REGULAR MEETING & PUBLIC FORUM AGENDA
Wednesday, January 21, 2015 - 6:00 p.m.
CCRPC Offices; 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202
Winooski, VT  05404

CONSENT AGENDA –

C.l

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 November 19, 2014 Meeting* (Action; 5 min.)
5. Public Forum for FY16 UPWP Project Solicitation*
6. FY15 Work Program and Budget Mid-Year Adjustment* (Action; 20 min.)
7. Approval of Huntington Town Plan* (Action; 10 min.)
8. Resolution to Recognize Michele Boomhower’s 6 years of service* (Action)
9. Resolution to Recognize Melanie Needle’s 10 Years of Service* (Action)
10. Approve prioritization of District Leveling Projects* (Action)
11. Chair appointments to FY16 UPWP Committee (Chair Action)
12. ECOS Indicators Report (Information, 15 min.)
13. Executive Director’s Updates (Information; 15 min.)
   a. Legislature/Legislative Breakfast review
   b. FY16 UPWP Project Applications due Jan. 23rd
   c. Monthly Project Status Report* (sent separately)
14. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports* (Information, 5 min.)
   a. Executive Committee (minutes December 15, 2014 & draft minutes Jan 7, 2015)*
      i. Act 250/Sec 248 letters*
   b. Transportation Advisory Committee (minutes Dec. 2, 2014 & draft Jan. 6, 2015)*
   c. Planning Advisory Committee (draft minutes November 12, 2014)*
15. Members’ Items, Other Business (Information, 5 min.)
16. Adjourn

The Jan. 21st Chittenden County RPC meeting will air only once on Thursday, January 29, 2015 at 1 p.m. and will be available on the web at:  http://www.cctv.org/watch-tv/programs/chittenden-county-regional-planning-commission-46

Upcoming Meetings - Unless otherwise noted, all meetings are held at our offices:
• Transportation Advisory Committee – Tuesday, February 3, 2015; 9:00 a.m.
• Executive Committee, Wednesday, February 4, 2015; 5:45 p.m.
• CCRPC Meeting - Wednesday, February 18, 2015; 6:00 p.m.
• Planning Advisory Committee – Wednesday, March 11, 2015; 2:30-4:30 p.m.
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
Regular Meeting Minutes

Date: Wednesday, November 19, 2014
Time: 6:00 p.m.
Place: CCRPC Offices; 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT 05404

Members:

9 Bolton, Joss Besse
10 Buels Gore, Garret Mott
11 Burlington, Andy Montroll
12 Charlotte, Absent
13 Colchester, Marc Landry
14 Essex, Jeff Carr
15 Essex Junction, Dan Kerin
16 Hinesburg, Andrea Morgante
17 Huntington, Absent
18 Jericho, Catherine McMains
19 Milton, Brian Palaia, Alternate (6:40)
20 Richmond, Absent
21 St. George, Absent
22 Shelburne, John Zicconi
23 S. Burlington, Chris Shaw
24 Underhill, Brian Bigelow
25 Westford, Dave Tilton
26 Williston, Chris Roy
27 Winooski, Mike O’Brien
28 VTrans, Amy Bell
29 Socio/Econ/Housing, Lisa Falcone
30 Conservation/Environment, Don Meals
31 Industrial/Business, Tim Baechle
32 Agriculture, No Representative

Ex-Officio (non-voting):

35 Burlington Int’l Airport, Absent
36 CCTA, Absent
37 FHWA, Absent

Others:

41 Brian Searles, VTrans Secretary
42 Matthew Langham, VTrans
43 Fred Duplessis, Sullivan Powers & Co.
44 Karen Bates, Dept. of Env. Cons.
45 Diane Meyerhoff, Third Sector Assoc.
46 Kim Villemaire, CCTV

Staff:

48 Charlie Baker, Executive Director
49 Michele Boomhower, Asst/MPO Director
50 Dan Albrecht, Senior Planner
51 Pam Brangan, Senior Planner
52 Forest Cohen, Business Manager
54 Christine Forde, Senior Trans. Planner
55 Melanie Needle, Senior Planner

1. Call to Order; Changes to the Agenda

The meeting was called to order at 6:00PM by the Chair, Andy Montroll. Andy welcomed a special guest, Brian Searles, the retiring Secretary of the Agency of Transportation. The agenda will be amended to add item 1A.

1A. Send-off to Brian Searles, Secretary, Vermont Agency of Transportation

Michele Boomhower of the CCRPC thanked Brian for his years of service to the state and Chittenden County in his various leadership roles. She listed the numerous projects and processes that Brian and his agency successfully supported. Brian successfully nominated the CCRPC for an achievement award from the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (AMPO). Additionally, CCRPC has been recognized by the National Association of Development Organizations (NADO) for its work with the CIRC Alternatives process. Brian thanked everyone for their good wishes and willingness to volunteer their time for this important work.
2. Public Comment Period on Items NOT on the Agenda. There were none.

3. Approve Consent Agenda (MPO Business). There were no items on the Consent Agenda.

4. Approve Minutes of October 15, 2014 Meeting

JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, DULY SECONDED BY CATHERINE MCMAINS, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 15, 2014 WITH CORRECTIONS. During discussion, Catherine McMains noted a missing “A” on page 1, line 30. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH THREE ABSTENTIONS FROM GARRET MOTT, DAVE TILTON, AND LISA FALCONE.

5. Public Hearing & Approval of Major TIP Amendment – Colchester Park & Ride (MPO Business)

Christine Forde of the CCRPC staff explained that the proposed Colchester Park & Ride, a new project, requires a major amendment to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The proposed facility will be located at an existing parking lot on the west side of US Routes 2 and 7 just north of Interstate 89 Exit 16 and opposite Hercules Drive. Since the STIP hasn’t yet been adopted, we will be amending FY15 in both last year’s and this year’s TIP.

Chair Montroll opened the public hearing at 6:14PM. As there were no public comments, the Chair closed the public hearing at 6:14PM.

JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, DULY SECONDED BY CHRIS SHAW, TO APPROVE THE TIP AMENDMENT. VOTE:

Bolton   Yes  Burlington   Yes (4)  Charlotte  Absent
Colchester   Yes (2)  Essex   Yes  Essex Jct.  Yes
Hinesburg  Yes  Huntington  Absent  Jericho  Yes
Milton  Absent  Richmond  Absent  Shelburne  Yes
So. Burl.  Yes (2)  St. George  Absent  Underhill  Yes
Westford  Yes  Williston  Yes  Winooski  Abstain
VTrans  Yes

THE MOTION CARRIED WITH 18 OF 24 VOTES AND 12 OF 18 COMMUNITIES VOTING IN FAVOR WITH ONE ABSTENTION FROM MIKE O’BRIEN.

6. FY14 Audit Presentation and Acceptance

Fred Duplessis of Sullivan Powers reported that the audit is complete and the financial statements are in full conformance with generally accepted accounting principles. There are no findings and CCRPC is now considered a “low-risk auditee.” Jeff Carr and Andy Montroll thanked the staff, especially Bernie and Forest, for their work to ensure a clean audit.

JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, DULY SECONDED BY GARRET MOTT, TO ACCEPT THE AUDIT AS PRESENTED. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH ONE ABSTENTION FROM TIM BAECHLE.

7. TMDL Committee Recommendations

Andy Montroll reported that the final TMDL recommendations were transmitted to the Vermont Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) Commissioner Mears, as requested by the Board at the last meeting. Charlie Baker made a presentation about the latest version of TMDL requirements with information from US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Vermont DEC.
8. Presentation on Basin 5 Plan
Karen Bates of the Vermont Agency of Nature Resources made a presentation entitled, “Development of the Northern Lake Champlain Direct Discharges Tactical Plan.” To best use their resources, the Agency is identifying areas with high pollutants and directing their efforts there. This is a two-year planning process which will conclude in early 2015.

9. Town Plan Approval for Jericho Town Plan Amendments
Catherine McMains explained that the Town hasn’t yet adopted the Plan; there is another public meeting tomorrow night where they expect to adopt the plan. There is a tight deadline due to an expired village center designation.

MARC LANDRY MADE A MOTION, DULY SECONDED BY GARRET MOTT, TO APPROVE JERICHO’S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND CONFIRM THE TOWN OF JERICHO’S PLANNING PROCESS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ATTACHED RESOLUTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOTE OF THE MUNICIPAL REPRESENTATIVES.

10. Permit Improvement Recommendations
Charlie Baker presented the recommendations from the Permit Improvement Committee with revisions by both the Planning and Transportation Advisory Committees (PAC/TAC). There was discussion about carrots versus sticks to change development behavior; whether encouraging development in appropriate planning areas (like growth centers) also discourages development outside those areas (like in rural parts of municipalities). Zoning in rural areas, outside of centers, is often supportive of suburban-type development, which is a concern to some board members. The group discussed adding stronger statements about the type and amount of growth in rural, non-designated growth areas.

GARRET MOTT MADE A MOTION, DULY SECONDED BY DAN KERIN, TO ACCEPT THE PERMIT REFORM RECOMMENDATIONS AS WRITTEN (WITH PAC/TAC REVISIONS). During discussion, ANDREA MORGANTE MADE A MOTION, DULY SECONDED BY DAVE TILTON, TO REVISE THE RECOMMENDATION ON PAGE 2, PERMITTING PROCESS RECOMMENDATIONS: “IF THIS RECOMMENDATION WOULD RESULT IN A MORE EFFICIENT AND TIMELY PROCESS IN DESIGNATED GROWTH AREAS, IT IS MAY BE APPROPRIATE TO DEVELOP MORE STRINGENT STANDARDS...” (bold text added, strikeout text deleted).

THE MOTION FAILED WITH SIX VOTING IN FAVOR (DON MEALS, CATHERINE MCMAINS, ANDREA MORGANTE, DAVE TILTON, GARRET MOTT, AND JOSS BESSE) AND TEN VOTING AGAINST (MIKE O’BRIEN, JOHN ZICCONI, TIM BAECHLE, MARC LANDRY, BRIAN BIGELOW, CHRIS SHAW, BRIAN PALAIA, JEFF CARR, DAN KERIN, AND CHRIS ROY).

Andrea Morgante made a point that she supports sending these recommendations to the State; but that the CCRPC must recognize the character of rural areas.

A series of friendly amendments were made to the original motion and accepted by Garret Mott and Dan Kerin. Charlie Baker asked to move the paragraph under the permitting process to the smart growth section and make section 2a more readable. Joss Besse explaining the thinking behind continuing to require Act 250 review of “village centers” under Smart Growth Recommendations, 2a. This is a minor designation and the committee didn’t feel it warranted exemption from Act 250. This should be reflected in both paragraphs. Charlie Baker asked to change the statement under 2a to read:
“eliminate OR LIMIT Act 250 review entirely in the state-designated areas (downtown, neighborhood, new town center, growth center, village)…” (bold text added, strikeout text deleted).

The Chair called the vote on the original motion with amendments. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH ONE ABSTENTION FROM AMY BELL.

11. Executive and MPO Directors’ Updates

11a. Electronic Voting Question: The Public Meeting Law Statute does not allow CCRPC to vote via email; conference calls and remote participation in a face-to-face meeting are allowed.

11b) Legislative Breakfast: December 18th, 7:30AM, DoubleTree Hotel, South Burlington

11c) ECOS State of the County Themes: Charlie provided a draft statement of priorities for the Legislative Breakfast & ECOS Annual Report. The draft priorities are: TMDL, Smart Growth, Economy, and Fiscal Sustainability. The group discussed adding support for the ongoing CIRC alternatives projects, recognition of Act 145, incentives for shared/regional services, and local management of larger transportation projects.

11d) FY 16 UPWP Outreach to Communities: Requests have been made to municipalities; Michele and Charlie have visited almost all municipal legislative bodies.

11e) Monthly Project Status Report (distributed separately)

12. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports: Included in the Board packet.

13. Members’ Items/Other Business

Garret Mott noted that when the CCRPC and CCMPO merged a decision about MPO membership and voting was postponed for one year; it’s time to discuss this. Charlie Baker noted that the bylaws were updated this spring and offered to review those changes with Garret after the meeting.

