REGULAR MEETING & PUBLIC HEARING AGENDA
Wednesday, February 15, 2017, 6:00 pm
CCRPC Offices at 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202
Winooski, VT 05404

CONSENT AGENDA:

DELIBERATIVE AGENDA

1. Call to Order; Changes to the Agenda
2. Public Comment Period on Items NOT on the Agenda
3. Action on Consent Agenda (MPO Business) (Action: 1 min.)
4. Approve Minutes of January 18, 2017 Meeting * (Action: 2 min.)
5. Public Hearing and Approval of Major TIP Amendments * (Action: 10 min.)
6. Multi-Jurisdictional All Hazard Mitigation Plan adoption * (Action: 10 min.)
7. Water Quality Funding recommendations * (Action: 20 min.)
8. Demographic Forecasts presentation * (CCRPC, EPR & RSG Staff) (Information: 20 min.)
9. Regional Dispatch Report presentation (Information: 30 min.)
10. Chair/Executive Director’s Updates (Information: 5 min.)
   a. ECOS Annual Report
   b. Municipal Roads General Permit
   c. Executive Director’s Report (to be sent separately)
11. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports * (Information: 2 min.)
   a. Finance Committee (draft minutes January 25, 2017)*
   b. Executive Committee (draft minutes February 1, 2017)*
      i. Act 250/Sec 248 letters *
   c. Planning Advisory Committee (draft minutes January 11, 2017)*
   d. Long Range Planning Committee (draft minutes January 12, 2017)*
   e. Water Quality Financing (Draft minutes January 23, 2017)*
   f. UPWP Committee (Draft minutes, January 26, 2017)*
   g. All Hazards Mitigation Plan Update Committee (draft minutes January 9, 2017)*
12. Member’s Items
13. Adjournment

*Attachment

The February 15th Chittenden County RPC meeting will air on Saturday, February 18, 2017 at 1:00 p.m. It will also be available online at: https://www.cctv.org/watch-tv/programs/chittenden-county-regional-planning-commission-64

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

- Transportation Advisory Committee – **Wednesday**, March 8, 2017; 9:00 a.m.
- Clean Water Advisory Committee - **Wednesday**, March 8, 2017; 11:00 a.m.
- MS4 Subcommittee – Wednesday, March 8, 2017; 12:30 p.m.
- Planning Advisory Committee – Wednesday, March 8, 2017; 2:30 p.m.
- Finance Committee – **Wednesday, March 8, 2017**; 5:15 p.m.
- Executive Committee - **Wednesday, March 8, 2017**; 5:45 p.m.
- Long Range Planning Committee – Thursday, March 9, 2017
- Brownfields Advisory Committee - Monday, March 13, 2017; 3:00 p.m.
- CCRPC Board Meeting - Wednesday, March 15, 2017; 6:00 p.m.
- Energy Sub-Committee - Tuesday, March 21, 2017; 5:00 p.m.

Tentative future Board agenda items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Agenda Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| March 15th | Bylaw amendment adoption  
Warn UPWP Public Hearing for May  
Chittenden County Active Transportation Plan approval  
Demographic forecasts approval  
Draft Municipal Road General Permit recommendations  
Proposed Functional Class Changes Presentation (tentative) |
| April 19th | Regional Services Agreement for Stormwater approval  
Functional Class Changes approval (tentative)  
MTP Update and Transportation Project review |
| May 17th  | UPWP & Budget Public Hearing and approval  
Transportation Capital Program Project Prioritization  
Draft Regional Energy Plan review (tentative)  
Warn TIP public hearing for July |
| June 21st | Annual Meeting – Election of Officers |
DATE:  Wednesday, January 18, 2017
TIME:  6:00 p.m.
PLACE:  CCRPC Offices; 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202; Winooski, VT  05404
PRESENT:  Bolton: Joss Besse  Buel’s Gore: David Scherr
           Burlington: Andy Montroll  Charlotte: Jim Donovan
           Colchester: Absent  Essex: Jeff Carr
           Essex Jct: Dan Kerin  Hinesburg: Andrea Morgante
           Huntington: Barbara Elliott  Jericho: Catherine McMains
           St. George: Jeff Pillsbury  Shelburne: John Zicconi
           So. Burlington: Chris Shaw  Underhill: Brian Bigelow
           Westford: Dave Tilton (6:01)  Williston: Chris Roy
           Winooski: Mike O’Brien  VTrans: Amy Bell
           Business/Industry: Absent  Conservation/Environment: Don Meals
           Socio/Econ/Housing: Lisa Falcone
Ex-Officio:  CCTA: Absent  FHWA: Absent
           BIA : Absent  FTA : Absent
           Others : Matthew Langham, VTrans  Joe Colangelo, Shelburne Town Manager
           Bob Henneberger, TAC  Scott Moody, CCTV cameraman
           Staff: Charlie Baker, Executive Director  Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
           Eleni Churchill, Trans. Program Mgr.  Dan Albrecht, Senior Planner
           Marshall Distel, Transportation Planner  Christine Forde, Sr. Transportation Planner
           Lee Krohn, Senior Planner  Bernie Ferenc, Trans. Business Manager

1. Call or Order/Changes to the Agenda: The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by the Chair, Chris Roy. There were no changes to the agenda.

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. Approve Minutes of November 16, 2016 Meeting. CATHERINE McMAINS MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JIM DONOVAN, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 16, 2016, WITH CORRECTIONS IF ANY. Catherine suggested a change on page 5, item 11 – change “There” to “These”. Jim Donovan had a question on page 2, Tactical Basin Plan Recommendations – he suggested we add the letter as an attachment to the minutes, rather than trying to explain the meaning of the “xx” referred to. MOTION CARRIED WITH JOHN ZICCONI AND DAVE TILTON ABSTAINING.

5. FY 18 UPWP Public Forum. Chris Roy asked if there were members of public who wanted to submit requests. There were none, but he left the public forum open in case someone comes in. Jeff Carr noted that when we ask for projects people need to understand that there is a process and that
requests need to go through the municipalities. There’s a committee that will review all applications and measure them against programmatic goals, ECOS goals, budget constraints, etc.; and make recommendations to the board.

6. Regional Dispatch Update. Joe Colangelo, Shelburne Town Manager, came to the meeting to expand on the presentation he made at the legislative breakfast about dispatch/PSAP (Public Safety Answering Point) inefficiencies. Dispatching and 911 call taking are two different functions (for the most part.) Dispatchers talk to public safety employees (police officers, fire/rescue departments to tell them where to go. 911 call takers (in call centers or PSAP) receive the 911 calls from the public (typically in stressful situations). In Chittenden County, there are two primary PSAPs - Williston State Police and Shelburne Dispatch. In Chittenden County, there are 8 dispatch centers – some dispatch centers like So. Burlington and Burlington only dispatch for their police, fire, emergency departments. Milton contracts with Colchester. Shelburne Dispatch dispatches for 40+ agencies in three different counties. He then gave some scenarios of how this works between 911 call takers vs. dispatchers in various towns which shows how delays can happen. He feels that it doesn’t make sense that there are multiple different dispatch centers in Chittenden County. The study we’ve undertaken is to show how we could provide better service to our citizens. There should be a general manager for the county who knows how to dispatch and can be in charge of that service. We are both over staffed and under staffed because they are all spread out and need to be in one location to cover each other. When asked if someone calls from their land line will the call taker know where to location is, Joe said yes. However, if you call from your cell phone, you can reach a call taker from neighboring states or countries. Joe noted that according to dispatchers, there is something lost without local knowledge of the area (i.e. call is answered in St. Albans for a Chittenden County municipality). When it was noted that the system sends a 911 call to the call taker who’s been sitting idles the longest, members asked why it couldn’t be sent to the nearest available location. A brief discussion ensued. Joe Colangelo noted that in their research they found an article from 1967 that said we should consolidate dispatch. Charlie noted the consultant is finishing the technical report by January 31st and there will be a presentation at South Burlington City Hall in the afternoon for police, fire and rescue departments to attend, and an evening presentation for elected officials. Lee Krohn has been CCRPC’s project manager on this. Some managers have been working together on the governance part of this and CCRPC members should know there may be a role for CCRPC in the interim and potentially in the long term. Members thanked Joe Colangelo for coming.

7. Bylaws Amendments – Approve for municipal review and warn for public hearing. Charlie noted that for CCRPC to enter into an inter-municipal services agreement, according to the legislation passed last year, requires a bylaws amendment. Last spring, we heard about stormwater group wanting to have just one agreement with MS4 group. So, last fall we began work on amending our bylaws. Another bylaw change started a year ago, when we formed the ad hoc Clean Water Advisory Committee (CWAC). We asked them to give feedback by the end of 2016 on whether they should become a standing committee. Two other changes include changing terms of officers from maximum of two years to four; and to change “encourage” to “expected” relating to CCRPC board members serving on committees. We need to send these proposed amendments to the municipalities for their review and hold a public hearing before we take action. Andy Montroll said the Board Development Committee reviewed the bylaws and made suggested changes which then went to the Executive Committee. ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JEFF CARR, TO FORWARD THESE DRAFT BYLAWS TO THE MUNICIPALITIES FOR A 30-DAY REVIEW AND WARN A PUBLIC HEARING FOR OUR MARCH BOARD MEETING. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
8. All Hazards Mitigation Plan (AHMP). Dan Albrecht reviewed the presentation agenda: set stage for Board consideration of adoption of Multi-Jurisdictional All-Hazards Mitigation Plan in February or March; Recap of Hazard Mitigation & Multi-Jurisdictional & Local Hazard Mitigation Plans; Describe hazards, assess risks & vulnerabilities and develop strategies; and detail on draft six categories of regional action. He reviewed the definition of Mitigation & Hazard Mitigation Planning. He noted one key thing to stress is that mitigation is one of the four phases of emergency management, which also include Preparedness, Response and Recovery. We have done these plans twice before (in 2005 and again in 2011). We anticipate FEMA approval in late winter 2017. The plans are a pre-requisite for Hazard Mitigation grants, and to obtain at least 12.5% from state for disaster repairs under ERAF. The 2017 municipal annexes are being finalized – Emily has done 8; Dan – 6 and Lee 4 plans. Dan then reviewed the elements of an AHMP – hazards identification; risk assessment; vulnerability analysis; and mitigation strategies. He reviewed examples of Natural Hazards; Technological Hazards and Societal Hazards. He presented a slide showing federally-declared disasters between 1990-2016 showing number of disasters, number of impacted municipalities; total repair costs and most costly disaster. Vulnerabilities include: 486 structures located in the 100-year floodplain; 205 structures in the River Corridor Protection Area; and 201 “geomorphically-incompatible” culverts. He reviewed examples of municipal strategies for rural towns and urban-suburban towns. He then reviewed draft regional action in 6 categories and gave examples. The public has had the opportunity to be involved for both the Multi-Jurisdictional AHMP and the 18 municipal AHMP annexes. Next steps include staff meeting with DEMHS & FEMA on January 27th to review Richmond’s AHMP which will serve as our template and we hope only minor revisions will be needed. FEMA issues an “Approval Pending Adoption” (APA), CCRPC board adopted Multi-Jurisdictional AHMP at February or March meeting. Remaining municipal AHMPs submitted to VDEMHS/FEMA in February. FEMA issues APAs; governing bodies adopt Multi-Jurisdictional AHMP and local AHMP. Andrea was glad to see ECOS mentioned as she feels it should be involved in everything. She also feels we should develop the plans by watershed rather than by town. There is more opportunity for inter-municipal cooperation. Charlie noted that we’re the only region that does this collectively. The rest of the state does these plans individually for each municipality.

