 REVISIONS AS APPROPRIATE TO THE BOARD TO WARN A PUBLIC HEARING FOR MAY. JOHN ZICCONI  
26 SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

27  
28 6. Personnel Policy Recommendations – Compensation Study. Charlie noted that one of the Executive  
29 Committee's duties is to be responsible for personnel policies. Now that the compensation study is  
30 complete, we have a proposed salary range table and several job descriptions we need to address.  
31 We've had a draft report for a couple of months which staff has reviewed. We asked the consultant for  
32 more information in certain areas, but did not take their exact recommendation for salary ranges. They  
33 did look at benefit comps and recommended raising the life insurance coverage to \$150,000 (from  
34 \$50,000). Staff recommends we allow staff to increase the life insurance themselves through payroll  
35 deductions (if we have enough interest), since there is a tax liability for life insurance provided by the  
36 employer for amounts over \$50,000. The consultant also suggested adding an 11<sup>th</sup> holiday. However,  
37 staff feels we have a generous PTO package and don't need another holiday. All agreed it would have  
38 been nice had the consultant compared the whole salary/benefit package rather than individual  
39 components. A lengthy discussion ensued about the proposed salary ranges, and which positions fit  
40 where, and how specific salary adjustments would be made. Charlie asked that members leave those  
41 specific employee issues up to him to deal with. He will review proposed raises with the Executive  
42 Committee in June. ANDREA MORGANTE MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY LOU MOSSEY, TO ACCEPT  
43 THE STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SALARY RANGES AND JOB DESCRIPTIONS AND  
44 RECOMMENDATION ON LIFE INSURANCE SUBJECT TO ENOUGH EMPLOYEES WANTING TO PARTICIPATE;  
45 AND TO ACCEPT THE COMPENSATION STUDY REPORT AS INFORMATION AND ALLOW THE EXECUTIVE  
46 DIRECTOR TO USE THIS INFORMATION IN OUR DISCUSSION TO MAKE SALARY ADJUSTMENTS. MOTION  
47 CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

48

- 1 7. Act 250 & Section 248 Applications:
- 2 a. New England Clean Power Link. Regina distributed a revised draft of the memo (Information
- 3 Request Served Upon Petitioner) to the Public Service Board that was sent to members earlier
- 4 today. In the meantime, the Petitioner submitted all of their responses to the first set of
- 5 Requests for Information. Some of our questions have already been answered – therefore
- 6 Regina suggested that we remove some of them. Our first two questions deal with revenue –
- 7 taxes and leased revenue: 1. It is clear that municipal taxes will be paid for the land based
- 8 transmission lines, however the line in the lake is not taxable as real property. We are
- 9 questioning the logic behind this; and 2. Regarding the question from Marc on lease agreement,
- 10 they talk about lease revenue for the transmission lines on the land, but not on the cable in the
- 11 lake. We are questioning the logic behind this. Our other questions include extending the lease
- 12 agreements if the lines are used for longer than expected; once the state okays this what impact
- 13 does it have on projects that have yet to come forward; and a suggestion to alert NOAA and the
- 14 Coast Guard regarding the impact on compass navigation. Regina noted that the company is
- 15 providing money for various funds including Clean Water. The environmental issues are well
- 16 covered by questions from CLF and ANR. John Zicconi feels that we should provide the
- 17 responses to the municipalities letting them know we dug into these questions. It was noted
- 18 that Colchester, South Burlington, Shelburne and Charlotte will be impacted, but not Milton or
- 19 Burlington.
- 20 b. Gardner Construction, Inc., Colchester – Application #4C1277. Regina noted that this is for a
- 21 10-unit Planning Residential Development on 3.2 acres near McRae Road in Colchester and we
- 22 don't have too many concerns. It's hard to have TDM on such a small scale, but there are
- 23 sidewalks that connect to the larger sidewalk system. The project is just off the corner of
- 24 Porter's Point Road and Prim Road (3 lots from the corner). JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION TO
- 25 APPROVE THE LETTER WITH OUR COMMENTS BE SUBMITTED TO THE D.E.C. ANDREA
- 26 MORGANTE SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
- 27
- 28 8. Agenda Review for April 15, 2015 meeting. Members reviewed the draft agenda and discussed
- 29 potential ongoing projects that might be of interest to full board. We will ask Dan Albrecht to do a
- 30 presentation on All Hazard Mitigation Plan (AHMP) to give towns a heads up.
- 31
- 32 9. Chair/Executive Director's Report.
- 33 a. Legislature. 1. Charlie noted that the Water Quality Bill is being discussed and funding is
- 34 bouncing around so we don't know where that will end up. Senate Natural Resources
- 35 Committee is taking it up this week and want to get through it quickly. There is still support for
- 36 contracting with RPCs on basin plans. 2. COG (Council of Governments) bill is not going
- 37 anywhere this year. There is more work to be done with VLCT. 3. The Economic Development
- 38 bill is bouncing around committees. 4. The bill in the House for ten-year municipal plan update
- 39 requirement, but the Senate has not had any discussion on it. Since its past cross over, Charlie
- 40 feels the Senate may not take this one up. 5. House Transportation Committee is finishing the
- 41 Transportation bill and they want to study commuter rail service from St. Albans to Montpelier.
- 42 Discussion ensued about what other spurs might be included. Charlie feels a link to Burlington
- 43 was included, but he will look at this more closely to see if we need an item in our work
- 44 program.
- 45 b. Organizational Transition. Charlie thanked John Zicconi for helping screen the applicants for
- 46 Transportation Program Manager. We had interviews two weeks ago. Charlie announced that
- 47 Eleni Churchill will be the new Transportation Program Manager. It was a tough choice. Andy
- 48 Montroll helped with the interviews. The applicants for junior positions have been screened

1           and we have interviews with the final two candidates next week. We'll have to decide if we  
2           have the right applicant for the additional transportation staff position to backfill from Eleni's  
3           promotion. We had 60 applicants with only ten that we didn't think we wanted.  
4

5   10. Other Business. There was none.  
6

7   11. Executive Session. None needed.  
8

9   12. Adjourn. ANDREA MORGANTE MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JOHN ZICCONI, TO ADJOURN AT 7:32  
10 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