14. Adjourn

MARC LANDRY MADE A MOTION, DULY SECONDED BY JEFF CARR, TO ADJOURN AT 8:17PM. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Meyerhoff
CCRPC Seeks Planning Project Ideas

Public asked to offer project suggestions for organization’s annual work program

Winooski, VT - The public is invited to offer suggestions to the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC) for regional transportation and land use planning projects in Chittenden County.

The CCRPC is currently preparing next year’s work program and the public is invited to participate in a public forum scheduled as part of the regular Board meeting on Wednesday, January 21 at 6 p.m. at the CCRPC offices (110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski). Comments will also be accepted until January 23 via email (bdavis@ccrpcvt.org) or by phone (802-846-4490 x17). Our current work plan is available online at http://www.ccrpcvt.org/workplan/. Residents are encouraged to discuss project ideas with their municipal staff and officials since local support and matching funds are typically required for projects.

The CCRPC is one of 11 regional planning commissions in Vermont, and also serves as the State’s only Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). The CCRPC acts as the principal forum for planning, policy and community development in the region by providing planning and technical assistance that meets the needs of its member municipalities and the public, while remaining consistent with federal and state requirements. The CCRPC’s work results in the development and implementation of plans that support sustainable development and improve the region’s quality of life and environment.

Note that CCRPC funds cannot be used for construction projects, but its planning helps projects get closer to reality. The final work program will be approved in May 2015. For more information and to view a list of recent and current projects of the CCRPC, visit http://www.ccrpcvt.org/workplan/.

Bus service to Winooski is available on the CCTA Essex Junction bus line or the Riverside/Winooski bus line. 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, elong@ccrpcvt.org, at least 3 business days prior to the meeting.

# # #
Issues: Annually the CCRPC prepares a mid-year work program and budget adjustment to address budgetary alterations and changes in projects anticipated for the balance of the fiscal year.

The following two attachments outline the mid-year budget adjustment changes:

**CCRPC FY 2015 Work Program Mid-Year Adjustment**
The Work Program changes are shown in the spreadsheets that follow. New tasks are highlighted in green. Tasks that are being reduced in budget this fiscal year are highlighted in pink. The remaining tasks are existing tasks that have changes in staff hours and/or consultant dollars.

**CCRPC FY 2015 Budget Mid-Year Adjustment**
The CCRPC budget as adopted on 05/21/14 was: $5,177,770
The proposed budget as adjusted on 01/21/15 is: $5,283,223
This represents an overall programmatic increase of $105,455 (+6.7%).

Costs were adjusted by program task to more accurately account for consultant and staffing costs expected by June 30, 2015. According to FHWA, there are additional Federal Planning (PL) funds available for fiscal year 2015 to cover the increase in the transportation planning projects.

It is estimated that we will end the year at least $50,000 negative primarily due to the adjustment in our indirect rate to compensate for excess revenue in previous years. It is likely that we will end the year significantly more negative given staff vacancies for the next few months.

Executive Committee Recommendation: The Executive Committee reviewed the work program and budget adjustment on 01/07/15 and voted to advance the program to the full Commission for review and approval.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Commission approve the FY15 Mid-Year Work Program and Budget Adjustment.

For more information contact: Charlie Baker, Executive Director 846-4490 ext. 23 or cbaker@ccrpcvt.org
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
January 21, 2015
Agenda Item 7: Huntington Town Plan Approval and Confirmation

Issues: The Town of Huntington has requested, per Title 24 V.S.A §4350, that the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (1) approve its 2014 Town Plan, and (2) confirm its planning process. This is a complete update of the Town Plan. Attached is the proposed Resolution of approval and the staff report to the Planning Advisory Committee. The Planning Advisory Committee held a public hearing and reviewed the Plan (for the second time) on January 14th. The Town of Huntington Selectboard adopted this Town Plan on September 8, 2014.

Please note that municipal planning process confirmation and plan approval decisions shall be made by majority vote of the commissioners representing municipalities, in accordance with the bylaws of the CCRPC and Title 24 V.S.A.§ 4350(f).

Planning Advisory Committee Recommendation: The Planning Advisory Committee held a public hearing on January 14, 2015 at 3:40 pm at the CCRPC Offices and made the following motion: “The PAC finds that the Huntington 2014 Town Plan, as submitted, meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC approval, and that the municipality’s planning process meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC confirmation. The PAC recommends that the Plan, and the municipal planning process, should be forwarded to the CCRPC Board for approval.”

Executive Committee Recommendation: NA

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the CCRPC Board approve Huntington’s Town Plan and confirm the Town of Huntington’s planning process in accordance with the attached resolution.

For more information contact: Regina Mahony, Senior Planner 802-846-4490 x28; rmahony@ccrpcvt.org
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC)

Resolution

Huntington’s Town Plan Approval & Planning Process

WHEREAS, Title 24, V.S.A.§ 4350 in part requires that CCRPC shall review the municipal planning process of our member municipalities including review of plans; that each review shall include a public hearing which is noticed as provided in 24 V.S.A.§ 4350(b); and that before approving a plan the Commission shall find that it:

1. is consistent with the goals established in Section 4302 of this title;
2. is compatible with its Regional Plan;
3. is compatible with approved plans of other municipalities in the region;
4. contains all the elements included in § 4382(a)(1)-(12) of this Title.

WHEREAS, the CCRPC at its May 22, 2013 meeting approved the CCRPC Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans dealing with local plans and CCRPC action; and

WHEREAS, The Town of Huntington, Vermont is a member municipality of this Commission; and

WHEREAS, The Town of Huntington formally requested CCRPC to approve its Town Plan and confirm its planning process; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Advisory Committee reviewed the Town Plan amendment and planning process on November 20, 2013; and

WHEREAS, The Town of Huntington’s Selectboard adopted the 2014 Town Plan on September 8, 2014 with revisions; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Advisory Committee reviewed the Town Plan amendment and planning process a second time following Selectboard adoption; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Advisory Committee held a warned public hearing at the CCRPC, located at 101 W. Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, Vermont on January 14, 2015 at 3:40 PM, reviewed the records and recommended that the Commission approve Huntington’s Town Plan as meeting the requirements of 24 V.S.A.§ 4350 and the Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans and confirms the community’s planning process as consistent with Title 24, Chapter 117; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION, that, in compliance with 24 V.S.A.§ 4350 and the Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans, CCRPC approves Huntington’s Town Plan and the Commission finds that said Town Plan:

1. is consistent with the goals established in Section 4302 of Title 24;
2. is compatible with the 2013 Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the ECOS Plan, adopted June 19, 2013;
3. is compatible with the approved plans from other adjacent Chittenden County municipalities; and
4. contains all the elements included in § 4382(a)(1)-(12) and/or is making substantial progress toward attainment of the elements of this subsection;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION, that, in compliance with 24 V.S.A.§ 4350 and the Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans, CCRPC confirms the Town of Huntington’s municipal planning process.

Dated at Winooski, this 21st day of January, 2015.

CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

________________________________________________
Andy Montroll, Chair
The Town of Huntington has requested, per 24 V.S.A §4350, that the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (1) approve its 2014 Town Plan; and (2) confirm its planning process.

This draft 2014 Town Plan is a complete update of the Huntington Town Plan. A previous version of this Plan update was conducted by the PAC on November 20, 2013. Since then the Planning Commission held their hearings, submitted it to the Selectboard, the Selectboard made recommendations for amendments, these were made and the Plan was adopted by the Selectboard on September 8, 2014. The amendments are attached to this report and CCRPC does not find them to change the original recommendation for approval. However, they are more than minor so Staff decided to bring this Plan back to the PAC for review before forwarding to the CCRPC Board.

Following the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission’s (CCRPC’s) Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans (2013) and the statutory requirements of 24 V.S.A. Chapter 117, I have reviewed the draft 2014 Huntington Town Plan to determine whether it is:

- Consistent with the general goals of §4302;
- Consistent with the specific goals of §4302;
- Contains the required elements of §4382;
- Compatible with the 2013 Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan (per §4350); and
- Compatible with approved plans of other municipalities (per §4350).

Additionally, I have reviewed the planning process requirements of §4350.

Staff Review Findings and Comments

1. The 2014 Huntington Town Plan is consistent with all of the general goals of §4302. See the Huntington Planning Commission Report submittal and Appendix A submittal that describes how the Plan is consistent with these goals.

2. The 2014 Huntington Town Plan is consistent with the specific goals of §4302. See the Huntington Planning Commission Report submittal and Appendix A submittal that describes how the Plan is consistent with these goals.

3. The 2014 Huntington Town Plan contains the required elements of §4382. See the attached Appendix A submittal that describes compliance with these required elements.

4. The 2014 Huntington Town Plan is generally compatible with the planning areas, goals and strategies of the 2013 Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan.

5. The 2014 Huntington Town Plan is compatible with the municipal plans for Richmond, Hinesburg, Bolton, Starksboro, Buel’s Gore and Duxbury & Fayston.
6. Huntington has a planning process in place that is likely to result in an approved plan. In addition, Huntington has provided information about their planning budget and CCRPC finds that Huntington is maintaining its efforts to provide local funds for municipal and regional planning.

Additional Comments/Questions:
The previous review in November, 2013 included a number of recommended comments/edits that were not necessary for CCRPC approval and confirmation of the process. While the minor typos were addressed and the text associated with the State Village Center Designations was amended, the other comments remain for the next iteration of the plan and are listed here.

1. While the State Village Center Designations are shown on Map 6, the State has preferred to see the boundaries more clearly on a separate map. Huntington should review the map with ACCD to determine if a more specific map will be needed prior to renewal of the designations (they will expire in June, 2017). CCRPC did create a Map #8 for this purpose but it does not appear in this final Plan.
2. The housing chapter should include a reference to the ECOS Plan as the housing targets are out of date – though the intent is still the same. So you could simply add “and further reiterated in the ECOS Plan.” I wouldn’t consider this to be a substantive change considering the ECOS housing goal is already referenced later in the Plan. In addition, the 10% targets are not necessarily regional policy at this point – though we aren’t opposed to it. The 2007 Plan included “25% affordable housing units for subdivisions over 4 lots” and I didn’t see it in this Plan – was that ever enacted in the regulations?
3. What is the purpose of this implementation task in the Historic Features section: “Explore permit process for removal of privately-owned historic buildings”?
4. Once the Huntington Green project is completed, it would be good to revisit the concept that payment of a fee in lieu of affordable housing could be used for elderly housing to determine if, at that point, there is still a greater need for elderly housing rather than non-age restricted affordable housing.
5. A discussion on housing costs in comparison to median income to address affordability would be very helpful in the next plan.
6. Regarding the implementation element, correlations are often made to the Capital Planning program and identify the improvements that are most imperative which is excellent. For future plans I would recommend including an implementation chart identifying timeframe, responsible parties and funding (when known).
7. Consider adding an energy efficiency element to the Land Use chapter describing that more dense, Village based development is more energy efficient.

Proposed Motion & Next Steps:
PROPOSED MOTION: The PAC finds that the Huntington 2014 Town Plan, as submitted, meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC approval, and that the municipality's planning process meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC confirmation. The PAC recommends that the Plan, and the municipal planning process, should be forwarded to the CCRPC Board for approval.
WHEREAS, Chittenden County Metropolitan Planning Organization (CCMPO), hired Michele A. Boomhower on September 29, 2008 to be their Executive Director; and

WHEREAS, Michele Boomhower has earned the respect of her colleagues by demonstrating leadership during the 2009 move to Winooski and the merger of CCMPO & CCRPC and upholding the highest professional standards for CCRPC and Chittenden County municipalities; and

WHEREAS, Michele Boomhower has led numerous major projects for CCRPC including: managing the transportation planning efforts; development of our annual work programs; Tropical Storm Irene recovery efforts; organizing and overseeing the CIRC Alternatives Task Force leading to two national awards; Logistics Co-Chair for the 2014 National Tools of the Trade Conference held in Burlington; and

WHEREAS, throughout her career at CCRPC, Michele Boomhower has generously shared her expertise for planning and provided invaluable guidance on complex transportation issues with staff, Commissioners and municipal officials; and

WHEREAS, Michele Boomhower’s kind and generous heart, sense of humor, and thoughtfulness will be missed by staff, Commissioners and municipal officials; now

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION thanks Michele Boomhower for her outstanding work, dedication, professionalism and high ethical standards during her six plus years with CCRPC and wishes her well in her new positon at the Vermont Agency of Transportation.

