REGULAR MEETING & PUBLIC FORUM AGENDA
Wednesday, January 20, 2016 – 6:00 p.m.
CCRPC Offices: 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202
Winooski, VT 05404

5:30 BOARD TRAINING – Emergency Management and Mitigation – Lee & Dan

● CONSENT AGENDA – NONE

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) – Nothing this month
4. Approve Minutes November 18, 2015 CCRPC Board Meeting* (Action; 2 minutes)
5. Public Forum for FY17 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)* (Information; 10 minutes)
6. Approval of 2016 Jericho Town Plan and Confirmation Process* (Action: 5 minutes)
7. Warn Public Hearing for ECOS Plan Update for March 16th Board meeting* (Action: 5 minutes)
8. FY16 Mid-Year Adjustment Approval* (Action: 10 minutes)
9. ITS Plan Update Presentation and Approval* (Action: 30 minutes)
10. Approve District Leveling recommendations* (Action: 5 minutes)
11. Executive Director’s Updates (Information; 10 minutes)
   a. Legislative Breakfast
   b. ECOS Annual Report
   c. MOU with VTrans and CCTA
   d. CCRPC 50th Anniversary
   e. Monthly report (to be sent separately)
12. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports * (Information, 5 minutes)
   a. Executive Committee (minutes, Dec. 2-2015 & Draft Jan. 6, 2016)*
      ii. Act 250/Sec 248 letters*
   b. Transportation Advisory Committee (minutes December 1, 2015 & draft from January 5, 2016)*
   c. Long Range Planning Committee (minutes December 9, 2015 and draft from January 12, 2016)*
   d. Clean Water Advisory Committee (CWAC) (minutes December 1, 2015*)
   e. Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) (draft minutes November 18, 2015)*
13. Members’ Items, Other Business (Information, 5 minutes)
14. Adjourn

The January 20th Chittenden County RPC meeting will air on Friday, January 29, 2016 at 1 p.m. and will be available on the web by January 23, 2016 at: http://www.cctv.org/watch-tv/programs/chittenden-county-regional-planning-commission-

Upcoming Meetings - Unless otherwise noted, all meetings are held at our offices:
• FY17 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Committee Meeting: Thurs., Jan 28, 2016; 5:30-7:0) p.m.
• Transportation Advisory Committee – Tuesday, February 2, 2016 9:00 a.m.
• Clean Water Advisory Committee – Tuesday, February 2, 2016, 11:00 a.m.
• Executive Committee, Wednesday, February 3, 2016; 5:45 p.m.
• All Hazard Mitigation Plan Committee - TBD
• CCRPC Board Training/Meeting - Wednesday, February 17, 2016; 5:30 p.m./6:00 p.m.

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 Vaughn, CCRPC Title VI Coordinator, at 802-846-4490 ext. *21 or evaughn@ccrpcvt.org, no later than 3 business days prior to the meeting for which services are requested.
1. Call to order and changes to the agenda. The meeting was called to order at 6:05 p.m. by the Chair, Andy Montroll. He thanked Regina Mahony for the training session on Regional Planning, which was held at 5:30 p.m. Charlie noted that item 8 should read ECOS accomplishments, not ECOS indicators.

2. Public Comment Period for items NOT on the agenda. There were none.

3. Action on consent agenda. There were no items on the consent agenda.

4. Approval of October 21, 2015 Meeting Minutes. CATHERINE McMAINS MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O’BRIEN, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 21, 2015 WITH ANY CHANGES. MOTION CARRIED WITH ABSENCE FROM DAVE TILTON, BRIAN BIGELOW AND GEORGE SCHIAVONE.

5. FY15 Audit Report. Andy introduced Fred Duplessis, a principal at Sullivan Powers & Co., the firm that prepared our audit. Mr. Duplessis gave an overview of the FY15 financial reports and management letter. It basically states that our financial statements are in conformance with generally accepted government auditing standards. The major change this year for us, and municipalities, is that we are required to include our portion of the unfunded balance of the Vermont Municipal Employees Retirement Fund. The fund is 98% funded at this time. Our total liability is $44,000 out of $9 million. The Management Discussion and Analysis (MD&A) begins on
page 4 and it gives a good summary of what’s happened. We ended up with a small deficit. We had budgeted for an $80,000 deficit, but it was only $39,000. This was caused by truing up the indirect rate from previous years. The last page – Summary of Auditor’s Results – shows that they issued a clean opinion and there were no deficiencies. There are good controls and good checks and balances. They audited two programs – Federal Highway planning funds and Federal Transit Administration planning funds. CCRPC retains its status as a low-risk auditee.

Andy noted that the Executive and Finance Committee members met with Fred earlier this month; and as we’ve been doing in the past few years, we met without staff to ask pointed questions. Fred then answered questions for board members. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JEFF CARR, TO ACCEPT THE FY15 AUDIT REPORT. MOTION CARRIED WITH TIM BAECHLE ABSTAINING.

6. MOU with VTrans and CCTA. Charlie noted that federal regulations require that MPOs have an agreement with the state DOT and transit authority. The last one was signed in 2002. We are cleaning things up post-merger. Charlie reviewed this page by page. The first significant change has to do with amending the UPWP.

- 4.a. is new language that refers to reality of when we do the mid-year adjustment. He described the process.
- There is new Section IV. Number 2 adds Corridor studies and other transportation planning studies. There are new items i. and j. on page 9. i. CCRPC acknowledges that conducting a scoping study does not guarantee project advancement. J. VTrans reserves the right to advance an alternative different from the municipally preferred alternative. Jeff Carr wondered why we would include language that VTrans can do what they please. Amy said this doesn’t have to be in the MOU because after a scoping study is done, the project development process continues at VTrans and things are taken to the public and choices are made. Charlie said the process has been that VTrans presents the alternative to the municipality. Jeff Carr would like to have an explanation of why they want to do a different alternative. Discussion continued about communication to the municipality with the rationale for a change.
- Page 9, Item 4. Add Section 248 to the title.
- Page 10 - we added participation in Transportation Improvement Districts.

7. Legislative Breakfast. Charlie noted that there will be a legislative breakfast on Thursday, December 10th from 7:30-9:00 a.m. at the DoubleTree. He has been having informal discussions with managers and others to see what we should talk to our legislators about. We have more than half of our legislators signed up. We surveyed the legislators last year and they wanted to do it again. They recommended we limit the number of topics to 3. We’ve tried to come up with some ideas for rural communities. The ideas we’re contemplating are: Water Quality Funding; ANR PILOT (payment in lieu of taxes); and municipal shared services. Charlie then asked members for other things they feel are more important. He noted that last year he gave a brief introduction on each topic and then either a board member or municipal selectboard member/manager discussed the topic in more detail. Deadline for comments on topics are due by December 2nd before the Executive Committee meeting. Jeff Carr wondered if we were missing an opportunity to hear from gubernatorial candidates; and perhaps reduce the topic areas by one. Members agreed to invite gubernatorial candidates to come. Andrea Morgante wondered if we should eliminate water quality...
since legislation was passed this year. Wouldn’t it be better for participating in Section 248 hearings. Justin Dextredeur said the TMDL regulations will be coming up which will impact all communities. Legislature will have to deal with the water quality TMDL guidelines this session before Section 248 issues. Charlie said there is a movement to use RPCs as a compromise to develop regional energy plans that include siting and thus have more weight in the process. One of the things that he found was that that doesn’t seem to have been much of an issue in Chittenden County. Marc looks at this as a hot potato and he feels the answer in is Montpelier. Andrea said we should get expertise in the energy area or hire a consultant so we can speak to that in Act 250 arena, and not just transportation. (Dan Kerin came in.)

8. **ECOS Accomplishments.** Regina said every year as a part of the ECOS Indicator Report we like to highlight what our member municipalities and partners have accomplished. We’d like the board’s input in collecting FY15 accomplishments under the 8 ECOS strategies, which are listed in the memo. She’s looking for 1-2 things from each municipality this year.

- Dan Kerin said Essex and Essex Junction are looking to share services. They’re looking to merge the highway departments; they’ve consolidated tax billings and unified managers; and all departments are working together. They’re also looking into having employees from town and village to be paid under one payroll system. The village plan will be incorporated as part of the town plan. Jeff noted they did a 2½ year study. When they did a bond issue, they did a huge public information effort to show savings. They also recently merged the school districts along with Westford.
- Chris Shaw said South Burlington now has a TIF district and Housing Trust Fund.
- Chris Roy said Williston has been doing a lot with stormwater quality and we should contact James Sherrard for more information.
- Catherine said Jericho may be getting a grocery store in the village center with the form based code which is in effect.
- Andy said Burlington’s form based code should be done soon. Use for FY16.

And Andy suggested members get other things to Regina as soon as possible.

9. **Executive Director’s Update.** Charlie noted that this Director’s report was emailed on Monday. He asked members if they find it useful and all agreed it was.

10. (omitted from agenda)

11. **Committee/Liaison Activities.** Andy noted the various committee minutes were included in the packet.

12. **Members’ items/other business.** It was noted that there will be no board meeting in December. Only the legislative breakfast.

13. **Adjourn.** JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MARC LANDRY, TO ADJOURN AT 7:06 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc
Chittenden County RPC 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 CCRPC’s regular Board meeting on Wednesday, January 20 at 6 p.m. at the CCRPC offices (110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski). Comments will also be accepted until January 22 via email (bdavis@ccrpcvt.org) or by phone (802-861-0129). The CCRPC’s current work plan is available online at http://www.ccrpcvt.org/workplan/. Residents are strongly encouraged to discuss project ideas with their municipal staff and officials, as local support and matching funds are typically required for projects.

The CCRPC provides planning and technical assistance in the areas of community development, transportation, agriculture, natural resources, housing, economic development, and emergency management to the 19 municipalities of Chittenden County and the public. The collaboration between the CCRPC, Chittenden County municipalities and other related resource agencies results in the development and implementation of plans that support sustainable development and improve the region’s environment and quality of life. For more information about the CCRPC, please visit ccrpcvt.org.

Note that while CCRPC funds cannot be used for construction projects, the organization’s planning helps projects get closer to reality. The final work program will be approved in May 2016. 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 Vaughn, CCRPC Title VI Coordinator, at 802-846-4490 ext *21 or evaughn@ccrpcvt.org, at least 3 business days prior to the meeting.

# # #
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission  
January 20, 2016  
Agenda Item 6: Jericho Town Plan Amendment Approval and Confirmation

**Issues:**

The Town of Jericho has requested, per Title 24 V.S.A §4350, that the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (1) approve its 2015 Town Plan; and (2) confirm its planning process.

Attached is the proposed Resolution of approval and the staff report to the Planning Advisory Committee. The Planning Advisory Committee met on November 18, 2015 and recommended that the Plan, and the municipal planning process, should be forwarded to the CCRPC Board for approval. This meeting served as the public hearing for the Plan and was warned as such.