11   Respectfully submitted,  
12

13   Bernadette Ferenc  
14

DRAFT

April 2, 2015

Stephanie Monaghan  
District #4 Coordinator  
111 West Street  
Essex Junction, VT 05452

RE: Gardner Construction, Inc, Colchester; Application #4C1277

Dear Ms. Monaghan:

The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission's Staff and Executive Committee have reviewed this Act 250 application for a Project described as the construction of a 10-unit Planned Residential Development on a 3.2 acre parcel to be served by 575 linear feet of public road, municipal water, on-site sewage treatment and disposal and on-site stormwater treatment and control. The Project is located at 14 Macrae Road, in Colchester, VT. The project has received approval from the Town of Colchester Development Review Board. **We offer the following comments:**

The project is located within the Village Planning Area as defined in the Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the *2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan*. We find this project to be consistent with the Planning Areas for the following reasons:

1. The Village Planning Area is identified in the Plan as an area planned for growth, and therefore this project helps implement Strategy #2 of the Plan which calls for 80% of new development in the areas planned for growth.
2. The project is proposed to be served by municipal water and is close to existing services (though not on municipal sewer or within close proximity to CCTA transit service routes).
3. The density and uses are consistent with the local regulations.

Therefore, we find this project to be in conformance with the Planning Areas of the *2013 Chittenden County Regional Plan*.

In addition, we'd like to take the opportunity to comment on Criterion 9(L). We find that this project meets the following definition of an existing settlement in full: an existing center that is compact in form and size; that contains a mixture of uses that include a substantial residential component and that are within walking distance of each other; that has significantly higher densities than densities that occur outside the center; and that is typically served by municipal infrastructure such as water, wastewater, sidewalks, paths, transit, parking areas, and public parks or greens. Therefore, we find this project to be in conformance with Criterion 9(L).

Regarding transportation, the proposal has comprehensively included an internal network of sidewalks that connects to the existing sidewalk infrastructure. The application indicates that the project is for 10 townhomes and does not generate enough traffic to require TDM strategies. We tend to agree that it is difficult to address TDM effectively at such a small scale. We do recognize that there are garages that can accommodate personal bike storage.

Due to the detailed level of development review in most Chittenden County municipalities and the environmental permit reviews at the Department of Environmental Conservation, CCRPC will give specific attention in its Act 250

reviews to the type of use and the Planning Areas section of the *2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan*. While there are many other topics covered in the *2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan*, there has been significant analysis at the Regional level regarding transportation impacts. The CCRPC will also focus its attention on transportation, where appropriate, in accordance with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, which is within the *2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan*.

These comments are based on information currently available; we may have additional comments as the process continues. Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Charlie Z Baker". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Charlie Baker  
Executive Director

Cc: CCRPC Board  
Certificate of Service



April 6, 2015

Andrew N. Raubvogel, Esq.  
Geoffrey H. Hand, Esq.  
Brian S. Dunkiel, Esq.  
Victoria M. Westgate, Esq.  
Dunkiel Saunders Elliott Raubvogel & Hand, PLLC  
91 College Street - PO Box 545  
Burlington, VT 05402-0545

**Re: Docket # 8400 - Petition of Champlain VT, LLC  
d/b/a TDI New England, for a Certificate of Public Good**

Dear Attorney Raubvogel:

Enclosed for your response is the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission's Information Requests on Petitioner. All parties will receive a copy via email and via US Mail.

Thank you for your attention on this matter. Please contact me if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Charlie L Baker".

Charlie Baker  
Executive Director

cc: Service List



STATE OF VERMONT  
PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD

Petition of Champlain VT, LLC, d/b/a TDI New  
England, for a certificate of public good,  
pursuant to 30 V.S.A. §248, authorizing the )  
installation and operation of a high voltage )  
direct current (HVDC) underwater and )  
underground electric transmission line with a )  
capacity of 1,000 MW, a converter station, and )  
other associated facilities, to be located in Lake )  
Champlain and in the Counties of Grand Isle, )  
Chittenden, Addison, Rutland and Windsor, )  
Vermont, to be known as the New England )  
Clean Power Link Project (“NECPL”)

**Docket #8400**

**INFORMATION REQUESTS SERVED UPON PETITIONER BY THE  
CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION**

The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (“CCRPC”) by: Charlie Baker, Executive Director and Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager, hereby serves the following set of Information Requests upon the Petitioner in this matter in accordance with Public Service Board (“Board”) Rule 2.214 and V.R.C.P. 33 and 34, and requests that Petitioner answer the requests in accordance with V.R.C.P. 33 and 34 and deliver its answers and all requested documents and materials to the CCRPC via email not later than May 14, 2015. Petitioner is requested to provide a copy of its answers in electronic format, that is, in Word or pdf or other format readable to CCRPC.

**INSTRUCTIONS**

1. Reproduce the request being responded to before the response per V.R.C.P. 33.
2. Responses to any and all CCRPC requests that are contained herein or that may be filed later should be supplied to the CCRPC as soon as they become available to Petitioner. That is, Petitioner should not hold answers to any requests for which they have responsive data, documents, etc. until responses to any or all other requests are compiled.
3. V.R.C.P. 33 requires the response to each request to be made under oath by a person competent to testify concerning the response and all documents and exhibits produced as part of the response. With respect to each request, please state (1) the name(s) and title(s) of the person or persons responsible for

preparing the response; and (2) the administrative unit which maintains the records being produced or maintains the data from which the answer was prepared; and (3) the date on which each question was answered.