ADOPTED THIS 21st DAY OF JANUARY, 2015 IN WINOOSKI, VERMONT

ANDREW H. MONTOLL, CHAIR
RESOLUTION HONORING MELANIE NEEDLE

WHEREAS, Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC) hired Melanie Needle on December 13, 2004; and

WHEREAS, Melanie Needle has provided outstanding efforts in serving the CCRPC Commission and Chittenden County Municipalities; and

WHEREAS, over the past 10 years she has overseen many special projects, including:

- Playing a key role in the developing the 2013 ECOS Plan
- Leading the creation and annual updating of ECOS indicators
- Conducting numerous build-out analysis for our member municipalities
- Initiated CCRPC involvement in projects such as STAR and Vermontivate
- Leadership Champlain Class of 2014
- Leadership Champlain Board member
- Leading CCRPC’s Energy and Climate program

WHEREAS, throughout her career at CCRPC, Melanie Needle has always been positive, professional and held high ethical standards in her work, thereby earning the respect and gratitude of her peers, municipalities and the public;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION celebrates Melanie Needle for her outstanding work, positive attitude, dedication, professionalism, and support of the leadership over the last 10 years and looks forward to many more years working together.

ADOPTED THIS 21st DAY OF JANUARY, 2015 IN WINOOSKI, VERMONT

ANDREW H. MONTROLL, CHAIR
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission  
January 21, 2015  
Agenda Item 10: Action Item  

VTrans District Pavement Leveling Program

Issues: CCRPC is being given the opportunity to prioritize district pavement leveling projects in Chittenden County. The following four projects have been identified by VTrans for consideration for state fiscal year 2016 (beginning July 1, 2015).

- **US2, Bolton** – beginning just south of the Richmond town line and extending south for 1.8 miles. The pavement in this location is in Very Poor condition and leveling would consist of one inch overlay to smooth out the very rough surface. This section is scheduled to be repaved in 2017 and the leveling would be an interim fix. The District currently spends a lot of time patching this section.

- **VT2A, Essex-Colchester** – beginning north of North Street and extending north 3.8 miles to south of Jocelyn Court. Pavement condition in this segment varies from Very Poor/Poor/Fair and Good.

- **VT2A, St. George-Williston** – beginning at the Hinesburg town line and extending north for 4.9 miles to north of Hurricane Lane. Pavement condition in this segment varies from Very Poor/Poor and Fair.

- **US7, Colchester-Milton** – North of Rathe Road extending north 5.1 miles to north of the Milton town line. Pavement condition in this segment varies from Very Poor/Poor/Fair and Good. There are sections in this segment that will be skipped due to good condition and a pending construction project (VT2A/US7).

CCRPC staff applied our project prioritization methodology to these projects and developed project ranks. The CCRPC scores will be one of a number of factors that will be considered in determining the sequence in which the projects advance (see discussion below).

A major factor influencing the prioritization using CCRPC’s methodology is functional class. The methodology gives a higher number of points to projects that facilitate the movement of goods on principal arterials over minor arterials or collectors. The project on US2 in Bolton, while not on an arterial roadway, is the second on the project list because it has the worst pavement condition.

The projects and prioritization results are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>CCMPO Qualitative</th>
<th>Planning Designation</th>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Pavement Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US7, Colchester-Milton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Metro/Suburban/Center/Rural/Village</td>
<td>Principal Arterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US2, Bolton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Major Collector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT2A, Essex-Colchester</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Enterprise/Village</td>
<td>Minor Arterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT2A, St. George-Williston</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Village/Rural</td>
<td>Minor Arterial/Major Connector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Background:** The VTrans District Pavement Leveling Program performs pavement leveling on state highways throughout the state. The program is funded with state funds. Projects are identified by the Maintenance Districts and consider, among other things, the following factors:

- When was the last time the road was paved?
- Is it on the Pavement Management Program schedule and if so what year?
- Has VTrans received a high number of public comments in the last 12 to 24 months?
- Traffic volumes
- Is this a location that is “maintenance heavy” for the district?
- Have there been any past district projects in this area?
- What will be needed for work by the district prior to leveling, and can we get it done?
- Can we “save” the road before it becomes “the poorest of poor”?
- Does the project connect to a previous year(s) project
- Regional Priority

**TAC Recommendation:** Approve the prioritized district leveling project list and forward it to VTrans.

**Staff Recommendation:** Approve the prioritized district leveling project list and forward it to VTrans.

**For more information contact:**

Christine Forde
cforde@ccrpcvt.org or 846-4490 ext. 13
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
January 21, 2015
Agenda Item 11: UPWP Committee Appointment, Process and Schedule

**Issues:**
Annually the CCRPC is required to develop a Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) to satisfy our state requirements as a regional planning commission and our federal requirements as a metropolitan planning organization. To assist the CCRPC Board and Staff in developing a draft UPWP, the FY16 UPWP Committee must be appointed by the Chair. This Committee will meet three times between January and March of 2015. There may also be various other forms of communication with the staff in the process of developing a draft document for approval by the CCRPC Board.

**FY16 UPWP Committee membership:**
- Chris Roy, Williston (Chair), Board
- John Zicconi, Shelburne, Board
- Andrea Morgante, Hinesburg, Board
- Justin Rabidoux, South Burlington, TAC
- Barbara Elliott, Huntington, TAC
- Joss Besse, Bolton, PAC
- Ken Belliveau, Williston, PAC
- Amy Bell, Vermont Agency of Transportation
- Chris Jolly, Federal Highway Administration (ex-officio, non-voting)
- Meredith Birkett, Chittenden County Transportation Authority (ex-officio, non-voting)

**FY2016 CCRPC Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Process**

Fiscal Year 2016 provides an opportunity for the region and the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC) to continue the good work of the past and to build on the momentum that state and federally funded regional planning programs have enabled. In order to take advantage of these opportunities the CCRPC uses the ECOS Plan to provide vision and strategic direction for the UPWP (Unified Planning Work Program) process, a solid timeline for activity, and an understanding of how the process will incorporate the voices of our member communities, interest and stakeholder groups, and all others with interest. The attached schedule provides more details.

---

**For more information contact:**
Charlie Baker, Executive Director
[cbaker@ccrpvt.org](mailto:cbaker@ccrpvt.org) 802-846-4490 x23

or

Bryan Davis, Senior Transportation Planner
[bdavis@ccrpvt.org](mailto:bdavis@ccrpvt.org) 802-846-4490 x17
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid November</td>
<td><strong>Staff</strong> sends solicitation and project application to municipalities and partner agencies with response deadline of January 23, 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early January</td>
<td><strong>Staff</strong> obtains federal FTA &amp; FHWA PL funding amounts, and other relevant anticipated funding levels, and develops anticipated available budget for FY2016 UPWP, solicits for programs needs and considers tasks based on known requests and emerging issues, and concepts for additional work plan elements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/21/15</td>
<td><strong>Board</strong> holds public forum to gain ideas from the public, interest groups and communities for FY2016 UPWP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/23/15</td>
<td>Deadline for ideas from Public, Partner Agencies and Municipalities for FY2016 UPWP inclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/28/15</td>
<td><strong>Finance Committee</strong> meets to begin review of FY2016 UPWP budget assumptions for employee &amp; indirect costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/29/15</td>
<td><strong>UPWP Committee</strong> meets to receive orientation to the UPWP Process including new format (based on ECOS Plan); presentation of regional program tasks – committed &amp; conceptual; presentation of CCTA Transit planning tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/19/15</td>
<td><strong>UPWP Committee</strong> meets to review Municipal/Partner UPWP Applications and Staff recommendations for funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late February</td>
<td><strong>Staff</strong> sends Draft FY2016 UPWP text to UPWP Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/03/15 (TAC)</td>
<td><strong>TAC, PAC, and Executive Committee</strong> briefed on Draft FY2016 UPWP development progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/04/15 (Exec)</td>
<td><strong>TAC, PAC, and Executive Committee</strong> briefed on Draft FY2016 UPWP development progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/11/15 (PAC)</td>
<td><strong>TAC, PAC, and Executive Committee</strong> briefed on Draft FY2016 UPWP development progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/19/15</td>
<td><strong>CCRPC UPWP Committee</strong> meets to finalize Draft FY2016 UPWP for Executive Committee &amp; TAC consideration on April 1/ April 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/25/15</td>
<td><strong>CCRPC Finance Committee</strong> meets to review Draft FY2016 UPWP budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/01/15 (Exec)</td>
<td>Report to <strong>TAC and Executive Committee</strong> on the final Draft FY2016 UPWP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/07/15 (TAC)</td>
<td>Report to <strong>TAC and Executive Committee</strong> on the final Draft FY2016 UPWP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/15/15</td>
<td>Presentation of UPWP to <strong>Board</strong>; <strong>Board</strong> votes to Warn FY2016 UPWP for Public Hearing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/17/15</td>
<td><strong>Staff</strong> mails FY2016 UPWP to all municipalities, posts on web, notices public hearing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/22/15</td>
<td>Update to <strong>CCRPC Finance Committee</strong> on final Draft FY2016 UPWP budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/06/15</td>
<td>Update to <strong>CCRPC Executive Committee</strong> on final Draft FY2016 UPWP budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/20/15</td>
<td>Public Hearing on FY2016 UPWP at the <strong>Board</strong> meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

The ECOS Plan adoption in June, 2013 culminated efforts of over 60 organizations in Chittenden County, including all of the municipalities, working together. The ECOS Plan addresses the challenges facing the County and includes strategies to improve our community and achieve our shared vision for a healthy, inclusive and prosperous Chittenden County.

The ECOS Partnership formed to keep the focus on implementing the plan. The Partnership includes the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC), the City of Burlington, Fletcher Allen Health Care, Greater Burlington Industrial Corporation, Lake Champlain Regional Chamber of Commerce, United Way of Chittenden County, University of Vermont, and the Vermont Department of Health. The Partners remain committed to working together to build upon our collaborative successes and address areas of concern, using principles known as collective impact, to meet ECOS’ goals.

Collective impact results from the commitment of a group of people representing different sectors to a common agenda for solving a specific problem. This approach is collective, as diverse partners participate, having recognized that no one piece will bring success without the others. For example, we cannot achieve greater mobility, accessibility, affordability and health without concentrating development in planned growth areas. Further, we cannot concentrate growth without providing adequate infrastructure. Visually, these collective interrelationships are described in the Circle of Prosperity. Only by effective collaboration can we achieve improved outcomes without additional public expenditures. The ECOS Project will meet its goals through collective impact.

The 2014 ECOS Scorecard: State of Chittenden County compiles indicators depicting progress toward our goals. The Report indicators are drawn from the most reliable statistics, objectively based on substantial research, and intended to be understood by broad audiences.

The summary that follows represents some of the most interesting trends, accomplishments, and actions needed to address the most pressing issues in our community. As we work collectively toward achieving our goals for a healthy, inclusive and prosperous Chittenden County, this Annual Report Summary and ECOS Scorecard will serve as a tool to help track our progress and guide our actions. This work would not be possible without the help of our partners: the public and public representatives (federal, state, municipal and regional), and the business and non-profit sectors.
DEMOGRAPHICS

- NOTE—the Demographics have not yet been updated.
- From 2010 to 2012, Chittenden County’s population increased by 1.3%, or about 2,000 people. For comparison, the population of the state of Vermont has remained relatively unchanged.
- The percent of our population over the age of 65 increased by 2%, and those under age 18 decreased by 2%. For comparison, 12.1% of Chittenden County’s population is 65 and over, compared to 15.7% for Vermont and 13.7% for the US.
- Chittenden County is more diverse when compared to the state of Vermont as a whole. From 2007 to 2012, the non-White or Hispanic population grew from 11,362 to 14,877 people, or from 7.4% to 9.4% of the total population. In comparison, Vermont’s non-White or Hispanic population grew from 4.8% to 6%. This is an increase of 25+% for both the State and County.
- Refugee resettlement is contributing to population increases, with over 50 languages spoken.
- The number of Black or African Americans in Chittenden County has increased by 60% since 2007. In 2007, the Black or African American population was 2,409 and grew to 3,806 in 2012.