The Plan has been adopted by the Jericho Selectboard on January 7, 2016 without substantial changes. Some clarifications of intent were made to the plan after Planning Advisory Committee review, which do not constitute substantial changes. A summary of these changes is attached. Staff is recommending approval by the CCRPC Board at this time.

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 and reviewed the Plan on Wednesday, November 18, 2015 at the CCRPC Offices and made the following motion:

The PAC finds that the draft 2016 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.

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.

**Executive Committee Recommendation:**

NA

**Staff Recommendation:**

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

**For more information contact:**

Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager  
802-846-4490 x28; rmahony@ccrpcvt.org
MEMORANDUM

From: Katherine Sonnick, Planning Coordinator
Date: January 11, 2016
RE: Selectboard Amendments to the 2016 Jericho Town Plan

At the December 17, 2015 Jericho Selectboard public hearing, the following changes were approved by the Selectboard to be included in the draft of the Town Plan.

1) Page 15, Commercial district description in the Land Use Chapter. The Selectboard believes that the red underlined text will clarify the description of the district.

   The rural character of the VT Route 15 corridor will be enhanced by carefully planned development and suburban strip development shall be avoided. While roadside visibility is important for the viability of some businesses, strip development is prohibited in the district. Strip development is defined as linear commercial development along a VT Route 15 that includes three or more of the following characteristics: broad road frontage, predominance of single-story buildings, limited reliance on shared access to VT Route 15, lack of connection to any existing settlement except by VT Route 15, lack of connection to surrounding land uses except by VT Route 15, lack of coordination with surrounding land uses, and limited accessibility for pedestrians. Access and traffic between VT Route 15, town and private roads, and developed parcels shall be carefully managed. Curb cuts shall be limited to avoid impeding circulation on Route 15, and interior circulation roads shall be required on larger parcels. Green space, landscaping to screen parking from VT Route 15, and other “character of the neighborhood” criteria, must be met in order to preserve the rural character of the community and the views of the mountains.”

2) Page 39, Wetlands section. The red underlined text adds additional protection recommendations for wetlands.

   All Class I and Class II wetlands plus a 50-foot buffer shall be protected from development or other alteration. Additionally all Class III wetlands plus a 50-foot buffer should be protected from development or other alteration.

3) Page 46, Table 4.5, Private Conserved Land. Added Philip Sharpsteen’s 70.45 acres of conserved land on Nashville Road to the table.

4) Page 88, Implementation 9.2.2.1. The term “3-rod” was removed from sentence.
5) Page 98, Recreation and Open Space. Language was changed from the town is “considering forming” to the town “formed” a Recreation Committee.

6) Page 100 and 101, Appointed and Hired Sections. Changed the Treasurer position from “appointed” to “hired”.

7) Page 111, Energy Efficiency and Conservation section, third paragraph. Addition of the following language in red and underlined for clarification purposes at the end of the paragraph:

   Energy efficiency services are also available from Vermont Gas Systems and from Champlain Valley Weatherization Services for qualified households.

8) Added a column in implementation spreadsheet for the Recreation Commission. Also added responsibilities where applicable for the Commission.

At the Selectboard’s January 7, 2016 second public hearing, they made the following changes prior to adopting the Town Plan.

1) Page 45, Table 4.3 Conserved Land with Public Access and Public Open Space was broken out into two tables: Table 4.3 Conserved Land with Public Access and Table 4.4 Public Open Space

2) Pages 45 and 97, Mobbs Farm acreage changed to 278.

3) Page 97, Recreation and Open Space Section. Added the following language in red:

   Barber Farm is a 158-acre parcel which was conserved by the Vermont Land Trust. The majority of the land is being farmed but there is a public access through a short trail, which connects the Kikas Valley Farm to the Barber Farm. This trail potentially could be extended with the consent of another landowner to reach Barber Farm Road.

4) Page 104, the following new implementation task was added:

   Implementation 10.1.5.7. Consider the implementation of a municipally operated curbside composting service and offering other composting services.
Staff Review of the 2016 Town of Jericho Comprehensive Town Plan
Emily Nosse-Leirer, CCRPC Planner
November 6, 2015

The Town of Jericho has requested, per 24 V.S.A §4350, that the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (1) approve its 2016 Comprehensive Town Plan; and (2) confirm its planning process.

This draft 2016 Comprehensive Town Plan replaces a 2014 update to the 2011 Town of Jericho Comprehensive Town Plan, which was intended solely to add information about flood resilience and Jericho’s Designated Village Centers. The 2016 Plan is an update of the entire 2011 plan, and incorporates new input from Town boards and residents. CCRPC completed an initial review in June 2015, as the Plan was updated. The review is attached with annotations explaining what was completed. This is an excellent plan that shows clear connections between different aspects of planning. The Jericho Planning Commission’s public hearing will be held on November 17, 2015.

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 2016 Town of Jericho Comprehensive 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 2016 Town of Jericho Comprehensive Town Plan is consistent with all of the general goals of §4302. See the attached Appendix A submittal that describes how the Plan is consistent with these goals.

2. The 2016 Town of Jericho Comprehensive Town Plan is consistent with the specific goals of §4302. See the attached Appendix A submittal that describes how the Plan is consistent with these goals.

3. The 2016 Town of Jericho Comprehensive Town Plan contains the required elements of §4382. See the attached Appendix A submittal that describes compliance with these required elements.

4. The 2016 Town of Jericho Comprehensive 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 2016 Town of Jericho Comprehensive Town Plan is compatible with the municipal plans for Essex, Underhill, Bolton, Richmond and Williston. The towns all have similar goals and visions and the land use strategies on the borders are compatible. The analysis of this issue is thorough.
6. Jericho has a **planning process** in place that is likely to result in an approved plan. In addition Jericho has provided information about their planning budget and CCRPC finds that Jericho is maintaining its efforts to provide local funds for municipal and regional planning.

**Additional Comments/Questions:**
- The connections made between every chapter in the plan are impressively clear and thorough.

**Proposed Motion & Next Steps:**
PROPOSED MOTION: The PAC finds that the draft 2016 Town of Jericho Comprehensive 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.

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. The public hearing was not conducted at this PAC meeting, and therefore should be held by whichever body (PAC or CCRPC Board) sees the Plan next in this review 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 Jericho, Vermont is a member municipality of this Commission; and

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

WHEREAS, The Planning Advisory Committee reviewed the Town Plan and planning process; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Advisory Committee held a warned public hearing at the CCRPC, located at 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, Vermont on Wednesday, November 18, 2015, reviewed the records and recommended that, upon Selectboard adoption, the Commission approve Jericho’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.

WHEREAS, The Town of Jericho’s Selectboard approved the 2016 Jericho Town Plan at its January 7, 2016 meeting;

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 Jericho’s 2016 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 Jericho’s municipal planning process.

Dated at Winooski, this 20th day of January, 2016.

CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

__________________________________
Andy Montroll, Chair
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC)
Resolution
Jericho’s Town Plan & 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 Jericho, Vermont is a member municipality of this Commission; and

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

WHEREAS, The Planning Advisory Committee reviewed the Town Plan and planning process; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Advisory Committee held a warned public hearing at the CCRPC, located at 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, Vermont on Wednesday, November 18, 2015, reviewed the records and recommended that, upon Selectboard adoption, the Commission approve Jericho’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.

WHEREAS, The Town of Jericho’s Selectboard approved the 2016 Jericho Town Plan at its January 7, 2016 meeting;

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 Jericho’s 2016 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 Jericho’s municipal planning process.

Dated at Winooski, this 20th day of January, 2016.

CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

__________________________________________________
Andy Montroll, Chair
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission  
January 20, 2016  
Agenda Item 7: Warn ECOS Plan Amendments Public Hearing

**Issues:** Within our FY16 ACCD Contract we are responsible for making the following updates to the ECOS Plan: Utility/Facilities, Child Care, and Surrounding Regions. We are also responsible for adding a Flood Resiliency element now that it is a new State requirement (this is largely based on the All Hazard Mitigation Plan that is currently being updated by the All Hazards Mitigation Plan Committee).

Staff and the Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC) have been preparing the necessary ECOS Plan amendments since October. The first public hearing will need to take place on March 16, 2016 in order to adopt the updated ECOS Plan by June. It will be too late to warn that public hearing at your February meeting, so we are asking you to warn the hearing now. We will then provide you with a presentation on the proposed amendments at your February board meeting.

The schedule is attached for your information.

---

**Executive Committee Recommendation:** The Executive Committee recommends that the Board warn the first public hearing for the ECOS Plan amendments for Wednesday, March 16, 2016 at 6:00pm.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends that the Board warn the first public hearing for the ECOS Plan amendments for Wednesday, March 16, 2016 at 6:00pm.

**Staff Contact:** Contact Regina Mahony with any questions: rmahony@ccrpcvt.org, 846-4490 ext. 28.
### ECOS Plan Update Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>AHMP</th>
<th>LRPC</th>
<th>TAC</th>
<th>PAC</th>
<th>Exec. Comm.</th>
<th>CCRPC Board</th>
<th>Key Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9-Sep-15</td>
<td>AHMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AHMP Committee reviews comments on Chittenden County AHMP Hazards and Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-Oct-15</td>
<td></td>
<td>LRPC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LRPC reviews Utility/Facilities, Earth Extraction and Child Care ECOS Plan Update Sections (Chapter 2 and 3 if needed).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Nov-15</td>
<td>AHMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AHMP Committee reviews draft Chittenden County AHMP Hazards and Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Dec-15</td>
<td></td>
<td>LRPC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LRPC continues to review Utility/Facilities, Earth Extraction and Child Care sections; and reviews Surrounding Regions, and Chittenden County AHMP Strategies and Draft Flood Resiliency outline for ECOS Plan Update (likely for Chapter 2 and 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Jan-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Committee reviewed scheduled for the ECOS Plan Update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-Jan-16</td>
<td></td>
<td>LRPC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LRPC meets to review Flood Resiliency section, ECOS Project list with WWTP upgrades (from TMDL), and incorporate all final edits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**End of January, 2016**

Staff sends the Plan to interested parties and publishes hearing notice in the paper no later than February 15, 2016. This begins the public comment period for the ECOS Plan Update.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>TAC</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/2/2016 Or</td>
<td>TAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TAC reviews ECOS Plan Update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Mar-16</td>
<td>PAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PAC reviews ECOS Plan Update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-Mar-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>Board holds First Public Hearing, and warns second public hearing for May 18, 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Apr-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Committee reviews comments and revisions to the ECOS Plan if needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-Apr-16</td>
<td></td>
<td>LRPC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LRPC reviews comments and revisions to the ECOS Plan if needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Early April, 2016**

Staff sends the Plan to interested parties and publishes hearing notice in the paper no later than April 18, 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Board</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-Apr-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Board reviews any comments and revisions to the ECOS Plan if needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-May-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>Board holds second Public Hearing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Jun-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>ECOS Plan update is adopted at the Annual Meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CCRPC Board
01/20/2016
Agenda Item 8: Action Item

FY 16 Mid-Year Adjustment

**Background:** Each year CCRPC reviews the approved work program and budget at mid-year and makes changes where needed. Some consultant projects don’t begin until mid-year so funds are adjusted to reflect how much we believe will be spent by June 30th. Some may require additional funds to complete. Staff makes adjustments from time estimated in the UPWP tasks to where they’ve actually been spending their time.