4. Where information requested is not available in the precise form described in the question or is not available for all years (or other periods or classifications) indicated in a series of years (or other periods or classifications), please provide all information with respect to the subject matter of the question that can be identified in Petitioner's workpapers and files or that is otherwise available.
5. These requests shall be deemed continuing and must be supplemented in accordance with V.R.C.P. 26(e). Petitioner is directed to change, supplement and correct its answers to conform to all information as it becomes available to Petitioner, including the substitution of actual data for estimated data. Responses to requests for information covering a period not entirely in the past (or for which complete actual data are not yet available) should include all actual data available at that time and supplementary data as it becomes available.
6. Wherever responses include estimated information, include an explanation (or reference to a previous explanation) of the methods and calculations used to derive the estimates.
7. Some of the CCRPC's requests may make particular reference to a portion of Petitioner's filing. Notwithstanding this specific direction, these items should be understood to seek discovery of all information available to Petitioner that is responsive to the questions stated.
8. "Identify," when used in connection with natural person(s) or legal entities, shall mean the full name and current business address of the person or entity.
9. "Document," as used herein, shall be construed as broadly as possible to include any and all means and media by which information can be recorded, transmitted, stored, retrieved or memorialized in any form, and shall also include all drafts, versions or copies which differ in any respect from the original. All spreadsheets provided must have all formulae intact and accessible.
10. "Petition," as used herein, means Petitioner's petition filed with the Vermont Public Service Board in this docket, unless the context indicates otherwise.
11. With respect to each document produced by Petitioner, identify the person who prepared the document and the date on which the document was prepared.
12. If any interrogatory or request requires a response that Petitioner believe to be privileged, please state the complete legal and factual basis for the claim of privilege, provide the information required by the 5/16/95 order in Docket No. 5771 and respond to the parts of the interrogatory or request as to which no privilege is asserted.
13. If any interrogatory or request is objected to in whole or in part, please describe the complete legal and factual basis for the objection, and respond to all parts of the interrogatory or request to the extent it is not objected to. If an objection is interposed as to any requested documents, please identify the document by author, title, date and recipient(s), and generally describe the nature and subject-matter of the document as well as the complete legal and factual basis for the objection.
14. To expedite the discovery process and the resolution of this docket, Petitioner should contact CCRPC as soon as possible, and prior to the above deadline for response, if it seeks clarification on any of these information requests.

15. CCRPC reserves the right to submit additional information requests to Petitioner.

### INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS TO PRODUCE

#### Economic Interests

1. Pre-filed direct testimony of Todd Singer, page 8, line 11-14: Mr. Singer explains, “*TDI-NE currently estimates \$301,200,000 in property taxes will be paid during both the construction period and the 40 year life of the Project. These taxes will be paid to the Towns along the terrestrial route even though the majority of the right of ways are owned by the State of Vermont.*” Mr. Singer further explains, line 17-20, “*It is TDI-NE’s understanding that the land-based portions of the Project -- the underground transmission cables and the Converter Station -- will be taxable as real property, but that the cables within Lake Champlain are not.*” Please provide further information regarding why the cables within Lake Champlain are not taxable as real property; and furthermore why the lakefront municipalities will not receive tax revenues from this project.
2. Pre-filed direct testimony of Todd Singer, page 12, line 10-14: Mr. Singer explains, “*TDI-NE currently estimates \$21,900,000 in right of way lease payments will be made to the Vermont Department of Transportation (“VTrans”) during the 40 year life of the Project. The right of way lease payments would compensate VTrans for use of the State of Vermont-owned road and railroad right-of-ways (“VTrans Route”) that are incorporated in the Project route.*” Mr. Singer’s pre-filed testimony did not include any information regarding lease revenue for the Lake Champlain portion of the project. Please provide further information regarding anticipated lease revenues from the cables within Lake Champlain; and furthermore whether the lease agreements will be made with the State or the lakefront municipalities for the cables within Lake Champlain.
3. Please explain how and when the lease agreements will be extended if the life of the project expands beyond 40 years.
4. Please explain the impact and standing of TDI-NE’s transmission project relative to any permitting of other, perhaps competing, users.

#### Environmental/Geomagnetic Fields

5. Pre-filed direct testimony of Dr. William Bailey, page 23, line 13-18: Dr. Bailey explains “*The effect of the cables on navigational compass readings is small. In water depths of just 10 feet, the maximum compass deviation would be 8 degrees directly over the cable and would decrease to 1.3 degrees at a distance of 10 feet or more from the cable centerline. See Exh. TDI-WHB-3. The small compass deviation and narrow width of area affected would not be a problem for boaters and the location of the cables will be indicated on nautical charts of Lake Champlain.*” Considering the impact on compass navigation will NOAA and the Coast Guard be notified of the effect of the cables on navigational compass readings so that users of these devices will be adequately alerted of the effect?

Dated at Winooski, Vermont this 2<sup>nd</sup> day of April 2015.

Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Charlie Z Baker". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized "Z".

Charlie Baker  
Executive Director  
Chittenden Cty. Regional Planning Commission  
110 West Canal Street, Suite 202  
Winooski, VT 05404

cc: Parties

**PSB Docket No. 8400 – Service List**

<p>JoAnn Q. Carson 11 Northshore Drive Burlington, VT 05408</p>	<p>Adam Lougee, Executive Director ACRPC 14 Seminary Street Middlebury, Vermont 05753</p>	<p>Sheila Grace, Esq. Jeanne Elias, Esq. Vermont Department of Public Service 112 State Street, Drawer 20 Montpelier, Vermont 05620</p>
<p>Kim Sears 18 Paddock Lane Williston, VT 05495</p>	<p>Donald J. Einhorn, Esq. Vermont Agency of Natural Resources 1 National Life Drive, Davis 2 Montpelier, Vermont 05620</p>	<p>Town of Fair Haven Selectboard/ Planning Commission Herbert A. Durfee, III, Town Manager 3 North Park Place Fair Haven, Vermont 05743</p>
<p>Thomas Dunn, President VELCO Rutland Headquarters 366 Pinnacle Ridge Road Rutland, Vermont 05701</p>	<p>Michael S. Adams, Senior Project Manager U.S. Army Corps of Engineers New England District 11 Lincoln Street, Room 210 Essex Junction, Vermont 05452</p>	<p>Town of Wallingford Selectboard Attn: Sandi Switzer, Town Administrator 75 School Street Wallingford, Vermont 05773</p>
<p>Thomas Kennedy, Executive Director SWCRPC Ascutney Professional Building - Route 5 P.O. Box 320 Ascutney, Vermont 05030</p>	<p>Elizabeth B. McDonald, Esq. Dept. of Environmental Conservation One National Life Drive – Main 2 Montpelier, Vermont 05620</p>	<p>Toni H. Clithero, Assistant Attorney General VT Agency of Transportation 1 National Life Dr. Montpelier, VT 05633</p>
<p>Kenneth A. Nolan Manager of Power Resources Burlington Electric Department 585 Pine Street Burlington, VT 05401</p>	<p>Andrew N. Raubvogel, Esq., Geoffrey H. Hand, Esq., Brian S. Dunkiel, Esq., Victoria M. Westgate, Esq, of <b>Dunkiel Saunders Elliott Raubvogel &amp; Hand, PLLC</b> 91 College Street - PO Box 545 Burlington, VT 05402-0545</p>	<p>Sandra Levine, Senior Attorney Conservation Law Foundation 15 East State Street - Suite 4 Montpelier, VT 05602</p>
<p>Kevin E. Brown, Esq. Langrock, Sperry, &amp; Wool PO Drawer 531 - 111 South Pleasant Street Middlebury, VT 05753</p>	<p>S. Mark Sciarrotta, Esq. Vermont Electric Power Company, Inc. 388 Pinnacle Ridge Road Rutland, VT 05701</p>	<p>Taylor Newton, Regional Planner Northwest Regional Planning Commission 75 Fairfield Street St. Albans, VT 05478</p>
<p>Sharon Combes-Farr &amp; Bruce Farr 934 East Lake Road Ludlow, VT 05149</p>	<p>William &amp; Ruth Combes C/O Sharon Combes-Farr &amp; Bruce Farr 934 East Lake Road Ludlow, VT 05149</p>	<p>Carolyn Browne Anderson, Esq. Green Mountain Power Corporation 2154 Post Road Rutland, VT 05702</p>
<p>William F. Ellis, Esq. McNeil, Leddy &amp; Sheahan 271 South Union Street Burlington, VT 05401</p>	<p>Richard H. Saudek, Esq Diamond &amp; Robinson, P.C. 15 East State Street - PO Box 1460 Montpelier, VT 05601-1460</p>	<p>John W. Kessler, Esq., ACCD Dale E. Azaria, General Counsel, DHCD 1 National Life Drive – 6<sup>th</sup> Floor Montpelier, VT 05620-0501</p>
<p>Kimberlee J. Sturtevant, Asst. City Attorney Office of the City Attorney &amp; Corporation Counsel City of Burlington 149 Church Street-Room 11 Burlington, VT 05401</p>		