ECONOMY

Trends & Issues

- The number of businesses in Chittenden County is increasing and has surpassed 2008 levels, which indicates recovery from the economic downturn. Chittenden County saw a decrease of 1.5% (87 businesses) in the number of registered businesses between 2008 and 2010. 2012 was the first year since 2008 where the number of registered businesses exceeded the 2008 number. Chittenden County gained 132 new businesses or increased by 2% between 2012 and 2013.
- Since 2009, Chittenden County and Vermont’s unemployment rates have decreased. In 2013, Chittenden County’s average unemployment rate was 3.5%; statewide it was 4.4% and nationally it was 7.4%.
- We continue to experience tight labor supply in the following sectors: professional/technical, production/technical, and computer and mathematical.
- Since 2010, median household income in Chittenden County has risen 16% and is $64,950 US median income was $52,250. Vermont median household income was $52,570.
- Income disparities are still evident; median household income for Black/African American and Asians are about 1/3 lower than for Whites.
- The average wage in Chittenden County has increased by 8% since 2009 and continues to increase. Those working in the financial sector earned the highest average wage in 2013.

Notable Accomplishments

- In terms of business growth in 2014, Dealer.com, All Earth Renewables, ReArch Company, Vermont Smoke & Cure, and the University of Vermont Medical Center were in the top ten for fastest one-year sales growth.
- The Burlington downtown mall will be comprehensively redeveloped consistent with the planBTV Downtown & Waterfront Master Plan. An investment of more than $200 million in new retail, office, housing, and public spaces will create new jobs, grow State and local revenues and restore pedestrian and bike connections for the Marketplace area. The project once fully completed is expected to generate $450 million in economic activity.
High Priority Actions

- The Greater Burlington Industrial Corporation (GBIC) is working with IBM to get additional sites available for manufacturing uses.
- More targeted workforce development is needed to meet the needs of technology and manufacturing employers with a focus on science, technology, engineering, and math to further the growth of our knowledge-based economy. These technical skills are supplemented by the presence of a strong arts and creative community. More work is needed to identify opportunities to provide training to the existing workforce that don’t yet have the skills needed for the 21st century workplace.
- Support is needed to improve the effectiveness of workforce development programs and relations between the Workforce Development Council, Agency of Human Services, the Departments of Education, Labor, and Economic Development.
- Retention-based incentives for strategic, high value added employers are needed.

ENVIRONMENT

Trends & Issues

- 197 acres of wildlife habitat were converted to development between 2006 and 2011. This is actually 20% less than what was lost between 2001 and 2006.
- Air quality continues to improve with a 25% decrease in particulate matter and an 18% decrease in ozone from 2012 to 2013.
- To address clean water goals, the Lake Champlain Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) will require the reduction of 216 tons per year (this means a 34% reduction) of phosphorous flowing into Lake Champlain and its streams and rivers (from Vermont).
- Natural gas consumption increased by 21% from 2012 to 2013 in Chittenden County due to residents and businesses switching over from dirtier fuel sources and a large compressed natural gas supplier coming online. Total energy consumption in Chittenden County has been decreasing from a high of 40 trillion BTU in 2003/4 to 32 trillion BTU in 2012, a 20% decrease.
- Since 2013, 77 total renewable energy projects have been installed in Chittenden County, generating an additional 514 kw of electricity.
- There are a total of 15 charging stations in Chittenden County; 5 Fast Charging and 10 Level 1 & 2 stations. As of October 2014, 262 of Vermont’s 801 registered electric vehicles are located within Chittenden County.

Notable Accomplishments

- Progress is being made by Chittenden County’s urban and suburban municipalities to establish flow restoration plans to improve the water quality of streams impacted by stormwater run-off. Stormwater management improvements are also taking place in non-MS4 towns, including installation of a large, two-tiered rain garden in Hinesburg near the Route 116, Silver Street intersection, thanks to funding from a State Ecosystem Restoration Grant and assistance from the Lewis Creek Association.
- The Vermont Shoreland Protection Act established a permit program to ensure environmentally responsible development around the shores of lakes and ponds greater than 10 acres in size.
- The Vermont Energy Investment Corporation (VEIC) and the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC) completed an electric vehicle (EV) charging station installation guide which includes municipal EV charging model bylaw language.
- The Vermont Public Service Department completed the Total Energy Study which identifies policy and technology pathways to employ in order to reach Vermont’s energy and greenhouse gas goals.
• Four of our municipalities (Colchester, Essex Junction, Huntington & Jericho) have adopted Municipal Plans that include flood resiliency elements. Colchester has applied for FEMA’s Community Rating System which recognizes and encourages community floodplain management activities that exceed the minimum National Flood Insurance Program standards.
• Passed State energy related legislation that increased incentives for renewal energy production and increased financial incentives for energy efficient technology.

**High Priority Actions**

• Significant efforts will be needed by all parties to meet clean water standards for Lake Champlain. Prioritizing and funding these investments will be a substantial challenge, and an opportunity to improve our community and the health of Lake Champlain.
• Continued work around capital investments, regulatory reform, technology innovation, and public engagement is needed to reduce energy consumption and fossil fuel usage to achieve the state’s goals of 90% renewables by 2050 and a 50% reduction of greenhouse gas emissions by 2028. For example, provide comprehensive plan and bylaw language to municipalities for electric vehicle charging stations and assistance to businesses who like to install charging stations.
• Continued flood resiliency planning at the municipal and regional level including a risk analysis and hazard mitigation prioritization tool pilot project to bring relevant transportation and river management data into one place to help prioritize infrastructure investments, and be better prepared for flood events. In addition, the All Hazard Mitigation Plan update will begin in 2015.

**Quality of Place**

**Trends & Issues**

• In 2013, 85% or 373 of the total 439 units of new housing development occurred in areas planned for growth, exceeding the goal of 80% for the third year in a row.
• At the end of 2013, the vacancy rate for all of Chittenden County still remains low at 1.2% - causing high rents and negatively impacting the overall housing market (a healthy vacancy rate is 3-5%). On a positive note, the number of affordable project-based rental units increased by 1% or 52 units with the addition of one project-based rental complex completed between 2013 and 2014.

**Notable Accomplishments**

• Chittenden County municipalities are succeeding in encouraging redevelopment and development in areas planned for growth. Some specific highlights include:
  • Richmond adopted interim zoning to study and address the Casing property which was a major driver of water and sewer infrastructure for the village water system and has been vacant for 15 years;
  • Burlington received a Neighborhood Development Designation from the State to help encourage development in and around the Downtown. Redevelopment projects benefitting from this program include two underutilized properties on No. Winooski Avenue.
• Improvements to Vermont’s growth center designation process were made by the Legislature and ACCD.
• Transportation demand management strategies became an Act 250 requirement (Act 147 of 2014).
• A mechanism for collection of state transportation impact fees was established to cost share capital projects resulting in capacity increases (Act 145 of 2014).
• Improved coordination between local development review for Site Plan applications and VTrans highway access permitting was established (Act 167 of 2014).
• Investments in efficient transportation projects during 2014 included:
  • US2/Exit 14 improvements—Staples Lane, South Burlington
  • Transportation Demand Management - Regional Transportation Demand Management pilot project (Go! Chittenden County) with local and regional transportation partners including: Expansion of TDM services through Campus Area TMA (CATMA); Bike commuter workshops and walk/bike site assessments by Local Motion; Bus Pass Program through CCTA; Park It Pledge Program through Car Share VT; Carpool/Vanpool Matching through Go! Vermont and Way to Go! Week through VEIC
  • Continued implementation of the United Way Neighbor Rides program including the recruitment/retention of 26 volunteer drivers and provision of 3,157 rides, an increase of 13% over the prior year
  • Improved service of commuter transit to Milton and Colchester on Route 7, operating six times a day
  • Williston mid-day transit service
  • Installation of nine transit shelters with solar lighting in Colchester and Williston
  • The formation of an Employee Transportation Coordinator Network, with 15 local businesses currently enrolled
  • More miles of sidewalks and shared use paths, up 3% from 2011. Projects include Hinesburg Village VT 116 Corridor Improvements from Charlotte Road to Community School and Williston South Brownell Sidewalk Connector
  • Commuter Bus service to Jeffersonville began service in October 2013
  • Montpelier Link ridership up 10% over 2013 despite overall CCTA ridership decline from driver’s strike
  • 50% expansion in spaces at the Richmond Park and Ride
  • Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) per capita declined 2% from 2012Continuation of construction of the VT 15 Footbridge to replace footbridge adjacent to VT 15 over Browns Trace River in Jericho
  • Paving of VT128 (Essex to Westford), US2 (South Burlington to Williston) and VT2A (Williston), US 2 (Bolton-Waterbury)
• Planning for investments in efficient transportation projects during 2014 included:
  • Bicycle and Pedestrian Studies; Charlotte Village to US7 Pathway Study; Charlotte US7/Ferry Road/Church Road Crossing Study; Colchester Severance Road Path Study; Essex VT15 Sidewalk – Old Stage Road to Essex Way; Hinesburg Sidewalk Study; Milton Sidewalks Study; Richmond US2 Path; Winooski – Essex Junction VT15 Multi-use Path; Williston US 2 Multimodal scoping – Taft Corners to Williston Village; Williston Mountain View Road Shoulder Study
  • Corridor Studies: Burlington North Avenue; Hinesburg VT116; Milton US7; Williston Essex Network Transportation Study (WENTS)(Williston/Essex/Essex Junction); Winooski Main Street, US 7 to Exit 16
  • Scoping Studies: Burlington Railyard Enterprise; Burlington Prospect Street/Pearl Street/Colchester Avenue; Burlington Pearl Street; Charlotte Park-and-Ride; Charlotte US7/Harbor Road/Falls Road; Colchester Exit 17; Milton US7/Middle Road/Railroad Street; Williston Park-and-Ride, Williston Exit 12 and New Local Roads; Essex/Williston VT 117/North Williston Road Flood Plain Elevation; Williston VT2A - Industrial Avenue/Mountain View to River Cove Road,
  • CIRC Highway Alternatives Task Force – CCRPC staff, VTrans and the “CIRC Communities” (Colchester, Essex, Essex Junction, and Williston) completed a series of projects and planning activities which will aid in meeting the original Purpose and Need of the CIRC Highway Project, which broadly stated are mobility, congestion, transportation demand, safety, livability, and economic development. (http://www.circtaskforce.org/)
  • Assistance was provided to seek hazard mitigation funding from FEMA for property owners with structures in hazard zones in Underhill and Huntington.
High Priority Actions

- Form-based code efforts initiated in Burlington, South Burlington, Shelburne, Westford, Jericho, and Winookski.
- More investments in efficient transportation projects are needed. Projects for 2015 include:
  - Continuation of construction on the 3-year Milton I-89 bridge replacement over Lamoille River
  - Construction of Colchester VT2A/US7/Creek Road/Bay Road Intersection
  - Construction of Charlotte US7 improvements
  - Permitting and design of Colchester Exit 16 improvements; Essex Junction Crescent Connector Road; Hinesburg VT116/CVU Road Improvements; Jericho VT15/Browns Trace Intersection Improvements; South Burlington VT116 Culvert; Williston US2/Industrial Avenue Intersection; Williston VT2A/James Brown Drive Traffic Signal; Winookski Circulator safety improvements
  - Intelligent Transportation System Plan update which describes how to best use telecommunications and computing technology to boost the efficiency of roadway, transit and emergency and maintenance vehicle response systems, and provide timely information on travel options.
  - Transportation Improvement Program – The Federal Fiscal Year TIP for 2015 through 2018 was adopted by the CCRPC at its July 16, 2014 meeting (http://www.ccrpcvt.org/tip). The FY15-FY18 TIP includes nearly $240 million in federal dollars for transportation projects within the county.
  - Burlington Pedestrian and Bicycle Action Plan - refinement of facilities identified in 2011 Transportation plan and 2013 planBTV
  - Burlington Waterfront Bike Path Realignment - to realign and improve the bike path near the Moran Plant
  - Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects: Burlington Champlain Elementary Pedestrian Crossing Improvements; Burlington Wayfinding Improvements; Colchester sidewalk along Water Tower Hill; Colchester Fort Ethan Allen Sidewalk Improvements; Essex VT2A Bike Path – Old Colchester Road to Pinecrest Drive; Hinesburg Village North Sidewalk from Commerce Street to Riggs Road; Jericho Browns Trace Multimodal Connection from Jericho Center to MMU High School; Milton McMullen Road Sidewalk Improvement Project; Jericho VT15/Underhill Flats Sidewalk; Williston Harvest Lane Sidewalk; Williston Meadow Run to Alliance Church Path
- Huntington Lower Village Bicycle/Pedestrian Scoping Study
- Exit 12 Park & Ride lot Williston

Community

Trends & Issues

- Based on the Opportunity Index, which looks at pre-school enrollment, high school graduation, post-secondary education, access to healthy foods, access to healthcare, and engagement in civic life, Vermont ranks first among the states for overall opportunity and overall education, with Chittenden County ranking first among Vermont counties for having the highest opportunity index score.
- In the 2013/2014 school year, only 47% of 11th grade students in Chittenden County were proficient in math and only 45% were proficient in science. These percentages are significantly worse for English language learners and low income students.
• On average, low income and non-white residents in Chittenden County have significantly worse outcomes related to health and education. For example, residents with incomes below 250% of the federal poverty level are three times more likely to be diagnosed with diabetes, cardiovascular disease and asthma, and are twice as likely to be diagnosed with depression.