In the Mid-Year Adjustment document (posted separately) we have shown the original budget amount, the mid-year projected amount and the difference, whether up or down.

**Yellow highlighted** areas indicate that changes were made either in task description or consultant dollars. If the whole line is highlighted it means the task was added at mid-year. In some cases we hadn’t anticipated a task needing to continue into FY16 and in other cases, we hadn’t anticipated the task at all, (i.e. Winooski River Bridge – 2.3.5.1).

**Executive Committee Recommendation**
CCRPC staff and the Executive Committee recommend approval of the FY16 Mid-Year Adjustment by the CCRPC Board.

**For more information contact:** Charlie Baker, Executive Director at cbaker@ccrpcvt.org or at 846-4490 ext. *23
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chittenden County RPC</strong></td>
<td><strong>ADOPTED FY16</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mid-Year Adjusted</strong></td>
<td><strong>FY16 to Mid-Year</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Municipal - Regional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Planning Grant - ACCD</td>
<td>$363,145</td>
<td>$364,474</td>
<td>1,329 0.37%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/Town Dues (exclusive of MPO match)</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>1,948 3.37%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS Income</td>
<td>$57,754</td>
<td>$57,742</td>
<td>0 0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Income</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>0 0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income</td>
<td>$1,680</td>
<td>$1,680</td>
<td>0 0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>0 0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Assistance</td>
<td>$33,600</td>
<td>$33,938</td>
<td>338 1.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champlain Valley National Heritage - LCBP</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>0 0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Municipal/Regional Staff Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$460,119</strong></td>
<td><strong>$463,734</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,615 0.79%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO Transportation Staff Funding - FHWA, FTA, VTrans</td>
<td>$1,340,088</td>
<td>$1,276,467</td>
<td>(63,621) -4.75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match Staff</td>
<td>$146,899</td>
<td>$141,830</td>
<td>(7,069) -4.75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regionally Matched Consultant/Dues</strong></td>
<td><strong>$38,075</strong></td>
<td><strong>$43,198</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,123 13.46%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans Prog Mgmt Services</td>
<td>$2,013,248</td>
<td>$1,941,929</td>
<td>(71,319) -3.54%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCSP Grant - FHWA</td>
<td>$1,460,086</td>
<td>$1,460,086</td>
<td>0 0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circ Alternatives Phase II</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$191,361</td>
<td>(8,639) -4.32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Time Traffic - Aid - FHWA</td>
<td>$67,712</td>
<td>$62,662</td>
<td>(5,050) -7.46%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LC Byway 06-04 (Visitor Info. improvements) - FHWA</strong></td>
<td><strong>$250,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$250,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>357 96.93%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LC Byway 06-06 (Interpretation &amp; Outreach) - FHWA</strong></td>
<td><strong>$368</strong></td>
<td><strong>$725</strong></td>
<td><strong>357 96.93%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LC Byway 08-05 (Corridor Mgt Plan &amp; Cap. Bldg) - FHWA</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,631</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,641</strong></td>
<td><strong>10 0.61%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LC Byway 08-06 (Interpretation &amp; Rec Access) - FHWA</strong></td>
<td><strong>$368</strong></td>
<td><strong>$368</strong></td>
<td><strong>0 0.00%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LC Byway 09-02 (Byway Publications) - FHWA</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,209</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,209</strong></td>
<td><strong>0 0.00%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LC Byway 10 -02 Islands Bike Rest Areas - FHWA</strong></td>
<td><strong>$327</strong></td>
<td><strong>$327</strong></td>
<td><strong>0 0.00%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LC Byway 11 -01 Islands &amp; Chittenden Bike Rest Areas - FHWA</strong></td>
<td><strong>$650</strong></td>
<td><strong>$650</strong></td>
<td><strong>0 0.00%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LC Byway 12-011 (Interpretive Planning) - FHWA</strong></td>
<td><strong>$327</strong></td>
<td><strong>$327</strong></td>
<td><strong>0 0.00%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Staff Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,572,084</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,505,521</strong></td>
<td><strong>$66,163 -4.21%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Resources &amp; Energy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownfields 2015 Hazardous - EPA Not Awarded</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0 0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure - ANR</td>
<td>$2,634</td>
<td>$2,634</td>
<td>0 0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Stormwater Education (RPC Staff)</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$24,520</td>
<td>4,520 22.60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality Project</td>
<td>$5,391</td>
<td>$5,391</td>
<td>0 0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604(b) Water Quality Project</td>
<td>$2,020</td>
<td>$2,020</td>
<td>0 0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality - ANR</td>
<td>$3,606</td>
<td>$3,606</td>
<td>0 0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Forest Management Plans</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>0 0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Resources Staff total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,653</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,533</strong></td>
<td><strong>$120 -2.58%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emergency Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emer Mgmt Perf Grant - Chittenden - VEM</td>
<td>$49,911</td>
<td>$50,352</td>
<td>441 0.88%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Hazard Mitigation Plan Update - FEMA</td>
<td>$71,530</td>
<td>$45,221</td>
<td>(26,309) -36.76%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDRP HCOP - ANR</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>0 0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide HMEP</td>
<td>$4,191</td>
<td>$4,185</td>
<td>(6) -0.15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Emergency Png Committee Administration</td>
<td>$2,988</td>
<td>$2,984</td>
<td>(4) -0.14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emergency Management Staff total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$174,550</strong></td>
<td><strong>$146,601</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,949 -16.01%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal - Operations Support</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,211,386</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,169,088</strong></td>
<td><strong>(51,498) -2.32%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal - Project Consultant Income</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,856,023</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,583,619</strong></td>
<td><strong>(272,404) -8.37%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 4,867,096</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 4,753,707</strong></td>
<td><strong>(124,700) -2.56%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal - Operations Support</strong></td>
<td>$2,221,386</td>
<td>$2,169,888</td>
<td>(51,498)</td>
<td>-2.32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal - Project Consultant Income</strong></td>
<td>$2,656,823</td>
<td>$2,583,619</td>
<td>($73,204)</td>
<td>-2.76%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>$4,878,209</td>
<td>$4,753,507</td>
<td>($124,702)</td>
<td>-2.56%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Expenses</strong></th>
<th><strong>ADOPTED FY16</strong></th>
<th><strong>Mid-Year Adjusted</strong></th>
<th><strong>FY16 to Mid-Year</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 Salaries</td>
<td>$1,299,111</td>
<td>$1,282,908</td>
<td>($16,203)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 Benefits</td>
<td>$524,265</td>
<td>$493,046</td>
<td>($31,219)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 Worker’s Comp Insurance</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 Recruitment</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education/Partnerships</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88 Conference &amp; Training</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87 Conference Travel</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89 Program Workshops/Meetings</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 Mileage</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 Electric Vehicles/CarShare</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>($1,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92 Communications/PR</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93 Publications</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office &amp; General Operations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95 Rent</td>
<td>$126,500</td>
<td>$126,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96 Audit/Accounting</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$25,455</td>
<td>$3,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97 Copier</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98 Equipment &amp; Software Maint</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99 Depreciation</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Supplies</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 Telephone/Internet</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102 Postage</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 Equipment Purchase</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>($1,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104 Utilities</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105 Ineligible</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106 Insurance - General Liability</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107 Janitor</td>
<td>$4,400</td>
<td>$4,400</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108 Payroll Processing</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109 Legal</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 Internal Consultants</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>($8,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111 Software Purchase</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112 Reserve</td>
<td>$210</td>
<td>$179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operations Support Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$2,221,386</td>
<td>$2,169,888</td>
<td>($51,498)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Consultant Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$2,656,823</td>
<td>$2,583,619</td>
<td>($73,204)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>$4,878,209</td>
<td>$4,753,507</td>
<td>($124,702)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus/(deficit)</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To correct for the over-recovery of indirect costs in the previous year, we had to reduce our rate from about 82% actual to 79.26% in FY16. The approximately 3% lower Indirect Rate will reduce CCRPC’s revenue about $30,000 in FY16.

*These revenue lines do not include “in-kind” match.
Chittenden County Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Plan – Approve ITS Plan Resolution

Background:
In 2014, the CCRPC hired Cambridge Systematics, Inc. to assist with the update of the 2005 Regional ITS Architecture and development of a 2016 Chittenden County ITS Plan. A Steering Committee was formed to provide general guidance during the development of the plan—see a list of committee members below. An ITS Plan & Architecture is a structured guideline to plan, define, and integrate ITS technology in a region. A regional ITS Plan is required as per USDOT rule 23 CRF Part 940 and FTA policy on transit projects to allow for regionally significant ITS projects to be eligible for federal transportation funding. Other benefits of an ITS Plan include: understanding of regional system gaps and needs; promotion of data and information sharing among partners and discussion of new technologies; and advancement of projects based on regional ITS Strategic Plan.

Steering Committee
- Nicole Losch, City of Burlington
- Justin Rabidoux, South Burlington
- Robert T. White, VTrans
- Meredith Birkett, CCTA (during her tenure at CCTA)
- Katelin Brewer-Colie, Local Motion
- Dick Hosking, VTrans District 5
- Jason Charest, CCRPC
- Eleni Churchill, CCRPC
- Peter Keating, CCRPC

TAC, Executive Committee and Staff Recommendation:
The CCRPC TAC, Executive Committee and staff recommends that the Board approves the 2016 Chittenden County ITS Plan Resolution. The Final Draft ITS Plan can be downloaded from: ftp://ftp.ccrpcvt.org/sai/ITS_Plan_Update/Draft_Report/

CCRPC Staff:
For more information please contact Sai Kumar Sarepalli, (802) 846-4490 ext. *16, ssarepalli@ccrpcvt.org.
RESOLUTION OF THE
CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVING THE 2016
CHITTENDEN COUNTY INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM (ITS) PLAN

WHEREAS, the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC), is one of 11 regional planning commissions in Vermont, and also serves the region as the sole Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) operating within Vermont, acts as the principal forum for planning, policy and community development and is responsible for managing the continuous, cooperative and comprehensive Transportation Planning process in Chittenden County; and

WHEREAS, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) issued a Final Rule 940 and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) issued a similar policy on National ITS Architecture on January 8, 2001 to implement §5206(e) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century; and

WHEREAS, the Rule/Policy requires that any region currently implementing ITS projects shall have a regional ITS architecture in place by April 8, 2005 and that ITS projects funded by the Highway Trust Fund and the Mass Transit Account must conform to the regional ITS architecture; and

WHEREAS, the CCRPC published the Regional Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Architecture for Chittenden County (April, 2005), a “living-document” prepared to guide the planning and implementation of ITS in Chittenden County; and

WHEREAS, the 2025 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), as amended in January 2010, recommends ITS projects to improve travel efficiency and manage traffic flows with technology-based tools; and

WHEREAS, in 2014, the CCRPC hired Cambridge Systematics, Inc. to assist with the update of the 2005 Regional ITS Architecture and development of a 2016 Chittenden County ITS Plan; and

WHEREAS, A Steering Committee was formed to provide general oversight and guidance during the development of the ITS Plan with representation from the Cities of Burlington and South Burlington, the CCRPC, Vermont Agency of Transportation (VTrans), Chittenden County Transportation Authority (CCTA), and Local Motion. Input for the ITS Plan was also gathered from the following organizations: Vermont Department of Motor Vehicles, Vermont State Police, Burlington Airport, University of Vermont (UVM), Greater Burlington Industrial Corporation (GBIC), National Weather Service and the University of Vermont Medical Center; and

WHEREAS, the Chittenden County Technical Advisory Committee and the Executive Committee recommended approval of the Chittenden County ITS Plan at their January 5, and January 6, 2016 meetings, respectively; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission hereby approves the Chittenden County ITS Plan, dated January 2016, as the regional vision and policy plan regarding the use of specific ITS applications to address regional transportation needs.