1 CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
2 PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE - MINUTES  
3

4 DATE: Wednesday, March 11, 2015  
5 TIME: 2:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.  
6 PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT

**Members Present**

Joss Besse, Bolton  
Eranthie Yeshwant, Winooski  
Paul Conner, South Burlington  
Ken Belliveau, Williston  
Edmund Booth, Huntington  
Dana Hanley, Essex  
Sarah McShane, Underhill  
Clare Rock, Richmond  
Jeannine McCrumb, Charlotte

Dean Pierce, Shelburne  
Barbara Young, St. George  
Everett Marshall, Huntington  
Paul Conner, So. Burlington

**Staff**

Regina Mahony, Senior Planner  
Dan Albrecht, Senior Planner

**Other**

7  
8  
9 **1. Welcome and Introductions**

10 Joss Besse called the meeting to order at 2:39 p.m.  
11

12 **2. Approval of January 14, 2015 Minutes**

13  
14 Ken Belliveau made a motion, seconded by Dana Hanley to approve the January 14, 2015 minutes. No further  
15 discussion. MOTION PASSED.  
16

17 **3. UPWP Update**

18 Regina reported that the last UPWP Committee meeting will take place next Thursday, 3/19<sup>th</sup>. Ken Belliveau  
19 and Joss Besse have served on that Committee on behalf of the PAC. The packet is being prepared at the  
20 moment. There may still be some asks to municipalities to prioritize their requests if they submitted multiple  
21 requests. Clare Rock asked when the decisions will be made. Ken Belliveau suggested that you probably  
22 would have already heard from Charlie if your request couldn't be met.  
23

24 **4. All Hazard Mitigation Plan Updates & Associated Efforts**

25 Dan Albrecht provided an overview of the process and timeline for the All Hazard Mitigation Plan (AHMP)  
26 update (process and timeline is attached):

- 27 • The AHMP are required in order for municipalities to maintain eligibility for pre-disaster mitigation  
28 funding. Also the State is requiring these plans in order to get the best State match share (in addition to  
29 other requirements).
- 30 • The current AHMP and municipal annexes expire in August 2016. We need to have the final plan  
31 submitted to FEMA prior to this date and we are planning on a July 8, 2016 deadline.
- 32 • A Committee will need to be established to help with this process. Representatives appointed by each  
33 municipality's governing body, one or more representatives appointed by LEPC #1, one or more  
34 commissioner representatives of CCRPC, and ex-officio officials from VEM and Vermont ANR will be  
35 invited to serve on the committee.
- 36 • CCRPC will have an intern working on updating the tabular data this summer. Dan Albrecht, Lee Krohn  
37 and Regina Mahony will assist the municipalities with updates to the recommendations, strategies and  
38 actions.
- 39 • CCRPC will visit with the Selectboards for an intro presentation; will seek input from Municipal Staff;  
40 and will return to the Selectboards for final approval.

41 Clare Rock asked about the timing of the annexes v. the County wide plan. Dan Albrecht explained that we've  
42 done them altogether on the past two rounds and so the expiration dates are all the same, and we intend to get  
43 these updates all adopted at the same time as well. Clare Rock asked what the public engagement includes and  
44 Dan Albrecht explained that we've done the two Selectboard meetings in the past and we can do more if

1 wanted/needed. Paul Conner asked who should be the lead contact at the municipalities. Dan Albrecht  
2 suggested that we should look at the recommendations, strategies and actions in each municipality and  
3 determine who makes the most sense considering the plans cover multiple departments. It would be helpful to  
4 have one main point of contact at each municipality.

5  
6 Dan Albrecht further explained that FEMA likes to see progress on the recommendations within the previous  
7 plans. We've completed many of the Fluvial Erosion Hazard assessments, established River Corridor plans,  
8 the floodplain maps and regulations have been updated, some landslide hazard work has been done, etc. Dan  
9 Albrecht showed the PAC Table 5-3 from Williston's annex as an example of the specific municipal  
10 recommendations within the plans.

11  
12 Clare Rock asked if there are actual specific regional emergency strategies in the Plan. Dan showed the  
13 strategies on page ii of the County plan – these include culvert assessments (we've been working on a tool for  
14 this), Climate Action Plan (completed), we've done a lot of outreach on the Emergency Relief & Assistance  
15 Fund (ERAF), and we've worked on better coordination between transportation, emergency needs and aquatic  
16 organism passage. The Nature Conservancy has also worked on some data regarding culverts and aquatic  
17 organism passage and CCRPC will pull this altogether for the AHMP update. Clare Rock suggested that  
18 perhaps – if a number of municipalities identify FEMA's Community Rating System (CRS) as a strategy  
19 perhaps CCRPC would consider taking on responsibility for some of the actions required in that program.  
20 Clare Rock described that Rhode Island has taken on 10 of the activities and therefore has made the program  
21 more feasible for the municipalities within the State.