• Substance abuse remains an issue in Chittenden County and has many negative consequences. While alcohol consumption is the most prevalent form of substance abuse in Chittenden County, there is also an ongoing concern about opiate abuse. In 2013, for the first time, the number of Vermonters receiving treatment for opioids has surpassed the number for those being treated for alcohol abuse. Abuse of alcohol and illicit drugs strains families, communities, medical and social service systems, and public safety.

• Homelessness remains a persistently serious issue for Chittenden County. According to the Point in Time Survey, the number of homeless individuals increased by 7% between 2011 and 2014. The Point in Time Survey counts the number of homeless people throughout the State on a single night every January.

• The drop-out rate for all Chittenden County Schools increased from 5.2% in 2012 to 6.2% in 2013. At 25.4%, Winooski High School has the highest drop-out rate in the County.

• Food insecurity persists throughout the County, with 1 in 8 people not being able to afford access to enough healthy food due to financial constraints.

**Notable Accomplishments**

• United Way of Chittenden County has been working with employers through their Working Bridges collaborative to develop and share effective initiatives and policies that help employers improve retention, productivity and advancement of low-to-moderate income (LMI) workers. To date, several employers have seen significant reductions (~50%) in turnover and unscheduled time off for their LMI employees.

• In 2013, UWCC’s Director of Community Impact & Volunteer Mobilization participated in a cross-sectoral leadership development fellowship offered by the CDC’s National Leadership Academy for the Public’s Health, along with leaders from the Health Department’s Burlington District Office, Fletcher Allen Community Health Improvement, and Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission/ECOS. The goal of the fellowship was to develop capacity within and among key local organizational for cross-sectoral leadership in addressing public health priorities. In additional to participating in the leadership development curriculum, the Chittenden County team is now working with the Chittenden County Hunger Council to develop local messaging around the problem of food insecurity – and it’s cause and consequences -- in our community and the ways in which various sectors must play a role in solving this community problem.

• CCRPC and UVM’s Center for Rural Studies received a grant from the Substance Abuse Mental Services Administration to conduct a community assessment on behavioral health trends in Chittenden County. Human service, social service, and local government officials were all in agreement that alcohol abuse, illegal drug abuse, and domestic violence were high priority issues.

• The University of Vermont Medical Center (formerly Fletcher Allen Health Care) is again being counted as a top performer among leading academic medical centers in the 2014 University Health System Consortium (UHC) Quality and Accountability Study, nationally recognized as the most important analysis of its kind.

• A farm-to-school program is investing $100,000 to bring locally grown food to cafeteria tables and classrooms in Vermont.
High Priority Actions

- Take additional actions to meet the increasing opiate crisis including actions for prevention, treatment and recovery.
- Support public schools and higher education efforts to increase the quality and quantity of STEM graduates to make sure that graduates have the skills and competencies they need for the 21st century workplace.
- Strengthen career development and experiential programs at institutions of higher education to prepare graduates for jobs in the County.
- Explore the development of efforts to advance equity in our organizations and the region.
- Implement the CCRPC Public Participation Plan, to ensure all residents are involved in the decisions that impact our community.
- Continued Collective Impact: United Way of Chittenden County, in partnership with UVM Medical Center, CCRPC, Fanny Allen Foundation are currently funding several initiatives jointly, including Neighbor Rides, a children’s mental health pilot, and a transitional housing project. UWCC just received a $100,000 two year grant to establish a funders collaborative and to bring collective impact training to the funders and the non-profit sector. We expect the training to take place in the Spring 2015.
CCRPC Board  
01/21/2015  
Agenda Item 12: ECOS Annual Report

ECOS Scorecard: The State of Chittenden County

Issues: In collaboration with the ECOS Partnership, CCRPC is excited to share the DRAFT 2014 ECOS Annual Report Executive Summary (see attached). The executive summary tells the story learned from the ECOS indicators and illustrates what the County’s trends, issues, and notable accomplishments were for the previous year (please note that the accomplishments list is not yet complete). Please review the executive summary and consider if there are other issues that your community is concerned about, or interested in highlighting, that should be reflected in the summary.

Deadline For Comments: January 21, 2015

Additionally, The ECOS Partnership worked together to develop an online tool for the ECOS indicators called the ECOS Scorecard. The ECOS Scorecard communicates how well we collectively are working towards the ECOS goals and also makes data about Chittenden County more accessible to the decision makers and others.

Staff is working on finalizing the Scorecard. Next Tuesday January 20th, you will receive a link to the ECOS Scorecard.

For more information contact:  
Please send comments or questions to Melanie Needle  
mneedle@ccrpcvt.org or 846-4490 ext. 27
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
Executive Committee Special Meeting

Date: Monday, December 15, 2014
Time: 5:45 p.m.
Place: CCRPC Offices; 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404
Present: Debra Kobus, Secretary-Treasurer Andrea Morgante, At-Large
          John Zicconi, At-Large Lou Mossey, Immediate Past Chair
          Charlie Baker, Executive Director Michele Boomhower, Asst/MPO Director

The meeting was called to order at 5:45 p.m. by Debra Kobus, acting chair.

Executive Session: ANDREA MORGANTE MADE A MOTION TO GO INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION AT 5:57
P.M. TO DISCUSS PERSONNEL MATTERS. JOHN ZICCONI SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED
UNANIMOUSLY.

ANDREA MORGANTE MADE A MOTION TO COME OUT OF EXECUTIVE SESSION AT 6:40 P.M., SECONDED
BY JOHN ZICCONI. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

There was no further business and the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Charlie Baker, Executive Director
The meeting was called to order at 5:50 p.m. by the chair, Andy Montroll.

1. Changes to the agenda, Members’ Items: There were none.

2. Approval of November 4, 2014 Joint Executive & Finance Committee Minutes. JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION SECONDED BY ANDREA MORGANTE TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 4, 2014 JOINT EXECUTIVE & FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING. MOTION CARRIED WITH LOU MOSSEY ABSTAINING.

3. Approval of December 15, 2014 Special Executive Committee meeting minutes. LOU MOSSEY MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 15, 2014 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING, SECONDED BY JOHN ZICCONI. THE MOTION CARRIED WITH ANDY MONTROLL ABSTAINING.

   a. A&C Realty, c/o Al Senecal, Essex; Application #4C1274. This is for the construction of a 20,000 sq building (to include 17,000 sf of warehouse and 3,000 sf office space), 1500 ft of new access drive and excavation of 90,000 cy of rock over a five year period. The project is located on Old Colchester Road in Essex near the intersection of Route 2A and 289. We note that the project is within the Enterprise Planning Area of the ECOS plan and that it will not contribute to a pattern of strip development in that it is surrounded by other industrial uses. This letter was circulated to members via email in early December for concurrence since we did not have our regular December meeting. JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY LOU MOSSEY TO APPROVE THE LETTER. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
   b. Holly Girl/VIP, Colchester: 4C0757-4B-1. This is a follow-up to a business expansion on Water Tower Hill in Colchester. They had a proportional share condition in their permit and are trying to reduce that share. Our November 6th letter recommended that 1) they become a member of CATMA to assist the owner in realizing the estimated trip reductions through support programs; 2) monitor their peak hour trip count a year after building occupancy in order to determine if the estimated reductions are being realized; and, 3) if the trip reductions are not realized a year after building occupancy, work with CATMA and CCRPC on mechanisms to improve the reduction, or pay the traffic mitigation fees associated with the peak hour trips that have not been reduced. The developer is fine with joining CATMA Employee Transportation Coordinator Network, which offer ideas on how companies can encourage transit, car-pooling, etc. They also agreed to the monitoring of trip reduction. They do not agree with having to pay the mitigation
fee for trip reduction not realized, but would continue to work on trying to reduce those trips. Joe Segale of VTrans responded to the applicant’s letter and offers that “The fact that the State will use federal or state funds to pay its share of the project cost does not relieve developers from the responsibility to pay their fair share of any additional capacity provided by the transportation project beyond what is necessary to address background growth and existing deficiencies.” We agree with the Act 145 clarifications provided by Joe Segale in his December 23, 2014 letter. Regina did note that District #4 Environmental Commission has been frustrated with VTrans not being at the table to explain their position, but we’ve been working with VTrans to remedy that.

c. **Criterion 9(L) Comments.** Regina noted that we had briefly discussed making comments on this criterion at our November meeting, but there was no clear indication of when that might be appropriate. It came to our attention that the Natural Resources Board would be meeting in December to talk about Criterion 9 (L) Procedures and Rulemaking, so we prepared the memo in this meeting packet. Our main comments are:

- We recognize the statute, as currently written, pigeon holes land use into two types: existing settlement and commercial strip development. We do not believe that established industrial and office parks fall within either of those areas and while a statute change may be needed, a procedural amendment could help clarify our concerns.
- We are uncertain how existing zoning will be acknowledged.
- We urge the Board to not include a definition of “contribute to” in the Act 250 Rules at this time.

Her memo addresses each of these in greater detail. We have not had a response from the Natural Resources Board and Regina will keep us posted. When asked if the legislature would be addressing this in the session, Charlie said it was doubtful as this was added in the 2014 session and there doesn’t seem to be any interest in doing so.

5. **Agenda Review – January 21, 2015 Board Meeting.** Members reviewed the proposed agenda for January. We will have a public forum to get ideas for the FY16 Work Program. The chair will appoint the UPWP Committee members. Chris Roy, as Vice-Chair, will chair that committee and Andrea Morgante and John Zicconi will represent the board. There will be 2 members of the TAC and 2 from the PAC as well. Charlie noted that Chris Granda of Richmond asked for the opportunity to present the Total Energy Study report completed in December. This is trying to develop policy to meet state energy goals for renewable energy and green-house gases by 2050. Member agreed that this agenda was rather full so we should consider it for the February meeting agenda. Staff will be sure board members receive that report prior to the board presentation.