9. FY2017 Mid-Year UPWP & Budget Adjustment. Charlie noted that we review our budget every year when we’re half way through the year. He reviewed the 11x17 budget spreadsheet showing revenues and expenses. He noted 3 new tasks that came up since the beginning of the fiscal year. The last two columns show the percent change and the dollar change between the adopted vs. mid-year adjustment. The swings in our budget are related to the indirect rate, which is based on expenses from two years ago; and they will happen every year. Chris Roy noted that our reserve is a little on the light side. Our organizational goal is to have a three-month reserve. Charlie then reviewed the UPWP document and tasks. Bernie noted that we have a new Appendix A showing funding sources as she found an error yesterday. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JIM DONOVAN, TO APPROVE THE MID-YEAR ADJUSTMENT INCLUDING THE NEW APPENDIX A DISTRIBUTED TONIGHT. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

10. Chair/Executive Director’s Updates.
   b. ECOS Annual Report. We are working on the annual report and a draft will be available by the next meeting.
c. **Municipal Roads General Permits.** There is a draft framework that was sent out a week ago. We’ll be reviewing this with the TAC and CWAC for their input to DEC. They’ll keep this open for comments before final rule-making.

d. **Water Quality Funding.** The Treasurer developed funding recommendations for the legislature. Charlie distributed copies of the Executive Summary to members. We anticipate our ad hoc Water Quality Funding committee will meet again next week to develop recommendations on this. One major recommendation is to use bonding in the next two years while we look for a more permanent source of funding for water quality. The treasurer is trying to fill 50% of the need with state revenue. There is also talk about setting up a stormwater utility locally, regionally, or statewide. It’s a lot to think about with that committee and we hope to have something back here in February. Charlie received a call and was told that they’re very interested in RPC input to see what roles RPCs are interested in performing. He’s told them that municipalities probably don’t want to collect the fees for the state. Discussion ensued as there is a lot to review here. Chris Roy noted that there are already four towns that have developed stormwater utilities and are dealing with funding. We’re once again getting into the mindset that it’s the individual towns’ problems and we don’t need to get involved. We need to get the point across that we’re all part of the Lake Champlain Basin and need to have a broader vision. There are also questions for farmers who are having to do much more already. Charlie noted that he chairs the VAPDA Natural Resources Committee and will be testifying on this for all RPCs as well as CCRPC.

e. **Major TIP Amendments – Public Hearing in February.** We will hold a public hearing in February to review and approve a couple of major TIP amendments. In order to meet the 30-day warning the Executive Committee approved the warning at its January 5th meeting.

f. **Executive Directors’ Report.** Charlie sent the report for November/December earlier today.

11. **Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports.** These were all included in the meeting packet.

12. **Members’ Items.** There were none.

13. **Adjournment.** JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CHRIS SHAW, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:25 P.M. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
February 15, 2017
Agenda Item 5: Action Item
FY2017 Transportation Improvement Program Major and Minor Amendments

Issues

Four amendments are proposed to the FY2017-2020 TIP – two are defined as Major Amendments because they have cost increases in excess of 25 percent. Major Amendments require a public hearing to give the public the opportunity to comment on the proposed change. The other two changes are defined as minor amendments and can be approved by the Board following the TAC’s recommendation.

The Public Participation Plan requires a 30-day public comment period for Major TIP amendments. Both of the major amendments are time sensitive because VTrans needs time to prepare for the 2017 construction season. Delay until mid-March would have a negative impact on the project schedules. To accommodate the notice requirement the Executive Committee warned the public hearing on January 4 and opened the public comment period.

Major Amendments

VT2A/US7/Creek Road/Bay Road Intersection, Colchester (Project HP037, Amendment FY17-04)

› Description of Change – Increase federal funds for construction from $2,378,880 to $3,765,000. Add $480,000 in FY17 and $906,120 in FY18. This is a 58.3 percent increase in construction cost which is defined as a major amendment.

› Reason for Change - The previous $2.38 (federal) million cost was based on Preliminary Plans which had been developed many years ago, prior to the project advancing into ROW. Once the project came out of ROW VTrans began developing Final Plans and the new estimate was established this past summer. The new estimate is based on revised unit costs for all items, some minor changes based on ROW negotiations, additional traffic control considerations and other small changes. The project also includes a non-participating item – a waterline replacement which is not included in the federal estimate because it is being funded by Colchester Fire District #3.

Exit 16 Park and Ride, Colchester (Project IN014, Amendment FY17-05)

› Description of Change - Increase construction cost from $250,000 to $800,000. Add $330,000 in FY17 and $220,000 in FY18. This is a 42 percent increase in project cost which is defined as a major amendment.

› Reason for Change – The original cost estimate was based on minimal construction to convert an existing parking lot to a park-and-Ride lot. Upon further investigation, it was determined that the following items would be desirable or necessary:
  - Lighting: Existing light fixtures will be replaced with energy efficient LED and EV1 charging outlets and will meet the height requirement of 30 inches above finished grade. The electric meter will be replaced to support the new lights and EV1 charging outlets.
  - Ledge Face: Ledge scaling will be performed to prevent boulders/rocks from falling onto the park and ride and the ditch along the west side of the property will be regraded to improve drainage and contain any rocks that fall from the ledge face.
- **Stormwater Pond**: The existing ditch along north side of property will be regraded to accommodate the proper stormwater treatment and to remove invasive species (phragmites)
- **Pedestrians**: A bench will be placed along the east side of the access road near a future sidewalk. A retaining wall will be built near the south end of the property to allow for the placement of the bench.
- **Traffic Signal**: The single signal head that faces US 7 northbound will be replaced with a dual signal head because the existing aerial telecommunication lines impede the view of the signal head.
- **Pavement**: The parking lot will be milled and repaved because of cracks and imprints from trailers previously parked on the lot.

The above changes add $810,000 to the TIP in FY17 and $1,126,120 in FY18. The TIP is a fiscally constrained document and cannot exceed a maximum dollar amount independently set for each year. To accommodate the changes listed above funds must be removed from other projects on the TIP to maintain an equal total amount. The following minor amendment are proposed to maintain fiscal constraint.

**Minor Amendments**

**Railyard Enterprise Project, Burlington** (Project HC015, Amendment FY17-06)
- Description of Change – Reduce funds in FY17 from $960,000 to $150,000.
- Reason for Change – A Supplemental Scoping study is currently underway and will be completed to be completed in late spring 2017. This project is not anticipated to advance significantly in FY17 so $150,000 is adequate to accommodate the project needs.

**Champlain Parkway, Burlington** (Project HC001A, Amendment FY17-07)
- Description of Change – Move $1,015,000 in federal construction funds from FY17 to FY21.
- Reason for Change – The current schedule for this project is to begin construction in the fall of 2018 which will be FY19. The project has $14.7 million in FY19 and $14.9 million in FY20. The funds in FY18 are not needed.

**Modifications and Overruns** (Project OT017, Amendment FY17-08)
- Description of Change – Designate the use of $111,120 from Modifications and Overruns in FY18 to be used to maintain fiscal constraint.

**TAC Recommendation:**
Recommend that the Board approve the Minor TIP amendments.
Recommend that Board hold a Public Hearing for the Major TIP amendments and approve them.

**Staff Recommendation:**
Recommend that the Board approve the Minor TIP amendments.
Recommend that Board hold a Public Hearing for the Major TIP amendments and approve them.

**For more information, contact:**
Christine Forde
cforde@ccrpcvt.org or 846-4490 ext. *13
Consider adoption of 2017 Chittenden County Multi-Jurisdictional AHMP

Issues:
On February 3, 2017 the Risk Analysis Branch of FEMA Region I issued a notice to the CCRPC that the draft Chittenden County Multi-Jurisdictional All-Hazards Mitigation Plan (AHMP) and the draft Town of Richmond AHMP had met the mitigation planning requirements specified in 44 CFR 201 and that the plans are “approvable pending adoption.” As noted by staff at your January 18th meeting, this means that the CCRPC will be working with its other municipalities to finalize their draft AHMPs and submit them for formal review by FEMA as well. The attached resolution for your consideration is modeled after those that each municipality also considers once FEMA authorizes approval.

Staff Recommendation:
Adoption of the resolution will demonstrate the resolve of the CCRPC to carry out the actions endorsed in the Multi-Jurisdictional AHMP.

Background:
The draft MJAHMP and the municipal AHMPs being finalized and submitted to FEMA in the coming weeks represent the culmination of work over the past 22 months by CCRPC staff (Albrecht, Krohn and Nosse-Leirer) assisted by numerous municipal staff along with members of the CCRPC’s AHMP Plan Update Committee. For more information, see http://www.ccrpcvt.org/our-work/emergency-management/hazard-mitigation-plan/ Once a municipality adopts its FEMA review and approved AHMP, the municipality is eligible to apply for various FEMA grants as well as help meet standards for a favorable match percentage under the State Emergency Relief and Assistance Funds program.

For more information contact:
Dan Albrecht, 846-4490, ext. * 29  dalbrecht@ccrpcvt.org

Attachments:
See attached resolution. See final draft of Multi-Jurisdictional AHMP at http://www.ccrpcvt.org/about-us/commission/agendas-minutes/
Resolution: 2017 Chittenden County Multi-Jurisdictional All-Hazards Mitigation

WHEREAS, the 2017 Chittenden County Multi-Jurisdictional All-Hazards Mitigation Plan (Plan) and its attendant municipal All-Hazards Mitigation Plans attached as Annexes analyze hazards and assess risks in the County as a whole and in the individual municipalities; and the Plan and its Annexes recommend the implementation of a variety of actions to mitigate against damage from hazard events; and

WHEREAS, municipalities in Chittenden County have historically experienced severe damage from natural hazards and they continue to be vulnerable to the effects of the hazards profiled in the Plan which result in loss of property and life, economic hardship, and threats to public health and safety; and

WHEREAS, the 2017 Chittenden County Multi-Jurisdictional All-Hazards Mitigation Plan and a template for an annexed municipal All-Hazards Mitigation Plan have received an “Approval Pending Adoption” determination from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) under the requirements of 44 CFR 201.6; and

WHEREAS, the Plan specifically addresses hazard mitigation strategies, and plan maintenance procedures for the CCRPC and recommends several hazard mitigation actions (projects) that will provide mitigation for specific natural hazards that impact the municipalities in the County with the effect of protecting people and property from loss associated with those hazards; and

WHEREAS, adoption of this Plan and its applicable municipal All-Hazards Mitigation Plan by an individual municipality and subsequent FEMA Formal Approval will make them eligible for funding to alleviate the impacts of future hazards;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission:

1. The 2017 Chittenden County Multi-Jurisdictional All-Hazards Mitigation Plan is hereby adopted as an official plan of the CCRPC;

2. CCRPC staff are hereby directed to pursue implementation of the recommended actions;

3. Future revisions and Plan maintenance required by 44 CFR 201.6 and FEMA are hereby adopted as part of this resolution for a period of five (5) years from the date of this resolution; and

4. An annual report on the process of the implementation elements of the Plan will be presented to the CCRPC Board by the Executive Director.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned have affixed their signature this ___ day of ___________ 2017.

________________________  __________________________
CHRISTOPHER D. ROY      CHARLES BAKER
CCRPC Chair               CCRPC Executive Director

Attest: ____________________

110 West Canal Street, Suite 202
Winooski, Vermont 05404-2109
802-846-4490
www.ccrpcvt.org
Thank you very much for the hard work and consultation that went into developing this report and its recommendations. It is a significant step forward in developing a long term funding system for achieving our shared clean water goals.

**Support**: In order for the State of Vermont to establish a stable, long-term source of water quality funding to meet our water quality goals, we **support** the following:

1. **Statewide Approach.** We endorse an approach that takes a State-wide perspective on addressing water quality, beyond a focus only on the Lake Champlain basin or a particular region; while acknowledging Lake Champlain is an invaluable asset to the entire State and its economy.

2. **Biggest bang for the buck.** Raising the majority of needed funding statewide will allow the State to best manage investments that have the greatest cost-effectiveness. The cost to society will be less if effective investments are made in high-priority locations. This is important to most efficiently meet our Clean Water goals.

3. **Real Need.** There are significant funding gaps for municipalities and other regulated entities to achieve compliance. The total cost of capital investments in clean water are estimated at \$115 million per year for the next 20 years. The funding gap is \$62 million per year. The current recommendation is to fund \$25 million per year.