Dated this 20th day of January 2016 in Winooski, Vermont.

CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

______________________________
Andrew H. Montroll, Chair
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
January 20, 2016
Agenda Item 10: Action Item

VTrans District Pavement Leveling Program

District Leveling Background:
The VTrans District Pavement Leveling Program performs pavement leveling on state highways throughout the state each year. The leveling projects have a limited scope and consist only of providing a thin overlay coat of pavement designed to last until funds become available for a more comprehensive project. These project allow quick improvements to be made to road surfaces at a lower cost per mile so more mileage can be addressed. The methodology for selecting segments for District Leveling is as follows:

Step 1 - Potential projects are identified by the VTrans Asset Management and Performance Bureau and consider the following factors:

- Pavement condition - 20%
- Ride (bumpiness) of the pavement - 30%
- Vehicles per day traveling on the segment - 20%
- Age of the pavement - 10%
- Proportion of the overall project length that is in very poor condition - 20%

Step 2 – The final ranking includes input from both the Regional Planning Commissions and the VTrans Maintenance Districts as follows:

- Asset suitability ranking from Asset Management and Performance Bureau described above – 60%
- District ranking – 20%
- RPC ranking – 20%

Regional Prioritization:
Two projects in Chittenden County were identified by the VTrans Asset Management and Performance Bureau for consideration in state fiscal year 2017 – beginning July 1, 2016. The projects are listed below and a map showing the location of the projects is attached.

- VT2A, St. George-Williston – beginning north of Ayer Road and extending north for 3.8 miles approximately to Hurricane Lane. Pavement condition in this segment varies from Very Poor to Poor.
- VT15, Westford-Cambridge – beginning north of Cowie Road and extending north 3.5 miles approximately to Blanchard Road.

CCRPC staff applied our project prioritization methodology to these projects and developed project ranks. The projects and prioritization results are provided below.

VT2A scores slightly higher because 1) the segment provides access to a village planning area, 2) traffic volumes are higher and 3) a greater proportion of the segment is in Very Poor condition as compared to VT15.
## CCRPC Prioritization

### District Leveling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>CCRPC Score</th>
<th>Planning Designation</th>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Pavement Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Village/Rural</td>
<td>Minor Arterial/Arterial Major Connector</td>
<td>Very Poor/Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Minor Arterial</td>
<td>Very Poor/Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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
District Leveling Projects for Consideration in Chittenden County - 2017

VT2A, St. George - Williston
Approximate Limits – Ayer Road to Hurricane Lane - 3.8 miles
  › Planning Designation: Village/Rural
  › Average Daily Traffic: 5,676 vehicles
  › Functional Class: Minor Arterial/Major Collector

VT15, Westford-Cambridge
Beginning North of Cowie Road Extending North 3.5 miles
(approximately to Blanchard Road)
  › Planning Designation: Rural
  › AADT: 4,300
  › Functional Class: Minor Arterial
The meeting was called to order at 5:40 p.m. by the chair, Andy Montroll.

1. **Changes of the agenda, Members’ Items.** Regina has a Section 248 letter for members to review.

2. **Approval of November 4, 2015 Joint Executive/Finance Committee Meeting Minutes.** LOU MOSSEY MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BRIAN BIGELOW, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 4TH MEETING. MOTION CARRIED WITH JOHN ZICCONI ABSTAINING.

3. **Act 250/Section 248 Applications**
   a. **SolarCity Corporation, Docket No. 8634.** Regina noted that we had discussed this a little last time. Chris Roy recused himself from discussion as his firm has just been retained by SolarCity. This is a project on 38 acres off of W. Milton Road in Milton to construct a 4.9 MW solar electric generation facility. In comparison to other projects we’ve dealt with it’s larger, but you cannot see much of it. We received a letter from the landowner that he now objects to the project, which is not really in our purview. She is not sure what position the Selectboard has taken, and is awaiting word from the manager. The planning commission has no objection. She says it is in conformance with our plan and does not affect transportation.

   John Zicconi wondered about these conforming to our plan. Based on state energy goals of having 90% of our power be from renewable sources and eventually being self-sufficient, it is a good thing, but where does it stop. PSB seems to approve every solar project even if municipality is reticent. Charlie noted that energy siting has been studied over the past couple of years trying to determine a policy on these. Maybe if municipalities have specific wording (but not too specific) in the plan that may have an influence. He expects the recent siting commission will come back with recommendations from the last gubernatorial appointed committee that we should have the RPCs plan for their region. Mike O’Brien wondered if there’s been discussion about pulling the reins to not let this get too far. Lengthy discussion continued about whether we’d put some criteria on it. Our ECOS plan could address this, but it wouldn’t have much weight. Farm fields are being taken up, but the ag department feels we are preserving the land so they don’t have an issue. Charlie said the PSB is going to prepare for a time when the RPCs will be planning this. They have funded 3 RPCs to try to see how this will work and two more will begin in January. PSB said they’ll fund all RPCs beginning July 2016. He anticipates this to be an 18 month – two year project. He also anticipates that the percentage of renewables will increase and then we’ll have to quadruple these solar project to meet that
goal. When asked what impact 4.9 MW is, it was noted that it’s enough to power 1,437 homes.

The project we just approved in Williston is for 2.5 MW.

BRIAN BIGELOW MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY LOU MOSSEY, TO AUTHORIZE CHARLIE BAKER TO SIGN THE LETTER TO THE PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD. MOTION CARRIED WITH CHRIS ROY ABSTAINING.

4. Draft MOU with VTrans and CCTA. John Zicconi said because there is a section dealing with Conflict Resolution which states that in the event we’re not satisfied with the decision of the Secretary of Transportation we can appeal to the Vermont Transportation Board, and he is Executive Secretary he will abstain for all votes on this MOU. Since the Board meeting we have made a couple of changes.

a. Starting at the bottom of page 7, we have added/Sec 248 to any reference of Act 250.

b. Page 9, c. VTrans asked us to reword the last phrase to read “...with the VTrans Project Development Manual or the soon to be adopted VTrans Project Definition Process Guidebook.”

c. On page 9, we have reworded 3.j. to say “Because a number of years can pass between CCRPC’s project scoping and VTrans project development, there may be occasions when VTrans will pursue a preferred alternative different from the municipality-preferred alternative. VTrans and CCRPC will endeavor to work with the municipality to develop a mutually agreed-upon project. VTrans will communicate its final decision and rationale to the municipality following a project’s acceptance into the Capital Program.” Charlie said that after discussions with Michele Boomhower and Amy Bell and Jeff Carr, the original language did not really reflect the reality. He described our experience with the Milton Hourglass project. After some discussion it was agreed to change the middle sentence to read “VTrans and CCRPC will endeavor to work with the municipality in an effort to develop a mutually agreed-upon project.”

d. We deleted the first sentence in 4b on page 9.

e. Page 11, 4b. We changed it to read “The TIP will be developed by CCRPC consistent with the CCRPC bylaws, and PPP, and other applicable policies.”

Charlie then asked if members were comfortable with him sending the revised MOU to VTrans for their legal review. LOU MOSSEY MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CHRIS ROY, TO APPROVE THE REVISED DRAFT TO FORWARD TO VTRANS AND CCTA FOR THEIR APPROVAL. MOTION CARRIED WITH JOHN ZICCONI ABSTAINING.

5. Legislative Breakfast Agenda/Speakers. Charlie asked members if they planned to attend. Lou will not be there. The program as Charlie and Andy discussed will begin with breakfast at 7:30 a.m. Charlie will take a few minutes to talk about key initiatives of the CCRPC for those who don’t deal with us on a regular basis: the new CWAC, ITS plan and AID grant; active transportation plan; land use and zoning efforts; form based code and All Hazards Mitigation Plans. Major topics suggested include: a) Water Quality – Charlie was thinking about asking Tom DiPietro, Dennis Lutz or Bryan Osborne to speak to stormwater/water quality concerns; and the municipal stormwater grant program. Do we want to say that something needs to be done to help pay for these mandates. It was suggested that Dawn Francis could speak to this as well.
b. PILOT – Payment in Lieu of Taxes for state-owned land in municipalities. Charlie will ask a Bolton select person to talk about this, unless Barbara Elliott or Todd Odit want to present the topic.
c. Shared Services and the COG bill. A way for municipalities to work together to share equipment, etc. to get more bang for the buck.

All of these topics are about things that affect municipal budgets and funding needed. Town managers have been involved with this. The only other bill that has attracted his attention is the
permit process improvement bill. This one has been supported by Housing Vermont. The bill as he
understands it is trying to do a couple of things. – Stay the clock on other permits so they don’t
expire while you’re trying to negotiate another one; and the other part of it is they are trying to
have an administrative hearing officer within DEC to have a hearing before it goes to court. Brief
discussion ensued. He thinks he might just recommend people look at this bill. It was suggested
that in case we don’t discuss PILOT, perhaps we should bring up energy siting that may be coming
up. Charlie will work out the program before the Legislative Breakfast.

6. **Chair/Executive Director’s Report.**
   a. Charlie is almost done with municipal visits. He still has Milton and Winooski. Andy noted that
      the overall view is that the RPC does a lot to help out municipalities. John said it’s good for us to
take time to go out and talk to selectboards every once in a while. Charlie has had positive
      reports.
   b. ECOS Annual Report. We’re still looking for accomplishments and will be sending requests to
town managers, planners, the TAC, PAC and board members. This year we’ll try a more low-
tech approach.
   c. COG bill – there have been meetings with some state agencies who have had concerns, so he’s
      been meeting with Commerce and others met with Transportation.
   d. Charlie received another call from Richmond about the creamery property and brownfields
      redevelopment project. They are still looking for a non-profit to take ownership of the property
      for a short time to apply for grant funds to help with the redevelopment. Charlie has been
      hoping GBIC would take it on, but they seem to think it’s too small for them. After much
discussion, members again noted that we are not in that business and would prefer not be
      involved. Even if we could do it, it doesn’t mean we should do it.