6. **FY15 Mid-Year Budget Adjustment.** Charlie began by explaining items on the spreadsheet which includes new tasks, some with only staff costs, some tasks we are deleting; and existing tasks that have changes in consultant dollars associated with them. Some are necessitated by carryover dollars from FY14, which were amended to actual numbers, as well as increases in project costs. We also reduced some consultant dollars in FY15 to reflect what we feel will actually be spent by June 30th. Some will have additional funds added in FY16 to complete the projects. Charlie then reviewed the Revenue and Expense spreadsheet. This budget includes replacing the transportation program manager, and adding a new land use planner and one transportation planner, right now. We received word today that the AID grant will be funded, but we just don’t know how soon. The staff time for that grant is included in PL line right now, but we’ll have to move it to the new grant line. Charlie reviewed other areas where we deleted grants that had been anticipated, but not received – such as energy siting, LEPC for Central Vermont, brownfields. On the expense side, there is a reduction in staff/benefit lines reflecting loss of
staff planner (Paul) and vacancy of a couple of months to replace Michele. We also reduced
communication/PR expense by spreading website revamp into FY16; saved $4,000 in workmen’s comp
insurance by changing companies; saving $10,000 in general liability insurance. However, we added
$5,000 for equipment maintenance for IT services; $11,500 for continuing updates on our project
management software. Amy Bell pointed out that if we are going to hire 3 additional staff that we
probably need to increase our Recruitment line item from $500, which we will do. As noted when this
budget was adopted, we expect a deficit due to the decrease in our indirect rate, to correct the previous
year’s “surplus”. ANDREA MORGANTE MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CHRIS ROY, TO RECOMMEND
SENDING THE BUDGET ADJUSTMENT TO THE FULL BOARD WITH ANY CHANGES FOUND TO BE
NECESSARY. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

7. Chair/Executive Director’s Report:
   a. Legislative Breakfast review. Charlie reported that there were 64 attendees at the legislative
breakfast last month. We asked attendees to complete a survey about the event and 28 did respond. He reviewed the survey responses and noted that all were interested in a similar event in 2015.
   b. Compensation Study Update. We had expected a report in late December, but now anticipate
something by the end of January, so we hope to discuss this at the February Executive
Committee meeting. Depending on recommendations received, we may be bringing changes to
the Personnel Policy regarding salary ranges, and perhaps job titles/descriptions.
   c. Organization Transition. Charlie noted that he and Michele complete annual evaluations for
staff that she supervised. At a staff meeting this morning, we discussed a few organizational
charts, but didn’t come to any conclusions. Andy Montroll noted that this is the opportune time
to discuss organization structure. Members agreed that Charlie Baker would be mpo director, at
least in the interim. Charlie noted that we’re hoping to have the structure worked out in a
couple of weeks so we can advertise the positions we’ll need. He anticipates at least two
months for the hiring process. We do need to see if staff members want to take more
responsibility and therefore we might not need to hire a senior manager position. Members
suggested we have a short Executive Committee meeting prior to the January 21st board
meeting to get updated on organizational structure and positions we’ll be advertising. JOHN
ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CHRIS ROY, TO MAKE CHARLIE BAKER THE INTERIM
MPD DIRECTOR. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

8. Other Business. There was none.

9. Executive Session – not needed.

10. Adjournment. JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY LOU MOSSEY, TO ADJOURN THE
MEETING AT 7:05 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc
December 2, 2014

Peter Keibel
District #4 Coordinator
111 West Street
Essex Junction, VT  05452

RE: A&C Realty, c/o Al Senecal, Essex; Application #4C1274

Dear Mr. Keibel:

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 20,000 sf building (to include 17,000 sf of warehouse and 3,000 sf of office space), 1500 lf of new access drive and excavation of 90,000cy of rock over a five year period. The Project is located on 123 Old Colchester Road, in Essex, VT. The project has received approval from the Essex Planning Commission; however they still need a Conditional Use approval for extraction of earth resources. We offer the following comments:

The project is located within the Enterprise Planning Area as defined in the Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan (the Plan). While, a portion of the property is also within the Rural Planning Area, the office building will be constructed entirely within the Enterprise Planning Area. We also understand that the blasting will take place entirely within the Enterprise Planning Area as well, though this is not clear on the site plans. We find this project to be consistent with this Planning Area for the following reasons:

1. The Enterprise 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. This project is within the sewer service area (though water and sewer lines have not yet been extended to the property) and this type of use is appropriate in this area (it has long been zoned for industrial use).

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

We also find that this project meets the requirements of Criterion 9(L). We find that this area does not meet the exact definition of “existing settlement”. Therefore, under Criterion 9(L), the applicant must show that any project outside an existing settlement:

i. Makes efficient use of land, energy, roads, utilities and other supporting infrastructure, and either:
ii. (I) Will not contribute to a pattern of strip development along public highways, or (II) If the project will be confined to an area that already constitutes strip development, it will incorporate infill and is designed to reasonably minimize the characteristics of strip development.

The proposed project will make efficient use of land once the material has been removed and the office building is put in its place. Secondarily, we find that this proposed project will not contribute to a pattern of strip development as it is in an already developed industrial area. Other developed properties in this industrial area include a self-storage and moving business, an equipment sales and rental facility, and a heating fuels facility. Rather than contributing to strip development, the A&C Realty project would be located behind all of these uses (as viewed from VT2A/Colchester Road), with an entrance off Old Colchester Road.

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,

Charlie Baker
Executive Director

Cc: CCRPC Board
Certificate of Service
December 26, 2014

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

RE: Holly Girl/Vermont Information Processing, Inc., Colchester; Application #4C0757-4B-1

Dear Ms. Monaghan:

The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission’s Staff I have reviewed the Response to Recess Order 4C0757-4B-1 prepared by Michael J. Burke, P.E. of Krebs & Lansing Consulting Engineers dated December 19, 2014.

We offer the following comments:

CCRPC’s letter dated November 6, 2014 included the following recommendations:

1. become a member of CATMA to assist the owner in realizing the estimated trip reductions through support programs (for example, CATMA will alert the owner of bike commuter workshop offerings twice/year); and
2. monitor their peak hour trip count a year after building occupancy in order to determine if the estimated reductions are being realized; and
3. if the trip reductions are not realized within a year after building occupancy, work with CATMA and CCRPC on mechanisms to improve the reductions, or pay the traffic mitigation fees associated with the peak hour trips that have not been reduced.

The Applicant’s submittal on December 19, 2014 included comments on these three suggestions, and we concur with the Applicant’s responses specific to these three suggestions.

Regarding the Applicant’s comments specific to our Act 145 statement in our November 6, 2014 letter, we agree with the Act 145 clarifications provided by Joe Segale, VTrans, on December 23, 2014.

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,

Charlie Baker
Executive Director
Cc: CCRPC Board
Certificate of Service
Thank you for this opportunity to provide comment on the Criterion 9(L) Procedure and Rulemaking. The comments have not been reviewed by our Executive Committee or Board but have been developed from conversations that we’ve had over the last few months as we’ve been reviewing Act 250 applications. We have two main comments:

1. We recognize the statute, as currently written, pigeon holes land use into two types: existing settlement and commercial strip development. We do not believe that established industrial and office parks clearly fall within either of those areas and while a statute change may be needed, a procedural amendment could help clarify our concerns; and

2. We are uncertain how existing zoning will be acknowledged; and

3. We urge the Board to not include a definition of “contribute to” in the Act 250 Rules at this time.

Industrial & Office Parks:
Established industrial and office park areas do not meet the definition of “existing settlement”. Nor do these areas meet the definition of “strip development” as it is defined as linear commercial development. Therefore it is unclear how development proposals (including development of vacant lots and improvements on existing developed lots) within already developed industrial and office parks will be treated under Criterion 9(L). Considering the importance and uniqueness of these land use types, we request that they either be exempted from 9(L), or at the very least an amendment is made to the Procedure to describe how redevelopment and infill of these areas will be reviewed under 10 V.S.A. § 6086(9)(L)(i), (ii)(I) and (ii)(II).

For example, the first paragraph of the Efficient Use Requirement section of the Procedure could be amended to read: “Although much of the focus of Criterion 9(L) is on commercial development, the efficient use requirement applies to non-commercial projects, such as residential subdivisions and industrial/office parks, as well as to mixed-use projects.”

These areas are generally not “surrounded by existing strip development” and therefore they will likely be judged on whether they are contributing to strip development or not (10 V.S.A. § 6086(9)(L)(ii)(I)), rather than infilling existing strip development (10 V.S.A. § 6086(9)(L)(ii)(II)). Therefore, it would be helpful to acknowledge this under the first sentence of this section in the Procedure. Perhaps the first sentence could read: “If a project is not surrounded by existing strip development, for instance an industrial park or residential subdivisions, Criterion 9(L) requires the applicant to prove that the project does not contribute to strip development.”

Existing Zoning:
Under the Contributes to Strip Development section of the Procedure it lists “zoning of adjacent land” as another factor that may indicate that a project will contribute to strip development, however it is unclear what effect existing zoning will have. We’d recommend deleting this factor as the project should be subject to factors within the project site, rather than something that is beyond their control. If local zoning does enable strip development on adjacent properties that is not a factor the applicant could control or change. It is establishing a regulatory standard beyond the reach of the Applicant. However, if the intent of this factor was to provide weight to the existing local zoning in the affirmative (in other words if the surrounding area is in commercial development the municipality has planned it that way for a reason and that should be supported in the same way that planning for rural development on one end of the project site should be supported). Either way, the local zoning is beyond the control of the Applicant.

Contribute to Definition:
We believe that it would be pre-mature to include a definition of “contribute to” for the purposes of 9(L) in the Act 250 Rules at this time. We agree with the statement “A state or municipal highway project does not, by itself, contribute to strip development” however we feel that the rest of the proposed definitions are too unclear at this point in time to include in the official Rules (especially reference to local zoning for the reasons explained above). Therefore, we would recommend that the highway sentence be added to the Procedure, and the Rules be re-visited at a later date if necessary.
DATE: Tuesday, December 2, 2014
TIME: 9:00 a.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Office, 110 West Canal St. Winooski, VT

Members Present
Nicole Losch, Burlington
Bryan Osborne, Chair, Colchester
Jennifer Murray, Jericho
Katherine Sonnick, Milton
Charlene Wallace, Bike/Pedestrian
Sandy Thibault, CATMA
Meredith Birkett, CCTA
Bob Henneberger, Senior Citizens
Matt Langham, VTrans
Dennis Lutz, Essex
Bruce Hoar, Williston
Justin Rabidoux, South Burlington
Barbara Elliot, Huntingdon
Chris Jolly, FHWA

Staff
Michele Boomhower, Assistant/MPO Director
Jason Charest, Senior Transportation Planning Engineer
Eleni Churchill, Senior Transportation Planning Engineer
Bryan Davis, Senior Transportation Planner
Peter Keating, Senior Transportation Planner
Chris Dubin, Transportation Planner
Christine Forde, Senior Transportation Planner
Sai Sarepalli, Transportation Planning Engineer

Others
Alyson Platzer, United Way, Neighbor Rides
Dave Roberts, VEIC
Lev McCarthy, UVM

Bryan Osborne convened the meeting at 9:05AM with a round of introductions.

1. Consent Agenda
This was no consent agenda this month.

2. Approval of Minutes
Bryan noted that the version in the meeting packet was a “tracked changes” version and that approval would accept those changes. A MOTION WAS MADE TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 4TH BY MEREDITH BIRKETT AND SECONDED BY SANDY THIBAULT. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. Public Comments
No members of the public were present.

4. United Ways’ Neighbor Rides Program
Alyson Platzer, United Way’s Neighbor Rides Program Coordinator, attended and provided the TAC a primer on the program. She described the program as a “multi-stakeholder initiative to increase access to life-sustaining and life-enriching activities for transportation-disadvantaged elders and persons with disabilities in Chittenden County.” The impetus for the program comes from demographic trends where, in Chittenden County, by 2030, 27% of population will be 60 and older and for those without access to personal vehicle 69% delay medical appointments and 40% have difficulty getting to important daily activities.

Alyson explained that the program runs under collaborative management and relies on community outreach, volunteer recruitment and support, reliance on local champions and the matching and dispatching of drivers to riders.

The program is little more than 18 months in operation but has established goals which include to recruit, train and retain 30-50 volunteer drivers, increase the number of rides provided to seniors and persons with disabilities by volunteer drivers, and decrease the cost per ride across human services transportation and increase capacity to provide more rides. So far, the program has achieved the following:
Retained 26 out of 29 Volunteers
Provided 3,157 Volunteer Trips
Saw a 6% decrease in trip cost
Experienced an 8% increase in total rides (across all modes)

Discussion topics following Alyson’s presentation included the possibility of an “app” for future matching, background checks for volunteer drivers, meetings with local governments where the program has been featured, future marketing/advertising of the service, and the sustainability of having enough drivers to meet future demand.