22  
23 Regina Mahony then described the ERAF criteria to date, and the changes that will take place in March 2017  
24 in order for municipalities to be eligible for the full 17.5% of state share for the mitigation grant match.  
25 Regina Mahony and Dan Albrecht explained the status of the municipalities so far – all put 5 municipalities  
26 have been given early adopted status. This status goes away in March 2017, at which point the municipalities  
27 will need to have the four base criteria in place (adopted the most current Vermont Town Road & Bridge  
28 Standards, National Flood Insurance Program participation, an approved AHMP and annually adopted Local  
29 Emergency Operation Plans) and one of the following two options:

- 30 1. Community Rating System designation plus prohibit structures in Flood Hazard Areas.
- 31 2. Adopt River Corridor or River Corridor Protection Area protections for streams draining greater than 2  
32 sq. miles, 50' (non-waivable) setbacks from streams that drain less than 2 sq. miles, and Fluvial  
33 Erosion Hazard Area protections.

34  
35 Regina Mahony explained that part of the challenge is that the River Corridor maps that ANR has established  
36 do not include Phase 2 data that we have for much of Chittenden County. Therefore the River Corridor map is  
37 not as accurate as it could be. There are also some questions regarding how exactly the protections need to be  
38 implemented. For early adopter status many of CCRPC's municipalities have water quality setbacks that have  
39 been counted as adequate protection rather than adopted FEH overlays. CCRPC (along with the other RPCs)  
40 will continue conversations with ANR to determine the best method for incorporating the FEH data (we are  
41 hoping that we can create this map for Chittenden County ourselves), and to hopefully gain some level of  
42 flexibility in the protection methods. Regina Mahony then showed the PAC a map that Pam Brangan put  
43 together that shows how the various data layers (namely FEH v. River Corridor) compare to each other –  
44 specifically in Winooski the River Corridor is more expansive than the FEH data. Regina Mahony explained  
45 that CCRPC will repeat the exercise that we conducted to determine which municipalities were eligible for the  
46 early adopter status for the March 2017 changes. More information will be provided as we work this out with  
47 ANR.

#### 48 49 **5. Natural Resources Board Proposed Act 250 Rule Changes Regarding Master Plans**

50 Regina Mahony provided the PAC with recommendations from CCRPC's ad hoc Permit Review Committee  
51 regarding the Natural Resources Board's (NRB) proposal to allow the District Commissions to require Master  
52 Plans in some circumstances. The proposal and the ad hoc Committee's recommendations are as follows:

1 I. Master Plans

2 (A) Applicability and effect.

3 1) An applicant may seek review of a phased development or lot-by-lot build-out of a subdivision as a master  
4 plan decision.

5 2) Master plan applications shall be reviewed as a request for partial review under subdivision II of this rule.

6 3) The District Commission may require a master plan application if:

7 a) ~~the proposed development or subdivision involves multiple phases; or~~

8 b) the master plan process would avoid or limit piecemeal review of known development or subdivision  
9 planned for the reasonably foreseeable future.

10  
11 The ad hoc Committee felt that while there are some situations where master plans are a good step it shouldn't  
12 be required. Regina Mahony explained that these proposed changes come from some issues with the ski  
13 resorts – namely Killington ski resort, and Two Rivers-Ottauquechee RPC is in support of NRB's proposed  
14 change.

15  
16 The PAC also reviewed a suggestion that Dean Pierce had provided earlier via email:

17 3) The District Commission may require a master plan application if: a) the proposed development or  
18 subdivision involves multiple interdependent phases; or b) the master plan process would avoid or limit  
19 piecemeal review of development or subdivision planned for the reasonably foreseeable future.

20 Dean Pierce's suggested edit recognizes that multiple phases alone do not justify a master plan requirement.  
21 But if there are multiple phases and future phases rely (in some way) on the first phase—and vice versa—the  
22 master plan review would be justified.

23  
24 The PAC discussed the ad hoc Committee's proposal, as well as Dean Pierce's, and felt that they didn't fully  
25 understand how the situation would play out in Chittenden County. They discussed that the proposal did seem  
26 a bit vague without timing or something additional added to 3a. It is important to note that some members had  
27 to leave the meeting before this agenda item was concluded. Ultimately, the remaining members came to  
28 consensus on the following:

29 3) The District Commission may require a master plan application if: a) the proposed development or  
30 subdivision involves multiple interdependent phases; or b) the master plan process would avoid or limit  
31 piecemeal review of ~~known~~ development or subdivision planned for the reasonably foreseeable future.

32  
33 **6. Underhill 2015 Town Plan**

34 Public hearing opened (3:50pm). No one from the public was in attendance. Public Hearing closed.

35  
36 Regina provided a quick overview of the Staff report and specifically brought attention to the recommendation  
37 to add responsible parties and timeframe to the implementation steps. Dana suggested that implementation  
38 action plan be done right in the beginning because no one looks at the table in the back. Joss reiterated that  
39 this is a new recommendation that we've been asking municipalities to consider. Clare Rock asked if  
40 Appendix A includes a public engagement section and if CCRPC is reviewing public engagement steps that  
41 the municipalities have undergone in developing the Plans. Regina Mahony stated that Appendix A includes  
42 the broad state goal regarding engagement, but beyond that we haven't specifically reviewed the public  
43 engagement process. Sarah McShane explained that they didn't get too much public feedback but they did get  
44 input from a lot of the other Town Committee's. Clare Rock also asked about the Act 59 requirements and if it  
45 was in Appendix A. Regina Mahony explained that it isn't listed in there because it isn't a requirement for  
46 RPC approval, but it is a good idea to include it as a reminder.

47  
48 Joss Besse stated the Staff report should be corrected to make it clear that the boundary between Underhill and  
49 Stowe is the State Forest, not the Firing Range; and that the public hearing was held (correct this at the end of  
50 the motion). Regina Mahony will make those corrections to the Staff Report.

51



1 Dana Hanley made a motion, seconded by Jeannine McCrumb, that the PAC finds the draft 2015 Underhill  
2 Town Plan, as submitted, meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC approval, and that the municipality's  
3 planning process meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC confirmation. Upon notification that the Plan  
4 has been adopted by the municipality, CCRPC staff will review the plan, and any information relevant to the  
5 confirmation process, for changes. If staff determines that changes are substantive, those changes will be  
6 forwarded to the PAC for review. Otherwise the PAC recommends that the Plan, and the municipal planning  
7 process, should be forwarded to the CCRPC Board for approval. Discussion: Ken Belliveau asked about the  
8 timing because we are making a recommendation before the Town has finalized their process. The PAC  
9 reminded the PAC No further discussion. MOTION PASSED. Sarah McShane and Everett Marshall  
10 abstained.

### 11

### 12 **7. Regional Act 250/Section 248 Projects in the Horizon**

- 13 • So. Burlington – City applied for 2mW solar farm; Cider Mill Phase 2 (City just received application –  
14 this will ultimately go to Act 250); Friendly’s redevelopment will likely go to Act 250 soon. Market  
15 St. – 12 total units in 4 bldgs. – this is the second project in the TIF District.
- 16 • Huntington – none
- 17 • Williston – Act 250 permit on a bike/pedestrian bridge over the Allen Brook – municipal application.
- 18 • St. George – the municipality may be co-applicants on School House Place - a development at Town  
19 Center. The specifics of the mixed use proposal are still being worked out.
- 20 • Bolton - nothing
- 21 • Winooski – the hotel in Downtown is moving through the process, but this was already approved in  
22 the master plan so it won’t go through Act 250 again.
- 23 • Charlotte – nothing

### 24

### 25 **8. Other Business**

- 26
- 27 a. DRB Summit – Regina Mahony explained that 4/27<sup>th</sup> appears to be the most popular date so far.  
28 Regina asked the PAC to fill out the survey regarding what topics to discuss, and if they have a DRB  
29 member to recommend for the roundtable panel.
- 30 b. Potential Training Topics – There was a very brief discussion about potential training topics for the  
31 next meeting including Food Insecurity – information was provided in the packet after the minutes, the  
32 Revised Energy Code and May VEIC Workshop. There were mixed opinions about food insecurity as  
33 a topic, and the energy code revisions appear to be better suited for developer’s as an audience rather  
34 than planners. Joss Besse suggested that there will likely be legislative updates to discuss at the next  
35 PAC meeting.
- 36 c. Jeannine McCrumb provided the following updates:
  - 37 ○ There is a meeting scheduled for March 25<sup>th</sup> at the State house regarding siting standards for  
38 renewable energy facilities. There are a number of different bills proposed and the purpose of  
39 this meeting is to hash out issues within the various bills.
  - 40 ○ Charlotte is considering applying for a Village Center Designation - Jeannine McCrumb  
41 indicated that Regina Mahony is likely to hear from the folks working on the proposal.
  - 42 ○ Jeannine McCrumb watched a Rural Roads and Water Quality webinar hosted by Watershed  
43 United. It was very well done and provided information on road inventory and TMDL  
44 requirements coming down the pike. The presentation can be found here:  
45 <http://www.watershedsunitedvt.org/presentations>.

### 46

### 47 **7. Adjourn**

48 The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m. The next meeting will take place on May 13, 2015 from 2:30pm to  
49 4:30pm.

50  
51 Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony

1 CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
2 TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE - MINUTES  
3

4 DATE: Tuesday, April 7, 2015  
5 TIME: 9:00 a.m.  
6 PLACE: CCRPC Office, 110 West Canal St. Winooski, VT  
7

8 **Members Present**

9 Roger Hunt, Milton  
10 Peter Wernsdorfer, Winooski  
11 Dennis Lutz, Essex  
12 Bruce Hoar, Williston  
13 Barbara Elliott, Huntington  
14 Justin Rabidoux, South Burlington  
15 Matt Langham, VTrans  
16 Amy Bell, VTrans  
17 Charlene Wallace, Bike/Pedestrian  
18 Sandy Thibault, CATMA  
19 Bob Henneberger, Seniors  
20 Meredith Birkett, CCTA  
21 Brian Bigelow, Underhill  
22 Katherine Sonnicks, Jericho  
23 Chris Jolly, FHWA  
24

**Staff**

Peter Keating, Senior Transportation Planner  
Eleni Churchill, Senior Transportation Planning Engineer  
Chris Dubin, Transportation Planner  
Christine Forde, Senior Transportation Planner  
Jason Charest, Senior Transportation Planning Engineer  
Bryan Davis, Senior Transportation Planner  
Charlie Baker, Executive Director  
Sai Sarepalli, Transportation Planning Engineer  
Dan Senecal, Senior Planner

**Others**

Dick Hosking, VTrans  
John Olin, Hoyle Tanner

25 Peter Keating convened the meeting at 9:00AM. He announced a new agenda item, 5A, a new TIP  
26 amendment that will be presented by Christine.  
27

28 **1. Consent Agenda**

29 The consent agenda item was transferred to the regular agenda by a unanimous vote.  
30

31 **2. Approval of Minutes**

32 A MOTION WAS MADE TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF March 4, 2015 BY BOB  
33 HENNEBERGER AND SECONDED BY MEREDITH BIRKETT. THE MOTION PASSED  
34 UNANIMOUSLY.  
35

36 **3. Public Comments**

37 There were none.  
38

39 **Consent Agenda**

40 The consent agenda item was revisited with Justin asking about the North Avenue crosswalks  
41 Transportation Alternatives project and how this might be impacted by the recent North Avenue Corridor  
42 Study recommendations. There was general consensus that these are closely coordinated and will not  
43 have a negative result. DENNIS LUTZ MADE A MOTION APPROVING THE CONSENT AGENDA,  
44 SECONDED BY CHARLENE. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.  
45

46 **4. All Hazard Mitigation Plan**

47 Dan Senecal highlighted the process and schedule for CCRPC's updates to this regional plan as well as its  
48 individual town sections. Staff is looking for TAC review and comment on updating the various plan  
49 sections including the list of mitigation strategies that Dan went over in some detail. These strategies from  
50 the 2011 plan have made some progress and Dan noted these in the documents sent with the TAC meeting  
51 packet. Dan also noted that current plans will expire on August 8, 2016. These plans will need to be updated

1 and resubmitted to FEMA Region 1 by that time in order to a) maintain the eligibility of the County's  
2 municipalities to apply for various FEMA grants and b) maintain the best cost-share percentage available for  
3 Public Assistance dollars under the State Emergency Relief and Assistance Funds program. In the discussion  
4 that followed the following points were made: 1) The need to clearly define which parties are doing which  
5 tasks, to whom and when; 2) Include the rail system in the plan, and 3) tread carefully on having firms on  
6 retainer and be aware of the bureaucratic issues around doing that.  
7

#### 8 **5. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment**

9 Christine addressed this Essex VT128 slope stabilization project noting it is a major amendment because  
10 it is new. Dennis and Dick provided more detail on this flood prone section as well. The amendment will  
11 add \$307,000 in TIP FY15 for construction. Following discussion, BRUCE HOAR MADE A MOTION,  
12 SECONDED BY BRIAN BIGELOW THAT THE BOARD HOLD A PUBLIC HEARLING AND  
13 APPROVE THIS AMENDMENT. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.  
14

#### 15 **5A. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment**

16 Christine distributed a memo describing this TIP amendment, noting that although it's defined as minor,  
17 since we're bringing it up at the meeting, we needed to have it on the agenda. This \$980,000 project is the  
18 result of a recently received federal grant to implement Bluetooth technology to communicate real-time  
19 transportation conditions in selected corridors. This grant source is designed to support projects that  
20 accelerate innovation through the application of technology tools. VTrans will be a project partner.  
21 Discussion that followed included a concern about Bluetooth being phased out, but the feeling is that the  
22 project, as defined, is flexible to accommodate a technology change should that occur. Also, there was  
23 some reassurance that although specific corridors are identified in the description, it would be flexible  
24 enough to expand if deemed appropriate. Following discussion DENNIS LUTZ MADE A MOTION,  
25 SECONDED BY JUSTIN RABIDOUX THAT THE \$908,000 BE ADDED TO THE FY15 YEAR OF  
26 THE TIP. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.  
27

#### 28 **6. FY16 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)**

29 Bryan briefed the TAC on this year's process to develop the work program based on partner  
30 organization/town solicitation of planning projects, a vetting and fine tuning process within budget and  
31 staffing constraints with a draft document the result. That draft UPWP has been reviewed by the UPWP  
32 Committee, including both FHFA (Chris Jolly) and VTrans (Amy Bell) staff. This item will also be on the  
33 May TAC agenda for review and a recommendation to the Board to adopt.  
34

#### 35 **7. High Risk Rural Roads Projects**

36 Sai reviewed this item from last month when the TAC agreed to forward a list of six priority projects  
37 (three corridors and three hazard locations) to VTrans. VTrans decided to create safety plans for the  
38 following two projects:

- 39 • Programmatic Corridor:

40 West Milton Road in Milton from US 7 to Town line (3.9 miles).

- 41 • Hazard Location:

42 Bear Trap Road in Milton, ½ mile to 1 mile from the US 2 intersection  
43

44 The next step is for Milton to submit an agreement to participate to VTrans by the end of the month. This  
45 will be followed by field visits this summer and a safety analysis report completed for the Town in  
46 November. Safety recommendations should then be implemented within two years. There was some  
47 discussion on why our submitted priority projects were not selected and VTrans determined that these had  
48 previously been studied – although it seemed that not all safety element recommendations had been

1 implemented (signs on Oak Hill Road, Williston). Dick Hosking reminded members that Class Two  
2 paving grant applications should include signs in their applications.  
3

4 **8. Sidewalk Program Application Reviewers**

5 Peter reminded members that this year's sidewalk grant application is available and due on April 24<sup>th</sup>.  
6 Staff is seeking some TAC members to help review/evaluate those applications. Charlene, Justin and Bob  
7 agreed to help.  
8

9 **9. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports**

10 Peter directed members to the project list on the back of the agenda and asked for questions/comments on  
11 them.  
12

13 **10. CCRPC March Board Meeting Report**

14 Peter cited a public hearing and Board approval of the TIP amendments previously recommended by the  
15 TAC, a presentation from Sandy Thibault of CATMA, and approval of the transportation project  
16 prioritization as recommended by the TAC. Charlie elaborated on Sandy's presentation and Sandy  
17 explained how CATMA has now gone region-wide and is no longer exclusively focused on the  
18 Burlington Hill institutions. They have also changed their name (Chittenden Area TMA) and revised their  
19 web site – see: <http://catmavt.org/>  
20

21 The meeting adjourned at 10:05 a.m.  
22

23 Respectfully submitted, Peter Keating



### **UPWP Committee Meeting 3**

**March 19, 2015**

#### **Staff notes**

##### **Attendees:**

Chris Roy, Board & Committee Chair  
Andrea Morgante, Board  
Joss Besse, PAC  
Ken Belliveau, PAC  
Barbara Elliott, TAC  
Amy Bell, VTrans  
Meredith Birkett, CCTA  
Chris Jolly, FHWA

##### *Staff:*

Charlie Baker  
Forest Cohen  
Bryan Davis  
Christine Forde  
Regina Mahony

#### **1. Welcome & Introductions**

- Committee Chair Chris Roy opened the meeting at 5:35 pm.
- Introductions were made.

#### **2. Review and approval of UPWP Committee Minutes – Meeting #2 (Action)**

- Amy made a motion to approve the notes from Meeting #2. Andrea seconded the motion. All voted in favor. **Bryan to update notes to clarify which Chris is being referenced in meeting #2 minutes.**

#### **3. Review of FY16 Program and Budget**

- Charlie led a discussion of the draft FY16 UPWP Program and Budget and noted changes and updates. Row numbers are in reference to specific tasks in the draft UPWP:
  - Keep brownfield tasks shaded yellow until we find out the grant status
  - We won't discuss rows shaded white unless Committee members have questions
  - Rows 26-27: municipal technical assistance
  - Blue row shading indicates a new task that uses non-federal funds
  - Rows 32-33: municipal technical assist
  - Amy – as scenic byways grants expire will these staff time be included under general tasks in future years? Charlie – yes, this would then fall under row 12/task 1.2.1. Chris Jolly notes that scenic byways funding will lapse at some point in the future; we will be informed if our projects are affected. Rows 18-19 have some construction elements and may be affected – VTrans will let us know.

- Row 34: pink/red row shading means that a project is not recommended, in this case Lamoille Area Land Use Planning Study (Milton).
- Andrea – is there a process to determine if staff has capacity to take on projects? Charlie – yes, staff worked through estimating their hours for ongoing and new projects to determine capacity, in addition to available funding. Andrea – what about when a project takes longer than anticipated, or takes less time? Charlie – the mid-year adjustment allows us to reconcile those projects. Andrea – if a project takes longer but a town hasn't committed to the additional funds, how does that work? If a project requires additional consultant transportation dollars and therefore additional local match, we would work with the town on the timing to ensure match was available. If the consultant dollars were expended and the project required additional staff time, no match would be required.
- Row 35: red text font indicates that staff needs to update the existing language. In this case the scope hasn't been updated yet but will soon before the final UPWP draft is available.
- Row 38: this project is currently a placeholder and depends on actions of the state legislature.
- Row 44: Transportation Improvement District project in Williston as follow up to the WENTS study from the Circ Alts effort. This is a new consultant effort.
- Row 45: There is a similar item in the FY15 UPWP; this will put together a Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) as a required Transportation Program Initiative (TPI) task from VTrans. Lee Krohn learned a lot from Mike Munson and will lead this effort.
- Row 47-51: Transportation Demand Management (TDM) projects. Burlington (row 51) funding amount reduced from 18k to 15k.
- Row 58: third and final phase, Burlington Downtown Parking initiative. Total expended to date is close to 300k.
- Row 60: second phase in a three year effort.
- Row 61: 47k is final amount with match.
- Row 62: 100k was budgeted for project with 50k included in FY15 and final 50k to be included in FY16.
- Row 65: budget and scope have been updated to include Southern Gateway as part of Town of Shelburne Transportation Study for 40k.
- Row 66: **update task name to reflect phase 1 of 3.**
- Row 67: staff time to help develop Williston Village Master Plan.
- Row 70: this may include consultant assistance, and the Town planned for match.
- Row 71: Town agreed to defer this project; we may be able to include it in mid-year or FY17. Interns may be able to begin collection this summer depending on workload.

- Row 72: staff time for technical assistance.
- Row 73: staff time to continue WENTS effort.
- Row 78: our 20k is only a portion of a much larger budget.
- Row 82: this bridge analysis was added as a separate project from the Barrett/Riverside/Colchester intersection study (row 99).
- Row 83: budget increased from 22,500 to 30k at suggestion of CCRPC staff.
- Row 84: project not recommended after discussion with Town of Shelburne. Joss – similar to the Essex project, what was the process to identify projects not recommended? Charlie – staff hours were programmed and analyzed, and we asked municipalities with multiple requests to identify their priorities. Barbara – will we note in FY17 if these projects are deferred? Andrea – we should ask towns on the UPWP application if a project is a new application or resubmittal. **Bryan will add this to FY17 UPWP application.**
- Chris Jolly – looking at row 82 as example, who pays the total match? Charlie – the math works out between consultant costs and staff costs so that match is covered.
- Row 85: Williston sidewalk project in Blair Park.
- Row 91: Fourth year of this effort. No final phase identified. Drive Electric VT is an initiative; we could consider how this could be combined with other similar partnerships (e.g., TDM) rather than including it as part of municipal requests. We could consider different applications. Joss – applications could indicate results and costs of previous efforts and how current request builds on those efforts. Chris Jolly – do all projects have a final deliverable or year-end final report? In some cases yes, but a final report may not be appropriate for all projects. Deliverables could be identified as part of scope of work and contract. Progress reports may also indicate efforts to date (such as milestones, public events, etc.).
- Row 96: deferred from FY15; this is phase 1 of 2.
- Row 97: not recommended; Row 103 was more of a priority.
- Row 99: Burlington intersection scoping (see also row 82).
- Row 103: Priority for the Town. Budget increased from 30k to 60k.
- Row 105: original request came from UVM TRC and would be in partnership with VTrans as well. This is also related to row 104.
- Row 117: combines some previously separate tasks.
- Row 119: This has new funding from emergency management. The row isn't colored because it is an ongoing task.
- Row 128 and 129: TMDL tasks with staff time.
- Row 132: new urban forest grants.

- Row 144: **should be shaded yellow since this project is pending.**
  - Row 148: **project not funded so it will be removed.**
  - Row 163: Staff time for two white papers. **Should be colored blue rather than green** (i.e., non-federal dollars).
  - Chris Jolly – Row 156 – is the 271k consistent with previous years? Charlie – we would have to check but seems consistent.
  - Row 165: shaded red because this is likely to be removed or included as part of another task.
  - Row 174: this is a placeholder in case we spend staff time on various efforts.
- Chris Roy – when you examine the available budget and staff time, how does this look? Charlie – this proposal is slightly in the black by a few thousand dollars. We’re still in the process of reconciling the impacts of updating our indirect rate so that still has an impact. Chris Roy – so this recommendation fits within current programming? Charlie – correct. Chris Jolly – does this draft budget include carryover? Charlie – no, this only includes new funding and new tasks. Carryover would only refer to consultant tasks/budgets that would carryover into FY16. Generally the transportation budget is about 2 million in federal PL funds, plus 400k in FTA funds, plus required match = 3 million. We then would add unexpended federal PL funds from previous years, but we’ve really closed the gap on those funds so the total expected budget is likely to be less next year.

**4. Recommendation to advance FY16 Program & Budget to the Executive Committee (Action)**

- Joss made a motion to accept and recommend the draft FY16 UPWP Work Program and budget to the Executive Committee. Andrea seconded the motion. No discussion. All voted in favor.

**5. Next Steps & Adjourn**

- Next steps: the draft will be presented to the Executive Committee on April 1, to the TAC on April 7, and for full Board consideration and warning for public hearing on April 15.
- After today’s meeting the UPWP Committee has fulfilled their responsibilities. This draft document is available to the public and is posted on the CCRPC website.
- Joss – we’ve had previous discussions about the TDM program and how to incorporate it into the FY17 UPWP. Charlie – staff is meeting in September to continue this discussion and we will decide on how best to package TDM in the next round of project requests for FY17.
- The meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.