   It is important to keep in mind that these costs do not include project planning and development costs or ongoing operating and maintenance costs, which may be as much or more than the capital costs on an annual basis and are ongoing. So, the total true cost may be \$230 million or more.

   Considering these additional project planning and development costs and operating and maintenance costs, the State should raise enough revenue to cover 80% of capital costs, or \$50 million/year.

4. **Raise funds statewide.** These compliance efforts will be most assisted by meeting a significant portion of the cost through statewide revenues. Municipal budgets, and their limited base of property taxes, cannot afford the significant cost of water quality compliance on their own. This will allow for equitable revenue-raising statewide and decrease inequity among municipalities in raising sufficient revenue to implement what needs to be done. Please keep in mind that any municipal costs that are not covered by the State will still be borne by taxpayers at the municipal level, but probably in very unequal ways as some towns move more quickly and some more slowly.

5. **Immediate funding.** We support the interim funding proposal of extending the property transfer tax surcharge for another year to 2019 and using state bonding capacity until a long-
term revenue can be implemented. The three priorities, in order, for this interim period should be:

i. Developing the administrative systems to determine, collect, and distribute parcel-based revenue.

ii. Investing in project development.

iii. Investing in capital projects that are “shovel ready.” There is some concern here that those that are “shovel ready” now may not be the most cost effective projects.

6. **Nexus.** That there be a clear nexus between how funding is raised and water quality; that is, the revenue source should be closely related to either a significant pollution source or a direct beneficiary of improved water quality. Meeting the documented stream impairment and phosphorus, stormwater, and nitrogen TMDL requirements should be the principal targets.

7. **Parcel Fee/“All-in.”** A broad-based approach that spreads these costs out among all Vermonters. A parcel-based fee of some kind makes the most sense in terms of having a rational nexus and having an “all in” approach. This would include properties that are exempt from property tax including government facilities, State roads and buildings. In concept, we support the recommendation to implement a parcel-based tiered fee at the beginning of FY19, with a more accurate impervious-based tiered fee to follow when ready.

8. **Additional revenue source options.** With regard to the various fee/tax mechanism listed on pages 59-60 of the Treasurer’s Report, the State should continue to explore the adoption of fees with a clear and defensible nexus to water quality.

9. **Additional Resources.** The State of Vermont should raise revenue and bond, as necessary, to provide the match necessary to obtain additional Federal or private funding opportunities. DEC should take an active role in finding and applying for federal funding.

10. **Clean Water Fund Board.** At least one municipal representative should be added to the Clean Water Fund Board in 2017.

11. **Administration Options.** – Of the four Administration Options presented (see last page for summary table), we would like to see Option 1: Water Quality Improvement District as a Utility implemented by 2019. Funds should be raised in a statewide system with billing, parcel (GIS and impervious) analysis, and consistent determinations regarding billing, trading, credits, and enforcement decisions made at this level. Some percentage of the funding should be kept at the state level for administration and so that high level priorities can be decided by the Clean Water Board about priority investments in different categories and/or watersheds. This will facilitate development of trading networks so that real prioritization takes place and also provides mechanism for municipalities with less cost-effective implementation options to meet their regulatory obligations.

   The majority of funds should be distributed to regions for project identification, management, technical assistance, and long term operation and maintenance. Providing these functions regionally will minimize costs and reduce potentially redundant services if all of this work were to happen at a municipal level. Regardless of which option is chosen, it should provide funding for and support:

   i. regional prioritization of projects;
ii. a pool of project development, engineering, management/monitoring funds in each region;

iii. a regional or municipal capital improvement plan approach to project selection rather than competitive grants;

iv. partnerships between municipalities, property owners, RPCs, conservation districts, and watershed associations;

v. development of a long-term framework for ensuring proper maintenance, operations and management of these new clean water assets

12. Administration Options Cost Analysis. While we assume Option 1 will be most cost effective if billed and collected at the state level, we need some more analysis of the cost of administration for the four administrative options. In particular, the cost of billing and collecting the fees needs to be examined. Municipalities have major concerns about being asked to bill on behalf of the state including tax exempt properties that do not receive municipal bills.

Relationship to existing stormwater utilities:

13. Don’t double-charge. We strongly believe that property owners/municipalities with existing stormwater fees not be “double charged”. Any statewide fee levied for the purpose of water quality should not reduce existing funding of municipal stormwater programs/utilities. A statewide fee should provide for credits if a property owner is paying into a municipal stormwater programs/utility or for their own permit (3 acre, Ag). We want to make sure that municipal stormwater utilities have the flexibility to meet the requirements of their permit with DEC.

14. Access to State funding. Even if a municipality has established a stormwater utility or some other locally-based revenue raising mechanism, municipalities would still like to be able to access additional state funds because no municipalities have the capacity to raise all of the revenues required to address the needs.

15. Regional Collaboration. A system that allows for regional collaboration with other municipalities or with property owners with separate stormwater permits when individual municipalities determine that this option would be in their best interest.

16. Roads? We wonder about the implications of the VTrans fee to stormwater utilities if the creation of municipal utilities is encouraged. Similarly, we wonder about how municipal roads would be handled since they will be covered under the Municipal Roads General Permit.

With regard to how the State of Vermont collects water quality funding, we have the following concerns and suggestions:

17. Collection generally. It is important that the collection system address:
   a. How to impose a new fee on tax exempt property
   b. How residents will be able to easily distinguish this fee from local property taxes.
   c. The cost of administration.
   d. Method of enforcement/penalties when entities do not pay fee

18. Not municipal collection. There is not a correlation between making funding decisions at a local/regional level and collecting the fees. While we appreciate the idea of driving the revenue
generation and use to a local level, requiring municipalities to collect these funds is problematic because:

a. Any municipality that does not already have a Stormwater utility would have to develop a new water quality fee collection system for all properties including tax exempt properties, separate from tax bills.

b. Property owners will not be able to distinguish the state fee from locally imposed taxes. Municipalities are clearly opposed to adding additional costs to the property taxes.

c. There will be a new cost burden imposed on every municipality to collect and enforce this fee.

19. **Statewide collection.** We believe that a detailed analysis of collection options will conclude that it will ultimately be more effective to develop a statewide billing system (paid for out of the revenues) than asking every municipality develop 255 separate billing systems to bill the fee and deduct their administrative costs. The state will have to develop an administrative monitoring system either way. This could build from state efforts to develop statewide parcel mapping (and maybe impervious layer if that is needed). Municipalities should have the option to add a surcharge to the State fee to obtain the costs needed to cover the 20% not being collected by the State.

20. **Collection costs.** The cost of collecting parcel fee revenue needs to be better defined as different options could vary widely. These costs should be covered by these new revenues and not be passed onto regulatory permit fees. If the State does decide on a municipally-based collection system, there needs to be further discussion as to how much, if any, beyond the cost for administration, of these state fees, remain with the municipality.

21. **Trust Fund.** Will these funds carry over from year to year, or be returned to the General Fund if unspent? We’d like to see some sort of trust or enterprise fund be established so that this revenue is always reserved for its intended purpose.

Regarding **permitting** responsibilities, we have the following comments:

22. Stormwater permitting responsibility of the State of Vermont should not be shifted from DEC to municipalities unless the individual municipality wants to do this. This might be done through a delegation process with full authority at the municipality’s option. Additionally, if the municipality chooses to take over this responsibility, there should be some manner of compensation allowed.

General concern:

23. **More $ Needed.** We are concerned that even if all revenues explored were implemented, they don’t generate enough to meet the needs.

24. We are concerned that if prioritization frameworks include cost-benefit (as they should) that communities with projects that are less cost beneficial (because of constraints of retrofitting in a developed area) might not receive funding. However, because of NPDES permitting requirements these communities will still be required to implement these less cost beneficial practices. A trading system would be very helpful in these situations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Funding Source for Administrative Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1: Water Quality Improvement District as a Utility</td>
<td>Establishes a local, regional or state utility to deliver water quality improvement services. Funds raised locally or regionally are retained locally or regionally, to target state-approved priority clean water improvement projects.</td>
<td>% of funds for full-time equivalent (FTE) at the State that can assist municipalities in the formation of water quality improvement districts (utilities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2: Clean Water Partnership Block Grant Program</td>
<td>Implementation is outsourced to partner organization via a new clean water block grant program; the grant is structured to achieve specified environmental performance outcomes, such as targeted pollutant reductions</td>
<td>% of funds set aside for program administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3: A New Municipal Clean Water State Aid Program</td>
<td>Applies a formula-based model, similar the VTTrans General State Aid to Town Highways, for distributing funds directly to entities, such as regional partner or even directly to municipalities; example includes distribution of funds directly for implementation that supports compliance with a state permit</td>
<td>% of funds set aside for program administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 4: Current Funding Model: Provide Enhanced Management Using State Agency Funding Programs</td>
<td>State agencies support outcome-based implementation using existing funding programs</td>
<td>% of funds set aside for program administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agenda Item #8
February 15, 2017
Chittenden County Forecast

Issue
At the February CCRPC Meeting, staff and the consultants from RSG and Economic & Policy Resources (EPR) will present the latest county and municipal population and total employment forecast and request Board member’s feedback. See the attachments for the Chittenden County Municipal Population and Employment Forecast.

As you may recall, at the October Board meeting staff introduced the topic of future population forecasts that were necessary for the Regional Plan, Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)/Transportation Model Update, and Regional Energy Plan. Since then, staff has been working with the consultants, RSG and EPR, to refine the initial county-wide population forecast per comments heard from the TAC, LRPC, PAC and the Board. As a result, the consultants worked to bring the forecast into alignment with the ACCD/VEIC Population Projection and to account for the County’s historically increasing share of the State’s total population. Additionally, the consultants developed a municipal-level population and employment forecast for each town.

The municipal population forecast was developed based on each municipality’s share of the 2015 county population and a population growth rate derived from a combination of the county forecasted average annual growth rates, the 2010-2015 average annual municipal population growth, and the 2010-2015 average annual municipal growth in total housing. The consultant is also developing a household forecast for the County and municipalities, which will be distributed at the Board meeting.

Please see the attached memo dated February 8, 2017 for a full description of the initial total employment forecast.

During February and March, Staff will review the forecasts with the TAC, LRPC, PAC, and the Board and share any feedback with the consultant. It is anticipated that the Board will consider approval of the county and municipal forecasts at their March meeting.

Background
Vermont Statute requires that all plans shall be based upon surveys of existing conditions and probable future trends, and shall be made in light of present and future growth and requirements (24 VSA §4302(d)). Therefore, the CCRPC has historically prepared future demographic forecasts for the Regional Plan and MTP. As we prepare for the 2018 update of the ECOS Plan, we need to yet again set the County’s population, housing, and employment forecasts. More specifically, forecasts are needed as inputs to the Energy Plan and Travel Demand Model which will inform the MTP.

In previous iterations of approving forecasts, the CCMPO/CCRPC have agreed that forecasts should describe the future as we expect it to be, not as we want it to be. Essentially, forecasts are a necessary planning tool which help us to understand the impacts of increased population and enable us to make informed decisions based on a potential growth scenario. Also, it is important to keep in mind that future growth predictions are continually updated and revised along with the Regional Plan. Figures 1-3 provide an overview of the various sets of predictions made for Chittenden County population since 1996. A similar figure for employment will be included in the Board presentation.

Staff Recommendation:
There is no recommendation at this time. Board approval is anticipated for consideration in March, and we will ask for a LRPC recommendation in March.

For more information, contact:
Melanie Needle
mneedle@ccrpcvt.org or 846-4490 ext. *27
Figure 1: Chittenden County Historic Population (1970-2015) & Population Forecasts

- Historic Population
- ACCD Population Projection
- VEIC draft Regional Energy Plan
- 2017 draft County Forecast
- 2013 ECOS Regional Plan
- 2006 Regional Plan
- 2001 Regional Plan/2001 EPR Report
- 1996 Regional Plan Low Range
- 1996 Regional Plan High Range
Figure 2: Chittenden County Historic Population (2000-2015) & Population Forecasts
### Figure 3: Chittenden County Population 1990-2015, Chittenden County Population Forecasts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996 Regional Plan</td>
<td>131,791b</td>
<td>140,000-144,000</td>
<td>150,000-154,000</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>168,000-171,000</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 Regional Plan</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>151,500</td>
<td>157,400</td>
<td>163,000</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 ECOS Plan</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>156,545b</td>
<td>164,710</td>
<td>174,348</td>
<td>184,694</td>
<td>195,070</td>
<td>205,445</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCD Population Projection</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>165,690</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>171,718</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Regional Energy Plan</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>165,690</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>171,718</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>186,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 draft Initial County Forecast</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>156,805a</td>
<td>161,382a</td>
<td>165,803</td>
<td>169,580</td>
<td>172,596</td>
<td>174,764</td>
<td>176,179</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual PopulationC</td>
<td>132,143</td>
<td>140,104</td>
<td>147,161</td>
<td>152,163</td>
<td>156,760</td>
<td>165,358</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a-Year ACS Estimate, 2010 needs to be adjusted to 156,705
- b-U.S. Decennial Census
- c-Historic Population - U.S. Dept. of Commerce
### Chittenden County Municipal Population Forecast - January 25, 2017

#### Population, Share of County Population, and Average Annual Growth --Chittenden County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>Total Projected Population</th>
<th>Share of County Population</th>
<th>Average Annual Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>156,805</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>161,382</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>165,803</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>169,580</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>172,596</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>174,764</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>176,179</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Population, Share of County Population, and Average Annual Growth --Bolton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>Total Projected Population</th>
<th>Share of County Population</th>
<th>Average Annual Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1,249</td>
<td>0.77%</td>
<td>1.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1,297</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>1,337</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>1,369</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>1,390</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>1,404</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Population, Share of County Population, and Average Annual Growth --Buels gore

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>Total Projected Population</th>
<th>Share of County Population</th>
<th>Average Annual Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>18.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Population, Share of Population, and Average Annual Growth --Burlington

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>Total Projected Population</th>
<th>Share of County Population</th>
<th>Average Annual Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>42,498</td>
<td>27.10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>43,015</td>
<td>26.65%</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>43,943</td>
<td>26.50%</td>
<td>0.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>44,738</td>
<td>26.38%</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>45,373</td>
<td>26.29%</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>45,873</td>
<td>26.25%</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>46,190</td>
<td>26.22%</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Population, Share of Population, and Average Annual Growth --Charlotte

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>Total Projected Population</th>
<th>Share of County Population</th>
<th>Average Annual Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3,768</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>3,862</td>
<td>2.39%</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>3,962</td>
<td>2.39%</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>4,047</td>
<td>2.39%</td>
<td>0.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>4,115</td>
<td>2.38%</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>4,164</td>
<td>2.38%</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>4,197</td>
<td>2.38%</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Population, Share of Population, and Average Annual Growth --Colchester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>Total Projected Population</th>
<th>Share of County Population</th>
<th>Average Annual Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>17,296</td>
<td>11.03%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>17,474</td>
<td>10.83%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>17,840</td>
<td>10.76%</td>
<td>0.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>18,153</td>
<td>10.70%</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>18,404</td>
<td>10.66%</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>18,604</td>
<td>10.65%</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>18,730</td>
<td>10.63%</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Population, Share of Population, and Average Annual Growth --Essex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>Total Projected Population</th>
<th>Share of County Population</th>
<th>Average Annual Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>19,692</td>
<td>12.56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>20,633</td>
<td>12.78%</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>21,321</td>
<td>12.86%</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>21,906</td>
<td>12.92%</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>22,372</td>
<td>12.96%</td>
<td>0.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>22,685</td>
<td>12.98%</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>22,895</td>
<td>13.00%</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Population, Share of Population, and Average Annual Growth --Hinesburg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>Total Projected Population</th>
<th>Share of County Population</th>
<th>Average Annual Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4,439</td>
<td>2.83%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>4,519</td>
<td>2.80%</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>4,625</td>
<td>2.79%</td>
<td>0.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>4,716</td>
<td>2.78%</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>4,788</td>
<td>2.77%</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>4,844</td>
<td>2.77%</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>4,879</td>
<td>2.77%</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Population, Share of Population, and Average Annual Growth --Huntington

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>Total Projected Population</th>
<th>Share of County Population</th>
<th>Average Annual Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2,031</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1,895</td>
<td>1.17%</td>
<td>-1.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1,884</td>
<td>1.14%</td>
<td>-0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>1,878</td>
<td>1.11%</td>
<td>-0.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>1,874</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
<td>-0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>1,881</td>
<td>1.08%</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>1,884</td>
<td>1.07%</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Population, Share of Population, and Average Annual Growth --Jericho

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>Total Projected Population</th>
<th>Share of County Population</th>
<th>Average Annual Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>5,077</td>
<td>3.24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>5,096</td>
<td>3.16%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>5,191</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>5,273</td>
<td>3.11%</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>5,339</td>
<td>3.09%</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>5,394</td>
<td>3.09%</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>5,428</td>
<td>3.08%</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Population, Share of Population, and Average Annual Growth -- Milton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>Total Projected Population</th>
<th>Share of County Population</th>
<th>Average Annual Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>10,329</td>
<td>6.59%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>10,721</td>
<td>6.64%</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>11,044</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>11,319</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>11,538</td>
<td>6.68%</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>11,690</td>
<td>6.69%</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>11,791</td>
<td>6.69%</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Population, Share of Population, and Average Annual Growth -- Richmond

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>Total Projected Population</th>
<th>Share of County Population</th>
<th>Average Annual Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4,142</td>
<td>2.64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>4,158</td>
<td>2.58%</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>4,236</td>
<td>2.55%</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>4,303</td>
<td>2.54%</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>4,357</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>4,402</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>4,430</td>
<td>2.51%</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Population, Share of Population, and Average Annual Growth -- St. George

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>Total Projected Population</th>
<th>Share of County Population</th>
<th>Average Annual Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
<td>4.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
<td>1.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
<td>1.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
<td>1.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>0.57%</td>
<td>0.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>0.58%</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Population, Share of Population, and Average Annual Growth --Shelburne

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>Total Projected Population</th>
<th>Share of County Population</th>
<th>Average Annual Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>7,218</td>
<td>4.60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>7,645</td>
<td>4.74%</td>
<td>1.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>7,929</td>
<td>4.78%</td>
<td>0.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>8,170</td>
<td>4.82%</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>8,362</td>
<td>4.84%</td>
<td>0.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>8,487</td>
<td>4.86%</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>8,572</td>
<td>4.87%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Population, Share of Population, and Average Annual Growth --South Burlington

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>Total Projected Population</th>
<th>Share of County Population</th>
<th>Average Annual Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>17,589</td>
<td>11.22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>18,730</td>
<td>11.61%</td>
<td>1.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>19,459</td>
<td>11.74%</td>
<td>0.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>20,081</td>
<td>11.84%</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>20,575</td>
<td>11.92%</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>20,892</td>
<td>11.95%</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>21,108</td>
<td>11.98%</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Population, Share of Population, and Average Annual Growth --Underhill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>Total Projected Population</th>
<th>Share of County Population</th>
<th>Average Annual Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3,051</td>
<td>1.95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>3,093</td>
<td>1.92%</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>3,161</td>
<td>1.91%</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>3,220</td>
<td>1.90%</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>3,266</td>
<td>1.89%</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>3,303</td>
<td>1.89%</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>3,326</td>
<td>1.89%</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>Total Projected Population</th>
<th>Share of County Population</th>
<th>Average Annual Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2,031</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2,034</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2,071</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>2,103</td>
<td>1.24%</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>2,129</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>2,150</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>2,164</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>Total Projected Population</th>
<th>Share of County Population</th>
<th>Average Annual Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>8,610</td>
<td>5.49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>9,149</td>
<td>5.67%</td>
<td>1.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>9,499</td>
<td>5.73%</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>9,797</td>
<td>5.78%</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>10,034</td>
<td>5.81%</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>10,187</td>
<td>5.83%</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>10,291</td>
<td>5.84%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>Total Projected Population</th>
<th>Share of County Population</th>
<th>Average Annual Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>7,229</td>
<td>4.61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>7,299</td>
<td>4.52%</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>7,451</td>
<td>4.49%</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>7,581</td>
<td>4.47%</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>7,685</td>
<td>4.45%</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>7,769</td>
<td>4.45%</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>7,821</td>
<td>4.44%</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The spreadsheet file provided to you on February 3, 2017 summarizes the results of our initial employment forecast for Chittenden County and its respective municipalities. These results reflect the forecasted total employment (full-time and part-time jobs) in each area from 2020 through 2040, consisting of both wage and salary employment and proprietors’ employment. It is important to note, as this forecast will be viewed alongside the population forecast that employment in this case refers to the location of employer and not the residence of the employee/proprietor. From 2015 through 2040, total employment in Chittenden County is forecasted to grow at an annual average rate of 0.90%. Table 1 below summarizes the results sent in the spreadsheet on February 3, 2017:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chittenden County</td>
<td>135,511</td>
<td>146,589</td>
<td>151,475</td>
<td>156,567</td>
<td>162,560</td>
<td>169,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buels gore</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>46,046</td>
<td>49,488</td>
<td>50,936</td>
<td>52,433</td>
<td>54,195</td>
<td>56,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>12,882</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>15,090</td>
<td>15,732</td>
<td>16,483</td>
<td>17,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex (Town and Junction)</td>
<td>15,842</td>
<td>16,423</td>
<td>16,629</td>
<td>16,839</td>
<td>17,085</td>
<td>17,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinesburg</td>
<td>1,489</td>
<td>1,593</td>
<td>1,608</td>
<td>1,622</td>
<td>1,638</td>
<td>1,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jericho</td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>1,154</td>
<td>1,193</td>
<td>1,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>3,548</td>
<td>4,036</td>
<td>4,230</td>
<td>4,432</td>
<td>4,669</td>
<td>4,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>1,894</td>
<td>1,998</td>
<td>2,083</td>
<td>2,172</td>
<td>2,276</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelburne</td>
<td>4,713</td>
<td>4,940</td>
<td>5,095</td>
<td>5,256</td>
<td>5,445</td>
<td>5,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So. Burlington</td>
<td>24,940</td>
<td>26,642</td>
<td>27,306</td>
<td>27,993</td>
<td>28,801</td>
<td>29,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underhill</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westford</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williston</td>
<td>17,405</td>
<td>19,599</td>
<td>20,716</td>
<td>21,877</td>
<td>23,245</td>
<td>24,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winooski</td>
<td>3,967</td>
<td>4,366</td>
<td>4,664</td>
<td>4,976</td>
<td>5,343</td>
<td>5,779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 is the product of two different forecasts: a county-level forecast and a municipal-level forecast. The municipal-level forecast utilized historical data from the Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages (“QCEW”) published by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics in conjunction with the Vermont Department of Labor. The QCEW historical employment data (2010 through 2015) for each municipality consist of only “covered” employment (salary and wage employment). The QCEW does not include any proprietors, whether farm and/or nonfarm. Additionally, the QCEW under reports farm employment and excludes military employment. We regressed and forecasted each municipality’s historical employment against the forecasted payroll employment for Chittenden County from the June 2016 Vermont Statewide Population Consensus Forecast—Legislative Joint Fiscal Office—Shumlin Administration. Table 2 below shows how the share of each municipality changes throughout the forecasted time horizon:

**Table 2: Municipal Covered Employment as a Percentage Share of County Covered Employment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chittenden County</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buels gore</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>33.98%</td>
<td>33.76%</td>
<td>33.63%</td>
<td>33.49%</td>
<td>33.34%</td>
<td>33.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>9.51%</td>
<td>9.89%</td>
<td>9.96%</td>
<td>10.05%</td>
<td>10.14%</td>
<td>10.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex (Town and Junction)</td>
<td>11.69%</td>
<td>11.20%</td>
<td>10.98%</td>
<td>10.75%</td>
<td>10.51%</td>
<td>10.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinesburg</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
<td>1.06%</td>
<td>1.04%</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
<td>0.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jericho</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
<td>0.73%</td>
<td>0.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>2.62%</td>
<td>2.75%</td>
<td>2.79%</td>
<td>2.83%</td>
<td>2.87%</td>
<td>2.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
<td>1.36%</td>
<td>1.38%</td>
<td>1.39%</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
<td>1.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelburne</td>
<td>3.48%</td>
<td>3.37%</td>
<td>3.36%</td>
<td>3.36%</td>
<td>3.35%</td>
<td>3.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So. Burlington</td>
<td>18.40%</td>
<td>18.17%</td>
<td>18.03%</td>
<td>17.88%</td>
<td>17.72%</td>
<td>17.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underhill</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westford</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williston</td>
<td>12.84%</td>
<td>13.37%</td>
<td>13.68%</td>
<td>13.97%</td>
<td>14.30%</td>
<td>14.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winooski</td>
<td>2.93%</td>
<td>2.98%</td>
<td>3.08%</td>
<td>3.18%</td>
<td>3.29%</td>
<td>3.41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The municipal-level forecast that only forecasts the change in salary and wage employment is utilized to get specificity on the shares of the county population for each municipality. The assumption moving forward is that the share of county covered employment, as summarized in Table 2, will be the same for total employment. This is an assumption that should be viewed with some skepticism, however due to the lack of total employment (primarily uncovered) data at the
municipal level, this assumption is necessary to provide a share-based breakout of municipal total employment.

The county-level forecast for total employment takes historical data on both salary and wage employment and proprietors employment from the Bureau of Economic Analysis for Chittenden County and regresses and forecasts it against the forecasted payroll non-farm employment for Chittenden County from the June 2016 Vermont Statewide Population Consensus Forecast—Legislative Joint Fiscal Office—Shumlin Administration. Chart 1 below shows how the two county-level employment forecasts differ with regards to the annual rate of growth:

**Chart 1: Chittenden County Forecasted Employment Growth**

As seen in Chart 1, proprietorship employment is forecasted to grow at a faster rate than salary and wage employment, although as Chart 2 below shows, the wage and salary employment represents the majority of total employment. The changes in the composition of the covered vs uncovered employment at the county level is an interesting trend to pay attention to and the diversity among municipalities’ job markets would lead us to believe that there will be areas in Chittenden County that expand proprietorship employment at faster or slower rates relative to the rest of the county. For the time being however, we have made the assumption that the growth in total employment for each municipality is similar for covered and non-covered employment.
Each municipality’s share of total employment at any given time period in the forecasted horizon is the same as its share of the salary and wage (covered) employment, as shown in Table 2. Table 1 summarizes those jobs totals for each area, and Table 3 below summarizes the annual average growth at each 5-year interval:

Table 3: 5-Year Average Annual Growth in Total Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chittenden County</td>
<td>1.69%</td>
<td>1.58%</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td>-1.58%</td>
<td>2.24%</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
<td>1.24%</td>
<td>1.41%</td>
<td>1.57%</td>
<td>1.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buels gore</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
<td>0.58%</td>
<td>0.58%</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
<td>0.76%</td>
<td>0.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>3.34%</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
<td>0.92%</td>
<td>0.92%</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
<td>1.16%</td>
<td>1.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>2.10%</td>
<td>2.39%</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>1.06%</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex (Town and Junction)</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
<td>0.34%</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinesburg</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>1.35%</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
<td>0.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
<td>-0.15%</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jericho</td>
<td>1.82%</td>
<td>1.43%</td>
<td>0.59%</td>
<td>0.59%</td>
<td>0.67%</td>
<td>0.77%</td>
<td>0.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>2.51%</td>
<td>2.61%</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>0.93%</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
<td>1.18%</td>
<td>1.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>1.08%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>1.07%</td>
<td>0.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelburne</td>
<td>2.32%</td>
<td>0.95%</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
<td>0.71%</td>
<td>0.81%</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So. Burlington</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>1.33%</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.57%</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
<td>0.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>4.39%</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
<td>1.44%</td>
<td>1.57%</td>
<td>1.72%</td>
<td>2.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underhill</td>
<td>-0.51%</td>
<td>1.82%</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
<td>0.71%</td>
<td>0.81%</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westford</td>
<td>2.53%</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>1.11%</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
<td>1.22%</td>
<td>1.36%</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williston</td>
<td>4.13%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>1.11%</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
<td>1.22%</td>
<td>1.36%</td>
<td>1.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winooski</td>
<td>5.31%</td>
<td>1.94%</td>
<td>1.33%</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
<td>1.43%</td>
<td>1.58%</td>
<td>1.52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We believe that this forecast for total employment in Chittenden County and the respective municipalities is a reasonable forecast based on the data. Please let us know if you have any questions and if it is desired to make any adjustments to the forecast.
The meeting was called to order at 5:42 p.m. by the Committee Chair, Brian Bigelow.

1. **Review of Financial Reports – FY17 through December**
   
a. **Balance Sheet:** Forest reviewed balance sheet as of December 31, 2016. Cash in checking (operating) - $124,362; Cash in savings (match) - $241,015; Cash in money market and CDs (reserve) - $233,861; Current assets over liabilities - $644,008. We have used up the match carried over from FY16 and now have $230,923 available.

   **Income Statement:** ACCD funds (row 4 & 5) are being expended ahead of budget. That means we'll likely use all the ACCD funds before the end of the fiscal year. Once that occurs we will match expenses with revenue from Local Dues (row 6). The Transportation staff billing line is close to budget for the year. There are some new programs this month: Regional Services (Dispatch) R-11, Act 174 Training, Row 43 and Malletts Bay Stormwater (r.48). As of December the All Hazard Mitigation Plan Update grant (row 55) has been billed out. It was noted that we had only budgeted $6,063 for FY17, but have spent $15,948 – Forest explained that when we put the budget together, we had anticipated spending more of the grant in FY16. That number will be adjusted in January now that the Mid-year Adjustment has been adopted. On the expense side, the Salaries expense is tracking very close to budget and benefits tracking a little further behind. The Depreciation line is going to be higher than budgeted as our new server cost more than anticipated. The telephone/internet line fluctuates each month based on when these charges show up on the credit card bills. Net income through December 2016 is $2,208 and for FY17 through December $17,058. Forest noted that in recent years, the second half of the fiscal year has been more positive than the first half, so a surplus how is an indication that we could end the year in the black.

   b. **Cash Flow/Projections.** Cash flow is strong for FY17 and when we look at December projection and the balance at the end of the month, we are slightly ahead of the projection - $599,238 vs. $592,086. Forest pointed out that some of that cash is not really ours yet. It is deferred revenue to be used as we work on those things such as Opioid Alliance. We have received funds from the Stiller Foundation and UVM Medical Center. Most of our other funding is reimbursable.

2. **Approve Journal Entries – Second Quarter FY17 – October-December 2016.** Members reviewed Journal Entries. MIKE O'BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BRIAN BIGELOW, TO APPROVE THE JOURNAL ENTRIES FROM OCTOBER-DECEMBER 2016. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. **Discuss FY18 UPWP & Budget meeting schedule.** Forest noted that the Finance Committee may be asked to review funding for the FY 18 UPWP. After some discussion, members suggested we meet a half hour before the Executive Committee meetings (5:15 p.m.), to eliminate another night meeting.
4. Other Business. There was none.

MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BRIAN BIGELOW, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 6:25 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc
The meeting was called to order at 5:45 p.m. by the Chair, Chris Roy.

1. Changes to the Agenda; Members’ Items. We need to take formal action on the letter regarding the Green Line Devco, LLC, which members had reviewed via email. We will add it to item 3. Because Brian and Mike will not be in town on March 1st, and there is a possibility that Andy won’t be either, members agreed to move the Executive Committee meeting to Wednesday, March 8th at 5:45 p.m.

2. Approval of January 4, 2017 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 4, 2017 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING. MOTION CARRIED WITH BARBARA ELLIOTT ABSTAINING.

3. Act 250 & Sec. 248 Applications.
   a. Green Line Devco, LLC – Docket #8847. They’ve applied for a Certificate of Public Good for a power line under Lake Champlain. Our questions to them are similar to what we sent for the TDI request last year. JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BARBARA ELLIOTT, TO RATIFY THE LETTER REGARDING GREEN LINE DEVC. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. Water Quality Funding Recommendations. Charlie distributed draft CCRPC comments on the State Treasurer’s Clean Water Report to the legislature. We had appointed an ad hoc committee including Brian Bigelow, Don Meals and others from the CWAC. There are a lot of issues. It recommends three different things in the short-term using $25M/year in new bonding capacity to get to the long-term solution; an affinity card that’ll go to water quality; and, continuing the property transfer tax based fee. They researched how other communities around the country have done this, and the answer is that they create stormwater utilities. They suggested that every town have a stormwater utility, but most of our stormwater professionals feel that is pretty unrealistic.
   Charlie walked members through each comment. It was recommended that we add some language to #1 to say, “We endorse an approach that takes a state-wide perspective and focuses on water quality issues state-wide beyond the Lake Champlain basin because it’s an invaluable asset and its health benefits all Vermont. Charlie then reviewed the four options for administering an expanded Clean Water Fund:
   a. Option 1: Water quality improvement district as a utility.
   b. Option 2: Clean Water partnership block grant program.
c. Option 3: A new municipal clean water state-aid program

d. Option 4: Current funding model: provide enhanced management using state agency
fundings programs.

In comment #11 we note we would like to see Option 1 implemented by 2019, but in #12 we say
that we assume Option #1 is cost effective, if billed and collected at the state level, but we need
some more analysis of the cost of administration for the four administrative options.

We then reviewed the relationship to existing stormwater utilities. Discussion ensued about how
the state would do a fair share. Members feel it should be needs-based vs. apportionment. There
should be a relationship between impervious surface and the fee. Chris said Williston had to do a
lot of analysis about how to deal with the fee for residential vs. business, and doing it statewide just
exacerbates it. It was noted that we are proposing the state cover 80% of capital costs with
municipalities covering the other 20%. Mike feels that the property fee should really cover 100%, or
come up with a mechanism for the state to cover the delta. Charlie noted that the VLCT and mayors
have taken a position supporting 80% so that municipalities have a stake in the projects. Chris
suggested that we add a surcharge to the state-wide billing to cover the match since it all comes
from property owners anyway. Discussion continued. There is $40M/year coming from the federal
government. Charlie asked members if they wanted to make recommendations to the board. The
CWAC will review these at their meeting next week and they will make recommendations to the
board at their meeting. Mike suggested the Executive Committee not weigh in on it, except for the
comments we added tonight and have the CWAC’s recommendations go to the Board. Members
agreed.

5. Regional Dispatch Update. Charlie distributed a summary of the Regional Dispatch Implementation
report from the consultant. They had two presentations yesterday – in the afternoon and the
evening for police, rescue, and fire chiefs, dispatchers, other public safety personnel, and elected
officials. There were about 50 people at each session. Charlie reviewed the consultant
recommendations; and how consolidation addresses issues specific to Chittenden County including
– staffing, mutual aid, fire-EMS calls, call taking process. They then reviewed countywide
challenges; and a timeline for implementation that proposes to proceed in three phases to be
completed by December 31, 2019. It was noted that they say 5 dispatchers per shift could cover the
whole county. Right now Burlington alone uses 3-4, but dispatchers do a lot more than just dispatch
work – many have other administrative work that the departments would then have to have
someone else do. Barbara didn’t feel they discussed the change management to deal with this in
each community to cultivate it. She noted that sometimes moving an office in the same building can
be traumatic, let alone moving to another location with new co-workers. Lengthy discussion ensued
about the fact that first responders and public safety folks need to be educated so this will work.
Charlie then reviewed governance issues and models examined. A union municipal district is
recommended. He then reviewed next steps in organizing, development and decisions. Andy said if
the initial contacts feel the staff is too few, you go with more and then right-size as you go along.
Barbara suggested that the graph show staff needed for a.m. and p.m. shifts to reassure there is
enough staff. We need to show high-volume and low-volume times side by side. Andy suggested
we leave the actual number alone while we figure that out. Charlie noted the consultant is done
and now we need to continue that momentum. Charlie will let board members know when he’ll be
visiting their selectboards/councils to report on regional dispatch. We will be asking each
community who currently provides dispatch services to appoint a member to the joint survey
committee to start work on exploring a union municipal district. The other communities will be contract towns. Charlie asked members to give him other feedback as it comes up.

6. **Chair/Executive Director’s Report.**
   a. We are doing employee evaluations right now. His evaluation will be done at the March Executive Committee meeting.
   b. Charlie and Eleni have been meeting with different state agencies to meet the new leadership.

7. **Agenda review for February 15th meeting.** Members reviewed and revised the proposed agenda.

8. **Other Business.** There was no other business.

9. **Executive Session.** None needed.

10. **Adjournment.** MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO ADJOURN AT 7:08 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc
January 30, 2017

Leslie A. Cadwell, Esq.
Alison Milbury Stone, Esq.
Legal Counselors and Advocates, PLC
PO Box 827
Castleton, VT 05735

Re: Docket # 8847 - Petition of Green Line Devco LLC for a Certificate of Public Good

Ms. Cadwell and Ms. Milbury:

Enclosed for your response is the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission’s Information Requests on Petitioner. All parties with email addresses listed in the ePSB Portal for this case will be notified of the case through our submittal in ePSB. All parties without email addresses listed will be notified by mail.

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

Sincerely,

Charlie Baker
Executive Director

cc: Service List
PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD

Petition of Vermont Green Line Devco LLC, pursuant to 30 V.S.A. §§231 and 248, for a certificate of public good to own, operate and construct an underwater and underground 400 MW high voltage direct current (HVDC) electric transmission line, converter station, and associated facilities to be located in Lake Champlain and the Towns of Ferrisburgh, Waltham, and New Haven, Vermont.

Docket #8847

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

The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission ("CCRPC") by: Charlie Baker, Executive Director, Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager, and Emily Nosse-Leirer, Planner, hereby serves the following set of Information Requests upon the Petitioner in this matter in accordance with Public Service Board ("Board") Rule 2.214 and V.R.C.P. 33 and 34, and requests that Petitioner answer the requests in accordance with V.R.C.P. 33 and 34 and deliver its answers and all requested documents and materials to the CCRPC via email not later than February 13, 2017. Petitioner is requested to provide a copy of its answers in electronic format, that is, in Word or .pdf format.

INSTRUCTIONS

1. Reproduce the request being responded to before the response per V.R.C.P. 33.

2. Responses to any and all CCRPC requests that are contained herein or that may be filed later should be supplied to the CCRPC as soon as they become available to Petitioner. That is, Petitioner should not hold answers to any requests for which they have responsive data, documents, etc. until responses to any or all other requests are compiled.

3. V.R.C.P. 33 requires the response to each request to be made under oath by a person competent to testify concerning the response and all documents and exhibits produced as part of the response. With respect to each request, please state (1) the name(s) and title(s) of the person or persons responsible for preparing the response; and (2) the administrative unit which maintains the records being produced or maintains the data from which the answer was prepared; and (3) the date on which each question was answered.

4. Where information requested is not available in the precise form described in the question or is not available for all years (or other periods or classifications) indicated in a series of years (or other periods or classifications), please provide all information with
respect to the subject matter of the question that can be identified in Petitioner’s workpapers and files or that is otherwise available.

5. These requests shall be deemed continuing and must be supplemented in accordance with V.R.C.P. 26(e). Petitioner is directed to change, supplement and correct its answers to conform to all information as it becomes available to Petitioner, including the substitution of actual data for estimated data. Responses to requests for information covering a period not entirely in the past (or for which complete actual data are not yet available) should include all actual data available at that time and supplementary data as it becomes available.

6. Wherever responses include estimated information, include an explanation (or reference to a previous explanation) of the methods and calculations used to derive the estimates.

7. Some of the CCRPC's requests may make particular reference to a portion of Petitioner’s filing. Notwithstanding this specific direction, these items should be understood to seek discovery of all information available to Petitioner that is responsive to the questions stated.

8. “Identify,” when used in connection with natural person(s) or legal entities, shall mean the full name and current business address of the person or entity.

9. “Document,” as used herein, shall be construed as broadly as possible to include any and all means and media by which information can be recorded, transmitted, stored, retrieved or memorialized in any form, and shall also include all drafts, versions or copies which differ in any respect from the original. All spreadsheets provided must have all formulae intact and accessible.

10. “Petition,” as used herein, means Petitioner’s petition filed with the Vermont Public Service Board in this docket, unless the context indicates otherwise.

11. With respect to each document produced by Petitioner, identify the person who prepared the document and the date on which the document was prepared.

12. If any interrogatory or request requires a response that Petitioner believe to be privileged, please state the complete legal and factual basis for the claim of privilege, provide the information required by the 5/16/95 order in Docket No. 5771 and respond to the parts of the interrogatory or request as to which no privilege is asserted.

13. If any interrogatory or request is objected to in whole or in part, please describe the complete legal and factual basis for the objection, and respond to all parts of the interrogatory or request to the extent it is not objected to. If an objection is interposed as to any requested documents, please identify the document by author, title, date and recipient(s), and generally describe the nature and subject-matter of the document as well as the complete legal and factual basis for the objection.

14. To expedite the discovery process and the resolution of this docket, Petitioner should contact CCRPC as soon as possible, and prior to the above deadline for response, if it seeks clarification on any of these information requests.

15. CCRPC reserves the right to submit additional information requests to Petitioner.
INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS TO PRODUCE

Economic Interests

1. Pre-filed direct testimony of Joseph Rossignoli, page 11, lines 13-15 and page 12, lines 4-6:

Mr. Rossignoli states that “VGLD’s proposal includes a number of direct financial benefits to the State of Vermont and communities impacted by the Project, including, but not limited to...An estimated $4.1M per year in property taxes to Vermont municipalities over the 40-year life of the Project.”

Pre-filed direct testimony of Joseph Rossignoli, page 25 in lines 5-6:
Mr. Rossignoli further states that “The Project will provide the State of Vermont and the towns of Ferrisburgh, Waltham, and New Haven a new source of tax revenue.”

The transmission line will be located underwater within several lakefront municipalities not named as tax revenue recipients in Mr. Rossignoli’s testimony. Please provide further information regarding whether those lakefront municipalities will receive tax revenues from this project.

2. Pre-filed direct testimony of Joseph Rossignoli, page 11, lines 13-15 and lines 18-22:

Mr. Rossignoli states that “VGLD’s proposal includes a number of direct financial benefits to the State of Vermont and communities impacted by the Project, including, but not limited to... $425,000 in annual payments to VTrans for use of a 1.3 mile stretch of limited access facilities along Route 7 during the 40-year life of the Project. Payments to VTrans will escalate by 3% per year beginning in year 11 of the Project.”

Pre-filed direct testimony of Joseph Rossignoli, page 12, lines 19-20:

Mr. Rossignoli states that “VGLD will explore providing additional benefits to the State of Vermont to recognize the Project’s use of, and installation in, Lake Champlain.”

Mr. Rossignoli’s pre-filed testimony did not include any information regarding lease revenue for the Lake Champlain portion of the project. Please provide further information regarding anticipated lease revenues from the cables within Lake Champlain; and furthermore whether the lease agreements will be made with the State or the lakefront municipalities for the cables within Lake Champlain.

Environmental/Geomagnetic Fields

3. Pre-filed direct testimony of Dr. William H. Bailey, page 10, lines 2-5:

Dr. Bailey explains: “Altogether, the presence of the cable will have a negligible effect on marine course navigation which relies upon magnetic compasses because the deviation is very small, would occur only within about 25 feet of the cable, and the lake is small.”
Considering the impact on compass navigation will NOAA and the Coast Guard be notified of the effect of the cables on navigational compass readings so that users of these devices will be adequately alerted of the effect?

Dated at Winooski, Vermont this 30th day of January 2017.

Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission

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

cc: Parties
DATE: Wednesday, January 11, 2017
TIME: 2:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT

1. Welcome and Introductions

Joss Besse called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m.

2. Approval of November 9, 2016 Minutes

Karen Purinton made a motion, seconded by Jacob Hemmerick, to approve the November 9, 2016 minutes. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.

3. Bike Parking

Bryan Davis provided the PAC with a presentation (see attached) on bike parking. Bryan showed a variety of bike racks that don’t work particularly well. Generally you want a rack where you can lean the bike up to it and securely lock both the frame and at least one tire. U racks work well, but you can definitely get creative with it. You also want to make sure the racks are sited in the right location – distance from a building, easily found, etc. Bryan provided the leading guidance documents on bike parking. Bryan indicated that we have the ability to assist a few towns with bike parking bylaw language and asked if there was any interested. We know Williston is working on this now. South Burlington and Burlington expressed interest. If any other municipalities are interested, please let us know.

4. Sharing Skill Sets

Regina Mahony introduced this topic, and credited Paul Conner for the idea. The idea is to better facilitate peer learning and skill sharing at the PAC. Each of you has likely done a deep dive into a specific topic for a zoning bylaw that others could benefit from. We thought we’d set aside 15 minutes on your agendas for folks to give a presentation on a zoning bylaw that you’ve researched, so that others are aware of the latest local research, and can look to each other for input when they do an update on a similar topic. Paul Conner gave an example that he talked with Alex Weinhagen when they were starting to look at energy efficiency regulations because Alex had done quite a bit of research on this topic for his bylaw amendment. Initial topic ideas include:

- Energy Efficiency
- Low Impact Development Stormwater Standards
- PUDs – topic request from Greg Duggan. South Burlington has done some work on this lately.

Paul Conner suggested that everyone send Regina one sentence description in next two weeks or so, and then we’ll send the list of topics out to the group to vote on, so we are sure that there is interest in the topics.
Meagan Tuttle asked if we have done these types of presentations to multiple planning commissions and do something a little more in depth? Paul Conner mentioned that they have done that and it could work as well; however, you could also ask another Planner to come to your PC to talk with them directly. Alex Weinhagen stated that it would probably help to start here at the PAC. Could be challenging to gather more than one planning commission in a room.

Regina Mahony added that CCRPC is required to host four trainings this year as well, so stay tuned for those.

5. Bonus Densities
Regina Mahony showed the PAC some initial data that she collected from each of the municipal bylaws on housing bonus densities (though she also made note if bonuses are allowed for other reasons as well). There is quite a range on the level of bonus density allowed (400% in Essex Center to 25% or none), and the requirements for receiving the bonus. Many of the bonus provisions are associated with PUDs, but not all. The method of calculation/process is also quite varied. In addition, Burlington, South Burlington and Hinesburg have an inclusionary zoning provision. There was a good amount of discussion about getting the base density correct, rather than issuing bonuses; and whether or not the bonuses are targeted to growth areas are allowed in all districts. The PAC members described whether applicants have made use of the bonus densities, and if not, why not:

Burlington – Meagan Tuttle explained that Burlington has bonus densities for two reasons: 1. Bonuses that help a developer accommodate the inclusionary requirement; and 2. Additional bonuses for those that go above and beyond the inclusionary requirement (or other public benefit reasons). Most of the bonuses are not economically worth it for the developer – they don’t get enough in return for having to incorporate the required elements in their project. Under the Form Based Code, the bonus densities will go away and the density will be set by right. Also, there has been a consultant looking at Burlington’s Inclusionary Housing provision and they are expecting the results in a couple of months.

Milton – Jacob Hemmerick stated that no one has used it in the last three years. His thought is that it would make more sense to get the base density correct.

Underhill – Andrew Strniste indicated that they have one application that is trying to take advantage of a bonus right now – from 1 unit to 2 units. The DRB isn’t clear on how to apply the bonus density so it’s been a challenge.

Essex – Greg Duggan described that it has been used in the Town Center (and there is some debate about whether the 400% bonus can be used for multi-family outside of the Town Center). Throughout the rest of Town, they only allow a 25% bonus, which are tied to PUDs (which are a mess). Dana Hanley stated that they are starting to look at zoning updates for the Town Center area.

Colchester - Karen Bates indicated that onsite septic is a huge limitation in Colchester and lots of times people can’t do more than the base density due to septic limits. S.D. Ireland wanted to do a bonus density at Severance Corners, but couldn’t meet the open space/buffer requirements associated with the PUD application. This was part of the reason the Town moved to a FBC system for Severance Corners.

Huntington - Everett Marshall indicated that they have bonus densities in their current and proposed regulations, however, to his knowledge they haven’t been used. Fell through the one time that it was proposed.

Bolton – Joss Besse stated that they don’t have a bonus density, but don’t see a lot of development.

South Burlington - Paul Conner explained that it has been used in the So. Village master plan (bonus of 30 or 40 units out of 350 overall); on Ferrell Street a building or two took advantage of a bonus density a few years ago; and Kirby cottage also got a bonus (which is now slated for buy-out by the airport). Those worked fairly well, but they don’t often see them requested where they allow both residential and commercial because there is a residential cap, but not a commercial cap. Cathy LaRose added that they’ve seen a few other one-offs here and there. The paper work and legal work associated with it doesn’t seem worth it. Partnering with CHT sometimes doesn’t work b/c it doesn’t often fit into CHT’s model (as an example, CHT doesn’t want to take on 2 units in a building).

Hinesburg - Alex Weinhagen described that Hinesburg’s density bonus is varied and you can get a bonus for a lot of reasons. It is a confusing provision that requires a lot of explanation. Have had one person take
advantage. Two others thinking about it right now. In Village area available to any kind of a development (not just PUDs), only PUD outside of Village for 25% by right – you don’t need to give anything to get anything except the amount of open space that is needed. 25% just isn’t enough especially when the base density is really low. The ones that have worked are the easy ones – small unit size b/c it works for multi-family. And that is something the Town really wants to see which has some real validity.

Lee Krohn asked if it would make more sense to flip the system on its head and write the bylaws to build what you want rather than establish a complicated system to allow waiver from the standards. Paul Conner indicated that they are in phase 2 out of 3 of a project to revise their PUDs (these are located based). He would be happy to share this work. Cathyann LaRose added that they find PUDs too easy, not too difficult as Jacob Hemmerick described in Milton. Karen Purinton agreed that Colchester’s PUDs are the same (too easy rather than too hard/complicated).

Regina Mahony added that Ferrell Madden (the national FBC Consultants that worked on the Winooski Form Based Code) indicated that most bonus provisions don’t give the developer nearly enough of a bonus to incentivize them to include affordable housing in their project. There will be more to come on this topic.

6. Bolton Town Plan

Joss Besse asked Paul Conner to run this part of the meeting since he is the Bolton Rep. Paul Conner indicated that this Plan is still in draft form, so we are doing an initial review and will see the Plan again before making a recommendation to the CCRPC Board. Emily Nosse-Leirer is the principal author of the Plan and didn’t do the Staff review but she provided an overview of where Bolton is on the process and some of the basic concepts of the Plan. Lee Krohn did the CCRPC Staff review and found that while not all required provisions are included yet, most are and he found the Plan to be consistent with the state requirements and the ECOS Plan. He further described the Plan as thoroughly researched, incredibly encyclopedic presentation of information about the community, and representative of a significant effort. Lee Krohn added that there is a question about the consistency between the proposed West Bolton Hamlet and the Rural Planning Area as described in the ECOS Plan. The West Bolton Hamlet is an effort to match the zoning with the traditional development pattern of the area, while also expanding the development capacity of the area. It makes good sense at the local level, and with this change there is still only 4% of the land area in Bolton that is developable, so it’s very small scale. There was a discussion about how we could resolve the differences between the two plans – potentially by including a commitment by CCRPC to update the ECOS Plan in accordance with the West Bolton Hamlet in their Resolution (and then CCRPC would officially amend update the ECOS planning area map in June 2018 when the Plan is updated). Paul Conner suggested that the scale of the West Bolton Hamlet is so small that perhaps it is consistent with the Rural Planning Area.

Comments from the PAC included:

- Alex Weinhagen asked how the Plan components will fit together in the final form, and specifically asked where the actions will end up. Emily Nosse-Leirer described that the goals and objectives will be further up front (as you can see in the graphic mock-up), while the actions will be in a table in the back. Alex Weinhagen suggested that perhaps the actions, what you are actually going to do, should be in front. He added that he liked the design mock-up but there could still be a lot less words, and more pictures.

- Paul Conner indicated that the Bolton Valley is described as a major economic driver for the Town, however the action is simply to increase the relationship. He suggested that it may be more effective to get more specific about how the Town is planning to do that.

- Paul Conner asked Lee Krohn to ensure that the communication back to the Bolton Planning Commission include a robust introduction about how great the Plan is.

- Meagan Tuttle described that she really liked how the format of the Plan is around the three core values rather than 12 chapters based on the required elements of the Plan. Meagan prefers that the actions are all in one chart, and perhaps a one or two page summary of the Plan could be drafted that accompanies the action table as a quick reference.

- Dana Hanley stated that this is a really great job.
CCRPC Staff will get these comments over to Bolton’s Planning Commission, and the Plan will come back to the PAC again further down the road.

7. Regional Act 250/Section 248 Projects in the Horizon
   - Essex – 32 unit PUD
   - Colchester – Nothing new
   - Underhill – nothing
   - Huntington – nothing
   - So. Burlington – This won’t go to Act 250, but they have received their first application for a bldg. in the FBC (3,600 sf).
   - Bolton – small development in West Bolton, probably won’t trigger Act 250
   - Richmond (as reported by Joss Besse) – Creamery project headed to Act 250. Mixed Use, 30,000 sf and 40 housing units. No senior component.
   - Hinesburg – Nothing new
   - Burlington – Burlington Town Center not going to Act 250 (currently reviewing under DRB); Cambrian Rise currently under DRB review and will go to Act 250, Pine St & Flynn Ave at Act 250, City Market.
   - Milton – nothing new.

8. Other Business
   a. Joss Besse stated that White Burke is working on an ask to the Legislature for more TIF districts, and looking for support for this ask.
   b. Regina Mahony explained that we expect to receive the answers to the current questions on county age cohorts, interim countywide employment, municipal level population, households, and employment forecasts in time for a February PAC meeting. However, these will also be presented to the Board on Feb. 15th, and we hope to have a Board vote on March 15th. Regina Mahony asked the PAC if they would like to meet for a special meeting on Feb. 8th to review these, or would you prefer to receive them via email (and we can point you to the Board presentation), and make your recommendation at your regularly scheduled March 8th meeting? The PAC would prefer to meeting in March, no need for a special meeting in February.
   c. The PSB has a new website, with searchable ePSB.
   d. An email will be coming from Melanie Needle shortly to request the 2016 development data.
   e. We will be sending out the Planning Area map soon to ask you to double check that the areas match up correctly with your zoning. We don’t anticipate any changes, except a minor tweak in Colchester, and potentially Bolton.
   f. We will be doing municipal level technical assistance as part of one of the Energy contracts. We are planning to work with Colchester, Shelburne and Winooski. Let us know if there is any other interest in this.
   g. Once the population forecast is set, that will be allocated down to the TAZ level for use by the Transportation model. We will run that distribution by you for a quick cross check to ensure that it makes sense from the municipal perspective. Expect this request in April.

9. Adjourn
   The meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony
DATE:      Wednesday, January 12, 2017
TIME:     8:30 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.
PLACE:    CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT

Members Present
Ken Belliveau, Williston – PAC Rep
Alex Weinhagen, Hinesburg – PAC Rep
Justin Rabidoux, So. Burlington – TAC REP
Lisa Falcone - Socio/Econ/Housing Board Rep
Heather Danis – ECOS Steering Committee Rep
Edmund Booth – ECOS Steering Committee Rep
Chris Shaw, South Burlington – Board Rep

Staff
Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
Melanie Needle, Senior Planner
Charlie Baker, Executive Director
Eleni Churchill, Transportation Program Manager

1. Welcome and Introductions
Chris Shaw called the meeting to order at 8:40 a.m.

2. Approve Minutes
Justin Rabidoux made a motion, seconded by Alex Weinhagen, to approve the minutes of November 10, 2016. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED. Edmund Booth abstain.

3. Plan Update Schedule
Regina Mahony provided the Committee with two updated schedules – the big overall project schedule, and a month by month schedule for the LRPC specifically with information about what Staff and other Committees are working on. We remain focused on keeping the update and public outreach specifically focused on the topics of transportation, energy and economic development. Regina reported that we do think we can set up the ECOS website with a left-hand Table of Contents of sorts on the ECOS Plan page. We will need to use our internet consultant to help us build this, but it shouldn’t be too difficult. Then we’ll see how much time we have to transition Chapter 2 of the current plan into an online only format. At the very least we will host the indicators online as they are now, and ideally, we’d incorporate the key issues into that format as well.

Chris Shaw asked about public engagement and emphasized that it would be helpful to give the public a heads up that we are working on this and that public input and feedback will be requested in the future; and we should set the public input comment period for a reasonable length of time for real input (certainly not two weeks). Staff explained the outreach and engagement timeline for each of the big pieces, but will certainly set the schedule for easily accessible, good length, public engagement efforts, likely in the Fall. Staff will also look into interactive, map based online engagement tools.

4. Updates in the Works
Potential re-organization options:

1. Population Forecasts – Regina Mahony provided an update on the forecast schedule. The county wide population forecast that was presented to this Committee in November has been revised based on comments from this Committee, the PAC and Staff. The forecast is now closer to the mid-range of the forecasts we reviewed in the graphs at the last meeting. This acknowledges that Chittenden County may grow at a faster rate than the rest of the County. The consultant has also responded to a few questions that we had about the age cohorts. At the end of January, we are expecting the municipal level population forecasts, and the households and employment forecasts. This information will be presented to the Board in February, and we will also bring it to this Committee if we have it before your meeting. At the very least we will send it to you via email with a link to the Board presentation, and we will discuss it at your March meeting. This will then be on the March Board agenda for
3. Energy Planning – Melanie Needle provided an overview of the Energy Planning work. To date 14 out of the 19 municipalities have received a presentation. We held the first Act 174 training on Dec. 8th. This was largely the same presentation that was given to the PCs with a bit more info about the data analysis component. The training was well attended. We have received comments from municipalities on local constraints except Williston, Winooski, Charlotte & Huntington. We’ll be adding those to the State resource and constraint area maps. The State level data was updated to be in line with the new criteria for energy certification. We just received the new energy map data at the end of December and may push the Energy sub-committee meeting back to Jan. 31st to give us a bit more time to set up the maps. The Energy sub-committee has also begun looking at the existing ECOS and Climate Action strategies and actions compared to the required pathways. The sub-committee is interested in developing actionable strategies that CCRPC and the municipalities can do. Melanie explained the three contracts we have for this work – two Dept. of Public Service grants (the first is for the regional energy plan, and the second is for outreach, municipal level data, and technical assistance for three municipalities); and our contract with VEIC that will help us develop an energy scenario for the transportation sector (likely lower VMT b/c the LEAP model assumes that this remains steady per capita). We’ve also had a discussion with VT Gas regarding the LEAP model assumptions that use of natural gas nearly zeros out to get to 90 by 2050. Ken Belliveau asked if we should we be working with VEIC instead. Staff stated that we are working with VEIC as well, but we have spoken with all the major utilities and the natural gas issue seems to be one that we may not reach a solution on, but need to at least acknowledge the challenges associated with moving away
from this fuel source. While most of the energy goals are in legislation, the 90 by 2050 goal is not.

We will look at a second LEAP analysis with some alternative VT Gas scenarios, and the population
forecast from our consultants. Alex Weinhegen asked when we’ll see the energy maps. Likely at your
February meeting.

4. Education Strategy – Amy Fowler, Deputy Secretary of Education, went through ECOS Education
strategy, and the associated sections in Chapter 2 to give us her opinion of whether the issues are still
accurate and the whether the actions are still on track. This was a very helpful review, and most the
content is still good as is.

5. Health Strategy – United Way, UVM-MC and the Dept. of Health in Burlington will be meeting in
early February to review the Health content. The UVM-MC has a community meeting in June that has
been well attended and will be a great avenue for getting feedback on that content. Heather Danis
added that it will provide an opportunity for those folks to engage more with ECOS.


5. Next Meetings
   February 9, 2017 from 8:30am to 10:00am

6. Adjourn
   The meeting adjourned at 9:50 a.m.

Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony
DATE: Monday, January 23, 2017
TIME: 3:30 p.m. to 5:00 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/our-work/environment-natural-resources/water-quality/#committee

Committee Members in Attendance
Burlington: Megan Moir (via phone)  Williston: James Sherrard  Underhill: Brian Bigelow

CCRPC Board: Don Meals

CCRPC Staff: Charles Baker; Dan Albrecht

1. **Changes to the Agenda/Members’ Items:** Charlie Baker called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. No changes were made to the agenda nor were there any Members’ items

2. **Review draft comments regarding Treasurer’s Water Quality Funding Report (Action)**

   Charlie distributed copies of the various comments which members and Dan had made on the first version of the proposed letter he distributed on January 20th. The Committee recommended changes to the following sections (see attached draft dated January 26 to see how proposed edits were incorporated):
   - Section #2: edit to reflect more general goal of prioritization/targeting of funds
   - Section #4: more emphasis that funds for project development and development of administrative system
   - Section #5: with regards to “Nexus”, add some language to more directly reference to TMDLs.
   - Section #6: add in short bullet point after “Parcel Fee / All-in” termed “Refinement of Additional Revenue Source options” to urge continued analysis of potential fees with direct nexus to water quality.
   - Relationship to existing SW utilities: edit to recommend option for credit trading between utilities
   - Administrative options: Options 2, 3 and 4 seem too much like business as usual. Option 1, with added ability for municipalities and others to form trading networks (and for example, raise funds in one area but spend it in another) is best.

   Charlie indicated he will edit the draft comment letter this week. Dan will send it to the Clean Water Advisory Committee for review at their February 7 meeting. The CCRPC Board will have it as an action item at its February 15th meeting.

3. **Other Business**

   There was no other business.

4. **Adjournment**

   The meeting adjourned at 5:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Dan Albrecht
UPWP Committee Meeting 1
January 26, 2017

Attendees:
Mike O’Brien, Committee Chair
Amy Bell, VTrans
Barbara Elliot, TAC
Chris Jolly, FHWA
Ken Belliveau, PAC
David Armstrong, GMT
John Zicconi, Board
Andrea Morgante, Board

Staff:
Charlie Baker
Regina Mahony
Eleni Churchill
Forest Cohen
Marshall Distel
Bernie Ferenc
Christine Forde

• Committee Chair Mike O’Brien opened the meeting at 5:35 p.m.
• Introductions were made.
• Marshall introduced the UPWP process and format based on the ECOS Plan. He explained that the FY18 UPWP will be organized to align with the 8 ECOS strategy and action areas.
• David Armstrong gave a presentation on Green Mountain Transit Planning initiatives for FY18 and also provided an overview of FY17 funding and FY17 project highlights. A discussion about a downward trend in GMT ridership was brought up during the presentation. David explained that this is a national trend and that low gas prices have been the main reason for decreased ridership. John Zicconi also mentioned that Amtrak ridership is down compared to past years. With a total budget of $402,340, this will be a level request for GMT over FY17. There was a brief discussion about transit signal priority routes. The planning schedule for the updated GMT service routes will continue into FY18.
• Marshall provided the Committee with an overview spreadsheet of the applications received from municipalities, transportation partners and the public. Committee members are asked to review the list and the applications in preparation for the next meeting. CCRPC Staff and the Committee walked through the spreadsheet and noted any initial corrections, comments and follow-ups needed. Marshall noted the 2 tabs on the spreadsheet (FY18 UPWP Requests and Data/Inventories). The Committee does not need to “approve” the data/inventory requests.
• Marshall stated that the group of regional projects (projects #1-6) do not have applications. These regional-level projects may use staff time or consultants to complete the work. Moreover, project #8 came in as an application from FY17, which makes it more of a carryforward project.
• After an initial look at the applications, the Committee agreed that project #7, #13, #14
#21, #22, #23, #28, #30 and will not use PL funding because they are either ineligible or are technical assistance requests.

- More discussion is needed on PL funding eligibility for project #10, #11, #18, #27 and #29.
- John Zicconi expressed concern about sight distance issues with project #10. In particular, he was concerned about the possibility of objects within the center of the roundabout obscuring the view of approaching traffic and creating a possible distraction. This was followed by more discussion about what should go in the center of the roundabout.
- Marshall will reach out to Burlington in regards to project #12 and will reach out to Williston to confirm project priorities.
- There was brief dialogue about whether project #15 could be considered regional.
- Chris Jolley brought up a question about the status of current FY17 projects.
- John Zicconi started a discussion about the research trends that were mentioned within the description of project #36.
- John Zicconi brought up the possibility of having excess funding compared to project requests. A discussion followed about whether we should reach out for more applications or offer more funding to existing project requests. Mike O’Brien expressed concern about opening up the application process again.
- Ken Belliveau questioned the downside risk to having fewer requests than what we might otherwise fund.
- The Committee expressed concerns about federal funding with the new administration. Chris Jolly explained how this process works with Congress, and explained that our funding is already in the FAST Act and should be set until FY 2020.
- The Committee reviewed public comments and discussed how to best address these interests. In addition to CCRPC Staff responding to these requests directly, the Committee asked that Staff send these requests to the respective municipalities so that they are aware of the requests and can respond to them if they wish to.
- Andrea Morgante mentioned a potential Stormwater planning project between Charlotte, Shelburne and Hinesburg as a regional project
- Discussion of the next steps: CCRPC staff plans to have assembled a spreadsheet under the ECOS framework which will include all of the FY17 carry forward projects, new regional projects, and proposed projects from municipalities and partner agencies for the second Committee meeting. We will include a staff recommendation with regards to whether or not the project is ready/appropriate to advance into the work program.
- Committee members will submit project comments by Friday 2/10.
- The meeting adjourned at 6:50.

Respectfully submitted,

Marshall Distel
Attendees: Dan Albrecht (CCRPC), Lee Krohn (CCRPC), Emily Nosse-Leirer (CCRPC), Karen Purinton (Colchester), Jake Hemmerick (Milton), Greg Duggan (Essex), Robin Pierce (Essex Junction), Paul Conner (South Burlington), Ken Belliveau (Williston), Staci Pomeroy (ANR, via phone), Brian Bigelow (Underhill), Sharon Murray (Bolton), Todd Odit (Jericho), Chris Shaw (CCRP Board appointee), Stephanie Smith (Vermont Division of Emergency Management and Homeland Security) and Lauren Oates (Vermont Division of Emergency Management and Homeland Security).

1. **Call to Order, Introductions and Changes to the Agenda**
   
   The meeting was called to order at 11:05. No changes were suggested to the agenda.

2. **Public comments on items not on the Agenda** – No one from the public was in attendance.

3. **Review and Action on Minutes of June 8, 2016** – Shaw made a motion, seconded by Belliveau to approve the minutes. No discussion. MOTION PASSED.

4. **Final Draft Chittenden County All Hazards Mitigation Plan**
   
   There were no members of the public in attendance and therefore no public comments were made.

   Dan Albrecht focused his comments on changes made to the Plan after issuance of the first draft in June 2016. Information on Extreme Temperatures, Flooding, Crime and Economic Recession was significantly improved with the addition of new tables and descriptions. Also added were several new analytical tables to better address FEMA planning requirements. These included tables addressing the state of knowledge regarding the Location-Extent-Impact for each Hazard and the types of Vulnerability associated with each Hazard.

   Albrecht noted and describe the two written comments received prior to the January 6th deadline. One comment from a Burlington resident expressed concerns over municipal garbage collection. The other from a Winooski resident (who had previously commented on the June draft) expressed concerns over pending F-35 fighter jet operations. He then walked through a Responsiveness Summary (see weblink above) showing how the revised text addressed the various comments received. The Committee recommended the following edits/clarifications:
   - Air Transportation / Military Aircraft Incident (p.96): text should be added to note that any type aircraft, civilian or military, could crash at the site. Albrecht indicated he also received some additional detail regarding Mutual Aid between responding fire departments from the South Burlington Fire Dept. Chief and from staff at the Burlington International Aiport which he will add to this section.
   - Rail Transportation Incident (p.98): the phrase “no continuing education efforts” should be modified to be indicate such efforts are limited or inconsistent, rather than non-existent.
   - Noise Pollution (p.102): This section should be improved with the addition of new content at the start of the section showing the broader context of long standing noise mitigation efforts related to Burlington International Airport operations such as ongoing mapping and municipalities participating in relevant federal mitigation programs.
   - Fluvial Erosion (Section 2.1.1.4): Pomeroy requested and the Committee concurred that clarifications are needed to this section to better describe DEC analysis and programs regarding this hazard. Albrecht indicated that he would send the word document to DEC staff to provide suggested “track changes.”
5. **Final draft of Town of Richmond AHMP**

There were no members of the public in attendance and therefore no public comments were made. No written comments were received on the Plan. Dan Albrecht recapped the changes in formatting of the municipal AHMP notably the addition of several new analytical tables to better address FEMA planning requirements and to show how the plan moves from hazard description to risk assessment to vulnerability assessment to identified mitigation strategies. Committee members recommended the following edits to the municipal template:
- Figure 3.2 showing Lake Champlain daily water levels should note the Base Flood Elevation of 101 ft. ASL for context.
- Section 3.1.2 should be edited consistent with the forthcoming DEC text edits concerning Fluvial Erosion.
- Section 3.2.5 should include a link to State data regarding Hazardous Waste Sites.
- Table 4-11 Land use compared to zoning. This could be improved with the addition of a column indicating Land Cover as the Land Use illustrates percentages relative to e911 structures, not Use relative to zoning.
- Section 5.4.1: add text in second to last paragraph to emphasize that municipalities will continue to carry out existing Actions such as Planning & Zoning, NFIP participation, even though they are not “new” strategies outlined as Action items in this plan.

Discussion concluding with members complimenting CCRPC staff. One member noted that he had hoped that such a comprehensive MJAHMP would have lessened the need for local plans to be so dense. Another member suggested the next time this plan is updated that the CCRPC survey towns first and ask that them to fill in basic technical data to save time.

6. **Next Steps**

Albrecht will meet with Oates and Smith plus FEMA staff later this month wherein FEMA will formally indicate whether the County Plan and the Richmond Plan meet their requirements. Hopefully, that will go smoothly with edits made at that time followed shortly thereafter by a determination by FEMA that the plans are “approved pending adoption”. Once that occurs, each individual municipal AHMP (other than Richmond’s) based upon that template can then be submitted to FEMA, whereupon FEMA will review it and then issue formal notices of “approved pending adoption” which authorizes each Selectboard/Council/Trustees to vote on the approving the County Plan and their respective municipal AHMP. After the votes, copies of the Plan and the approval resolutions are submitted back to FEMA at which point FEMA establishes their respective “effective” dates. Lastly, once that process is complete, then CCRPC will survey each municipality annually to determine mitigation actions from the local annex that are underway or have been completed.

7. **Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:25

*Respectfully submitted by Lee Krohn, AICP.*