5. Drive Electric
Dave Roberts of VEIC gave an update on electric vehicle planning activity. Topics covered included:

- Electric Vehicle (EV) overview
- State Supportive Programs
  - Zero Emission Vehicles (ZEV)
  - Incentives
  - Drive Electric VT
- CCRPC Planning Work
  - EV charging location prioritization and installation guidebook
  - Local bylaw updates
  - Fleet vehicle applications

The overview considered transportation’s role in greenhouse gas emissions, the energy efficiencies of various travel modes, types of electric vehicles and the benefits of switching to EVs. While VT is part of a ten state ZEV program, it, like a majority of states, provides some incentives to expand EV fleets. Dave went on to describe the Vermont EV programs that include vehicle and charging station outreach through Drive Electric VT, pilot incentives at point of EV purchase, downtown charging station grants, the State Infrastructure Bank, and building energy code requirements.

EVs are growing in number in VT as well as the number of charging stations available. Dave described the types of charging equipment, charging speeds, how charging sites are prioritized and the variety of cost ranges for the different types of chargers. Current EV activities include:

- Updating EV charging installation permit requirements
- Meetings with towns to discuss permit streamlining
- Support for property owners to develop work site and public charging, and
- Data requirements for fleet EV analysis.

Dave’s presentation led to considerable discussion and interest in EVs - vehicles, technology, charging and costs.

6. Burlington Bike Route Study
Lev McCarthy is a UVM student who analyzed bike routes in Burlington in order to forecast future demand and help select areas for appropriate bike investments. Specifically, his research goal was, “To gauge the pathway selection behavior of bicyclists in Burlington, surmise a pattern in their preferences, and ascertain where improvement would yield the most utility.” Lev collected the data for analysis through an in-person written survey and obtained 119 usable responses. Survey questions included, favorite places to cycle, the state of bicycle infrastructure, safety, and seasonal/weather variations. Survey distribution occurred at selected sites around the City that were identified destinations for cyclists. These included the Farmer's Market, Ski Rack, Outdoor Gear Exchange, Bike Recycle and Summervale. Lev’s analysis also broke down the data by demographics. The most popular road segments turned out to be North and South Winooski Avenue, Pine Street and Riverside Avenue. The most cited favorite cycling place (by far) was the Waterfront Bike Path. Protected bike lanes were the most desired infrastructure investment while car traffic and speed were the features most to be avoided. Winter conditions did inhibit survey responders from cycling in those months with icy roads and snow on the roads being the greatest deterrents. Lev concluded with five recommendations: Improving South Winooski Avenue, better bike lanes on Pine Street, protected bike lanes on North Avenue, improving pavement condition, and a bike box at the Pearl St/Winooski Avenue intersection.
7. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports
Peter referred members to the list on the back of the agenda. There were no questions or comments.

8. CCRPC November Board Meeting Report
Peter noted that the Board held a public hearing to add the I-89 Exit 16 Park and Ride to the TIP. He also mentioned that Charlie and Michele reported on their meetings with local governments which included discussion on the FY16 UPWP.

9. Chairman’s/Members’ Items
Dennis Lutz reported that the area’s lone traffic signal contractor was retiring and there was no one to take his place. He wanted to further discuss this with other towns and wondered if VTrans could get involved.

The meeting adjourned at 10:50 a.m.

Respectfully submitted, Peter Keating
DATE: Tuesday, January 6, 2015
TIME: 9:00 a.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Office, 110 West Canal St. Winooski, VT

Bryan Osborne convened the meeting at 9:05AM.

1. Consent Agenda
There was no consent agenda this month.

2. Approval of Minutes
Bryan asked for a motion to approve the December TAC minutes.
A MOTION WAS MADE TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 2, 2014 BY DENNIS LUTZ AND SECONDED BY BOB HENNEBERGER. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. Public Comments
No members of the public were present.

4. Remarks from MPO Director
Michele Boomhower said that “today” (1/6) was her last day at the CCRPC. She remarked that it has been a great pleasure working with the people in this county and that she was proud of the accomplishments that we have undertaken as a group of partners at the local, regional, state and federal level. It has been an amazing time—the merger, the CIRC Alternatives process /other efforts that have been recognized at the local, state and national level. She mentioned how pleasurable it has been to work specifically on transportation issues as the MPO director and this work will continue as she moves to VTrans. Michele reiterated that she appreciated the opportunity to work with the TAC and CCRPC staff and that she is looking forward to continue working with all as she moves to VTrans; the relationship will only be strengthened as she continuous the work to implement a number of initiatives that we were involved with here at the CCRPC. Bryan read a resolution in appreciation of Michele Boomhower’s accomplishments that the Colchester Selectboard will be signing on January 13– see resolution at the end of the TAC minutes.
5. VT Local Roads
Paul Keegan introduced himself as the interim manager of the Vermont Local Roads Program. He talked briefly about the goal of this program which is to provide technical assistance to municipalities and other organizations (road foremen, other municipal/RPC staff) on transportation issues through workshops and the Circuit Riders. Paul remarked that the transition from St Mike’s (past 32 years) to VTrans was difficult at first but things are improving considerably. He indicated that the core functions of the program will remain the same while the transition to VTrans allows them to increase the number of workshops offered by opening exclusive (up to now) VTrans workshops to municipalities; in addition, on-site technical assistance to municipalities will improve by hiring another Circuit Rider (for a total of two). Paul emphasized how important it is for towns to be on their list-serve so that they can receive information about upcoming programs/workshops and that is also a great way to get feedback from the municipalities.

There was extensive discussion following Paul’s overview of the Local Roads program. Responding to a question on the fee structure, Paul indicated that there will be no fee for their services anymore which is a benefit to municipalities. Justin Rabidoux indicated that the flyers (hard copy) that were sent to municipalities describing available courses are very useful as they provide a chance for Public Works staff that don’t have access to computers/internet to sign up for relevant courses. Paul answered that this is very useful information to have and that for the next 12 to 18 months they will probably continue sending the flyers out but they are hoping to transition to all electronic communications at some point in the future to reduce costs. Dennis Lutz talked about tailoring or targeting different classes for transportation staff with different levels of experience or expertise. Bryan asked whether they are considering offering the Management Academy course any time in the future. Paul answered that he liked all comments and suggestions offered and they will explore all these options. Responding to Chris Jolly’s question on what will be the program’s staff structure once the transition is complete, Paul said that there will be three permanent staff: the Vermont Local Roads Manager (the position was just filled) and 2 Circuit Riders. In addition, VTrans Training Center Staff (where the program is now housed) will also be able to provide assistance—there are currently eight permanent staff at the center.

6. Pavement Leveling Priorities
Christine Forde indicated that there is an item in the TAC packet that discusses/explains the prioritization methodology for the district pavement leveling projects (State FY16 - beginning July 1, 2015). The four Chittenden County projects that we were asked to prioritize are described in the packet as well as their ranking after prioritization. Christine used the prioritization methodology used for the TIP projects which is not a great fit for maintenance projects—by using this methodology the roadway’s functional class becomes the deciding factor in scoring the projects. The condition of the road was also important in determining the ranking— the project on US2 in Bolton, while not on an arterial roadway, is second on the project list because it has the worst pavement condition. Christine explained that the RPC and VTrans scores are combined for the final project score and she indicated that Matt Langham can talk about the VTrans methodology further.

Responding to Justin’s question on how this (RPC) prioritization information is used by VTrans, Matt provided a brief overview of the process which includes the following steps:
- The Districts develop the leveling project lists (9 or 10 per District) throughout Vermont
- The project lists are sent to the RPCs for prioritization
- Once the RPC rankings are provided, VTrans staff from various divisions (highway, operations, planning) and RPC staff meet to select projects in a way that distributes the available funds (11 million was last year’s budget) equitably around the state. Usually, two projects are selected per District per year depending on the project bids.
• The RPC priority/ranking is used as a tie-breaker but in the past the VTrans recommendations were in line with the RPC rankings

Responding to further questions on the nature of the pavement leveling projects, Matt answered that these are purely maintenance projects that don’t qualify for federal funds and they include only a Shim layer which is a thin asphalt layer over an existing paved surface.

Bryan commented that one of the biggest problems with old state routes that have concrete beds underneath is that over the years they are widened, due to maintenance treatments, way beyond the concrete slabs; this can result in a 2-3 feet of shoulder that is at a different level than the road surface/travel lanes. This situation gets worse once you start introducing curbs to these roadways. He remarked that this situation can be unsafe for all users but especially for bicyclists and motorcycle riders. Through his travel around the state he observed that there are areas where VTrans has paved miles of these shoulders to improve the condition and safety of the roadways. Bryan asked Matt if that would be a more economical approach to address some of these issues/problems for these routes, Matt answered that these (more involved) treatments fall under different, and usually more expensive, maintenance programs.

Matt and Amy Bell discussed a number of maintenance projects scheduled around the state that they will be getting different maintenance treatments.

A MOTION WAS MADE TO APPROVE THE PAVEMENT LEVELING PRIORITIES AS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF BY JUSTIN RABIDOUX AND SECONDED BY DENNIS LUTZ. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

7. Consultant Selection – South Burlington Planning Study

Lee Krohn discussed the goal and RFP process for the Chamberlin Neighborhood - Airport Area Transportation - Land Use Study in South Burlington. The CCRPC received 2 proposals in response to this RFP from the following consultant teams:

- LandWorks, DuBois & King, Inc., Adamant Accord, and Noise Pollution Clearinghouse; and

The proposals were reviewed and consultant interviews conducted by the selection committee consisting of CCRPC and South Burlington staff in December. Following the interviews, the committee unanimously agreed that the RSG Consultant team was the best team for this study and recommends that the TAC approves the RSG team for this project. Following Lee’s overview of the process, Bob asked if the FAA has requirements or restrictions for the open land after houses that are purchased by the airport are removed. Justin answered that the Airport Master Plan indicates what uses are allowed under FAA rules.

A MOTION WAS MADE TO APPROVE THE RSG CONSULTANT TEAM FOR THE CHAMBERLIN NEIGHBORHOOD PROJECT AS RECOMMENDED BY THE SELECTION COMMITTEE BY DENNIS LUTZ AND SECONDED BY BRUCE HOAR. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

8. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports

Bryan referred members to the list of projects on the back of the agenda. There were no questions or comments from TAC members.

Michele indicated that the FY16 UPWP Committee has been formed and Andy Montroll will “officially” appoint the Committee at the January 21 Board Meeting. The TAC representatives to this committee are: Justin Rabidoux, South Burlington; and Barbara Elliott, Huntington.
Chris Dubin briefly discussed VTrans’ request for information on unofficial Park & Rides at each municipality and he asked TAC members to e-mail him with any information that they might have. Michele asked Chris to send an e-mail to the TAC requesting this information.

Bryan asked about the State’s Park & Ride (P&R) Plan. Amy responded that the goal is to refresh and update the existing plan that is quite old and answer the basic questions of where we are going (needs & goals) and how are we getting there (ways to achieve the goals). She also commented that the new plan that RSG is working on will address maintenance issues; focus on strategic investments; include public transit needs; and discuss public/private partnerships. Responding to Bryan’s question on funding for state P&R lots, Amy said that most of it is CMAQ funding. Dennis commented that the municipal P&R program works but it is small and opportunistic—moving forward we should focus more on public/private partnerships. Bryan commented that we should also be asking what is the effect of P&Rs in areas designated as TIDs and how does that influence the traffic impact fees for the areas.

9. CCRPC December Board Meeting Report
There was no CCRPC Board meeting in December.

10. Chairman’s/Members’ Items
Dennis Lutz asked for a comprehensive schedule of all available grant opportunities for bike/ped programs. Michele responded that we already have the information and we will make it available to all either on the web site or via e-mail.

The meeting adjourned at 10:15 a.m.