7. **Other Business.** It was noted that we should send out a notice that will NOT be a board meeting in
December. Bernie will take care of this.

8. **Executive Session:** None needed.

9. **Adjournment.** MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CHRIS ROY, TO ADJOURN AT 7:05
    P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc
December 4, 2015

Mrs. Susan M. Hudson, Clerk
Vermont Public Service Board
Drawer 20, 112 State Street
Montpelier, VT 05620-2701

RE: SolarCity Corporation, Docket No. 8634
Certificate of Public Good - Section 248 Permit Application

Dear Mrs. Hudson:

Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC) has reviewed the Section 248 application submitted by SolarCity Corporation, Docket No. 8634, for a Certificate of Public Good ("CPG") to construct a 4.9 MW solar electric generation facility off of West Milton Road (the “Lamoille River Solar Project”). We understand that both the Planning Commission and Selectboard of the Town of Milton are aware of the project. Neither group has any objections to the project. However, on November 2, 2015 and December 1, 2015, Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC) received a letter from Edward Robinson, the owner of the land to be leased for the proposed project. In the letters, Mr. Robinson states that he objects to the project.

This project is located in the Enterprise Planning Area as defined in the 2013 Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the Chittenden County ECOS Plan (the Plan). While the Enterprise Planning Areas are generally areas of concentrated employment, the Plan is not intended to prescribe uses and we find that this project is not inconsistent with this planning area. Furthermore, when taking into consideration the energy goals and actions within the Plan that aim to increase renewable energy generation, we find this project to be in conformance with the 2013 Chittenden County Regional Plan.

Due to the detailed level of analysis of renewable energy facilities and its impacts by the Public Service Board, CCRPC will only give specific attention in its Section 248 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. We do not have any transportation related comments for this petition.

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
Date: Wednesday, January 6, 2016
Time: 5:45 p.m.
Place: CCRP Offices, 110 W. Canal Street; Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404
Present: Andy Montroll, Chair
Mike O’Brien, Secretary/Treasurer
Brian Bigelow, At-Large
John Zicconi, At-Large
Charlie Baker, Executive Director
Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
Eleni Churchill, Transportation Program Manager
Forest, Business Manager
Bernie Ferenc, Transportation Business Manager

The meeting was called to order at 5:48 p.m. by the Chair, Andy Montroll.

1. Changes to the Agenda; Members’ Items. Charlie said he has additional items under his ED report: District leveling, stormwater bill, and ECOS annual report. It was also noted that we hadn’t included review of January board meeting agenda. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JOHN ZICCONI, TO ADD THOSE ITEMS TO THE AGENDA. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

2. Approval of December 2, 2015 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JOYN ZICCONI TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 2, 2015 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. Act 250 & Sec. 248 applications. There were none this month. However there is something coming up in Shelburne with Vermont Railway moving their salt shed and building a siding. We have been asked by the town manager to perform some traffic analysis.

4. Draft MOU with VTrans and CCTA. John Zicconi will abstain from this discussion. Charlie noted there is one change on page 3 suggested by Chris Jolly regarding performance measures that are new requirement from Map 21 and FAST Act. We are looking to revise this language. We hope to be back next month with the final version to recommend to the board. Mike O'Brien requested wording clarification in another couple of paragraphs, which Charlie will make as appropriate.

5. FY16 Mid-Year Adjustment. Charlie reviewed mid-year adjustments showing where funds were added and deleted. He then reviewed the Income/Expense sheet. There are a few items that need adjustment and they will be in the version we send to the board members. JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BRIAN BIGELOW, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE MID-YEAR ADJUSTMENT, WITH ANY OTHER CHANGES, TO THE BOARD. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

6. Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Plan Update – presentation and recommendation. Eleni noted the TAC recommended approval of the plan to the board. We need an ITS plan in order to get federal funds for projects. We will prepare a resolution for the board to approve the plan. Mike O’Brien read the plan and noted that lights are not synchronized in some corridors. We have to rely on VTrans for the state routes, but we can work with municipalities on other routes and then hire staff or consultant to keep them up. There are apps for smartphones to find delays, etc. A lengthy discussion continued about some timing issues. Andy suggested that at the board meeting we start out with explanation of ITS and the plan. John pointed out that ITS in a small state like Vermont is to
increase capacity and incident management. JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O’BRIEN, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE ITS PLAN UPDATE TO THE BOARD. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMously.

7. Chair/Executive Director Report:
   a. Legislative Breakfast. Charlie gave an overview of the breakfast. We do need to hand out the survey at the event; online responses were very poor. It was well attended and it was noted that the municipal sharing was valuable because some of the legislators may now realize this is an important topic.
   b. ECOS Annual Report. We hope to have an update to distribute at the board meeting.
   c. District Leveling. The TAC prioritized the two Chittenden County projects that VTrans suggested for leveling (adding 1-2 inches of asphalt to smooth the surface). This will be on the board agenda for action.
   d. Exit 1 off 189. Charlie noted this is an issue about Act 250 and the role of the regional plan. In general, the District Commission in that area denied the permit because the regional plan says no major retail centers outside of centers. The appeals court said RPC plan wasn't clear enough in trying to restrict retail uses. The Two Rivers RPC is appealing and some other RPCs are joining that appeal. We are not joining, but are watching the situation.
   e. Another litigation going on is related to municipal stormwater utility payments by VTrans. Williston is trying to get a settlement with VTrans. VTrans is working on a bill on this issue, which Charlie just received and he will keep members informed.
   f. ECOS Plan Update Schedule. Regina distributed an ECOS plan update schedule. The LRPC has been working on amendments. However, we have to hold two public hearings with 30-day notices. In order to hold the first hearing on March 16th and have 30-day notice, we need to have the Board warn the hearing on January 20th. Does the Exec. Comm. mind if the board warns the hearing even if we don’t have a draft plan? The hearing itself ends the first comment period. We will have the draft plan to discuss at the February board meeting. The Committee was okay with warning the hearing at the January meeting.
   g. CCRPC 50th Anniversary. Charlie noted that our Annual Meeting will be the focus for our 50th anniversary. We’re also talking about doing a photo contest to engage the public with positive images of Chittenden County. John suggested putting the photos on the website and having three prizes. Also on the website we’d like to include things have happened over the last 50 years. We’re thinking of inviting past chairs, board members, former staff, legislators, state agency heads, partners and consultants; and perhaps having sponsorships for the event. We are also thinking of keeping it to appetizers. Guest speaker suggestions: Sen. Leahy, Sen. Sanders, author Chris Bohjalian. We would begin with a 15-20 minute board meeting to elect officers, adopt ECOS plan update and whatever other business, prior to the event.
   h. Staff Annual Evaluations. Charlie noted that we will have completed staff evaluations by our next Executive Committee meeting; and he suggested members do his evaluation on Feb. 3rd.

8. Other Business. There was no other business.
9. Review of Draft agenda for January 20, 2016 board meeting. Members reviewed the proposed board agenda and made changes.
10. Adjourn. BRIAN BIGELOW MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JOHN ZICCONI, TO ADJOURN AT 7:20 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc
DATE: Tuesday, December 1, 2015
TIME: 9:00 a.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal St. Winooski, VT

1. Consent Agenda
N/A this month.

2. Approval of Minutes
A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 3, 2015 PASSED WITH A CHANGE TO NOTE THAT BRIAN BIGELOW WAS PRESENT.

3. Public Comments
There were none.

4. Consultant Selection: ATMS/Bluetooth Corridor Project
Peter referred members to the memo in their meeting packet explaining this project. We had received five proposals for this work which comes from an Accelerated Innovation Deployment (AID) Demonstration grant from FHWA to implement Bluetooth monitoring equipment on up to five (5) corridors in Chittenden County. The review committee of CCRPC and VTrans staff met on November 17th to discuss technical and cost proposals. Based on their technical proposal and qualifications, the committee recommended selecting Liddell Brothers with VHB and PDP Associates. JUSTIN RABIDOUX MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE CONSULTANT SELECTION RECOMMENDATION. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY BRIAN BIGELOW AND PASSED UNANIMATELY.

5. FY17 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Update
Bryan Davis began with a short description of what the UPWP is and the various places/organizations its funding comes from. Eligible applicants for the funding include CCRPC member municipalities,

Members Present
- Bruce Hoar, Williston
- Bryan Osborne, Colchester and TAC Chair
- Barbara Elliot, Huntington
- Dennis Lutz, Essex
- Amy Bell, VTrans
- Dean Bloch, Charlotte
- Dick Hosking, VTrans, District 5
- Katelin Brewer-Colie, Bicycle/Pedestrian
- Bob Hennesberger, Seniors
- Chris Jolly, FHWA
- Maryann Michaels, Rail
- Sandy Thibault, CATMA
- Trevor Lashua, Hinesburg
- Robin Thibault, Essex Junction
- Justin Rabidoux, South Burlington
- Nicole Losch, Burlington
- Brian Bigelow, Underhill

Staff Present
- Eleni Churchill, Transportation Program Manager
- Christine Forde, Senior Transportation Planner
- Jason Charest, Senior Transportation Planning Engineer
- Bryan Davis, Senior Transportation Planner
- Charlie Baker, Executive Director
- Peter Keating, Senior Transportation Planner
- Marshall Distell, Transportation Planner

Others Present
- Dave Antone, Municipal Public Works Consulting
- John Olin, Hoyle Tanner
- Jim Ryan, DEC ANR
Transportation Advisory Committee

December 1, 2015

agencies and partner non-profits like CATMA, Local Motion, CarShare Vermont, United Way and AARP VT. He next went into some detail on the types of eligible activities the UPWP can spend funds on, such as: Transportation, Land Use, and Stormwater planning; scoping, corridor studies, multimodal plans and major and minor technical assistance projects. Bryan also pointed out things for which UPWP funds cannot be used, such as:

- Covering the cost of municipal employees
- Right-of-way acquisition
- Detailed design and engineering
- Surveying
- Stormwater/sewer system design
- Construction of transportation system facilities, and
- Capital-oriented implementation actions

Some funding history and background, and the details of funding match requirements were also explained, as well as how a project needs to demonstrate a community need and the public process to decide on which projects will be seek funding. Bryan concluded by describing contracting arrangements, how projects would be evaluated and the UPWP development schedule which will culminate in a Board public hearing next May. Staff is also seeking TAC members to serve on the UPWP committee and Barbara Elliot, Roger Hunt and Justin Rabidoux expressed interest.

6. Jericho Capital Improvement Plan

Bryan also presented this project, the first of its kind undertaken by CCRPC staff. It’s based on a task that VTrans has with other Regional Planning Commissions through the Transportation Planning Initiative (TPI). Bryan began by identifying his Jericho and CCRPC partners, Todd Odit, Doug Siple, Dave Antone and Chris Dubin. Jericho was selected as the first town due to much of the relevant inventory data being relatively new. Bryan described the use of the Pavement Condition Index (PCI) and the program PAVER to determine recommendations related to budgeting for roadways. He also described recommendations on culverts, upsizing, prioritizing and tying culvert work schedules to when the related road would be seeing work. Next steps and recommendations on intersections were described next and Bryan then identified some multimodal recommendations and their costs. He then briefly mentioned other CIP items including signs, signals, equipment, maintenance facilities, stormwater and street lights. Bryan concluded with some lessons learned from this first CIP assistance project:

- Almost too much data for our pilot CIP effort, particularly since the Town has a current CIP
- Cost estimating: stuck to 2015 Jericho Transportation Study and 2015 Jericho Bicycle and Pedestrian Facility Master Plan. Town staff already familiar with costs given existing/previous CIPs
- Benefits: CCRPC staff explored additional functionality within the PAVER software, specifically M&R module

The next community that will get help under this program is Bolton. TAC members felt that communities could benefit from training on PAVER and Dick Hosking mentioned the importance of hydraulic reports in determining proper culvert size

7. Naming Transportation Facilities

Peter referred TAC members to the draft Transportation Board rules in the meeting packet that laid out the process to go about naming facilities likes bridges and roads. The Transportation Board is looking for comments on their proposed rules by December 18th. Matt Langham said that he had done some research at the request of Michele Boomhower on this topic and learned that it is the VT Department of Libraries who currently have the naming responsibility – an authority, apparently, they no longer want.
8. Municipal Roads Program
Jim Ryan of the Watershed Management division of the Department of Environmental Conservation at the Agency of Natural Resources, is the Municipal Roads General Permit (MRGP) manager. He attended the TAC to address this newly developing permit program designed to reduce phosphorus runoff from roads in the Lake Champlain Basin. Jim began with some context on the problem noting the variety of sources of phosphorus pollution, variations by watershed, and road mileage by class. The permit program will apply to town class 1 through 4 roads. He then spoke about the purpose of the permit program, the importance of “hydrologic connection,” how the permit framework works and the development of road stormwater management plans. To illustrate how the permit program would work Jim used a hypothetical town as an example to calculate the town’s road mileage to which MRGP standards would apply. He then described a number of road related design and material details likely to be used to curb runoff. These included:

- Stone-lined ditches and check dams
- Turn outs
- Road crowning
- Culvert headers
- Culvert outlet stabilization
- Possible new techniques and Green Stormwater Infrastructure Practices

Jim went on to issues anticipated as frequently asked questions such as:

- Replacement to in-stream culvert
- Relocating roads
- What road classes are covered by the permit
- Possible class 4 road practices, (on this point there was discussion on just what responsibilities towns have on class 4 roads and would like to see some guidance) and
- Compatibility of MRGP and VTrans road and bridge standards

Jim noted that some towns are being proactive and proceeding with identifying road related water quality issues and that they will be credited for these efforts as part of the MRGP. He also mentioned assistance to towns in the MSGP process available from DEC and VTrans and the Regional Planning Commissions. This last point led to discussion on how the CCRPC, through its UPWP, can assist towns in this effort. Jim concluded with the outreach he’s been involved in to date and what the next steps are:

- Developing a draft permit through 2016
- Holding regional stakeholder meetings
- Convening the technical and core groups.

9. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports
Dick Hosking reported that VTrans has closed the Charlotte Park and ride facility located at the rail station due to lack of use.

10. CCRPC November Board Meeting Report
Peter reported that the Board discussed the draft MOU between CCTA, CCRPC and VTrans, a document that hasn’t been updated in several years.

The meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter Keating
1. Consent Agenda
N/A this month.

2. Approval of Minutes
A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 1, 2015 PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

3. Public Comments
There were none.

4. ITS Plan Approval/Recommendation to Board
Sai introduced this by providing some background and history on ITS planning in the region and the hiring of Cambridge Systematics (CS) to do the latest update. He then turned it over to Dan Krechmer of CS to provide further detail. Dan began with an overview of the topics he’d be covering then went into a formal definition of what ITS is. More simply ITS is using technology to provide rapid response for users and the professionals who run the transportation system. Specific areas of applications include highway management, emergency services, traveler information, traffic control, traffic control centers and automatic vehicle location (AVL). ITS is established around a National Architecture that state, regional and local plans must follow in order to assure inter-operability and to be eligible to receive federal funds for implementation. Having a regional ITS plan that follows the National Architecture has other benefits as well, including:

- The opportunity to identify regional system gaps and needs
- Opportunity to expand stakeholder outreach
- Promotes discussion of new technologies and how they can meet regional gaps and needs
- Identifies specific operational/ITS projects and strategies
- Encourages improved data and information sharing among agencies
• Identifies specific links between systems that will benefit transportation system users

Dan then went into some detail on the Plan process, addressing gaps and needs, highway and arterial projects, transit projects and other project types that include other modes, data management, weather related and vanguard projects. He then described the strategic deployment plan that identifies which projects should be short, medium or long term and the estimated costs of each strategy over time. Next steps will include:

- Incorporating short-term, high priority projects into the TIP
- Consider incorporation of Operational/ITS strategies into capital projects
  ♦ View ITS Plan project list as “toolbox” of strategies
  ♦ Analytical tools for benefit/cost evaluation
  ♦ When systems projects are being implemented refer to architecture for agency linkages and information exchanges
- Provide input to VTrans ITS Architecture and Plan
- Incorporate ITS/Operations into Long Range Plan – use ITS plan as starting point
- Update ITS architecture when new projects are implemented

Following brief discussion, BRUCE HOAR MADE AMOTION THAT THE TAC RECOMMEND ACCEPTANCE OF THE REGIONAL ITS PLAN TO THE CCRPC BOARD. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY ROGER HUNT AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. District Leveling Priorities
Christine reminded the TAC that this was an annual request from VTrans to the Regional Planning Commissions to help develop project priorities for pavement overlay designed to last until funds become available for a more comprehensive project. These projects are designed to allow quick improvements to be made to road surfaces at a lower cost per mile allowing more miles to be repaired. VTrans has identified only two projects in Chittenden County for this program paid for with State, not Federal, funds (although Chris Jolly reported that some federal funding would support this program). The two projects are on VT RT 2A St. George/Williston and VT RT 15 Westford/Cambridge. Discussion included:

- The possibility of new striping to narrow lane width to benefit bicyclists,
- if VTrans has performed a cost benefit of this program to document its efficiency, and
- how funding for this program has varied over time.

Following the discussion, ROBIN PIERCE MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ROGER HUNT, TO APPROVE THE DISTRICT LEVELING LIST OF PROJECTS AND FORWARD IT TO VTRANS.

6. VTrans Street Tree Policy
Amy presented this recently adopted VTrans policy and noted that she had previously reported to the TAC on a draft policy a little over a year ago. This project involved both an internal VTrans working group and an external group of other state agencies and environmental organizations. She then described the issues behind why a policy was needed and the various considerations VTrans maintenance staff is confronted with related to trees. These considerations include:

- Safety & Liability concerns
- Leaf litter and debris on highway
- Overhead hazards – particularly during storm events e.g. wind, ice and snow
- Damaged limbs from maintenance vehicles, large trucks and oversize vehicles
- Tree Shadows – icing during winter months
- Funding Pressures: Maintenance is 100% State funds

When Amy presented last year about the draft policy VTrans was only considering one tier but has now split this into a three tiered policy. Under these three municipal categories…

1. Take State Highway over as a Class I Town Highway (VTrans Preference)
2. Have or seek Downtown, Village Center, Growth Center or New Town Center Designation and meet established criteria.
3. If no designation or Designated but unable/unwilling to meet established criteria, VTrans will allow different levels of municipal control over street trees in the public right-of-way. There was some discussion under tier #1 where a municipality takes over highway control by a Class 1 designation. VTrans is considering a higher payment to towns that the current $11,200 per mile highway aid for Class 1 roadways and VTrans is working on a white paper specific to the Class 1 program. Amy will present that paper at a future TAC meeting.

7. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports
Peter directed TAC members to the list on the back of the agenda page.

8. CCRPC December Board Meeting Report.
Charlie reported that in lieu of a December Board meeting the CCRPC hosted a legislative breakfast for House and Senate representatives. He mentioned that two of the topics focused on were shared services and water quality.

9. Chairman’s/Members’ Items
There were none.

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter Keating
1. Welcome, Introductions and Role of Committee
Albrecht called the meeting to order at 11:03 a.m. Introductions were made with Albrecht noting that the CCRPC still needs to receive signed member appointment letters for some members. Baker recapped the purpose of the committee.

2. Lake Champlain TMDL & Vermont Clean Water Act (VCWA), Municipal Requirements
ANR staff, Rebecca Ellis, Kari Dolan and Christy Witters recapped the various requirements involving municipalities as a result of the passage of Act 64 or VCWA this past spring including: Municipal Roads General Permit, MS-4 management, Developed Lands (3 acre plus) permit, Tactical Basin Planning, and Wastewater Treatment. ANR staff noted that they would be hiring a new Water Quality Modeler to help on such issues as calculating performance of various water quality improvement projects and devising a system to prioritize projects.

Questions and discussion among Committee members, CCRPC staff and ANR staff focused on a variety of issues such as:
- The role and elements of a Phosphorus Control Plan and their relationship to Flow Restoration Plans.
- Tracking the implementation and performance of projects (Financial contributions by state and municipalities, Performance based outcomes, Education & Outreach, Environmental Outcomes)
- The need for standardized reporting to simplify workload of municipalities

ANR staff stressed that the implementation of the Act is just now evolving and they will be able to provide more definitive answers in the coming months. They expressed appreciation for the creation of Clean Water Advisory Committee and look forward to working with the Committee.

3. CCRPC Contract with ANR for VCWA outreach and basin planning
Albrecht and Baker recapped the various elements of CCRPC’s new Water Quality Outreach contract with ANR. With regards to the conduct of Road Erosion inventories necessary in preparation for aiding compliance with the pending Municipal Roads General Permit, several members expressed the desire to see CCRPC assist with this inventory using UPWP dollars. With regards to Tactical Basin Planning, Albrecht and Baker noted that the RPC will work to ensure municipal involvement in all facets of the development of such Plans. For FY16, the Lamoille River plan will be the primary focus.
Lutz noted that in the end what each municipality needs to have is a clear summary of projects and costs that it needs to make them fully compliant with the various requirements (MS-4, Municipal Roads, Wastewater Treatment facility improvements, Phosphorus Control Plans, etc.). The municipalities will likely need some assistance from the CCRPC to develop these plans and cost estimates.

4. **Set Next Meeting**

Albrecht noted that from 10:30 to 11:00 at the December 1st Transportation Advisory Committee, Jim Ryan from ANR will be presenting in more depth on the Municipal Roads General Permit. CWAC members who are not part of the TAC may wish to come to that meeting.

The next meeting of the CWAC will be at 11:00 a.m. on December 1, 2015. It may only be an MS-4 subcommittee meeting. Albrecht will send out a more detailed agenda later this month with more detail on whether there will be also be a full CWAC meeting in addition to the MS-4 subcommittee.

5. **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 12:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dan Albrecht
CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
MS-4 SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE CLEAN WATER ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

DATE: Tuesday, December 1, 2015
TIME: 11:30 a.m. to 12:50 p.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT
DOCUMENTS: Minutes, documents, and presentations discussed accessible at:
http://www.ccrpcvt.org/meetings/clean-water-advisory-committee/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS-4 Subcommittee Members in Attendance</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burlington: Megan Moir</td>
<td>Colchester: Bryan Osborne (left at 11:35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Junction: Chelsea Mandigo</td>
<td>Milton: Roger Hunt, Jeff Castle (Alt.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Burlington: Tom Dipietro</td>
<td>Williston: James Sherrard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIA: Amanda Hannaway -Corrente</td>
<td>University of Vermont: Lani Ravin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Attendees:</td>
<td>CCRPC Staff: Dan Albrecht; Charlie Baker; Regina Mahony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Pease, ANR; Julia Andrews, Andrews Marketing; Laura Dlugolecki, Winooski NRCD; Christy Witters; Jennifer Callahan;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Welcome & Opening Remark  The meeting commenced at 11:30 a.m. Bryan Osborne indicated the Town of Colchester would join the Chittenden County Stream Team starting in FY17. Mr. Osborne then left the meeting.

2. Changes to the Agenda  It was agreed to add a brief discussion of the EPA Soak Up the Rain Campaign.

3. Elect a Chair or Co-Chairs  DiPietro moved, seconded by Moir to nominate Annie Costandi and Chelsea Mandigo as candidates for Subcommittee co-chairs. There were no further nominations. DiPietro moved, seconded by Moir to elect Annie Costandi and Chelsea Mandigo as Subcommittee co-chairs. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Review updated version of the RSEP/CCST merger MOU  Dan Albrecht walked through the various elements of the draft MOU. Several minor clarifications and improvements were suggested. Albrecht indicated he would make these edits, make grammatical edits and improvements and then circulate it via email to members.

5. Report from Andrews Marketing on fall 2015 RSEP campaign results and preliminary discussion of Spring 2016 campaign  Julia Andrews noted the highlights of this fall’s advertising campaign. Overall web hits were lower than 2014 but still above 2011-2013 levels. WCAX, Xfinity and Google ads had the best click-per-cost results while Front Porch Forum was more costly and ABC-22 even more so. Overall, 71% of the annual traffic to the website is generated via the ad campaign. Average time on site is 43 seconds which is respectable. Revised performance numbers for all of 2015 will be included in the 2015 calendar year report.

With regards to spring 2016, Andrews indicated she will scope out the elements of a new animated video ad. Tom DiPietro, Megan Moir and James Sherrard volunteered to act as a subcommittee to advise this effort.

6. Report from WRNCD on CCST fall activities and planned spring activities  Laura Dlugolecki recapped the status report and the 3rd year of the Connecting the Drops (CTD) effort. Committee comments on the Drops effort include a recommendation to have all barrels painted by professional artists due to substantial time and effort needed to recruit students to do so and to go ahead with a CTD 4.0 in 2016 in either Shelburne, Milton or Burlington, the planned activity communities for 2016.

7. Set Next Meeting  January 5, 2016 after CWAC meeting, exact time t.b.d

8. Adjournment  The meeting adjourned at 12:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Dan Albrecht
CCRPC Long Range Planning Committee

Minutes

Wednesday, December 9, 2015

4:00 p.m. to 6:00 pm

Location: CCRPC Office, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT.

Attendees: Justin Dextrauder (Chair), Bob Henneberger, Jeannine McCrumb, Edmund Booth, Andrea Morgante, Heather Danis, Lisa Falcone, and Jim Donovan

CCRPC Staff: Emily Nosse-Leirer and Regina Mahony

1. Welcome and Introductions. The LRPC introduced themselves and explained their affiliations.

2. Approve Minutes from October 14, 2015. Bob Henneberger made a motion, seconded by Jeannine McCrumb to approve the minutes from October 14, 2015 with the addition of Lisa Falcone and Charlie Baker as attendees. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED. Jim Donovan abstained.

3. ECOS Plan Amendments. Staff review the proposed amendments to the following sections and the LRPC provided comments:

   a. Growth Relative Adjacent Regions – The LRPC agreed with the draft as written. There was a suggestion that we look at transportation and all hazard mitigation plan sections of the other regional plans as well to see if there are any issues or concerns that should be mentioned.

   b. Flood Resiliency – The LRPC agreed with the general strategy to incorporate flood resiliency into Sections 2.2.1, 2.3.3, 2.5.4, 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 rather than create a separate section as so much of the flood resiliency element is already included in the Plan. The Plan will also refer to the All Hazard Mitigation Plan that contains much more information regarding this topic. There was a recommendation to bring attention to the fact that we are seeing more flood events, and this is a concept that should be in the ECOS Plan, in addition to the All Hazard Mitigation Plan. It was also suggested that we incorporate the AHMP draft strategies into the existing actions.
under Section 3.2.3, rather than add new actions if possible.

c. Earth Extraction – There were some recommended text edits and a suggestion to clarify the huge economic value of these resources, and the reality of increasing construction costs as we exhaust them.

d. Utility & Facility Section - The LRPC reviewed the revisions to the sections within the Utility & Facility section and had the following suggestions:
   i. Distinguish between the number of schools and governing bodies (use a map if possible to show the supervisory unions and the school districts); describe the change in legislation that made consolidation easier and describe all efforts (both successful and un-successful) that have taken place since that legislation.
   ii. Remove reference to bookmobiles in the library section as it is not likely to be complete information. Add that reciprocal agreements exist in all Chittenden County libraries with the exception of Burlington.
   iii. Add a reference to the Energy Siting Committee’s work and the likelihood of RPC’s further involvement in renewal energy locations in the future to Strategy 2, #4.c.
   iv. Under Govt/Admin Facilities explain the ratio between volunteer and professional fire and rescue departments and the trouble recruiting volunteers – if not already described in the Plan. Reference the AHMP and add the number of jails. Also explain the merger work going on in Essex and Essex Junction.
   v. Under hospitals it was recommended that we assess and explain whether we have enough capacity to meet the demand for long-term care, mental health and drug addiction recovery facilities.
   vi. Throughout these sections it was recommended to simply include a reference to the location of further assessment if it exists within the Plan already.

e. Child Care – there was a recommendation to clarify the fourth sentence under the key issues section. It was also recommended to clarify strategies 2 and 3 to more accurately describe what CCRPC or other specific partners are going to do. CCRPC Staff will also review the Blue Ribbon recommendations to determine if we do indeed want to work towards implementation of them.

4. **Next Meetings.** The following list includes the proposed timeline for the remaining LRPC meetings:
   - **Tuesday, January 12, 2016 from 4pm to 6pm**
   - **Wednesday, April 13, 2016 from 4pm to 6pm**

5. **Adjourn.** The meeting adjourned at 5:35pm.
CCRPC Long Range Planning Committee

Minutes

Tuesday, January 12, 2016

4:00 p.m. to 6:00 pm

Location: CCRPC Office, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT.

Attendees: Justin Dextrauder (Chair), Edmund Booth, Paul Conner, Heather Danis, Lisa Falcone, Jim Fay and Bob Henneberger

CCRPC Staff: Emily Nosse-Leirer and Regina Mahony

1. Welcome and Introductions.

2. Approve Minutes from December 9, 2015. Bob Henneberger made a motion, seconded by Edmund Booth to approve the minutes from December 9, 2015. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.

3. ECOS Plan Amendments. Staff review the proposed amendments to the following sections and the LRPC provided comments:

   a. Update ECOS Project List – Regina explained that the yellow highlight indicates changes, and new projects are added at the end, including waste water treatment plant updates (WWTPs) as described in the TMDL. We ask for updates to this list every year, and with the addition of the WWTPs we thought we’d update the entire list as much as we can. The LRPC recommended that we identify the source document and date for the WWTP targets; as well as add a catch-all statement for projects that are brownfields eligible.

   b. Flood Resiliency – Regina handed out the draft flood resiliency language. Since the intent of this was mostly already addressed in the Plan, and the meat of this will be in the All Hazard Mitigation Plan update, the edits were limited to Sections 2.3.3 and 3.2.3. Regina explained that she was tempted to re-write 3.2.3 in full given the emphasis on the new TMDL and flood resiliency, however this was drafted with a great deal of input and she didn’t want to undo the work without that same level of review. The LRPC recommend a clarifying edit to the wastewater treatment plant
section.
c. Child Care – Regina explained that the high regulation/low profitability sentence was edited; and the Blue Ribbon Commission is in process so this action statement was edited accordingly. There was significant discussion regarding summarizing the problem accurately in a concise way. The LRPC suggested reorganizing the content to clearly describe the unaffordability, unmet need and what’s next (Blue Ribbon Commission). It was also recommended to add that if people can’t find child care they can’t work; and that municipalities could consider waiving fees for child care businesses.
d. Earth Extraction – Edited further based on comments from the last meeting. The LRPC recommended a clarifying edit regarding commercial viability.
e. Surrounding Regions – Regina explained that the last two sections for transportation and hazard mitigation were added as requested. Regina suggested that we don’t remove the commute to work data as we don’t have it from all of the regions. The LRPC felt that we should keep it in as an example as it is telling. The LRPC also suggested that we reinforce the lack of housing in the transportation section – as those demands are not going to decrease unless we have more housing that is affordable in Chittenden County. It was also suggested that we clarify that the Jeffersonville Commuter is a bus.
f. Utility & Facility Section - The LRPC reviewed the revisions to the sections within the Utility & Facility section and had the following suggestions:
   i. Schools – Regina explained that the content was edited based on input from the last meeting; and an additional edit was made since the packet went out (there 7 Chittenden South Boards). The LRPC felt that keeping specific information about each district/union was helpful. However it could be simplified to X boards, X schools and which Towns are served in a list or simple table. There was also a suggestion to display this as a map. Edmund Booth will work on a map, and the LRPC can decide if it is helpful to include.
   ii. Regina explained that the recommended edits were made to the library, energy and government facilities sections. Information on the Essex/Essex Junction consolidation to Govt. services was added. The LRPC suggested that this is described as “an example of creative solutions...”. Regina indicated that the specific information would be further updated with FY15 Annual Report.
   iii. Hospitals – Regina explained that at the last meeting the LRPC asked for a information regarding need of nursing facilities. Regina didn’t find this exact information from DAIL, however she added some information on a movement away from nursing facilities and towards home-based care. The LRPC recommended that we look further into unmet need and length of wait lists. While there is a movement to home-based care it does not help explain the overall need we are facing. We are significantly unprepared for the aging population.
g. The LRPC also discussed the data that is currently included in the ECOS Plan, and whether or not it should be updated. Regina explained that we now host the indicators online, and it would be a significant effort to update the data in the ECOS Plan itself. Considering we need to undergo a more comprehensive update in 2018
and the purpose of this amendment was to simply address the deficiencies, the LRPC does not feel the need to update all of the data at this time.

4. **Next Steps/Meetings.** The following list includes the proposed timeline for the remaining LRPC meetings:
   The first public hearing draft will be sent via email to the LRPC in the first week in February for review prior to it being sent out for public comment. No meeting will be needed. **Wednesday, April 13, 2016 from 4pm to 6pm – to address comments received at the Board’s first public hearing.**

5. **Adjourn.** The meeting adjourned at 5:45pm.
DATE: Wednesday, November 18, 2015
TIME: 2:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT

Members Present
Joss Besse, Bolton
Cathyann LaRose, South Burlington
Ken Belliveau, Williston
Dana Hanley, Essex
David White, Burlington
Alex Weinhagen, Hinesburg
Melissa Manka, Westford
Everett Marshall, Huntington

Staff
Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
Lee Krohn, Senior Planner
Emily Nosse-Leirer, Planner
Bryan Davis, Senior Transportation Planner

1. Welcome and Introductions
Joss Besse called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

2. Approval of September 9, 2015 Minutes
Alex Weinhagen made a motion, seconded by Ken Belliveau to approve the September 9, 2015 minutes. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.

3. Water Quality Program
Regina gave an overview of the Lake Champlain TMDL municipal requirements (see attachment); and CCRPC’s Contract with ANR for Vermont Clean Water Act outreach and basin planning. Regina explained that the contract with ANR is for municipal outreach and education, data assistance and assistance with development of the Tactical Basin Plans and prioritization of projects – and particularly to help coordinate with the municipalities on these Plans. Alex Weinhagen suggested that CCRPC help facilitate conversations with municipalities if trading phosphorus becomes available for wastewater treatment plants. Regina Mahony explained that we would be certainly be helpful in this facilitation if needed or requested.

4. CCRPC’s Unified Plan Work Program (UPWP) Solicitation
Bryan Davis provided an overview of the UPWP, program areas and the application. This presentation is attached to these minutes.

5. Jericho Comprehensive Town Plan Review and Public Hearing
Joss Besse opened the public hearing. No one from the public was in attendance. The public comment period was closed.

Emily Nosse-Leirer, summarized the Staff comments and explained that the comments have already been addressed. Katherine explained the process they went through in updating their Plan, including a public input survey. The Plan is mostly updated without any major changes in direction. The transportation and natural resource chapters are totally new. The Science to Action project was incorporated into the natural resource chapter and identified three tiers of natural resources for protection. The PC will be moving forward on getting this incorporated into the Zoning Regulations. Katherine explained that they’ve included some additional text to try to help participation in the PSB process. Alex asked about the number of implementation tasks. There are certainly quite a bit and they are thinking of ways to prioritize them. Melissa Manka explained that in Westford the PC has set up joint meetings with responsible parties for the implementation tasks as identified in the Plan for the first year.

Everett Marshall made a motion, seconded by Melissa Manka, that the PAC finds the draft 2016 Jericho Comprehensive 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. 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 discussion.
MOTION PASSED. Katherine Sonnick abstained.

6. Regional Act 250/Section 248 Projects in the Horizon

- Burlington – redevelopment of the Burlington Town Center. The Applicant is figuring out if they
  need to go to Act 250. It is a designated downtown so the threshold is larger, but it is unclear how
  they will count the hotel rooms. The next Plan will be presented in January.
- South Burlington – Pillsbury Manor Williston Road Senior Living Center looking to infill. Larkin
  Terrace Apartments near the movie theater is looking to redevelop (there are affordable housing units
  there now. It is a high density district and don’t know if they will ask for a density bonus and trigger
  new affordable housing requirements). Spear Meadows additional units proposed somewhere between
  40 to 70 units, and uses TDR.
- Huntington – nothing at this time
- Milton – 4.9 megawatt solar array, 38 acre of solar on Lamoille River. Municipal and Community
  Solar array on old landfill and wwtp property. Act 250: Two amendments to existing uses in
  Catamount.
- Bolton – nothing at this time
- Essex – Rick Bove project on Essex Way – big mixed use project (55 units). The Town is working
  with them on building design.
- Underhill – nothing at this time
- Jericho – Jericho Market stalled in Act 250, not quite sure what is holding it up.
- Williston – Section 248 permit coming around for cell tower collocated in silo – pretty small.
  Potential amendments – Finney Crossing. Finney Crossing fills up within a month of being built; the
  absorption rate is very fast. Commonwood Crossing in early stages - originally approved 7 to 8 years
  ago, former driving range, 173 dwellings plus 80,000 sq.ft. of retail.
- Westford – nothing at this time
- Hinesburg – big projects in Environmental Court (Hannaford project and north of Village). Minor
  amendment on a Town application for a new tenant in the old police station.

7. Other Business

a. Special PAC meeting on December 9th meeting at 2pm (1.5 hours max) to learn about the draft proposed
changes in what constitutes a Required Agricultural Practice, and changes in the definition of farm
structure and potential expanded regulatory authority for municipalities. NOTE: We will start at 2pm, not
2:30pm as my original email stated.
b. Permit Tracking Software Memo – CCRPC research is complete and reported in the attached memo. Lee
Krohn provided a brief overview of his research.
c. VPA Fall Conference Friday, December 11th – WATER
d. Jim Ryan will be coming to present to the TAC and CWAC on December 1st at 10:15am on the Municipal
Roads Permit if anyone is interested.

7. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony
Requirements for Municipalities

WASTEWATER
Wastewater Treatment Facilities

Of the 59 Vermont wastewater treatment facilities in the Lake Champlain Basin, 25 will receive new reduced phosphorus limits according to a permit reissuance schedule that is based on DEC’s five-year tactical basin planning schedule. Flexible options to meet the TMDL include:

- Require new or upgrade treatment facilities only when the current phosphorus discharge exceeds 80% of the facility’s annual phosphorus allocation.
- Employ annual average phosphorus loading rates (rather than concentration limits) to set TMDL-based discharge permit limits in order to allow operational flexibility in attaining the limits.
- Establish compliance schedules that couple phosphorus upgrades with other planned facility construction projects to enhance cost-effectiveness.
- Support opportunities to reallocate (i.e., trading) phosphorus limits for facilities within the same lake segment watershed as long as total permitted phosphorus discharge remains the same. Discharges in the Main Lake, Burlington Bay, and Shelburne Bay watersheds will be considered to be discharges to the same lake segment for reallocation purposes.

**Administrative processing fee**: $240; **application review fee**: varies; **annual operating fee**: $0.003/gallon of permitted flow ($200 minimum; $12,500 maximum). See website for details: [http://www.watershedmanagement.vt.gov/wastewater.htm](http://www.watershedmanagement.vt.gov/wastewater.htm)

STORMWATER
Municipal Roads General Permit

The new general permit for all municipal roads will go into effect before January 2018, with all municipalities signed up no later than 2021. Municipalities will be “credited” for projects implemented before the permit goes into effect. The general permit will require:

- Practices to reduce erosion and stormwater discharges being generated from roads and drainage systems. New roads will likely continue to be permitted as they are now. All practices will be consistent with the VTrans Road and Bridge standards.
- A management plan to oversee implementation and bring roads up to standards over several years. The general permit will not require separate approval for every maintenance activity or upgrade.
- Application fee: $400; **annual operating fee**: $2,000.

Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) General Permit

Municipalities that have municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) permits will require a new MS4 general permit. New components to the permit include:

- Long-range phosphorus control plans similar to the “flow restoration plan” requirements for municipalities with stormwater-impaired waters. Municipal road management requirements will be incorporated into the MS4 permit; separate permit coverage will not be required.
- Implementation plans for stormwater best management practices (BMPs) to reduce phosphorus in conformance with the Champlain TMDL.
- Application fee: $2,400; **annual operating fee**: $10 per acre of impervious surface.

The reissuance process for the MS4 permit will start within 3 months of the issuance of the TMDL. Regulated MS4s will be notified and included in the stakeholder process.

Municipally Owned Developed Land Permit

What’s required?

- All municipal sites with 3 or more acres of impervious surface, including municipal properties, will require a new developed land permit.
- If a site does not have a stormwater system designed to 2002 or more current standards, it will need to implement stormwater management practices.
- Smaller sites may be subject to the same requirement if necessary to implement the Lake Champlain TMDL, or stormwater TMDLs.
- Application fee: $860 per acre of impervious surface; **annual operating fee**: $160 per acre impervious surface.

The developed land general permit must go into effect before January 2018, with all projects in the Champlain basin under a permit by 2023, and the rest of the state under a permit by 2028.
**NEW PROJECTS**

New Municipal Projects Construction Standards

The permitting standards for new projects have not yet changed. However, by January 2016 DEC will report to legislature on the prospect of lowering the threshold for requiring a post-construction stormwater permit for new projects to ½-acre of impervious surface (it is currently 1 acre). The Department will also be revising its Stormwater Manual and Stormwater Rules over the coming year. The Manual and Stormwater Rules revisions will both go through the formal APA rulemaking process and municipalities will be invited to participate in rulemaking meetings and public comment processes.

### Timeline for Municipalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>MUNICIPAL OBLIGATIONS</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASTEWATER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Treatment Facilities (WWTFs)</td>
<td>Reductions from currently permitted phosphorus loads at 25 of 59 facilities in the Lake Champlain Basin.</td>
<td>Vermont DEC will issue wastewater discharge permits incorporating the new phosphorus allocations according to the five-year tactical river basin planning schedule (2016-2020).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STORMWATER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Roads General Permit</td>
<td>Implementation of practices to reduce erosion and stormwater discharged generated from roads and drainage systems.</td>
<td>The general permit must go into effect before January 2018, with all municipalities signed up no later than 2021.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit</td>
<td>MS4 municipalities will develop long-range phosphorus control plans following the reissuance of this permit.</td>
<td>The reissuance process for the MS4 permit will commence within 3 months of the issuance of the TMDL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STORMWATER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Permits for Municipally Owned Developed Land</td>
<td>VT DEC’s Stormwater Program will develop a general permit applicable to all sites with 3 or more acres of impervious surface, including municipal properties.</td>
<td>The general permit must go into effect before January 2018, with all projects in the Champlain basin under a permit by 2023, and the rest of the state under a permit by 2028.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Permits for New Municipal Projects</td>
<td>No change. Report to Legislature by January 15, 2016 on whether to lower the threshold for new projects from 1 acre to ½-acre of impervious surface.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Planning</td>
<td>No change. Towns are encouraged to seek funding for stormwater planning, which can be used in tactical basin plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>