Respectfully submitted, Eleni Churchill
RESOLUTION IN APPRECIATION OF
MICHÈLE BOOMHOWER

WHEREAS, Michele joined the Chittenden County Metropolitan Planning Organization (CCMPO) as Executive Director in the fall of 2008; and

WHEREAS, Michele has been a tremendous asset to the Chittenden County Metropolitan Planning Organization, the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC) and the member communities, and has been a leader of positive change and creative solutions to the issues facing Chittenden County, including the merger of CCMPO and CCRPC, the Circ Alternatives process, various regional and statewide planning initiatives and more; and

WHEREAS, Michele has been instrumental in helping the Town of Colchester advance critical infrastructure projects including the Campus Connector Road project, the Exit 16 interchange, Severance Corners, Exit 17 interchange, and many miles of pedestrian facilities making Colchester a safer and more walkable community, now therefore

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Colchester Selectboard and Town’s Administration, on behalf of the citizens of the Town of Colchester, hereby extend our most sincere appreciation to Michele Boomhower for her leadership, guidance, and tireless efforts to improve the transportation systems and the overall quality of life in Chittenden County and the Town of Colchester.

ADOPTED THIS 13TH DAY OF JANUARY 2015 BY
THE COLCHESTER SELECTBOARD

______________________________
Nadine Scibek, Chair

______________________________
Herbert Downing, Vice Chair

______________________________
Thomas Mulcahy, Clerk

______________________________
Marc Landry

______________________________
Jeffrey D. Bartley

______________________________
Dawn H. Francis, Town Manager
DATE:  Wednesday, November 12, 2014
TIME:  2:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT

1. Welcome and Introductions
Joss Besse called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m.

2. Approval of September 24, 2014 Minutes
Alex Weinhagen made a motion, seconded by Ken Belliveau, to approve the September 24, 2014 minutes. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.

3. Permit Tracking Research Update
Regina Mahony provided the PAC with a memo describing the permit tracking software research that Lee Krohn has done so far. Regina specifically pointed out the template the Massachusetts RPCs designed for use in Microsoft Access – this is available as a free download; and CitizenServe which Barre City has been using with great success. Regina and Lee will set-up an online live demo of CitizenServe and invite PAC members. CCRPC will continue to research the various software packages and provide this information in a simple matrix along with a white paper.

4. Permit Reform Recommendations
Charlie Baker provided the PAC with a general overview of Improving Vermont’s Permitting System – CCRPC Permit Improvement Committee’s recommendations for CCRPC Board approval. These recommendations are not in response to any specific legislation, but more general and contain similar concepts that this Committee drafted in 2011 and 2013. The PAC specifically discussed the Act 250 jurisdiction and Act 250 traffic impact under the Smart Growth recommendations; and review times, vesting and integrated municipal and state permitting recommendations under the Permitting Process recommendations.

Regarding the Act 250 jurisdiction recommendation (Smart Growth #2) discussion included: get rid of rules when duplicative, continue limiting Act 250 review when municipalities are doing good planning, do away with Act 250 review in growth centers by removing thresholds and remove Act 250 jurisdiction for buildings previously built before the designation was established, and remove Village designations from this recommendation as Act 250 concerns may not be addressed adequately with Village Center designations. It was also recommended that Permitting Process #6a be combined with Smart Growth #2. Regarding the Act 250 traffic impact recommendation (Smart Growth #4) clarify this recommendation because Act 250 already provides credit for pre-existing development (but not if vacant for an extended period of time and if the site was not covered by Act 250 previously). Regarding the review times recommendation (Permitting Process #2a) clarify that this refers to State Agencies except Act 250.
Regarding the vesting recommendation (Permitting Process #4a) there was a great deal of discussion over when vesting occurs. Charlie Baker explained the intent behind this recommendation which is to clarify when vesting takes place as it seems to vary by municipality, and to provide developers with an immutable decision on number of units and use prior to detailed and costly engineering - understanding that if that engineering requires a change in the number of units they’d have to amend. Williston’s regulations are very clear when vesting occurs, Colchester relies on case law that points to preliminary decisions as vested, Hinesburg considers sketch approval vested since the DRB takes a formal vote and issues a written decision. Paul Conner indicated that there may be some benefit in clarifying this in State Statute, however that will then remove a level of flexibility at the municipal level that can be helpful in establishing streamlining appropriate to each municipality. The PAC asked if this is creating a problem rather than correcting one that may not exist. Regina explained that the recommendation is rooted in a feeling that the development community doesn’t know when vesting occurs from one municipality to the next (this was also expressed at the Vermont Developers conference) and that costly engineering is needed before vesting occurs. Ken Belliveau explained in Williston you can’t figure out your density without doing some pretty sophisticated engineering. The recommendation should be clarified that we are talking about local approvals. Alex Weinhagen indicated that the language as written does not specify how and when vesting should happen, it just recommends that it be clarified, and he stated that he is fine with that recommendation.

Regarding the integrated municipal and state permitting recommendations (Permitting Process #6c) South Burlington has not conditioned DRB approvals on State permits because they don’t want it to be assumed that they are enforcing those permits, Williston does and you can’t get a Zoning Permit until you show the necessary State permits. Sarah Hadd stated that we are basically moving to this already with various requirements and she sees no problem with doing this – it seems like a reasonable responsibility to take on along with asking for limited Act 250 reviews.

Clare Rock suggested a recommendation to modernize notice requirements to allow for other options (as opposed to certified mail) and include consistent municipal review notifications. Dean Pierce described that they have done this within their own bylaws. The PAC also discussed that certified mailings are appropriate for some things like decisions and zoning violations.

5. Act 250 Potential Review Policy Changes
Regina Mahony provided the PAC with a memo describing three legislative changes that impact Act 250, and described how CCRPC is addressing these changes in their Act 250 reviews. These changes and discussion included:

- Act 147 of 2014 replaced the previous 10 VSA §6086(a)(9)(L) ‘Rural Growth Areas’ with ‘Settlement Patterns’, effective June 1, 2014. Regina showed the PAC the location of three recent Act 250 applications and showed how CCRPC interpreted the new 9(L) in these circumstances. In one circumstance, next to the The Essex, it was clear that the project area met the definition of existing settlement. However, projects on Water Tower Hill in Colchester and off of Industrial Avenue in Williston don’t meet the strict definition of existing settlement despite the fact that these areas are clearly already developed and really don’t represent strip development. However, CCRPC found that they do meet the definition of strip development and the projects are clearly infill and therefore should meet 9(L) – however, it still doesn’t seem like the correct analysis that these areas should be reviewed through as existing office parks and industrial parks are not acknowledged within the existing definitions. Regina indicated that CCRPC will likely provide the Natural Resources Board with feedback on these. The PAC indicated that there are some facilities – like a metal recycling facility – that should clearly be in an industrial area and not in Downtowns.

- Act 147 of 2014 added 10 VSA §6086(a)(5)(B) – incorporation of transportation demand management strategies, effective June 1, 2014. Regina indicated that CCRPC has already been making TDM recommendations and this new criterion helps support these efforts in appropriate areas.

- Act 145 of 2014 established a mechanism for collection of transportation impact fees, effective July 1, 2014. Regina indicated that the District Commission has been conditioning permits with
transportation impact fees and CCRPC is trying to recommending the collection of impact fees in an equitable manner.

Regina explained that the Executive Committee reviewed these changes as well. At this time they don’t feel a change is needed to the CCRPC Guidelines and Standards for Reviewing Act 250 and Section 248 Applications, however they suggested we may want to provide feedback to the Natural Resources Board as they develop rulemaking on 9(L).

6. Jericho Plan Public Hearing for Amendments to the 2011 Town Plan

Public hearing opened (3:55pm). No one from the public was in attendance. Public Hearing closed.

Regina Mahony provided an overview of the Plan amendments. The Town of Jericho is on schedule to update their Town Plan in 2016; however with Act 59 they had to update their Town Plan to include a Village Center Designation map in order to renew their designation. Because flood resiliency and economic development are new requirements since the last Plan update, flood resiliency language had to be included, and economic development was already included. Regina found that these sections met the requirements and recommended that the PAC forward the Plan to the CCRPC Board for approval. The Selectboard has their public hearing the night before the CCRPC Board hearing.

Ken Belliveau indicated that the majority of the data is from the 2000 Census since the 2011 Plan was likely drafted before the 2010 Census was released. With this approval the Plan won’t need to be updated until 2019 and the data will then be 20 years old. The PAC discussed how this has been addressed in the past. Regina indicated that we don’t have any real authority to provide our approval for a period of time less than 5 years. Paul Conner agreed with the importance of updating the data, however, not for the sake of updating without any new analysis. Sarah Hadd indicated that there is some 2010 housing data included and it shows relatively flat growth, so the data isn’t likely to show much change even if it was updated. In addition, they recognized that in this case Jericho is being forced to do a Plan amendment prior to when they otherwise would. Jennifer Murray indicated that they still intend to update the Plan in 2016 (though largely for the FBC area only), and they are only referring to this as an interim update. Ken Belliveau indicated that it would be helpful to have a set policy on this so everyone is on the same playing field. The PAC decided to add a note to their motion identifying that they understand the data will be updated in 2016.

There was also some discussion regarding whether flood resiliency was clearly included in the goals and strategies. While the content is there the exact words are not. The Staff report included a recommendation that this connection is improved in the next Plan. Clare Rock asked if the State provides any specific guidance in how to meet the new requirement. The PAC described that there is a lot of flexibility in how you can properly plan for flood resiliency because municipalities have different circumstances - including entire downtowns within floodplains. There was also some discussion about the budget and how the miscellaneous line has decreased, and how this is unfortunate as that money could be leveraged as matches for MPGs and other planning grants.

Alex Weinhagen made a motion, seconded by Paul Conner, that the PAC finds that the draft 2014 Jericho Town Plan, as submitted, meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC approval, and that the municipality's planning process meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC confirmation, recognizing that the Town will do a more complete update in 2016 including a data update. Upon notification that the Plan has been adopted by the municipality, CCRPC staff will review the plan, and any information relevant to the confirmation process, for changes. If staff determines that changes are substantive, those changes will be forwarded to the PAC for review. Otherwise the PAC recommends that the Plan, and the municipal planning process, should be forwarded to the CCRPC Board for approval. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED. Jennifer Murray abstained.
6. Regional Act 250/Section 248 Projects in the Horizon

- Burlington – Nothing new
- Williston – Nothing new
- Shelburne – new project east of Mobile Home Park with approximately 100 units
- Colchester – explained an interesting Act 250 decision for a veterinary application up by Exit 17 which was required to do onsite ag mitigation for two acres. The location is in between the existing vet office and a dog kennel and been under the same ownership for quite some time. Not likely to be a location for a farm.
- Bolton – nothing
- Jericho – nothing new
- Richmond – nothing
- Hinesburg – 10,000 sq.ft. of commercial behind Kinney Drug.
- So. Burlington – 40 – 50 units behind Willie Racine Jeep; Meadowland Business Park with 3 lots and 1 commercial building for 15,000 ft.sq. and the Kimball Ave. Ireland project.
- Winooski – nothing new

6. Other Business

a. Meeting schedule – Regina has not heard any challenges with meeting on the second Wednesday of the month, so the PAC will stick with that new day and the next meeting will take place on January 14th from 2:30 to 4:30pm.
b. CCRPC TMDL Recommendations – the Executive Committee memo was included in your packet as a FYI. These were reviewed by the TAC and the Executive Committee and submitted to the State.
c. DHCD Planning Manual Update – Act 146 of 2014 is requiring ACCD to update the Planning Manual. They plan to get it done in house within the year. The PAC wondered if new planners would be a good target audience for this as they would more likely use it, though the PAC in its entirety would be happy to vet pieces of the new Plan along the way. Regina suggested that this is also a helpful resource for new Board/Commission members. Sarah indicated that they only intend to publish the new manual on the web so perhaps CCRPC could provide some funding for printing a few for those who are not yet online.
d. Sustaining Agriculture Guide – Regina quickly showed the PAC the online location for the newly released Sustaining Ag Guide modules.

e. UPWP Requests – Regina explained that the UPWP solicitation will go out this week, and reminded the PAC to please ask for all the assistance you think you will need including Staff hours.
f. Clare Rock asked about adding CRS to a PAC agenda. Regina will add it to the list and ask Dan about it as he has been helping Colchester with this.

7. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m. The next meeting will take place on November 12, 2014 from 2:30pm to 4:30pm.

Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony