REGULAR MEETING & PUBLIC FORUM AGENDA
Wednesday, January 18, 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 November 16, 2016 Meeting * (Action: 2 min.)
5. FY18 UPWP Public Forum
6. Regional Dispatch Update – Joe Colangelo (Information; 15 min)
7. Bylaw amendments – Approve for municipal review and warn for public hearing* (Action; 20 min.)
8. All Hazard Mitigation Plan - presentation (Discussion, 20 min.)
9. FY2017 Mid-year UPWP & Budget Adjustment* (Action; 10 min.)
10. Chair/Executive Director’s Updates (Information; 5 min.)
   a. Personnel Update – New Finance Assistant, Michelle Thibault-Hatch
   b. ECOS Annual Report
   c. Municipal Roads General Permit
   d. Water Quality Funding
   e. Major TIP Amendments – public hearing in February
   f. Executive Director’s Report (to be sent separately)
11. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports * (Information; 2 min.)
   a. Executive Committee (draft minutes December 7, 2016 & January 4, 2017)*
      i. Act 250/Sec 248 letters *
   b. Transportation Advisory Committee (draft minutes January 3, 2017)*
   c. Clean Water Advisory Committee (draft minutes December 6, 2016 & January 3, 2017)*
   d. MS4 Subcommittee of CWAC (draft minutes December 6, 2016 & January 3, 2017)*
   e. Planning Advisory Committee (draft minutes Nov. 9, 2016)*
   f. Board Development Committee (draft minutes Dec. 14 2016)*
   g. Brownfields Committee (draft minutes November 15 & December 12, 2016 & January 9, 2017)*
   h. Long Range Planning Committee (draft minutes November 10, 2016)*
      i. Water Quality Financing (Draft minutes December 7, 2016)*
12. Member’s Items
13. Adjournment

*Attachment

The January 18th Chittenden County RPC meeting will air on Wednesday, January 25, 2017 at 8:00 p.m. and repeat on Thursday, January 26, 2017 at 1 a.m. and 7 a.m. It will also be available online at: https://www.cctv.org/watch-tv/programs/chittenden-county-regional-planning-commission-63

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 – Tuesday, February 7, 2017; 9:00 a.m.
- Clean Water Advisory Committee - Tuesday, February 7, 2017; 11:00 a.m.
- MS4 Subcommittee – Tuesday, February 7, 2017; 12:30 p.m.
- Executive Committee - Wednesday, February 8, 2017; 5:45 p.m.
- Long Range Planning Committee – Thursday, February 9, 2017
- Brownfields Advisory Committee - Monday, February 13, 2017; 3:00 p.m.
- CCRPC Board Meeting - Wednesday, February 15, 2017; 6:00 p.m.
- Planning Advisory Committee – Wednesday, March 8, 2017; 2:30 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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 15th</td>
<td>Regional Dispatch Report review (tentative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chittenden County Active Transportation Plan approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water Quality Financing recommendations (tentative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hazard Mitigation Plan adoption (tentative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Hearing and Approval of Major TIP Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 15th</td>
<td>Bylaw amendment adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warn UPWP Public Hearing for May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Population forecasts approval (tentative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation Project Status review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 19th</td>
<td>Regional Services Agreement for Stormwater approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Classification Map revisions (tentative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Municipal Road General Permit recommendations (tentative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 17th</td>
<td>UPWP &amp; Budget Public Hearing and approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation Capital Program Project Prioritization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Regional Energy Plan review (tentative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 21st</td>
<td>Annual Meeting – Election of Officers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In accordance with provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, the CCRPC will ensure public meeting sites are accessible to all people. Requests for free interpretive or translation services, assistive devices, or other requested accommodations, should be made to Emma Vaughn, CCRPC Title VI Coordinator, at 802-846-4490 ext. *21 or evaughn@ccrpcvt.org, no later than 3 business days prior to the meeting for which services are requested.*
1. **Call to order; Changes to the agenda.** The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by the Chair, Chris Roy. There were two changes to the agenda. Item 6. FY16 Audit will be discussed before Item 5. Lamoille Tactical Basin Plan public hearing. Item 8, Burlington Town Center update is scheduled for 7 p.m., and we will interrupt the meeting whenever Mr. Sinex arrives.

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

3. **Action on Consent Agenda.** (MPO Business.) There were amendments to the TIP to add 2015 bike/ped award projects on the consent agenda. MARC LANDRY MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JIM DONOVAN, TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. **Approve Minutes of October 19th Board Minutes.** CATHERINE MCMAINS MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY IRENE WRENNER, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 19, 2016 CCRPC BOARD MEETING. MOTION CARRIED WITH ABSENTIONS FROM JIM DONOVAN AND DON MEALS.

5. **FY16 Audit Report.** Fred Duplessis, managing partner at Sullivan Powers & Company, presented the audit report for FY16. He met with the Executive & Finance Committees two weeks ago to review the report. He described what the audit contains. It goes to the federal government and is posted on their website. The auditor’s opinion is on page 2, which states that our financial statements are in full conformance with generally accepted accounting principles. There were no changes in
regulations. Last year we had to include unfunded retirement amounts, and this year it was a larger number. There is nothing we can do about it and we’re paying what we need to. VMERS is a very well-funded system, but we do have to document our share of the unfunded liability. He said the first thing they look at is Management Discussion and Analysis starting on page 4, which is management’s comprehensive look at what happened during the year. Page 10 shows our net position of $480,727 which stayed in line with last year. Page 11 shows changes in net position which indicates our operating income of $41,945, with unfunded pension expense of ($64,513), which shows a deficit of $22,275. The notes to the financial statements then follow. Page 27 is a schedule of proportional share of net pension liability, which is $77M vs. $9M last year. It was noted that this is the Municipal Employees Pension fund as opposed to the State Employees or Teachers fund, which are both separate. Fred noted that this is the only one the State can raise the rate without raising taxes. He then reviewed the remaining Schedules showing budget vs. actual; indirect rate; ACCD funds and the schedule of federal awards. He directed member to the last page and noted that we had a clean audit which qualifies us to continue as a low-risk auditee, which means all federal regulations have been followed. Chris Shaw questioned the recommendation in the Management Letter about the Uniform Guidance allowing a non-Federal entity to delay implementation of the prescribed procurement standards for two fiscal years (or June 30, 2017). To delay implementation of the new standard CCRPC must document whether it is in compliance with the old or new standard. Chris Roy noted that the Executive Committee has already taken action to add this to the Administrative Policies, noting that we will amend the policies to conform to the new standards prior to that deadline. Chris Roy noted that a clean audit doesn’t just happen and he thanked the staff involved in this. Board members applauded Forest and Bernie’s efforts. DAN KERIN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL TO ACCEPT THE FY16 AUDIT REPORT AS PRESENTED. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

6. **A. Lamoille Tactical Basin Plan Public Hearing.** MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 6:17 P.M. CHRIS SHAW SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. There were no members of the public present, but the hearing was kept open in case someone comes in late.

**b. Tactical Basin Plan Recommendations.** Charlie noted that this is a new process where ANR is asking for CCRPC comments. This is the first basin plan to go through this process. The State promised EPA they’d have this done by December and they want our comments by December 1st. He noted that we told them from the start that this was not enough time for a proper review. The CWAC has reviewed and discussed this letter. Our comments just review what’s in our plan related to the basin plan. In some cases we suggest clarification. Charlie reviewed the letter item by item. Discussion ensued about river corridor protection areas. He noted that we really don’t have a list of specific projects, but on page 6 it gives recommendations regarding project priorities. The table summarizes the cost by sector along with the required phosphorus load reduction. We are recommending that the State look for ways for phosphorus reduction investments to be made in the most cost effective manner possible. i.e. since municipal wastewater infrastructure is the most costly and only contributes 4% to the load, that might not be the most cost effective method to reduce phosphorus levels. Don Meals noted that there may be trading with municipalities within the same lake segment, so if one municipality needs more phosphorous reduction they can trade with a municipality in the same sub-watershed.

No members of the public came so JIM DONOVAN MADE A MOTION TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 6:37 P.M. DAN KERIN SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

DON MEALS MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CATHERINE MCMAINS, THAT WE ACCEPT THIS LETTER WITH THE CORRECTIONS OF ADDING NUMBERS INSTEAD OF “xx” on page 6 of the letter. Jim Donovan thought changing the “xx” might confuse things because we had really only reviewed the
earlier draft of the plan and not the newest version. It was suggested to make a note that these comments are based upon the Oct 26th draft. DON AND CATHERINE AGREED TO THIS CHANGE. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. (VTrans did not vote.)

7. **BYLAW AMENDMENTS.** Andy Montroll reminded members that in the last legislative session, they adopted new legislation to allow RPCs to enter into inter-municipal agreements, but we have to amend our bylaws to allow that. The Board Development Committee (Andy, Catherine McMains and Jeff Carr) was charged with amending the bylaws. While doing that they reviewed other items in the bylaws. The packet contains the bylaws with suggested changes for the board to review and give feedback to the BDC. At the January board meeting we will warn a public hearing in March to allow a 30-day review of the bylaw amendments at the municipal level. He and Charlie walked members through the suggested changes:
   a. Page 7, Terms of Office (under Executive Committee). He is recommending four year limits in each office, instead of two year limits in each office.
   b. Page 11. Article XII. Committees. We recommend changing language that members and alternates be “expected” rather than “encouraged” to participate in at least one committee.
   c. Page 16, adding Clean Water Advisory Committee (CWAC) as a standing committee.
   d. Top of page 5, regarding voting on all business other than major transportation items (once a quorum has been established), to add language saying that “a majority of the members present is required to take action.”
   e. Karen Walton pointed out that in their triennial review FTA brought up that the FAST Act requires that the transit authority be a voting member of the MPO.
   f. Adding the Inter-municipal Services Agreements affects several articles:
      i. Page 2, Article III Duties and Responsibilities of CCRPC add E. which is language taken from the legislation.
      ii. Page 5, Article VI. Executive Director – add 7 to prepare recommendation to CCRPC.
      iii. Page 8, under power and duties of Exec. Comm. – to make recommendation to the board.
      iv. Page 10, Add new Article XI. Municipal Service Agreements. This was revised to add suggestions from Executive Committee and contains the real substance.

Charlie noted that we’ve been doing agreements with the Regional Stormwater Education Program (RSEP) and then the Stream Team for about 10 years. Earlier this year they worked on a joint agreement, but we need to have a bylaw provision before we can execute the agreement. Chris Roy said this is not meant to include everything, but to lay the framework for each individual agreement.

[Meeting was interrupted at this point for the Burlington Town Center Update.]

8. **Burlington Town Center Update.** Don Sinex, owner of Devonwood Investments made a presentation of his proposal for the Burlington Town Center, showing how the project has changed from his first vision two years ago after he purchased the property to the current multi-use project with new downtown zoning. The project will include office space, 275 apartments, parking garage and retail space facing Cherry Street, Bank Street, as well as on what will be Pine Street and St. Paul Street that will connect again on the other side of this property. Andy Montroll talked about the importance of local municipal plans and how it can set up good development. He said planBTV was well under way before Devonwood came along, but because we had the vision we were able to get things that we wanted. Charlie noted that the housing is limited to 275 units which is the limit to not require Act 250 review. Members thanked Mr. Sinex for coming.
7. **BYLAW AMENDMENTS – CONTINUED.** Discussion continued on bylaw amendments regarding municipal service agreements. Chris asked members for additional comments for the BDC. Andrea Morgante said the idea of in-kind match for use of municipal personnel, equipment and office space – she wondered how that would be determined. Chris said they’d have to work that out in each agreement. He suggested we add this to the list to be addressed by each agreement. Value of service needs to be clearly documented. Jim Donovan suggested that we might want to put all paragraphs about withdrawal together. Chris directed members to the schedule on the back of the agenda, where we show when various topics might be addressed by the board.

9. **FY18 UPWP Priorities and Funding Amounts.** Charlie noted that the packet contained material that we typically send to towns for them to request projects for the next UPWP. It outlines requirements and gives guidance. Since it came up at a board meeting we wanted members to review the material. We’d like to send this to municipalities soon to get them returned by mid-January. We also wanted to make sure they understand that there is more emphasis on public engagement and the costs need to be considered in the scope and budget for each request. Members thought it was good to go.

10. **Executive Director Update:**
    a. **Regional Dispatch study** is on track and we hope to have a recommendation in January or February. They are having discussions on technical and planning issues as well as governance. They’ve had pretty favorable feedback so far.
    b. **Legislative Breakfast.** Invitations were mailed today to Chittenden County legislators and town managers. It will be held on Tuesday, December 13th at the Double Tree.
    c. **Energy Standards.** The new energy standards have been received and we’re having a public meeting here on December 8, 2016 from 6-8 p.m. The Energy Committee is doing a lot of hard work.
    d. **Executive Director’s Report** was sent out yesterday.

11. **Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports.** There were included in the packet.

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

13. **Adjournment.** Chris wished everyone a Happy Thanksgiving and Happy Holidays since we won’t meet until January. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MARC LANDRY, TO ADJOURN AT 8:18 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc
Chittenden County RPC Seeks Planning Project Ideas

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

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

The CCRPC is currently preparing next year’s work program and the public is invited to participate in a public forum scheduled as part of the CCRPC’s regular Board meeting on Wednesday, January 18 at 6 p.m. at the CCRPC offices (110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski). Comments will also be accepted until January 20 via email (mdistel@ccrpcvt.org) or by phone (802-861-0122). The CCRPC’s current work plan is available online at http://www.ccrpcvt.org/about-us/commission/annual-work-plan-budget-finances/. Residents are strongly encouraged to discuss project ideas with their municipal staff and officials, as local support and matching funds are typically required for projects.

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

Note that while CCRPC funds cannot be used for construction projects, the organization’s planning helps projects get closer to reality. The final work program will be approved in May 2017. For more information and to view a list of recent and current projects of the CCRPC, visit http://www.ccrpcvt.org/about-us/commission/annual-work-plan-budget-finances/.

Bus service to Winooski is available on the CCTA Essex Junction bus line or the Riverside/Winooski bus line. In accordance with provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, the CCRPC will ensure public meeting sites are accessible to all people. Requests for free interpretive or translation services, assistive devices, or other requested accommodations, should be made to Emma Vaughn, CCRPC Title VI Coordinator, at 802-846-4490 ext *21 or evaughn@ccrpcvt.org, at least 3 business days prior to the meeting.

# # #
To: CCRPC Regional Dispatching Group  
From: Joe Colangelo, Shelburne Town Manager  
Date: December 13, 2016  
Re: Discussion Points for Dispatch/PSAP Inefficiencies – Follow-Up to Legislative Breakfast  

Dispatching and 911 Call Taking  
• Dispatching and 911 call taking are two different functions (for the most part)  
• Dispatchers talk to public safety employees – police officers, fire fighters, rescue departments  
  o Dispatchers tell the public safety personnel where to go (e.g. tell police officer to go to 123 A Street for a possible theft in progress)  
• 911 call takers receive the 911 call from the public (typically in stressful situations)  
• 911 call center = PSAP (Public Safety Answering Point)  
• In Chitt. Co. there are two primary PSAP’s (6 total in VT): Williston SP and Shelburne Dispatch  
• In Chittenden County there are 8 dispatch centers.  
  o Some dispatch centers like So. Burlington and Burlington only dispatch for their police, fire, emergency departments  
  o Milton contracts with Colchester  
  o Shelburne Dispatch dispatches for 40+ agencies in three different counties  

Scenarios  
• Scenario #1: Someone Hinesburg calls 911 to report a fire in their living room.  
  • Primary PSAP is Shelburne so call goes to Shelburne and then that same person dispatches Hinesburg Fire Department because Shelburne happens to have a contract to dispatch for Hinesburg Fire Department (this is the exception: not the rule)  
• Scenario #1a: Same person in Hinesburg calls 911 to report a fire in their living room  
  • This time the two Shelburne Dispatchers/911 call takers on duty already are on the phone with other 911 calls. The call then ‘rolls over’ to the 911 call taker in the state system who has gone the longest without taking a call. Equal chance of the call going to any of the other 5 PSAP centers (geography is not a factor)  
  • The 911 Call taker (say in St. Albans) then contacts Shelburne Dispatch whose line was busy with other 911 calls but receives a call from St. Albans on a different line (requiring now the Shelburne Dispatcher to be on two or more calls at once) who then will dispatch out the Hinesburg Fire Department
• Scenario #2: 911 Call from Burlington to report their spouse is having a heart attack
  • 911 Call goes to Williston State Police (unless it gets rolled over to one of the other 5 PSAPs) who then calls the Burlington Dispatch center who then sends rescue.
• Scenarios #3: 911 Call from Bolton reporting their neighbor has a knife and has hurt someone in the house
  • Bolton is in Williston SP’s PSAP area but let’s say this call rolls to Hartford.
  • Hartford then needs to contact Williston SP to dispatch State Police
  • Hartford also needs to contact Shelburne Dispatch who will dispatch ambulance service.
  • There could be a situation in which a 911 call requires the 911 call taker to make contact with three separate dispatch departments to dispatch the appropriate services (rescue, police, fire).

Issues

• Current system is inefficient.
  o (Valuable) time is lost due to the transfers
  o Currently Chittenden County is both over-staffed and under-staffed.
    • 45 total dispatchers
    • Ideal: 32 – 38
    • But the 45 dispatchers are dispersed throughout different municipalities which means there is little back-up support
      o Ideally the person answering 911 call can act as dispatcher to all necessary agencies and therefore able to be in contact with everyone including the member of the public in trouble. This rarely happens with our current set-up.
• Collective Bargaining Agreements
• Governance/Charter
• Funding mechanism
• Chitt. Co. 40% of all 911 calls in Vermont: 150K calls-for-service annually.

Benefits of Regionalization

• Professionalization
  o Give dispatchers ability to be in larger organization with opportunities for advancement
  o General Manager with specialization
  o Better training
• Consolidate Technology
• Likely (yet still unknown) cost control over the long run
• Provides critical number of dispatchers and 911 call-takers in one organization
  o Likelihood of roll-over calls from Chittenden Co. reduced
  o Same caller will take 911 call and dispatch

What’s at Stake?

• Lives/Safety - public and public safety personnel
• Cost Containment
• Efficient/Effective Delivery of Service
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
January 18, 2017
Agenda Item 7: Draft revisions to CCRPC Bylaws

**Issues:**
The attached draft Bylaws have been drafted by the Board Development Committee to address three issues: 1) authorizing CCRPC to enter into intermunicipal service agreements; 2) adding the Clean Water Advisory Committee as a Standing Committee; and, 3) revising the term limit for CCRPC officers from two years to four years. Background on each of these changes is described below.

1) In 2016, the Legislature approved and the Governor signed H.249, an act relating to intermunicipal services. This law (24 V.S.A. § 4345b) allows for municipalities to contract with their regional planning commission for the provision of services after the RPC amends its bylaws to authorize it to enter into intermunicipal service agreements and the agreement is approved by each municipal legislative body that wants to participate in the service. This law also requires that the RPC hold one or more public hearings. At least 30 days prior to any hearing required under this subsection, notice of the time and place and a copy of the draft bylaws, with a request for comments, shall be delivered to the chair of the legislative body of each municipality within the region.

   In May of 2016, CCRPC reviewed a draft MS4 agreement for CCRPC to provide intermunicipal services to several municipalities and other MS4 permittees to provide stormwater public education and public involvement services. That agreement is on hold pending adoption of updated bylaws.

2) In September 2015, the CCRPC created the ad hoc Clean Water Advisory Committee (CWAC). In addition to spelling out the Committee’s composition, member’s terms and duties the board charged that “(b) by the end of 2016, the Committee shall report back to the Commission with recommendations for formal incorporation, or not, into the CCRPC bylaws including membership composition and duties.”

3) The Board Development Committee discussed providing the ability of an officer to remain in office for more than the current two years and is recommending four years in lieu of eliminating the term limit altogether.

**CWAC Recommendation:** That the CWAC be established as a Standing Committee consistent with the proposed draft bylaw changes.

**Board Dev. Committee:** That the draft Bylaws dated 12/21/16 be considered by the CCRPC for adoption.

**Executive Comm. Recommendation:** That the draft Bylaws dated 1/4/17 be considered by the CCRPC for adoption with one additional sentence added in Article XI and that the draft be sent to the member municipalities for 30-day review.

**Staff Recommendation:** That the draft Bylaws dated 1/4/17 be considered by the CCRPC for adoption with one additional sentence added in Article XI and that the draft be sent to the member municipalities for 30-day review.

**Staff Contact:** Contact Charlie Baker with any questions: cbaker@ccrpcvt.org, 846-4490 ext. *23
ARTICLE I. NAME, VISION AND MISSION

The name of this regional planning organization is the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission. These by-laws shall regulate and govern the affairs of the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission.

The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission's organizational vision is to be a pre-eminent, integrated regional organization that plans for healthy, vibrant communities, economic development, and efficient transportation of people and goods while improving the region’s livability.

The mission of the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission is to act as the principal forum for planning, policy and community development in the region. We will do this by providing planning and technical assistance that meets the needs of our member municipalities and the public, while remaining consistent with our federal and state requirements. Our work will result in the development and implementation of plans that support sustainable development and improve the region’s quality of life and environment.

ARTICLE II. ENABLING LEGISLATION

The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission is an organization that combines the previously separate Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC) and Chittenden County Metropolitan Planning Organization (CCMPO). The CCRPC and CCMPO were combined with the adoption of these bylaws and subsequent actions to form one combined organization by action of the CCRPC and CCMPO Boards of Directors on May 18, 2011.

The legal basis and powers for Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission serving as the region’s regional planning commission stem from and are as stipulated in 24 V.S.A. § 4301 et seq., as amended, 24 V.S.A. § 4345 et seq. and such other laws as may be enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Vermont. The CCRPC was chartered by the municipalities of Chittenden County on May 2, 1966 with amendments to the original charter dated May 26, 1997 and September 28, 1998 and is funded in part through the State of Vermont property transfer tax as outlined in 24 V.S.A. § 4306(a). To the extent a conflict exists with a provision in Vermont statutes governing regional planning commissions, the Vermont statutes will control.

The CCMPO conducts Metropolitan Transportation Planning pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 134 and was designated by the Governor of Vermont on June 10, 1983 pursuant to Federal Highway Act of 1962, as amended (23 U.S.C. 101 et. seq.); the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1601 et. seq.); and by agreements dated April 20, 1983 and January 28, 1998 to serve as the metropolitan planning organization (MPO). In an agreement dated January 28, 1998 the CCMPO added membership to include the nine rural communities formerly
members of the Chittenden County Rural Planning Organization.

These bylaws hereby replace the charter and bylaws of the CCRPC and bylaws of the CCMPO.

ARTICLE III. DUTIES, RESPONSIBILITIES AND DUES

In keeping with its purpose, the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission will have the following duties and responsibilities:

A. In order to carry out the responsibilities of the regional planning commission, the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission should carry out the duties as stipulated in 24 V.S.A. Chapter 117, Section 4301 et seq., as amended, and such other laws as may be enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Vermont.

B. In order to carry out the responsibilities of the metropolitan planning organization (MPO), the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission should carry out the duties as stipulated in 23 CFR § 450.300 et seq., as amended, and such other laws and rules as may be enacted by the Congress of the United States, the United States Department of Transportation or the General Assembly of the State of Vermont.

C. Member communities provide local match funds for Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission programs funded in the annual work program under State and Federal law. Communities shall be assessed their reasonable fair share based on their community’s proportional equalized education grand list of the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission region. The most current data available for this grand list shall always be utilized in this distribution

D. The duties and responsibilities of members and alternates will be articulated in job descriptions developed by the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission.

D.E. The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission may enter into municipal service agreements to promote cooperative arrangements and coordinate, implement, and administer service agreements among municipalities, including arrangements and action with respect to planning, community development, joint purchasing, inter-municipal services, infrastructure, and related activities; and exercise any power, privilege, or authority, as defined within a service agreement under section XI of this bylaw, capable of exercise by a municipality as necessary or desirable for dealing with problems of local or regional concern.
ARTICLE IV. APPOINTMENT OF REPRESENTATIVES, TERM OF OFFICE

A. Board Membership in Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td>Buel’s Gore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>Essex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Junction</td>
<td>Hinesburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td>Jericho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George</td>
<td>Shelburne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Burlington</td>
<td>Underhill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westford</td>
<td>Williston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winooski</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont Agency of Transportation (VAOT)</td>
<td>US Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Industrial/Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-Economic-Housing)</td>
<td>Conservation/Environmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington International Airport (BIA)</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration (FTA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chittenden County Transportation Authority (CCTA)</td>
<td>Railroad Industry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Each member municipality’s locally elected legislative body shall appoint a representative (Municipal Representative) to the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission and that representative's alternate, with the alternate having voting privileges in the absence of the representative. It is desirable that the Municipal Representative be a current or past member of the locally elected legislative body. Municipal Representatives and alternates shall serve at the pleasure of their respective locally elected legislative bodies and may be removed during their term. The term of the Municipal Representative and alternate will be for two years beginning July 1st. Communities whose beginning letter falls between A through K shall appoint a representative for even numbered fiscal years; and, communities whose beginning letter falls from L through Z shall appoint a representative for odd numbered fiscal years. Appointments by locally elected legislative bodies to fill a vacancy shall be for the unexpired term.

C. Regional Board members represent the following sectors: Agriculture, Socio-Economic-Housing, Industrial/Business, and Conservation/Environmental. Staff shall solicit nominees from stakeholder organizations. Regional Board members shall be appointed by the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission for a term of two years for even numbered fiscal years at the June meeting. Regional Board members shall serve at the pleasure of the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission and may be removed during their term.

D. The Vermont Secretary of Transportation or his/her designated alternate will represent the State of Vermont Agency of Transportation.
E. The following Transportation Board Members will appoint their respective representatives and alternates: FHWA, FTA, CCTA, and the BIA. The Railroad Industry shall be represented by a representative each from Vermont Rail Systems and New England Central Railroad who will alternate years as the primary and alternate representative. Representatives of these organizations serve at the pleasure of their appointing bodies.

Article V. QUORUM & VOTING

A. MPO business is defined comprehensively to include all activities undertaken by the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission to carry out its responsibilities and authority as a metropolitan planning organization.

B. MPO voting. When conducting MPO business, the voting power of the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission shall consist of a total of 24 votes apportioned as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinesburg</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jericho</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelburne</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underhill</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williston</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT Agency of Transportation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Junction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Burlington</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westford</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winooski</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Municipalities that are incorporated shall each have at least one vote. A majority of the voting power (i.e. 13 of 24 votes) shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of MPO business at meetings. A majority of the voting power (i.e. 13 of 24 votes) and a majority of the municipalities (10 of 18) is required to adopt or amend MPO business.

Notwithstanding the need to make adjustments as a result of official corrections to the decennial census urbanized area boundary, the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission shall review, and amend as it deems appropriate, its voting mechanisms and voting distribution for the purposes of MPO business within one year of the publication of each decennial census urbanized area boundary.

C. All other business. For the purposes of voting on all other business, including elections, FHWA, VAOT, CCTA, Railroad Industry, FTA and BIA are non-voting Board members. A majority of the total of Municipal and Regional Board members shall constitute a quorum for
the transaction of all other business at meetings of the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission unless otherwise noted. Each Board member has one vote. Only Municipal Board members shall vote on approving municipal plans and planning processes per 24 V.S.A. § 4350.

ARTICLE VI. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

A. Executive Director shall:
   1) Be responsible to the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission.
   2) Conduct a regional planning program, within the framework of 24 V.S.A., Chapter 117, and other state statutes relevant to regional planning.
   3) Carry out all aspects of the regional transportation planning program in coordination with the Assistant/MPO Director.
   4) Manage contracts with consultants for the purpose of implementing the duly adopted Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP).
   5) Recommend changes to the bylaws, etc. to reflect the passage of new federal or state legislation.
   6) Be responsible for the office.
   7) Hire and manage staff including consultation with the Executive Committee when hiring the Assistant/MPO Director.
   8) Be in charge of all general correspondence of the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission.
   9) Assist the Secretary/Treasurer, and in this capacity shall be responsible for: a) keeping minutes of regular and special meetings of the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission; b) notifying Board members of their election to office or appointment to committees; c) receiving all money due the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission.
   10) Prepare an annual budget and UPWP, including estimated revenues and expenditures, for the fiscal year to be reviewed by the Executive Committee of the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission prior to submission for approval by the full Board.
   11) Disburse the funds in accordance with the budget and as authorized by the Secretary/Treasurer.
   12) Keep accounts which shall at all times be open to inspection by the Board members.
   13) Undertake such other duties as the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission shall assign.
   14) Prepare an annual written report after the completion of each fiscal year.
   15) Prepare a calendar for the ensuing year, which shall be presented to the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission.
   16) Prepare quarterly financial reports in a format approved by the Executive Committee and the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission.
   17) Prepare a recommendation to the CCRPC regarding any potential municipal service agreements and report on their status as appropriate.

B. Job descriptions and responsibilities for additional staff shall be on file.
ARTICLE VII. OFFICERS & EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

A. Election of Officers and Executive Committee

The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission shall annually elect three officers, a Chair, Vice-Chair, and Secretary/Treasurer. In addition, the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission shall annually elect two municipal Board members to the Executive Committee. One municipal Board member of the Executive Committee shall represent a community of 5000+ population; the other, a community of less than 5000 population, based on information from the latest census or population estimate completed by the US Census Bureau.

The Board Development Committee shall render its report of nominations to fill ensuing vacancies prior to the June meeting. The Board Development Committee may nominate one or more candidates for each office. Candidates may also be nominated from the floor.

The officers of the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission shall be elected by a two-thirds majority of the Board members present and voting pursuant to 24 V.S.A. § 4343(b). The results of the voting shall be announced at the June meeting of each year. In the event a majority for any office is not reached, the top two vote getters will have a run-off election and the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission will continue to vote until a majority is reached.

B. Qualifications and Duties of Officers

1) As a qualification for office, the Chair shall have served at least one year as a representative on the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission. The Chair shall have the power to call special meetings, establish agendas, preside over Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission meetings and, with concurrence of the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission, establish and appoint committees and their members. The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission will have at least those committees delineated in Article XI of these by-laws. The Chair shall execute agreements, contracts, and checks in accordance with administrative policies and procedures approved by the Executive Committee.

2) The Vice-Chair shall act as the Chair in the absence of the Chair, and in his/her absence have the same powers as the Chair.

3) The Secretary/Treasurer shall act as the Chair in the absence of the Chair and Vice-Chair, and in his/her absence have the same powers as the Chair. The Secretary/Treasurer shall be responsible for such secretarial and financial duties as are customary to the office.

4) In the absence of the Chair, Vice-Chair, and Secretary/Treasurer another member of the Executive Committee will act as the Chair with the consent of the CCRPC Board.

C. Membership and Elections for Vacancies of the Executive Committee

The members of the Executive Committee shall consist of six members: the Chair, Vice-Chair, Secretary/Treasurer, immediate past Chair and the two municipal members described
in Section A above, elected at the June meeting. In the event of a vacancy existing between
annual elections, the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission shall elect a
member to the Executive Committee to serve until the next June meeting.

D. Terms of Office

The terms of office of Executive Committee members shall begin immediately after the
June meeting of each year at which they are declared elected and shall end immediately after
the next June meeting unless re-elected; but officers shall hold office until their successors
have been elected and installed. The Chair, Vice-Chair and Secretary/Treasurer shall serve
no longer than four consecutive years in any one office. Municipal members of the
Executive Committee may not serve more than four consecutive years in that position.

E. Purpose, Power and Duties of the Executive Committee

The purpose of the Executive Committee shall be to facilitate the administration of the
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission, ensure that policy and planning
recommendations are brought before the Board, and ensure that the decisions of the
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission are implemented.

The Executive Committee shall be subject to the orders of the Chittenden County Regional
Planning Commission voting membership, and none of its acts shall conflict with action
taken by the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission. The duties of the Executive
Committee will include, but not be limited to, the following:

1) to monitor and assure the implementation of Chittenden County Regional Planning
Commission Board of Director decisions;
2) to oversee the development of the agenda for Chittenden County Regional Planning
Commission meetings;
3) to oversee the affairs of the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission between
its regular meetings but to act for the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
only when immediate action is required and the Chittenden County Regional Planning
Commission Board of Directors would not be able to take the necessary action;
4) to annually recommend to the full Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission at
the June meeting Regional Board members to be elected to represent the categories
prescribed in Article IV. A.
5) to oversee the activities of the Finance Committee (FC), Board Development Committee
(BDC), Unified Planning Work Program Committee (UPWPC), Transportation Advisory
Committee (TAC), Planning Advisory Committee (PAC), Long Range Planning
Committee (LRPC), and Clean Water Advisory Committee (CWAC) and to review
Committee recommendations prior to submission to the Board of Directors;
6) to oversee organizational and personnel policies;
7) to recommend for employment an Executive Director subject to confirmation by the
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission;
8) to support, and annually review the Executive Director;
9) to assist the Executive Director in the hiring of the Assistant/MPO Director;
10) to determine, recommend and transmit to the Chittenden County Regional Planning
Commission for approval all recommendations concerning public policy and plan
recommendations forthcoming from the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission's program, which would affect the Chittenden County region and its individual constituent cities and towns;

11) take action on Act 250/Section 248 applications per the CCRPC adopted Guidelines and Standards for Reviewing Act 250 and Section 248 Applications;

12) to make recommendations to the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission concerning entering into municipal service agreements;

13) to develop and update the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission strategic plan and report findings to the Board of Directors;

14) to establish sub-committees on an as needed basis; and

15) to submit a written report of its activities and/or minutes of its meetings prior to each Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission meeting.

F. Executive Committee Meetings
Meetings will be held, at a minimum, in advance of the regular meeting of the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission. Special meetings can be called at the request of the Chair or the Executive Director. A quorum to conduct business shall consist of four members. Members may participate via telephone or video conference if unable to attend in person.

Article VIII. MEETINGS

The rules of procedures of the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission shall be Robert's Rules of Order the latest edition. These procedures will be followed except where superseded by these by-laws.

Board members will be sent their meeting notification, agendas, and appropriate documents at least one week prior to the actual meeting date, except in the case of special meetings. The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission is a public body and shall comply with the Vermont Open Meeting Law (1 V.S.A. § 310 et seq.) and Access to Public Records Laws (1 V.S.A. §§ 315-320 et seq.). Special meetings may be called by the Chair or by a combined group of 50 percent or more of the voting Board members. The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission Board may employ a “Consent Agenda” process when appropriate for expediting minor administrative actions related to the efficient operation of the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission and the management of Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission programs and documents (e.g., qualifying TIP amendments). Any administrative change to Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission documents, policies, or procedures, other than items defined in Article X of these by-laws, may be identified and included in the Consent Agenda element of the full agenda for a regularly-scheduled Board meeting.

At the beginning of each Board meeting, under the “Changes to the Agenda” item, the Chair will entertain requests from any Board member to move individual Consent Agenda items to the Deliberative Agenda for discussion and action. The Board will then act on the Consent Agenda. If a Consent Agenda item is moved to the Deliberative Agenda for discussion and action, Board members will have the opportunity to request additional information on the item from staff,
municipalities, and/or agencies, as appropriate. The Board may then (1) move and vote to approve the item moved from the Consent Agenda to the Deliberative Agenda, at which time the subject administrative change becomes effective, or (2) move and vote to send the change to the appropriate body (e.g., Executive Committee, TAC, or staff) for further review and recommendation.

Article IX. FISCAL YEAR & MEETING DATES

The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission’s fiscal year shall be July 1st through June 30th.

The Annual Meeting shall be set by the Executive Committee and affirmed by the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission Board.

The June Meeting of the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission shall each year include the election of the organization’s Officers and the Executive Committee.

The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission Board shall annually establish the day, time, and location of the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission regular meetings. Meetings of the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission shall be conducted at least quarterly.

Article X. ADOPTIONS OR AMENDMENTS.

A. Bylaws

Upon recommendation of the Executive Committee or upon request by resolution through written ballot by a majority of the Board members any proposed amendment to the by-laws shall first be sent to the Board members and the Board member municipalities’ locally elected legislative bodies in preliminary form for consideration and comment for a period of not less than thirty days. Not later than thirty days after this period, the Executive Committee shall submit to the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission, (1) a report summarizing the comments received and recommendations of the Executive Committee; and (2) if authorized by the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission, the proposed amendment in final form as a written ballot. If submission of the amendment as a ballot is not authorized by the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission, but within ninety days after issuance of the report such submission is requested by a petition signed by at least twenty-five percent of the Board members, the Executive Committee shall, within thirty days following receipt of said petition, submit to the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission a written ballot of the proposed amendment as originally submitted. Adoption of any amendments shall require the affirmative vote of two-thirds majority of the Board members.

B. MPO Business

Before the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission may adopt or make other than minor amendments or administrative changes to MPO business, notice to Board member
municipalities’ locally elected legislative bodies and to the general public shall be given consistent with the Public Participation Plan.

Minor amendments to the UPWP, such as reallocating dollars between approved tasks, can be done with Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission Board approval, without a public hearing.

No municipality or organization shall challenge the validity of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), UPWP, or Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) as adopted according to this article, for procedural defects, after thirty (30) days following the day on which it was adopted.

C. Regional Plan
The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission shall hold public hearings and seek comments on a proposed Regional Plan or amendments consistent with 24 V.S.A. § 4348. The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission shall hold public hearings and review municipal plans and planning processes consistent with 24 V.S.A. §4350. The Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) is integrated into and part of the Regional Plan.

D. Metropolitan Transportation Plan
The MTP shall be considered and voted upon first as MPO Business. Then the full membership of CCRPC shall consider and vote upon the full Regional Plan.

E. Unified Planning Work Plan
The portion of the UPWP that is transportation funded shall be considered and voted upon as MPO Business. Then the full membership of CCRPC shall consider and vote upon the full UPWP.

**Article XI. MUNICIPAL SERVICE AGREEMENTS**

Participation by a municipality in a municipal service agreement shall be voluntary and only valid upon appropriate action by the legislative body of the municipality. To become effective, a municipal service agreement shall be ratified by the regional planning commission and the legislative bodies of the municipalities who are a party to the service agreement. The agreement may include other parties as may be relevant to a particular service. Any modification to a service agreement shall not become effective unless unanimously approved by all parties to the service agreement.

A municipal service agreement shall describe the services to be provided and the amount of funds payable by, and or formula for allocating costs to, each municipality that is a party to the service agreement. Service of personnel, use of equipment and office space, and other necessary services may be accepted from municipalities as part of their financial support and shall be clearly documented in the annual budget for the service approved by the parties to the agreement.

When deemed appropriate by the participating municipalities and the CCRPC, a service agreement will typically include, but not require, a governance committee made up of the participating municipalities and CCRPC. If a governance committee is formed, the service
agreement will include voting rights and financial obligations of each member.

Service agreements shall contain a termination date unless otherwise provided in the agreement. Service agreements shall contain a provision describing how parties may withdraw from the agreement prior to the termination date. If the service agreement includes the need for multi-year financial obligations this will be considered in both termination and withdrawal provisions.

i. The withdrawal provision of a municipal agreement with one municipality shall provide for at least 30 days’ notice unless otherwise provided in the agreement.

ii. The withdrawal provision of a municipal agreement with multiple municipalities shall provide for at least six months’ notice prior to the beginning of a fiscal year unless otherwise provided in the agreement.

Nothing within this section shall limit CCRPC’s ability to enter into contracts or agreements to provide services with other governmental organizations or non-profit entities, including those serving multiple municipalities.

Article XII. COMMITTEES

There shall be committees of the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission as described herein. All Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission Board members are encouraged expected to participate in a minimum of at least one standing committee. The Chair may appoint ad hoc committees for a specific purpose with the approval of the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission. Committees should include subject matter experts as needed to provide advice to the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission Board.

A. Finance Committee (FC)

The Finance Committee shall oversee the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission finances and matters related to organizational finances as specifically described in items 1-8 of this section.

The Chair of the Finance Committee shall be the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission Secretary/Treasurer. There shall be 2 additional members including the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission Vice-Chair and one member of the Board of Directors.

The Finance Committee shall meet on a quarterly basis or as needed to conduct the following activities:

1) oversee Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission finances;
2) oversee the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission annual budget development and report findings to the Executive Committee in cooperation with the Unified Planning Work Plan Committee;
3) oversee the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission annual audit and report findings to the Executive Committee;
4) oversee the staff benefit structure on an annual basis and report recommendations and/or findings to the Board;
5) oversee the staff compensation budget recommendations on an annual basis and report recommendations and/or findings to the Board;
6) oversee the development of a compensation study on a five year basis and report recommendations/findings to the Board;
7) conduct other duties as assigned by the Board and/or Executive Committee; and
8) establish sub-committees on an as needed basis.

B. Board Development Committee (BDC)

The Board Development Committee shall oversee the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission nominating process, updates to the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission bylaws, Board member development, communications, and engagement as specifically described in items 1-10 of this section.

The Chair of the Board Development Committee shall be the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission Immediate Past Chair (should there not be an available Immediate Past Chair the Executive Committee shall appoint a Chair). There shall be up to 4 additional members of the Board of Directors.

The Board Development Committee shall meet on a semi-annual basis or as needed to conduct the following activities:
1) prepare a slate of officers;
2) review and recommend updates of the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission bylaws on an as needed basis and report findings to the Executive Committee;
3) conduct new Board member recruitment in coordination with municipal locally elected legislative bodies;
4) oversee Board member training and development;
5) conduct periodic Board performance evaluations;
6) oversee and conduct Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission outreach and communications (or delegate to an ad hoc Community Engagement Committee);
7) oversee and conduct Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission marketing and branding (or delegate to an ad hoc Community Engagement Committee);
8) review and recommend updates of the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission Public Participation Plan on an as needed basis (or delegate to an ad hoc Community Engagement Committee) and report findings to the Executive Committee;
9) conduct other duties as assigned by the Board and/or Executive Committee; and
10) establish sub-committees on an as needed basis.

C. Unified Planning Work Plan Committee (UPWPC)

The Unified Planning Work Plan Committee shall oversee the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission annual work plan development process as specifically described in
items 1-5 of this section.

The Chair of the Unified Planning Work Plan Committee shall be a Board member selected by the Chair of the CCRPC. There shall be up to 12 members as follows:

- 3-5 Board members
- 2 Transportation Advisory Committee members
- 2 Planning Advisory Committee members
- Vermont Agency of Transportation
- Federal Highway Administration (ex-officio, non-voting)
- Chittenden County Transportation Authority (ex-officio, non-voting)

The Unified Planning Work Plan Committee shall meet on a semi-annual basis or as needed to conduct the following activities:

1) develop a draft annual Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) and report findings to the Executive Committee in cooperation with the Finance Committee;
2) review and recommend updates to the UPWP development process policies on an as needed basis and report findings to the Executive Committee;
3) develop performance measures to monitor the implementation of the UPWP, update the performance measures on an as needed basis, monitor the implementation of the UPWP using the established performance measures and report findings to the Executive Committee;
4) conduct other duties as assigned by the Board and/or Executive Committee; and
5) establish sub-committees on an as needed basis.

D. Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC)

The Transportation Advisory Committee shall oversee the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission transportation activities and policy development funded primarily through the Federal Highway Administration Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) program as specifically described in items 1-9 of this section.

The Chair of the Transportation Advisory Committee shall be a TAC member elected by the TAC or appointed by the Chair of CCRPC. There shall be up to 31 members and representatives of organizations as follows:

- 1 Board member
- Representatives of the 18 municipalities eligible to vote on MPO business as described in Article V. A.
- Vermont Agency of Transportation
- Federal Highway Administration
- Chittenden County Transportation Authority
- Burlington International Airport
- Campus Area Transportation Management Association
- Special Services Transportation Agency
- Person representative of the Business Community
- Person representative of the Disabled Community
1. Person representative of the Elderly Community
2. Person representative of the Environmental Community
3. Person representative of the Bicycle and/or Pedestrian Community
4. Person representative of the Rail Industry

The terms of TAC members will be for two years beginning July 1st, communities whose beginning letter falls between A and K shall appoint a representative to serve beginning in even numbered fiscal years and communities whose beginning letter falls from L through Z shall appoint a representative to serve beginning in odd numbered fiscal years.

Appointments of all other members will be on an annual basis by the Board Chair.

Appointments to fill a vacancy shall be for the unexpired term.

The Transportation Advisory Committee shall meet on a monthly basis or as needed to conduct the following activities:

1) review Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) updates, revisions, and amendments as developed by the Long Range Planning Committee;
2) review and recommend to the Board the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and TIP amendments, Sidewalk and Transportation Enhancement Grant program recommendations and priorities and other program ranking recommendations as needed;
3) review and recommend technical planning/engineering studies for inclusion in the UPWP;
4) review completed MPO funded planning and scoping studies;
5) oversee the selection of consultants to be retained for MPO funded projects and programs;
6) undertake MPO related technical and policy activities similar to the Planning Advisory Committee;
7) coordinate transportation land use activities with the Planning Advisory Committee;
8) conduct other duties as assigned by the Board and/or Executive Committee including recommendations to the Board as needed; and,
9) establish sub-committees on an as needed basis.

E. Planning Advisory Committee (PAC)

The Planning Advisory Committee shall oversee the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission regional planning activities and policy development as specifically described in items 1-13 of this section.

The Chair of the Planning Advisory Committee shall be a PAC member elected by the PAC or appointed by the Chair of CCRPC. There shall be up to 31 members and representatives of organizations as follows:

1. Board member
2. Representatives of the 18 incorporated municipalities and Buel’s Gore
3. 3-5 members of public/interest groups that may include, but are not limited to, the Vermont Department of Health and Champlain Housing Trust
4. Vermont Agency of Transportation and other interested state agencies (ACCD, ANR, AOA)
The terms of PAC members will be for two years beginning July 1st, communities whose beginning letter falls between A and K shall appoint a representative to serve beginning in odd numbered fiscal years and communities whose beginning letter falls from L through Z shall appoint a representative to serve beginning in even numbered fiscal years. Appointment of all other members will be on an annual basis by the Board Chair. Appointments to fill a vacancy shall be for the unexpired term.

The Planning Advisory Committee shall meet on a quarterly basis or as needed to conduct the following activities:

1) review municipal plans (with the inclusion of ad hoc Committee members from the involved and adjacent communities);
2) review and make recommendations to the Board regarding *Guidelines and Standards for Reviewing Act 250 and Section 248 Applications* and identify development projects that may require Act 250 or Section 248 review so that the Board’s role in the process may be proactive instead of reactive;
3) review and recommend regional planning technical/planning/engineering studies for inclusion in the UPWP;
4) provide interface between the Board, work groups and functions related to cross cutting planning issues and the Regional Plan;
5) develop regional planning policy recommendations for Board consideration and/or action;
6) provide input to MTP, UPWP, and TIP development, and other transportation planning processes, on issues or projects of a regional nature;
7) oversee the selection of regional planning and MTP land use related consultants to be retained for projects and programs;
8) evaluate and prioritize regional planning technical assistance;
9) review and make recommendations to the Board regarding Regional Plans of adjacent regions;
10) undertake regional planning related technical and policy activities similar to the Transportation Advisory Committee;
11) coordinate transportation land use activities with the Transportation Advisory Committee;
12) conduct other duties as assigned by the Board and/or Executive Committee; and
13) establish sub-committees on an as-needed basis.

F. Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC)

The Long Range Planning Committee shall oversee the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission development of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), the Regional Plan (RP), and other associated long range planning activities as specifically described in items 1-8 of this section.

The Chair of the Long Range Planning Committee shall be a Board member selected by the
Chair of the CCRPC. There shall be up to 14 members and representatives of organizations as follows:

- 3-6 Board members
- 1 or 2 TAC members
- 1 or 2 PAC members
- 1 to 3 members of public/interest groups
- 1 representative of the Vermont Agency of Transportation

The Long Range Planning Committee shall meet on a semi-annual basis or as needed to conduct the following activities:

1) develop the Metropolitan Transportation Plan at least every five years and present to the Board for adoption;
2) develop the Regional Plan at least every eight years and present to the Board for adoption;
3) develop policy recommendations related to the MTP and RP for Board consideration and/or action;
4) provide guidance to the MTP, RP, UPWP, and TIP development and other land use transportation planning processes on issues and/or projects of a long range planning nature;
5) coordinate activities with the TAC and PAC to assure consistency in plans and policy recommendations to the Board;
6) prepare an annual report of indicators to benchmark the region’s progress towards meeting regional and transportation planning goals;
7) conduct other duties as assigned by the Board and/or Executive Committee; and
8) establish sub-committees on an as needed basis.

G. Clean Water Advisory Committee (CWAC)

The Clean Water Advisory Committee (CWAC) shall oversee the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission activities and policy development regarding but not limited to, the Vermont Lake Champlain Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Plan and its related plans and programs.

The Chair of the CWAC shall be a CWAC member elected by the CWAC or appointed by the Chair of CCRPC. There shall be up to 24 members and representatives of organizations as follows:

- 1 CCRPC Board member or Alternate (who may also represent their municipality)
- Representatives of the County’s 19 municipalities
- University of Vermont
- Vermont Agency of Natural Resources (ANR)
- Vermont Agency of Transportation
- Burlington International Airport

The terms of CWAC municipal members will be for two years beginning July 1st, municipalities whose beginning letter falls between A and K shall appoint a representative to serve beginning in even numbered fiscal years and communities whose beginning letter falls from L through Z shall
appoint a representative to serve beginning in odd numbered fiscal years. Organizational members shall appoint a member for a 2-year term with an alternate if desired. Appointments to fill a vacancy shall be for the unexpired term.

The CWAC shall meet as needed to conduct the following activities:

1. oversee programming related to the CCRPC’s efforts in assisting the Vermont Agency of Natural Resources ANR with basin planning and surface water management including but not limited to:
   a. CCRPC’s assistance to Vermont ANR in the development of tactical basin plans;
   b. technical assistance and data collection activities, including information from watershed organizations, to inform municipal officials and the State in making water quality investment decisions;
   c. coordinating municipal planning and adoption or implementation of municipal development regulations to better meet State water quality policies and investment priorities;
   d. assistance to Vermont ANR in implementing a project evaluation process to prioritize water quality improvement projects within the region to assu...
Article XIII. RESOLVING CONFLICTING INTERESTS

A. Preamble
A public official must exercise his or her authority solely for the benefit of the public and, in fact, stand in a fiduciary relationship to the public. He or she is held by the law to a most rigid standard with respect to any activity which places his or her individual interest in a position where collision with public responsibility becomes possible. The law requires that not only must public officials actually separate private interests from public responsibility, but must also give every appearance of this separation.

A real conflict of interest exists when a private interest exists leading to a personal benefit or gain. An apparent conflict of interest exists when there is a perception that a conflict of interest exists leading to a personal benefit or gain.

Such a conflict would arise when (1) a Board member, (2) any member of his or her immediate family, (3) his or her partner, or (4) an organization which employs or is about to employee any of (1) through (3) above, have a financial or other interest in the firm selected for the award.

Board members of both the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission and the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission’s sub-grantees will neither solicit nor accept gratuities, favors, or items of value (excluding calendars, pens, and other nominal items) from contractors, potential contractors, or parties to sub-agreements.

When a significant real or apparent conflict of interest arises the concerned parties shall discuss the matter with the Executive Committee. Board members should raise the issue of a potential conflict of interest of another Board member or staff person whenever they feel one exists and the person in question does not declare a real or apparent conflict of interest. All real conflicts of interest require compliance with Section B below. The Executive Committee will determine all apparent conflicts of interest. If there is an actual conflict of interest the Committee shall decide on a case-by-case basis whether an individual can participate in discussions, but the individual shall not vote. Alternatively, if there is an apparent conflict of interest the Committee will decide whether and how an individual may participate and if the individual may vote.

B. Board Member Actions
In the event a real conflict of interest, as herein defined, does or would result, the Board member shall act as follows:

1) Disclosure. In the event a proposed contract, material or labor is to be furnished to the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission, the Board member shall state on the record the nature of his or her conflict of interest. He or she shall not communicate, either formally or informally, with any other Board member with respect to the awarding of such contract and shall not vote on the question of its issuance.

2) Disclosure of Fiduciary Relationship. In the event the Board member has fiduciary relationship with any individual, partnership, firm or corporation seeking to contract with the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission, or to provide materials or labor thereto, or has a fiduciary interest in a project or a project before Act 250 or other
regulatory board where the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission is a party, the Board member shall, regardless of contract amount, state on the record the nature of his or her interest, refrain from all formal or informal discussion with any other Board members with respect to such contract or project, and shall not vote on the question of its issuance or approval or disapproval.

3) Form. Upon joining the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission or at the beginning of the fiscal year, Board members will sign a form indicating that they have read and understand this Section.

ARTICLE XIIIIV. APPROPRIATIONS TO THE CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission may receive and expend monies from any source.

CCRPC Charter
ADOPTED by the Commission May 2, 1966.
AMENDED by the Commission May 26, 1997
AMENDED by the Commission September 28, 1998
Superseded by the Commission, May 18, 2011, effective July 1, 2011

CCRPC Bylaws
Amended by CCRPC September 23, 1991
Amended by CCRPC May 27, 1997
Amended by CCRPC February 27, 2006
Superseded by the Commission, May 18, 2011, effective July 1, 2011
Amended by CCRPC May 21, 2014

CCMPO Bylaws
Adopted by the Chittenden County Metropolitan Planning Organization July 15, 1983.
21, 2004, June 20, 2007 and superseded on by the bylaws of the CCRPC dated May 18, 2011,
effective July 1, 2011.
Draft 2017 Chittenden County Multi-Jurisdictional AHMP

Issues: Staff will provide an overview of the final draft of the Multi-Jurisdictional (MJ) AHMP with a focus on the Six Regional Strategies proposed over the next five years. Staff will be meeting with staff of the Vermont Dept. of Emergency Management & Homeland Security (VDEMHS) and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) in late January for a formal review session to determine if the Plan and the template for the municipal AHMP meet FEMA standards prior to FEMA issuing notice that the Plans can be adopted by local governing bodies and by the CCRPC. Staff would like to collect any input from the Board on needed improvements to the Plans prior to its meeting with VDEMHS and FEMA staff.

Staff Recommendation: Board members should familiarize themselves with the Plans especially Section 5 Mitigation Strategy: see documents posted for the January 9th AHMP Plan Update Committee meeting at: http://www.ccrpcvt.org/our-work/emergency-management/hazard-mitigation-plan/

Background: Commencing in the spring of 2015 through January 9, 2017, CCRPC staff have worked with the CCRPC AHMP Plan Update Committee to prepare drafts of the MJAHMP and the template for the individual municipal All Hazards Mitigation Plans. These drafts (prepared by Albrecht, Krohn and Nosse-Leirer) were submitted to VDEMHS staff this past spring and summer in order to maintain favorable cost-share match rates under the State Emergency Relief and Assistance Funds program. Assuming a favorable review from FEMA later this month, the final MJAHMP and the municipal AHMPs will be submitted to FEMA starting in February.

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

CCRPC Board
01/18/2017
Agenda Item 9: Action Item
FY 17 Mid-Year Adjustment

Background: Each year CCRPC reviews the approved work program and budget at mid-year and makes changes where needed. Some consultant projects don’t begin until mid-year so funds are adjusted to reflect how much we believe will be spent by June 30th. Some may require additional funds to complete and some of those will carryforward into FY18. Staff also makes adjustments in the number of hours they anticipate spending on each UPWP task.

In the Mid-Year Adjustment annual work plan document (posted separately) we have shown the original budget amount, the mid-year projected amount and the difference, whether up or down. The Mid-Year Adjustment to the FY17 Budget is also attached as a separate document in 11x17 format.

Blue highlighted areas indicate that changes were made either in task description or consultant dollars. If the whole line is highlighted it means the task was added at mid-year.

Executive Committee Recommendation: CCRPC staff and the Executive Committee recommend approval of the FY17 Mid-Year UPWP and Budget Adjustment by the CCRPC Board.

For more information contact: Charlie Baker, Executive Director at cbaker@ccrpcvt.org or at 846-4490 ext. *23
The meeting was called to order at 5:45 p.m. by the Vice-Chair, Mike O’Brien.

1. **Changes to the agenda; Members’ Items.** There were none.

2. **Approval of November 2, 2016 Joint Executive/Finance Committee meeting.** ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BRIAN BIGELOW, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 2, 2016 MINUTES OF THE JOINT EXECUTIVE/FINANCE COMMITTEES. MOTION CARRIED WITH JOHN ZICCONI ABSTAINING.

3. **Act 250 & Section 248 Applications.**
   a. **Indian Brook Properties, Reconsideration Essex, #4C1289R.** Regina noted that we’ve seen this application before, and it was denied because the project did not comply with Criteria 1(B), 4 and 9(B). The applicant has applied for, but has not yet received ANR Stormwater Permit, the receipt of which would create a rebuttable presumption that the project complies with criteria 1(B) and 4. The applicant has also reconfigured the project to attempt to address Criterion 9(B) by making this a 10-lot subdivision with nine single family lots and one 161-acre lot proposed as permanent open space. JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO APPROVE THE LETTER FROM STAFF BE SENT TO D.E.C. MOTION CARRIED, WITH BRIAN BIGELOW ABSTAINING. Brief discussion about the 161 acres to be left open and the various types of soils that wouldn’t be prime ag soils.
   b. **Encore Solar, Hinesburg, Docket #8845.** This is a solar project in Hinesburg and the letter is pretty much the same as we have done before. We do say that this is okay with us. The Town is happy with this project. ANDY MONTOLL MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JOHN ZICCONI, TO APPROVE THIS LETTER TO BE SENT TO THE PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD. When John questioned the phrase “not inconsistent”, Regina noted that we’d rather not say it’s consistent in the rural planning area, which is why we say “not inconsistent.” MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. (Chris Roy arrived.)
   c. **Vermont Green Line Devco, LLC, Lake Champlain, Docket #8847.** Regina noted that this is similar to the project that is proposed for under the lake. Last time we discussed this, the Executive Committee asked that we intervene to bring up the taxation issue. The paperwork in your packet is needed for that, more substance will be sent down the road. The pre-hearing conference happened last week. She brought this to us now because if we wait until the January Executive Committee meeting, we might miss the deadline. JOHN ZICCONI MADE A
MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO GIVE THE OKAY TO STAFF TO SEND THIS LETTER TO THE PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. **Draft Bylaws Review.** Charlie noted that the committee has not met since the board meeting. This version reflects changes suggested at the board meeting. He reviewed those changes.
   a. Page 4 adds CCTA as a voting member on MPO business and changes majority of voting power to 13 of 25 votes. This was a topic of debate the last time we updated the bylaws. However, the latest version of the federal transportation bill FAST ACT now requires the transit authority to be a voting member of the MPO. Legally they are still CCTA dba Green Mountain Transit (GMT).
   b. John questioned last sentence on page 2, and Charlie noted that this language came right from the statute.
   c. Charlie noted that he reordered the paragraphs under Article XI. Municipal Service Agreements. A change was recommended to the second paragraph. After some discussion it was agreed to add “the amount will be approved by the parties to the agreement.”
   d. Page 16 addresses adding the CWAC (Clean Water Advisory Committee) as a standing committee. The CWAC met yesterday and voted to recommend it become a standing committee.
   e. John likes the change on page 11, under Committees where we changed “encouraged” to “expected” regarding CCRPC members serving on committees.
   f. On page 17, #3, it was recommended to change “12” municipalities and organizations to “current” in case other communities become MS4 communities.
   g. Page 7, E.5 – we will add CWAC to the list of committees the Executive Committee oversees.
   h. Charlie said the CWAC was working on reviewing state policies and trying to decide where that responsibility should be included. Chris suggest in 4. A. on page 17.

It was noted that the Board Development Committee is set to meet next week and he will send these changes to Catherine McMains and Jeff Carr to have the committee make a recommendation to the Board. In January, we’ll warn a public hearing for March to give the 30-day review period to the municipalities.

5. **Legislative Breakfast Agenda review.** We have 4 topics which Charlie reviewed with members.
   Members made suggestions.

6. **Chair/Executive Director’s Report.**
   a. Charlie noted that Milton and Hinesburg Selectboard meetings went well and were very positive. He will finish up with St. George next week. John thanked Charlie for doing all the work to go out at night to see them all. Charlie said it is important to have these conversations.
   b. Shared Dispatch Services update. We’ll get the recommendation by January 30th and then we’ll be doing another round of these meetings in February. Last week we had a workshop with police chiefs, fire chiefs, managers and dispatchers. It’s been an interesting and informative process.
   c. Financial Assistant search. Charlie noted that we have hired a replacement finance assistant who will begin January 3rd.

7. No December board meeting.

8. No Other Business.

9. No Executive Session needed.

10. **Adjournment.** JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O’BRIEN TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:45 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc
The meeting was called to order at 5:45 p.m. by Vice Chair Mike O’Brien.

1. Changes to the agenda/Members’ Items: Charlie asked that since Jeff and Amy are on the telephone we move the work program and budget Mid-Year adjustment item up on the agenda, since that’s the item they are both interested in. We also want to add an item to have the Executive Committee warn a public hearing for the February board meeting for some major TIP amendments so we meet the required 30-day warning period. Members agreed.

2. Approval of December 7, 2016 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes. ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BRIAN BIGELOW, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 7, 2016 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. FY17 Mid-Year UPWP & Budget Adjustment. Members reviewed the budget spreadsheet showing income and expenses with budget vs. actual numbers to date; and what is recommended for the mid-year adjustment. We will be using less dues for non-transportation work. Transportation budget shows slightly less staff dollars, but more consultant dollars. The Natural Resources section shows the brownfields grants added. We also added Jericho Stormwater project for $19,851 for consultants and there is some staff time. Row 44, Malletts Bay Stormwater project has total project cost of $188,683, which includes $100,000 of PL funds and $88,683 from Colchester, so those funds show up here. Row 45 adds funds for Act 174 training for energy plans in the amount of $21,200. Row 57 adds $41,000 for a regional dispatch consultant that the municipalities are funding. The revenue side is up $287,388 or about 5%. Charlie then reviewed the expense side. The consultant expenses are up about 9%. Salaries and benefits are down slightly, as we now know actual healthcare costs for the second half of the year. The audit was cheaper than anticipated. Total operating expenses are down about 4%, but overall expenses are up 3.7%. We came up with $63,500 in the black, but he doesn’t expect that will be true in the end.

Charlie then reviewed the UPWP tasks. There are a few cells highlighted in yellow that we need to review to make sure the information is correct. Any significant changes to consultant dollars are highlighted in blue or are new projects. Members reviewed the changes and agreed to recommend these changes to the full board. JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL BY THE BOARD WITH ANY MINOR CHANGES STAFF IDENTIFY. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
3A. Warn a Public Hearing for Major TIP Amendments. Charlie noted that the TAC reviewed the major amendments yesterday and recommended approval to the board. Because there isn’t time between our January and February meetings to give a 30-day public hearing notice we’re asking the Executive Committee act on behalf of the Board to warn the public hearing for February. There is a budget change for the VT2A/Creek Road/Bay Road intersection in Colchester. It will increase federal funds for construction from $2,378,880 to $3,765,000 – to add $480,000 in FY17 and $906,120 in FY18. This is a 58.3% increase in construction cost which is defined as a major amendment. The second change is for Exit 16 Park and Ride in Colchester to increase construction costs from $250,000 to $800,000. We will add $440,000 in FY17 and $220,000 in FY18. This is a 42% increase in project costs. In order to maintain fiscal constraint, we also request minor amendments in the Railyard Enterprise Project to reduce FY17 funds from $960,000 to $150,000; and Champlain Parkway in Burlington to move $1,015,000 in federal construction funds from FY17 to FY21. These changes were reviewed and agreed to in Burlington as they won’t affect the project timing. When asked why the rush to hold the hearing in February, Charlie noted that the VT2A/Creek Road/Bay Road project has been bid and a contract is being negotiated. The Exit 16 Park and Ride has work that needs to be done in the winter rather than in the spring, so the sooner the TIP is amended the better. ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION TO WARN A PUBLIC HEARING ON THE MAJOR TIP AMENDMENTS FOR FEBRUARY 15, 2017 BOARD MEETING. JOHN ZICCONI SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. (Amy and Jeff left the meeting.)

   a. Winooski Hotel, #4C1065-18. Regina noted that this project is located on the circulator near Champlain Mill. It meets the ECOS plan. They will use shared parking arrangement and other TDM strategies, so we don’t have any transportation issues. The building will be seven stories on the river side and 6 stories on the road. It is in scale with the area. ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JOHN ZICCONI, TO APPROVE THE LETTER TO THE D.E.C. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
   b. 316 Flynn Avenue, Burlington, #4C1297. This development is at the corner of Flynn Avenue and Pine Street. It involves demolition of an existing commercial building and the subsequent redevelopment of an urban lot into a four-story mixed use building containing two ground-floor commercial spaces and 30 apartments and 34 surface parking spaces. The project meets 9(L) and is in line with the ECOS plan. We do have questions on the traffic study that doesn’t include future year analysis. JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO APPROVE THE LETTER TO THE D.E.C. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
   c. Allen Brook Development (Cottonwood), Williston, #4C0994-1. This project is located on the site of the former driving range on Route 2. It is described as a five-phase mixed use development on three parcels at full build out to consist of 50,925 sf of retail space, 11,725 sf of restaurant space, 20,110 sf of office space and 206 dwelling units. The current application is for phase 1 to consist of 19,795 sf retail space, 6,225 sf of restaurant space, 10,110 sf of office space and 46 dwelling units. We find it in line with the ECOS plan. The Traffic Impact Assessment and subsequent Traffic Technical Memo address several items concerning the project’s impacts. It meets 9(L) as it’s in a growth center. ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JOHN ZICCONI, TO APPROVE THE LETTER TO THE D.E.C. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
5. **Regional Dispatch Update – review of governance model.** Charlie distributed the draft Governance Evaluation. In the budget discussion, we talked about the $41,000 for consultant work. The consultant is from California but the project manager grew up in Colchester. The consultant is dealing with the operating side of regional dispatch. The governance part is being worked on with municipal managers, Charlie, Lee, and some chiefs (police, rescue, and fire). Aaron Frank has the lead on this. There are 38 organizations that are being dispatched right now from seven dispatch sites with 45 people working full-time as dispatchers under local government/union agreements. The preliminary study shows that with computer aided dispatch, we could see a reduction to 32-38 total staff. There could be labor savings but it is likely that we would have to rent a facility, purchase new equipment, etc.

They came up with three different possible governance structures (along with benefits, drawbacks and conclusions for each option), which Charlie reviewed with members – inter-municipal contracting; RPC shared services; regional special purpose government. There are some questions that we need addressed by an attorney, especially regarding the option for dealing with RPC. Members reviewed some of the questions for Counsel. Charlie then reviewed the proposed solution – to utilize CCRPC’s regional services model as an interim step to achieving a union municipal district. Discussion ensued. Charlie said the idea is to get rid of the seven dispatch services and have one dispatch center for the whole county. The consultant did talk to all rural services for police and fire. Members agreed for this to work towns are going to have to go beyond their boundaries and that a service like that needs to be regional. The consultant anticipates a final report by the end of January. The governance report will have to be reviewed by town managers and then get answers from our attorney. After final report is completed, Charlie and municipal managers/chiefs will spend time visiting all municipalities again to get feedback. Andy suggested we should give deference to the municipalities to see which structure would work better for them and then see what we need to do to accommodate them. Charlie asked members to give additional thoughts to him. John suggested we ask Joe Colangelo to come to the board meeting to give the same presentation he gave at the legislative breakfast.

6. **Draft Bylaw Amendments.** Charlie noted there are two new proposed sentences on pages 10 & 11, under Municipal Service Agreements in response to the dispatch discussion. The first one states “The vote of the RPC on the initial agreement and subsequent related votes shall be limited to consideration of the impact on the RPC budget and staff resources.” After a lengthy discussion members agreed to delete it. There was a general sense that we should be entering these agreements with a high level of trust and good faith. The second sentence on page 11 states “Nothing within this section shall limit CCRPC’s ability to enter into contracts or agreements to provide services with other governmental organizations or non-profit entities, including those serving multiple municipalities.” Members are okay adding that language. Charlie said the next step is to send the proposed revisions to the full board in January for their review. If the board agrees, we will send it to the municipalities for the 30-day review and public hearing in March. **ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BRIAN BIGelow, TO FORWARD THE PROPOSED BYLAW AMENDMENTS TO THE FULL BOARD AND THEN ADVANCE IT TO THE MUNICIPALITES FOR REVIEW. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**
7. **Chair/Executive Director’s Report.**
   a. **Finance Assistant.** Charlie reported that our new Finance Assistant, Michelle Thibault-Hatch, started yesterday.
   b. **Shared Dispatch Services Update.** Discussed earlier tonight.

8. **Review of January Board Meeting Agenda.** Charlie noted that we have a public forum for the FY18 UPWP. Members then reviewed other items proposed. When asked why we approve population projections, Charlie noted that the RPC has always done it. Andy suggested we pull out population projections from 10, 20 and 30 years ago and see how we’re doing. Charlie said one of the purposes of this current process is to be more realistic. We will add an item for Joe Colangelo to talk about Regional Dispatch before we address bylaw amendments. Charlie said there is an Urban Soils Report released recently that might need some comment from the board depending on the discussion at the Brownfields Committee.

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

10. **Executive Session.** There was no Executive Session needed.

11. **Adjournment.** JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BRIAN BIGELOW, TO ADJOURN AT 7:25 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc
January 5, 2017

Peter E. Keibel
Act 250 Coordinator
111 West Street
Essex Junction, VT 05452

RE: Allen Brook Development (Cottonwood); Williston; Application #4C0994-1 DRAFT

Dear Mr. Keibel:

The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission’s Staff and Executive Committee have reviewed this Act 250 application for a project described as a five-phase mixed use development on three parcels at full build-out to consist of 40,925 sf of retail space, 11,725 sf of restaurant space, 20,110 sf of office space and 206 dwelling units. We understand that the current application is for approval of Phase I (19,795 sf retail space, 6,225 sf of restaurant space, 10,110 sf of office space and 46 dwelling units) and partial findings for subsequent phases on all criteria except 1(B), 4 and 8. The Project is located at 6180 Williston Road in Williston, VT. Phase I of the project has received approval from the Town of Williston’s Development Review Board. We offer the following comments:

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

1. The Metro Planning Area is identified in the Plan as an area planned for growth, and therefore this project helps implement Strategy #2 of the Plan which calls for 80% of new development in the areas planned for growth.
2. The project will be served by municipal water and sewer service, and is accessible via GMT transit routes.
3. The density and uses are consistent with the local regulations.

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

We also find that this project meets the requirements of Criterion 9(L) as it is located within a state designated Growth Center.

The Traffic Impact Assessment (8/4/2016), Third Party Review (9/1/2016), and follow up Traffic Technical Memo (10/6/2016) have addressed several items concerning the projects impacts and we do not have anything further to add to the discussion.

Due to the detailed level of development review in most Chittenden County municipalities and the environmental permit reviews at the Department of Environmental Conservation, CCRPC will give specific attention in its Act 250 reviews to the type of use and the Planning Areas section of the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan. While there are many other topics covered in the 2013 Chittenden
County ECOS Plan, there has been significant analysis at the Regional level regarding transportation impacts. The CCRPC will also focus its attention on transportation, where appropriate, in accordance with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, which is within the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan.

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

Sincerely,

Charlie Baker
Executive Director

Cc: CCRPC Board
Certificate of Service
January 5, 2017

Stephanie H. Monaghan
Act 250 Coordinator
111 West Street
Essex Junction, VT 05452

RE: Winooski Hotel Group, LLC; Winooski; Application #4C1065-18 DRAFT

Dear Ms. Monaghan:

The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission’s Staff and Executive Committee have reviewed this Act 250 application for a project described as a boundary line adjustment between Lots 9 and 2 with the City of Winooski and construction of a 100-room hotel on new Lot 9. The Project is located at 4 Winooski Falls Way in Winooski. The Winooski City Council approved the project on March 28, 2016. We understand that this hearing is on Downtown Development Findings per 10 V.S.A § 6086b, and as such the hearing will review Criteria 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 8(A), 9(B), 9(C), 9(F), and 9(K). We offer the following comments:

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

1. The Center Planning Area is identified in the Plan as an area planned for growth, and therefore this project helps implement Strategy #2 of the Plan which calls for 80% of new development in the areas planned for growth.
2. The project will be served by municipal water and sewer service, and is accessible via GMT transit routes.
3. The density and uses are consistent with the local regulations.

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

The project is anticipated to generate a relatively minor amount of traffic when considering the volume of vehicles using the Winooski Circulator on a given day. We applaud the use of available satellite parking lots to accommodate the project’s parking needs. In addition, the project’s proximity to the nearby transit stop, hotel shuttle, and overall walkability of Winooski’s downtown makes it easy for hotel guests to avoid using their personal vehicle throughout their stay.

Due to the detailed level of development review in most Chittenden County municipalities and the environmental permit reviews at the Department of Environmental Conservation, CCRPC will give specific attention in its Act 250 reviews to the type of use and the Planning Areas section of the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan. While there are many other topics covered in the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan, there has been significant analysis at the Regional level regarding transportation...
impacts. The CCRPC will also focus its attention on transportation, where appropriate, in accordance with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, which is within the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan.

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

Sincerely,

Charlie Baker  
Executive Director  

Cc: CCRPC Board  
Certificate of Service
January 5, 2017

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

RE: 316 Flynn Avenue, Burlington; Application #4C1297 - DRAFT

Dear Ms. Monaghan:

The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission’s Staff and Executive Committee have reviewed this Act 250 application for a Project described as the demolition of an existing commercial building and the subsequent redevelopment of an urban lot into a four-story mixed use building containing two ground floor commercial spaces and 30 apartments, along with 34 surface parking spaces. The Project is located at 316 Flynn Avenue in Burlington, Vermont. All criteria are under review. The project was approved by the Burlington Development Review Board on October 13, 2016. We offer the following comments:

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

1. The Metro Planning Area is identified in the Plan as an area planned for growth, and therefore this project helps implement Strategy #2 of the Plan which calls for 80% of new development in the areas planned for growth.
2. The project is already served by municipal water and sewer service, and is accessible via GMT transit routes.
3. The density and uses are consistent with the local regulations.

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

We also find that this project meets the requirements of Criterion 9(L). Though the project is not located in a state designated center, we find that it is located in an existing settlement. 10 VSA 6001 (16) defines an existing settlement as an area that is “compact in form and size; that contains a mixture of uses that include a substantial residential component and that are within walking distance of each other; that has significantly higher densities than densities that occur outside the settlement; and that is typically served by municipal infrastructure such as water, wastewater, sidewalks, paths, transit and public parks or greens.” The site of the project exhibits all of these characteristics. Therefore, the project complies with the requirements of Criterion 9(L).

The Traffic Impact Study dated June 28, 2016 indicates there will be minimal traffic congestion impacts to the surrounding area and we concur with its findings. However, no future year (e.g. 2021) was analyzed that would have incorporated background traffic growth or planned developments such as the nearby City Market expansion or the Champlain Parkway. This could be because traffic volume on Pine Street has been relatively constant in recent years or because the Champlain Parkway will alleviate congestion at the study intersection. The exact reasoning is unknown as it was left unaddressed. We suggest the Commission ask for a future year analysis if they feel it’s necessary to determining mitigation strategies.
Due to the detailed level of development review in most Chittenden County municipalities and the environmental permit reviews at the Department of Environmental Conservation, CCRPC will give specific attention in its Act 250 reviews to the type of use, the Planning Areas section of the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan, and Criterion 9(L). While there are many other topics covered in the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan, there has been significant analysis at the Regional level regarding transportation impacts. The CCRPC will also focus its attention on transportation, where appropriate, in accordance with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, which is within the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan.

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

Sincerely,

Charlie Baker  
Executive Director

Cc: CCRPC Board  
Certificate of Service
DATE: Tuesday, January 3, 2017
TIME:  9:00 a.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal St. Winooski, VT

Members Present
Brian Bigelow, Underhill
Mary Anne Michaels, Rail
Eric Wells, Milton
Amy Bell, VTrans
Matt Langham, VTrans
Ashley Bishop, VTrans District 5
Dean Pierce, Shelburne
Barbara Elliot, Huntington
Chris Jolly, FHWA
Sandy Thibault, CATMA
Bruce Hoar, Williston
Bryan Osborne, Colchester, TAC Chair
Bob Henneberger, Seniors
Nicole Losch, Burlington
Katelin Brewer-Colie, Local Motion
Trevor Lashua, Hinesburg

Others Present
Chris Brunelle, Agency of Natural Resources
Kristopher McAvoy, VTrans District 5
Erin Lewis, VTrans

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

TAC Chair Bryan Osborne called the meeting to order at 9:00AM and asked for a round of attendee introductions.

1. Consent Agenda
N/A this month.

2. Approval of Minutes
BARBARA ELLIOT MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF November 1, 2016. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY BRUCE HOAR AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

3. Public Comments
There were none.

4. Flood Damage Reporting
Chris Brunelle of the VT Agency of Natural Resources attended to inform TAC members on town requirements to report flood damage and, before any flood event, report on any of their Emergency Protective Measures (EPM). Chris is available to help all Towns in this regard and can take reports over the phone or Towns can use the EPM website at ANR for reporting. Chris and other ANR staff are visiting RPCs and groups of Town Road Foremen in order to let them know their reporting responsibilities. These will help in the case of FEMA declarations and efforts to fund recovery from flood disasters. Chris noted that in his opinion the most important point is that if a municipality takes an EPM (an action necessary to preserve life or to prevent severe imminent damage to public or private property, or both) that they either contact a River Management Engineer by phone, email, or text and/or fill out the web based EPM reporting form. He also reported that the group that would benefit the most from EPM outreach is VT Local Roads and VTrans district staff. Peter mentioned having Chris attend a future road foremens’ meeting to discuss these issues.
5. Major and Minor TIP Amendments

Christine Forde started the presentation by briefly explaining the two major and three minor TIP amendments. The cost increases to the two major amendment changes are offset by shifting costs from the other three items. The proposed amendments are summarized below:

VT2A/US7/Creek Road/Bay Road Intersection, Colchester

- **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.

Exit 16 Park and Ride, Colchester

- **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.

Minor Amendments

Railyard Enterprise Project, Burlington

- **Description of Change** – Reduce funds in FY17 from $960,000 to $150,000.

Champlain Parkway, Burlington

- **Description of Change** – Move $1,015,000 in federal construction funds from FY17 to FY21.

Modifications and Overruns

- **Description of Change** – Designate the use of $111,120 from Modifications and Overruns in FY18 to be used to maintain fiscal constraint.

Christine then introduced Erin Lewis of VTrans to give more detail on the VT2A/US7/Creek Road project. Erin’s highlights included:

- Project history – This became an official VTrans project in 1995!
- Project Scoping - 1995 to 1997
- Conceptual Plans Complete - December 2000
- Public 502 Hearing Held - May 2001
- Project Updated for New Federal/State Criteria & Design Standards (including New Stormwater Regulations)
- Final Design - 2016
- Construction – 2017

Erin also noted the following project elements:

- Two New Signals: at Bay Road and Creek Farm Road
- Lowering Profile of US2/7
- Bicycle/Pedestrian Facilities including a Shared Use Path, new Pedestrian Signal, and Bike Shoulders
- Revealed a New Typical Section
- Identified areas of Access Management
- The final estimated project cost was $4.5M but the low bid came in at $3.6M

Following the presentation, BARBARA ELLIOT MADE A MOTION THE BOARD APPROVE THE THREE MINOR TIP AMENDMENTS AND THAT THE BOARD WARN A PUBLIC HEARING ON THE TWO MAJOR AMENDMENT ITEMS. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY BRUCE HOAR AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

6. FY18 UPWP

Marshall briefly went over the development status of next year’s work program. He noted that project solicitation letters went out last month to member towns and regional partners. Staff has been meeting
with regional partners and offering meetings with towns to answer any questions. If anyone needs any
more information they should contact Marshall.

7. Way to Go! Report
Bryan Davis went through a PowerPoint of this year’s highlights that featured changes from previous
years’ events. These included:

- Two-week Challenge - up from one
- New dates/season – Fall rather than Spring
- All trips count, not just commutes
- Improved website functionality
- Introduced new Carbon Throwdown Challenge and trophy
- Increased integration of K-12 school participants
- Refer-A-Friend component with incentives
- Videos to help spread the word
- 4 Award Categories: Carbon Cup, Carbon Throwdown, Carbon Cutting Leader & School
  Challenge
- Solar Tracker donated by AllEarth Renewables as school prize

Results, when compared to previous events, were impressive and included a 121% increase in the number
of participants and a 236% increase in Carbon savings.

Bryan also reported that a new bike share program is about to be launched at UVM and Champlain
College and a contractor had recently been selected. Bryan is also involved in a regional bike parking
effort and mentioned that annual Complete Streets reports from towns were coming due.

8. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports
Peter directed TAC members to the project list on the back of the agenda page and asked if members had
any questions. Bryan Osborne noted that his agenda did not list projects and it appeared other members
copies didn’t either.

9. CCRPC November Board Meeting Report.
Peter mentioned the Board heard an update on the upcoming FY18 UPWP development process and
budget.

10. Chairman’s/Members’ Items
No items came up.

The meeting adjourned at 9:50 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter Keating
DATE: Tuesday, January 3, 2017
TIME: 11:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT
DOCUMENTS: Minutes, documents, and presentations discussed accessible at:
http://www.ccrpcvt.org/meetings/clean-water-advisory-committee/

Committee Members in Attendance
Bolton: Deb Shelby     Hinesburg: Trevor Lashua     St. George:
Buels Gore: Hunting: Darlene Palola Underhill: Brian Bigelow
Burlington: Jenna Calvi Jericho:
Charlotte: Milton: Jeff Castle Williston: James Sherrard
Colchester: Warner Rackley Richmond: Winooski: John Choate (arr. 11:10)
Essex: Annie Costandi Shelburne: Chris Robinson VAOT: Burlington Airport:
Essex Junction: Chelsea Mandigo South Burlington: Tom DiPietro VANR:

Other Attendees: VT-DEC: Jim Pease
CCRPC Staff: Dan Albrecht; Charlie Baker

1. Welcome: Annie Costandi called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m. No changes were made to the agenda.
2. Review and action on draft minutes of December 6, 2016 (Action):
   After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, Trevor Lashua made a motion, seconded by James Sherrard to approve the December 6, 2016 minutes. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.
3. Update on anticipated elements of Municipal Roads General Permit
   As he has been participating in VT-DEC’s MRGP “Core Team” meetings, Charlie Baker briefed the Committee of the draft elements in the “framework” document loaded on the Committee’s webpage (see link above). An updated version of this document should be issued by VT-DEC soon. They will be seeking feedback on that rough draft by April before issuing the formal draft document and starting a formal public comment period in July. The final permit would then be issued in December 2017. By July 2018, each municipality will have to file a permit application which would likely consist of a simple Notice of Intent form along with basic information about the municipality. Authorizations would then be issued by October 2018 along with guidelines and a schedule for conducting Road Erosion Inventories (of “hydrologically-connected municipal road segments”) and developing a project implementation schedule for submission back to DEC no later than October 2020.

   Concerns raised by the Committee included:
   - Reporting should just be on an Annual basis with April being the preferred month as that matches the MS-4 permit report deadline and is just after Town budgets for the ensuing fiscal year are voted on in March.
   - Requirements with regards to fixing erosion issues on Class 4 roads will need careful monitoring as the permit is developed given the unique status of these roads and that in some cases, moving trucks and equipment on a Class 4 road to fix a problem at a specific location on that road may cause more erosion problems.
   - Fixing erosion problems such as rock-lining ditches or outfalls in, or adjacent to, wetlands or wetland buffers may trigger the need for a State wetland permit which impair efforts to improve municipal roads. There needs to be improved coordination between the MRGP program and the Wetlands Division to address this concern.
   - The annual operating fee of $2,000 is too heavy burden for the smaller towns and is not proportional to different situations. MS4 towns pay fees based upon the amount of impervious cover.
Discussion concluded with the Committee asking staff to see if Jim Ryan from DEC can present to the CWAC at the February 7th meeting.

4. Update on Water Quality Funding Options
Charlie Baker briefed the Committee on this issue as he participated in the summer information sessions sponsored by the Vermont Treasurer’s office and the Treasurer has also solicited feedback from CCRPC and Chittenden County municipalities while her office works to finalize the pending report to the Legislature. Additionally, the CCRPC Board created an ad hoc committee to work on this issue which met in early December. Participants included Megan Moir, James Sherrard and Brian Bigelow.

He recapped the elements of the December 21st email to the Treasurer which was posted on the Committee’s webpage (see link above). These were unofficial comments to the Treasurer however they do provide a sense of what elements should or should not be included in any funding package related to a parcel fee. A key point is that the package should have some sort of statewide fee collection and implementation mechanism rather than putting the burden of fee collection on the State’s 230+ municipalities. Committee members noted that it may be several months before any kind of final action is known given the change in the Governor and the start of a new legislative biennium. The item concluded with a recommendation that the Committee review the latest information on this issue at their February 7th meeting.

5. Process for development of CWAC official comments
Committee members noted the challenge to developing comments under short timelines. Ideally, given a 90 day comment timeframe, there is time for a first CWAC meeting to introduce the issue, a second CWAC meeting to formalize comments and lastly, formal review and adoption of the comments by the full CCRPC Board (or by the CCRPC Executive Committee) at a subsequent meeting. General consensus points were that a) that Staff or the Committee should request extensions to comment periods from agencies where applicable, b) that in between regular CWAC meetings, ad hoc meetings or conference calls should be scheduled and all members be invited, but not required to participate so that work on developing formal comments can continue and last, c) that the Committee should work towards providing its recommendations for comments/letters to the CCRP Board or Executive Committee for formal action.

6. Items for February meeting agenda
- Briefing on first draft of Municipal Roads General Permit
- Briefing on Treasurer’s report on options for raising revenue for Clean Water Fund.

7. Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 12:33 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Dan Albrecht
DATE: Tuesday, December 6, 2016
TIME: 11:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT
DOCUMENTS: Minutes, documents, and presentations discussed accessible at:
http://www.ccrpcvt.org/meetings/clean-water-advisory-committee/

Committee Members in Attendance

| Bolton: | Hinesburg: Trevor Lashua | St. George: |
| Buels Gore: | Huntington: Darlene Palola | Underhill: Brian Bigelow |
| Burlington: Megan Moir/ Jenna Calvi | Jericho: Westford: |
| Charlotte: | Milton: Jeff Castle | Williston: James Sherrard |
| Colchester: | Winooski: John Choate |
| Essex: Annie Costandi | Shelburne: VAOT: Jennifer Callahan |
| Essex Junction: Chelsea Mandigo | South Burlington: Tom DiPietro | VANR: |
| Burlington Airport: | University of VT: Lani Ravin | CCRPC Board: |

Other Attendees: VT-DEC: Jim Pease, Karen Bates. WNRCD: Holly Kreiner

CCRPC Staff: Dan Albrecht; Regina Mahony;

1. **Welcome:** Annie Costandi called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m. No changes were made to the agenda.

2. **Review and action on draft minutes of November 1, 2016 (Action):**

   After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, James Sherrard made a motion, seconded by Chelsea Mandigo to approve the November 1, 2016 minutes. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.

3. **Review of proposed changes to CCRPC bylaws incorporating CWAC as Standing Committee and recommendation to CCRPC Board on same:**

   Dan Albrecht provided the CWAC with the proposed bylaw language for incorporating CWAC as a standing committee at CCRPC Board. This includes the make-up of the Committee, the tasks, and the MS-4 subcommittee. This is the same language that was included in the original charge. There was consensus that more formal inclusion of watershed groups was not needed at this time (by the CWAC and the watershed groups). There was a brief discussion.

   Darlene Palola made a motion, seconded by Brian Bigelow, to recommended to the CCRPC Board that the CWAC be included in the CCRPC Bylaws as a standing committee, with the language as proposed, rather than an Ad Hoc Committee. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.

4. **Review of “municipal allocations” of Phosphorus in Lamoille TBP and discussion of how to help inform development of next TBP:**

   Dan Albrecht provided an overview of the municipal allocations by sector within the Lamoille TBP, as this wasn’t available the last time the CWAC reviewed this Plan. There were a number of questions regarding Table WLA-3 about the MRGP, MS4 and 3 acre program being treated differently for Milton and Essex (called out as the only MS-4 towns in the Lamoille Basin) v. the rest of the MS-4 Towns. Will the MRGP and 3 acre permit be incorporated into the MS-4 permits or not? Dan Albrecht showed the high phosphorus catchments and explained that these are areas where phosphorus could be reduced, Karen Bates explained that the catchments are areas where phosphorus could potentially be reduced, not that they have to be reduced in accordance with these tables. The miles of hydrologically connected roads, the estimated number of 3-acre parcels is also included. Milton’s WWTP is not called out as needing to address any phosphorus reduction because they are under their design flow.

5. **DEC Presentation Karen Bates: start of Winooski TBP update process (Discussion, 25 minutes)**

   Karen Bates provided the CWAC with an initial presentation of the Winooski TBP update process, starting from the ANR Atlas. We have a lot more data now than we did 5 years ago that will help us prioritize the
improvements. Karen Bates also described some of the engagement that has already occurred with some of the
watershed groups. Dan Albrecht described that there will be categories in the TBP, but we also have variety of
studies and other TMDLs that describe projects, and we’d like to be able to prioritize projects within this plan
based on phosphorus reduction and co-benefits. We weren’t able to do this in the Lamoille TBP, but that is the
intent for the Winooski TBP. James Sherrard expressed some concern regarding the prioritization because
some of the projects may not hit all of the priority criteria – for example some of the flow restoration projects
won’t reduce phosphorus. Karen Bates explained that this is a good question because it is unclear if the TBP
is only intended to prioritize ERP funds, or all grant programs. James Sherrard feels that it would be best if
the TBP helps prioritize for all of the TMDLs, not just phosphorus. How the TBP relates to the individual
funding sources is still unclear.
Karen Bates also suggested that RSEP should be explaining how they think outreach and education should
work since we are already doing this.
Jennifer Callahan added that these plans should be much more broad than just the phosphorus TMDLs because
there are many funding sources that will look to these plans for direction.

6. Comment letter on Draft TS-4 Permit and Phosphorus Control Plans* (Action, 20 minutes) Note:
The CWAC may elect to defer action on this letter and have it addressed by MS-4 Committee.

The CWAC discussed whether it makes sense for the CWAC to comment on this draft permit, and if it will
have an impact on the MS-4 phosphorus control plans. VTrans has already done quite a bit of commenting on
this permit, and they will not be participating in comments from the CWAC. Dan Albrecht explained that
folks can always recuse themselves. Charlie Baker explained this is no different than how the TAC operates,
where they are often submitting comments to VTrans, and VTrans recuses themselves from that discussion.
James Sherrard asked a broader question about whether the CWAC wants to set a policy that comments are
only submitted if there is consensus. Tom DiPetro explained that it is important for the CWAC to weigh in on
high level broad comments, but it won’t be possible for the full Committee to reach consensus on very detailed
comments. The municipalities can always send in more detailed comments on their own if they’d like. James
Sherrard suggested that if we are too broad we may be doing a disservice to clean water, and are intent is to
provide feedback on this.

There is a challenge with this particular situation because there wasn’t much time to respond to this particular
situation. The questions are whether the CWAC should set up a process to comment on these types of things
and to lay out the general rules of procedure on this; and whether the CWAC wants to send this letter or defer
action to RSEP.

Tom made a motion, seconded by Megan Moir, to defer this item to the MS-4 subcommittee. Further
discussion included the importance of providing comments on rule making, the importance of drafting the
letters more broadly to address water quality issues that is universally accepted by the entire CWAC, and the
relevancy of the topic to the entire CWAC. MOTION PASSED.

7. Items for January meeting agenda
• What the CWAC is and how to submit comments.
• Potential draft MRGP.
• Clean Water Financing.
8. **Welcomed new Burlington representative**
Jenna Calvi introduced herself. She has been recently hired and will take over Megan Moir’s responsibilities due to her promotion.

9. **Adjournment**
The meeting adjourned at 12:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony and Dan Albrecht
DATE: Tuesday, December 6, 2016
TIME: 12:20 pm to 1:15 pm
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT
DOCUMENTS: Minutes, documents, and presentations discussed accessible at:
http://www.ccrpcvt.org/meetings/clean-water-advisory-committee/

Committee Members in Attendance
Burlington: Megan Moir/Jenna Calvi  Milton: Jeff Castle  Williston: James Sherrard
Colchester: Shelburne:  Winooski: John Choate
Essex: Annie Costandi  South Burlington: Tom DiPietro  Burlington Airport:
Essex Junction: Chelsea Mandigo  University of VT: Lani Ravin  VAOT: Jennifer Callahan

Other Attendees: WNRC: Holly Kreiner
CCRPC Staff: Dan Albrecht, Charlie Baker, Regina Mahony

1. **Welcome:** Chelsea Mandigo called the meeting to order at 12:20 pm. Chelsea suggested having Holly provide a brief update on the Chittenden County Stream Team Update.

2. **Review and action on draft minutes of October 4, 2016:** After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, Tom DiPietro made a motion, seconded by Jennifer Callahan to approve the October 4, 2016 minutes. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.

3. **Comment letter on Draft TS-4 Permit and Phosphorus Control Plans** (Action, 20 minutes)
   Tom DiPietro made a motion, seconded by Annie Costandi that we submit these comments as the municipal members of the MS-4 subcommittee.
   Discussion ensued: How should we represent those commenting? Consensus included specifically including all of the municipal members (even those not here today), and explicitly state those that have recused themselves. This will be stated at the beginning of the letter. This will be on CCRPC letter head. Can we prepare a standard intro of what the CWAC is and what the MS-4 is? Yes, CCRPC will prepare this and use it as a template going forward. This is due tomorrow at 4pm.
   Tom, John, James, Chelsea, Annie, Jeff and Jenna Abstain voted to in favor of the motion with VTRANS and UVM abstaining.

4. **CCST: Brief Update.**
   A grant has been submitted for a rain garden installation education piece. Holly has reached out to the UVM Master Gardeners to see if they would be interested in adopting rain gardens. A list of rain gardens would be a beneficial addition to the annual report. Jim Kellog would like to add some sites to the Stream Team locations, and Holly would like to know if the MS-4 has any additional locations that they would be interested in. An application for this is due January 31st. Holly is also looking for an intern next year to help run the monitoring program because it takes a lot of time. The Basin Program and SeaGrant is doing a healthy soils and lawn care outreach. Any materials that are generated would be great, and if that can be kicked back here to keep the same message going out would be great. Also if there are events we should make sure these are on the website so that everyone knows about it. Perhaps the MS-4 municipalities could submit the events to the website themselves.

5. **RSEP: continued discussion with Tally Ho Design on Brand Revision/Update tasks (see PDF at link above)**
   Dave Barron and Ted Olson showed the general consensus for the branding concept. The tag line is “Rethink Runoff”. They also showed potential examples of how this could be used: “Redirect Runoff” and “Reduce Runoff”. They also showed how the Rethink Runoff cloud can be incorporated into the hand drawn Stream Team logo to help explain that they are the hands on group within RSEP. They also explained the use of “Ms. Drop” as opposed to “Mr. Drop”. Once these concepts are finalized they will roll this out into the new
website. They provided some of the website layout concepts. There was some discussion about incorporating the Stream Team facebook feed directly into the website, or Instagram could be easier – but it could automatically generate to both. You can pull in certain accounts or pull in a hashtag. But the hashtag could be used for something else. There was some discussion about the gender specific “Ms. Drop” and the Committee felt that this was a nice alternative to most of the “Mr.” characters out there. There was some discussion about the fact that the cloud is the main brand, and the character can be adjusted. There was consensus to keep “Ms. Drop”.

6. **Items for January meeting agenda**

Holly will provide the quarterly report of the Stream Team.
Tally Ho may come.

7. **Adjournment:** The meeting adjourned at 1:08 p.m.

   Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony and Dan Albrecht
DATE: Tuesday, January 3, 2017
SCHEDULED TIME: 12:30 p.m. to 1:15 p.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Members in Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burlington: Jenna Calvi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Junction: Chelsea Mandigo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester: Warner Rackley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton: Jeff Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williston: James Sherrard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex: Annie Costandi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelburne: Chris Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winooski: John Choate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington Airport:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of VT:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Attendees: VT-DEC: Jim Pease; Winooski NRCD – Holly Kreiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCRPC Staff: Dan Albrecht; Charlie Baker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Welcome:** Chelsea Mandigo called the meeting to order at 12:40 p.m. No changes were made to the agenda.

2. **Review and action on draft minutes of December 6, 2016 (Action):**

   After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, Tom DiPietro made a motion, seconded by James Sherrard to approve the December 6, 2016 minutes. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.

3. **Chittenden County Stream Team**
   a. **Quarterly Report** Holly Kreiner recapped the elements of the Status Update and the Work Plan which were posted on the Subcommittee’s page on the CCRPC website. Members asked Ms. Kreiner to provide the 2016 Summary report no later than March 1st so the members have time to attach it to their annual MS4 reports to VT-DEC. A brief discussion took place concerning water quality sampling sites. Ms. Kreiner noted that for some streams there are several stations that show similar results so it may make sense to discontinue operation of some of these. On the other hand, it would also make sense to establish new sites upstream of current sampling stations. She asked if establishing a sampling site outside of the MS4 would still be allowed. Members indicated that it would be. Members asked for her to continue to consult with each member municipality as needed regarding sampling locations.

   b. **Stream Team name: should it be changed given eventual RSEP & CCST merger and change in branding to Rethink Runoff** Holly asked for the Subcommittee’s thoughts on this. She had recently asked some of her acquaintances what Stream Team connoted to them vis-à-vis the work she did and it did not seem to fit. She also asked for feedback on the potential name of “Stormwater Troopers.” Members discussed whether a name change was appropriate. Dan Albrecht noted that the original name of Stream Team was chosen based upon it being a commonly adopted name for water quality work in the Pacific Northwest and because it takes the esoteric concept of stormwater and builds public buy-in by linking it to streams which the public identifies with and wants to protect. Members agreed to discuss this issue further with Tally Ho design.

4. **Items for February meeting agenda**
   - Review of latest concepts from Tally Ho Design

5. **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 1:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Dan Albrecht
DATE: Wednesday, November 9, 2016
TIME: 2:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT

Members Present
Joss Besse, Bolton
Ken Belliveau, Williston
Greg Duggan, Essex
Jacob Hemmerick, Milton
Andrew Strmiste, Underhill
Paul Conner, South Burlington
Sarah Hadd, Colchester
Katherine Sonnick, Jericho
Paul Conner, South Burlington
David White, Burlington

Everett Marshall, Huntington
Karen Purinton, Colchester

Staff
Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
Melanie Needle, Senior Planner
Charlie Baker, Executive Director
Pam Brangan, GIS Data & IT Manager
Jason Charest, Senior Transportation Planning Engineer

1. Welcome and Introductions
Regina Mahony called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m. and stated that we’ve added an agenda item regarding the upcoming ortho-imagery flyover.

2. Approval of September 14, 2016 Minutes
Jacob Hemmerick made a motion, seconded by Ken Belliveau, to approve the October 12, 2016 minutes. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED. David White abstained.

3. Imagery Data Upgrade
Regina Mahony stated that we’ve added this topic to the agenda because John Adams just sent an email to the VPA listserve a few days ago, and we wanted to explain the situation in Chittenden County. Pam Brangan explained the flyover for the new ortho-imagery is planned for 2018 for the majority of our region, so no decisions need to be made by December. However, half of Huntington will be flown in the Spring of 2017, and that decision needs to be made now. Just as last time, there is an option to upgrade the flyover from 30cm to 15cm. We did buy the upgrade last time, and we’d like to do that again. We will go ahead and put in the application for Huntington. The overall cost in Chittenden County will be much lower than last time, because the State is covering the cost in all designations, and in the Census Urban Area. We anticipate the cost to be $30-40,000, compared to $120,000 last time. There is also the option to purchase building footprint ($47/square mile) and/or impervious surface ($99/square mile) data, though we don’t need to make that decision at the start because we can go back and ask them after the imagery is flown (the State is not going to pay for these). While the December deadline is really just for Huntington, everyone needs to know the FY18 budget numbers now. Pam Brangan estimated a couple $1,000 at the most for each municipality. The PAC asked if we can provide each municipality with rough estimates for the upgraded imagery, footprint and impervious coverage. Joss Besse asked for this information to be sent to himself and Sharon. There was a question about the new lidar data that we are waiting for – will this be a better quality data set that can be used for all of these same purposes? If so, there may not be a need to upgrade to the better orthophoto imagery. Pam Brangan will look into this and provide the information to the municipalities.

4. Population Forecasts
Melanie Needle explained that we are updating the ECOS Plan and specifically need forecasts for the metropolitan transportation plan (MTP), and the energy plan. The transportation model, used to help update
the MTP, requires control totals for households and employment. Forecasts are also needed for modeling associated with energy planning. Because the energy plan work is part of a state wide effort, VEIC is using the high ACCD forecast for the modeling. Melanie explained that the consultant forecast that we got for the transportation model was developed for the State Transportation Plan for the Shumlin administration. This was a statewide projection that was disaggregated to the County. The PAC reviewed the graphs that showed the differences between the various forecasts.

Ken Belliveau questioned the transportation forecast methodology of disaggregating the state forecast to Chittenden County considering our growth has been so different than the rest of the State? Charlie Baker indicated that we’d like to hear any issues that folks have; he explained that we are going to have the Board approve the forecasts (County and municipal) and would like all of us to be comfortable with these; and suggested that these numbers are a forecast, not necessarily the goal to strive toward in the plans.

Ken Belliveau further explained that the ACCD projection seems more credible as it is based off of cohorts. It does seem that the current ECOS projection is very high and unrealistic. The ACCD model seems sensitive to what is really happening on the ground in Williston; and it did appear to show that the County was different than the other Counties. Ken Belliveau further added that we may want to include the forecast as a range.

Joss Besse asked if we are hoping to use the same projections for both ECOS, MTP and Energy Plan? Charlie Baker stated that we’d ideally like to. Though, the out years for each of the forecasts is different and currently we are stuck with VTrans using one projection, and the state wide energy planning effort using another.

Paul Conner asked about the fact that ACCD is basing its forecast on 1990 to 2000 growth rate, while EPR is basing their forecast on 2000 to 2010, so it makes sense that the results would be very different. Ken Belliveau suggested that it may make more sense to build the forecast off of a longer history. David White added that these two decades are a peak and a valley so they are two extremes. Paul Conner has suggested that we look at actual numbers rather than rates, especially when looking back over 10 years because it doesn’t compound. Paul Conner stated that the forecast they had done in South Burlington also showed no new population growth.

Charlie Baker stated that while the ACS survey is not a great source, it has shown a growth of 8 to 900 people per year. Does that seem right? Williston has seen an increase in population and housing. They are seeing twice the regional growth rate. South Burlington is seeing 140 housing units/year, however the forecast indicates that the population will remain flat for 10 years due to demographic shifts. Paul indicated that while this was based on a sound methodology it is still hard to believe. Sarah Hadd explained that the State no longer compiles birth and death rates, and asked if Paul’s consultant did this work. Paul Conner didn’t have the information in front of him, and isn’t sure. Sarah Hadd’s sense is that Colchester is staying flat, but it is really hard to know without the birth and death rates. However, there still seems to be a demand for more housing units and particularly multi-family. Greg Duggan indicated that it feels like Essex is closer to Williston, but haven’t investigated. Jake Hemmerick stated that they haven’t investigated in Milton lately, but based on actual parking needs it doesn’t appear that the household sizes are shrinking, at least in the townhouse units. Jericho doesn’t seem to be growing. Burlington may very well grow if everything in the pipeline goes through. There is no one from Winooski here, but it appears that there is quite a bit of growth in Burlington and Winooski.

Charlie Baker indicated that we will bring these questions back to the consultants, and will share figures with you when we get them.

5. ECOS Annual Report – Planning Area Growth Indicator

Regina Mahony stated that we wanted to share the data from the ECOS Housing Indicator since we just put it together. Melanie Needle gave a brief overview of the housing data. Eighty-six percent (86%) of the new housing units occupied in 2015 are in the areas planned for growth. We’ve always met the 80% goal since we’ve been tracking, but this is the highest percentage that we’ve seen since we’ve been tracking this. Paul
Conner stated that the map is great, but it would be helpful if the multi-family dot was larger so you could clearly see that those contain a higher number of units than the single family houses. Ken Belliveau stated that Williston did some mapping based on number of units, and the density really jumps out to you that way. Regina Mahony asked for everyone to let us know if the Planning Area boundaries have changed so we can reflect that in the updated ECOS Plan, though we hope there won’t be any shifts into the rural planning area. Melanie Needle asked the PAC if it would be okay to ask for the 2016 development data in December and receive it in January. The PAC would prefer for the ask to come in January.

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

So. Burlington – 109 Cider Mill approved now, but the applicant wants to go to 170.

Milton – nothing for Act 250, however they recently received an application for an access permit for a 120’ tall telecommunication tower in the public road ROW. South Burlington, Colchester and Williston have also heard from this company - Mobility co. out of the Atlanta area. They build one 120’ utility pole so you need less. Colchester and South Burlington have denied the access permits.

Underhill – one act 250 amendment to move a building envelope in a quarry.

Essex – hearing started last week for the quarry and conservation areas in Saxon Hill. The Indian Brook 9 lot subdivision got denied, so they are going back. They only have to go to Act 250 because a co-applicant was signed onto an application in So. Burlington. The Town would receive a good amount of conserved land out of that subdivision. Another application for 30 units in Essex/Essex Junction.

Williston – Cotton Wood II is the only big project on the horizon.

Huntington – there is an Act 250 application to upgrade a ski trail.

Colchester – going to get a 50 unit building in the spring in growth center so won’t trigger act 250.

Burlington – section 248 rooftop solar in south end Flynn ave. There is a public hearing for re-zoning for Cambrian Rise (old orphanage) on 11/28. After that they will be able to submit application. Downtown Mall project is exempt from Act 250 with 274 units.

10. Other Business - none

11. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony
CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
Board Development Committee
Meeting Minutes

Date: Wednesday, December 14, 2016
Time: 5:30 p.m.
Place: CCRPC offices; 110 W. Canal Street; Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404

Members present: Jeff Carr and Catherine McMains via teleconference. Staff present: Charlie Baker, Exec. Director

1. Committee chair, Catherine opened the meeting at 5:33pm.

2. Changes to the Agenda, Members’ Items – no changes.

3. Minutes - Catherine moved and Jeff seconded approval of the November 9, 2016 minutes. All in favor.

4. Review and revise Draft Bylaws* - The addition of CCTA as a voting member was discussed. FTA was consulted and we discovered that only MPOs with over 200,000 population are required to have transit agencies with voting rights. The draft bylaws were edited by removing CCTA voting rights from the draft. On a motion by Jeff, seconded by Catherine, the Board Development Committee recommended that the attached draft bylaws be considered by the CCRPC Board at their next meeting for public and municipal review subject to any non-substantive minor edits that Andy may identify by December 20th.

5. Other business – Jeff asked that we discuss how to groom new members for roles in the CCRPC. What can we do to build a back bench for CCRPC member municipalities and officers? This should be added to a future board agenda for discussion and to solicit ideas.

6. Adjournment – Catherine moved adjournment, Jeff seconded. All in favor. Meeting adjourned at 5:44.

Respectfully submitted,

Charlie Baker

Attachment: Draft bylaws dated 12/14/16
1. Call to Order, Introductions and Changes to the Agenda
The meeting was called to order at 3:00 pm. No changes were made to the agenda.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Members in Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curt Carter, Chair - GBIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Razelle Hoffman-Contois - VDH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin Dextradeur – Redstone (via phone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Vaughan – LCBP (arr. 3:05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Kirsten Merriman-Shapiro (arr. 3:21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Wernsdorfer – City of Winooski</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Others in attendance</th>
<th>Brett Long, VT-Dept. of Economic Development (via phone)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCRPC Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dan Albrecht; Emily Nosse-Leirer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Arrived after agenda item #4

2. Public comments on items not on the Agenda
There was no public comment.

3. Review and action of December 12, 2016 meeting summary
After a recap by Nosse-Leirer, on a motion made by Hoffman-Contois, seconded by Wernsdorfer, the summary of the December 12, 2016 meeting was approved.

4. Review and Action on Revised Conflict of Interest Policy
Nosse-Leirer recapped the proposed edits which were discussed at the December 12th meeting. After a brief discussion and a minor grammatical edit, on a motion by Wernsdorfer, seconded by Vaughan, the proposed revisions to the Conflict of Interest Policy were adopted.

5. Presentation and Q & A on DEC Statewide Soil Report
Members briefly discussed the draft report which was issued by DEC for comment in mid-December. [the report can be accessed here: http://dec.vermont.gov/waste-management/contaminated-sites/statewide-soil-report]. The current standards compared with those proposed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Soils</th>
<th>Lead (ppm)</th>
<th>Arsenic (ppm)</th>
<th>PAHs -B[a]P TEQ (ppb)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current RSLs (May 2016)</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>16 (RSL) 10 (VDOH std)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 VTDEC proposed Background</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industrial Soils</th>
<th>Lead (ppm)</th>
<th>Arsenic (ppm)</th>
<th>PAHs -B[a]P TEQ (ppb)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current RSLs (May 2016)</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 VTDEC proposed Background</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Carter noted, however, that based upon a recent conversation between CCRPC staff and DEC staff, the current thinking is that the Lead RSLs may not change from its current values of 400 ppm in soil for the residential scenario and 800 PPM for the industrial scenario by the time state soil standards are adopted or updated RSLs are issued. Hoffman-Contois noted that the EPA Regional Screening Level (RSL) tables are generally issued twice a year. She explained her understanding of how the current residential RSL of 400 ppm for Lead was developed noting that it is based on a blood lead level of concern of 10 micrograms per deciliter and a default run of the original version of an EPA model, revision of which has been under discussion for some time. She noted that the state of Vermont by law defines an elevated blood lead level as having blood lead level of at least 5 micrograms per deciliter. Dextradeur noted that further clarification is needed on what constitutes urban vs. real as well as clarifications on what is the driving determinant: the proposed use or the proposed site. In conclusion, the Committee voted - on a motion by Dextradeur, seconded by Vaughan- to ask CCRPC to request of DEC an extension to the comment period. Hoffman-Contois abstained.

6. **Site Nominations/Assistance Requests**

a. **Burlington: Redstone 316 Flynn Avenue, Mixed Use (Request for additional funds of $4,220 for Phase 2 ESA)**

Nosse-Leirer, Albrecht and Dextradeur (Redstone) noted that the initial $6,330 request, approved by the Committee at its December meeting, was based on an old quote and did not include QAPP preparation as required when Federal funds are used. The request for an additional $4,220 would pay for this QAPP along with recommended additional sampling. Vaughan noted that the project scores very high on our Site Evaluation matrix given its proposed housing element. [In consideration of the Committee’s Conflict of Interest policy, Mr. Dextradeur disconnected from the conference line]. In conclusion, the Committee voted unanimously (with Dextradeur abstaining) - on a motion by Merriman-Shapiro seconded by Vaughan- to approve the request for an additional $4,200 to support the project.

b. **Other Projects** Nosse-Leirer noted that she is working with Eleni Churchill of the CRRPC staff as well as staff of the DEC, EPA and the City of Burlington to potentially develop a Scope of Work related to hydrogeological studies at the 339 Pine Street property as part of the Railyard Enterprise Project. Wernsdorfer reported that the City of Winooski will soon issue a request for bids for redevelopment of the City’s “Lot D” property located on Abenaki Way (the empty lot used for parking just down the hill from CCV).

7. **Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Dan Albrecht
MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE
Curt Carter, GBIC
Kirsten Merriman-Shapiro, CEDO
Matt Vaughan, Lake Champlain Basin Program

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE
Dan Albrecht, Senior Planner
Eleni Churchill, Transportation Program Manager
Emily Nosse-Leirer, Planner

1. **Call to Order, Introductions and Changes to the Agenda**
The meeting was called to order at 2:42pm. No changes were made to the agenda.

2. **Public comments on items not on the Agenda**
There was no public comment.

3. **Review and action of October 28, 2016 meeting summary**
Adoption of the minutes from 10/28/2016 was deferred until the next meeting, as neither Kirsten nor Matt attended that meeting.

4. **Action on Site Nominations/Assistance Requests**
Dan gave an overview of the grant workplan, which estimates that the Petroleum grant and the Hazardous Grant would each pay for three (3) Phase Is, five (5) Phase II and three (3) archaeological assessments totaling $145,100 and five (5) Corrective Action Plans totaling $25,000. The workplan is not a commitment, but is important to keep in mind while funding decisions are being made.

The projects were all ranked based on the site selection Evaluation Criteria adopted by the committee in October 2016 and scored as follows: Winooski Hotel-55 points; City Market-44 points, and Alden Waterfront-23 points. The three projects requested specific amounts of money and discussion ensued over the correct amount of money to grant to each project, based on the degree to which each project meets the guidelines for site selection adopted by the committee. Dan suggested that the projects be granted funding based solely on their site selection scores rather than as a percentage of the overall need. Curt mentioned that he thinks funding should be prioritized for projects that would not be able to move forward otherwise. Matt made the point that if all these project requests were fully funded, almost 1/3 of the money would be gone. Kirsten made the point that determining the amount of money that should be allocated based on the amount requested may not be fair, because some applicants request 100% of their budget and some only request part of it to begin with. Eleni made the point that even if funding is not awarded in exact proportion to the scores given to the projects, the ranking of the amount of funding awarded should match the ranking of the scores. Matt wanted to confirm that
the projects would be successful with the amount of money granted, and staff and the committee agreed that they would be.

After discussion, the Committee recommended that CCRPC support the projects as follows:

**Winooski**: City of Winooski and Winooski Hotel Group, LLC: hotel development, 4 & 12 Winooski Falls Way (Phase 2 ESA)

- Overall Cost: $28,025
- **CCRPC Support**: $25,700

**Burlington**: City Market South End, Flynn Avenue (North Lot – Soil Monitoring)

- Soil Monitoring Cost: $42,207
- **CCRPC Support**: $20,000

**Burlington**: Parks & Recreation Dept, Alden Waterfront Park, (CAP and implementation)

- Requested: $30,000 out of overall $60,000 need through Spring 2017
- **CCRPC Support**: $18,000 of $36,000 needed in winter

In the future, staff expected to see a request for the City Market North project once

**Railyard Enterprise Project** Eleni Churchill discussed the application submitted by the Railyard Enterprise Project programs. For the project to move forward, a risk assessment must be completed. One of the major risks for the area is contaminated soils. Additionally, parts of the property need a hydrological assessment to ensure that the weight of new construction would not cause contamination from the Superfund properties near the proposed new intersection with Pine Street to move. The Committee then analyzed the project using the Evaluation Criteria and it scored 38 points. Eleni will provide a description of the work needed on the project, and Dan will check with Frank Gardner at EPA to determine what the correct classification of the project is, and to ensure spending brownfields money is acceptable due to the Superfund classification of adjoining sites. Eleni made the point that unlike some other projects, this project cannot go forward if the full amount is not granted. The full scoping study for the project will be available soon. Dan will start creating an RFP once Frank has approved the project.

5. **Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 4:01pm. The next meeting date will be decided later.

Respectfully submitted, Emily Nosse-Leirer and Dan Albrecht

*CCRPC Brownfields Advisory Committee meeting, Draft Minutes, Nov. 15, 2016*
1. **Call to Order, Introductions and Changes to the Agenda**

The meeting was called to order at 12:32pm. No changes were made to the agenda.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Members in Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curt Carter, Chair - GBIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Vaughan - LCBP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Others in attendance:**

| CCRPC Staff: | Dan Albrecht; Emily Nosse-Leirer |

* Seated after agenda item #4

2. **Public comments on items not on the Agenda**

There was no public comment.

3. **Review and action of November 15, 2016 meeting summary**

After a recap by Nosse-Leirer, on a motion made by Vaughan, seconded by Beaudin, the summary of the Nov. 15, 2016 meeting was approved. Hoffman-Contois abstained.

4. **Affirm formal list of Committee members and co-chair and vice-chair for FY17**

After a brief discussion, on a motion by Dextradeur, seconded by Beaudin, the following members, chair and vice-chair were approved for FY17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GBIC: Curt Carter, CHAIR</th>
<th>LCBP: Matt Vaughan, VICE-CHAIR</th>
<th>VDH: Razelle Hoffman-Contois</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UVM: Dr. Pablo Bose</td>
<td>Marcel Beaudin, AIA Emeritus</td>
<td>Redstone: Justin Dextradeur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Burlington: Kirsten Merriman-Shapiro</td>
<td>City of Winooski: Peter Wernsdorfer</td>
<td>VDEC: Patricia Coppolino (ex-officio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VDCED: Brett Long (ex-officio)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Set regular monthly meeting date and time**

After a brief discussion, the regular meeting time was set as 3 p.m. on the 2nd Monday of the month.

6. **Review of Conflict of Interest Policy**

   *(Discussion, 5 minutes)*

Albrecht noted that he felt remiss in not re-introducing the 2012 Policy either in the summer when the Committee resumed meeting after a long hiatus or at the last meeting. Had he done so, it would have been clearer as to how the policy would have impacted Ms. Merriman-Shapiro’s participation concerning the $18,000 award to support studies at the City of Burlington’s Alden Waterfront parcel. Albrecht and Nosse-Leirer asked the Committee if they were still comfortable with the Committee’s recommendation of an award. After a brief discussion, on a motion by Carter, seconded by Vaughan, the Committee voted unanimously (with an abstention by Dextradeur) to affirm the Committee’s prior action to award $18,000 towards needed Phase 2 studies at the Alden Waterfront parcel.

**CCRPC Brownfields Advisory Committee meeting, Draft Minutes, December 12, 2016**
During a brief discussion, Committee members noted that item B of the policy should be amended to strike the language “refrain from all formal discussions with the Advisory Committee...” with language allowing the member to present information on a project request, answer questions as needed, and then recuse themselves during deliberations. Given that potential changes to the policy were not noted as an “Action” item on the agenda, staff indicated they would prepare draft changes for consideration of amendment by the Committee at their next meeting.

7. **Site Nominations/Assistance Requests**

   a. **Presentation of Information by applicant’s representative, Justin Dextradeur and Questions/Answers from Committee members**

      **Winooski:** Redstone, Strand Theater, performance venue, ($5,950- ABCA / Corrective Action Plan)

      Nosse- Leirer recapped her scoring the evaluation criterial worksheet with the project scoring 60 base points with the bulk of the points scored due to its commercial potential and its economic impact. Dextradeur briefed the Committee. The building will be located on the former Key Bank lot and will be multi-story. It will consist of a 1,500 seat performing arts space, two retail spaces facing south and east respectively on the ground floor and office space on the higher floors.

      **Burlington:** Redstone 316 Flynn Avenue, Mixed Use ($6,330-Phase 2 ESA)

      Nosse-Leirer recapped her scoring the evaluation criterial worksheet with the project scoring 62 base points with the bulk of the points scored due to its housing potential and commercial potential. Dextradeur briefed the Committee. The building will be located on the corner of Pine & Flynn, the current Pine Street Deli location. The new building will have 30 housing units with ground floor retail.

      [In consideration of the Committee’s Conflict of Interest policy, Mr. Dextradeur left the room at 1:29 p.m.]

   b. **Action on Site Nominations/Assistance Requests**

      **Winooski:** Redstone, Strand Theater, performance venue, ($5,950- ABCA / Corrective Action Plan)

      **Burlington:** Redstone 316 Flynn Avenue, Mixed Use ($6,330-Phase 2 ESA)

      Committee members noted that both projects scored a high number of base points using the evaluation criteria relative to the three previous proposals acted on by the Committee and that the amount of funding requested was relatively low as well. Vaughan noted that as an LCBP staff person he was pleased to see that site cleanup at the Pine Street project will aid cleanup of nearby Englesby Brook.

      On a motion by Beaudin, seconded by Vaughan the Committee, with Mr. Wernsdorfer abstaining, voted to recommend to CCRPC to award the requested $5,950 for the Corrective Action Plan for the Strand Theater project. On a motion by Beaudin, seconded by Vaughan the Committee voted to recommend to CCRPC to award the requested $6,330 for Phase 2 studies at the Pine/Flynn project.

      [Mr. Dextradeur re-entered the room at 1:36 p.m.]

   c. **Railyard Enterprise District, potential new road, ($7,000; hydrology study)**

      Nosse-Leirer reported that she will work with EPA and City to address whether or not such as study is eligible for use of CCRPC’s funds. Dextradeur reported that other property owners in the vicinity (e.g. 453 Pine Street) had to investigate the same issues (i.e., if you build there, it can compress the soil which then causes the coal tar materials underground to move, as if one pressed on a sponge.

8. **Adjourn**

   The meeting adjourned at 1:42 p.m.

   Respectfully submitted, Emily Nosse-Leirer and Dan Albrecht

**CCRPC Brownfields Advisory Committee meeting, Draft Minutes, December 12, 2016**
1. **Call to Order, Introductions and Changes to the Agenda**

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 pm. No changes were made to the agenda.

### Committee Members in Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curt Carter</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Razelle Hoffman-Contois</td>
<td>VDH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin Dextradeur</td>
<td>Redstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Vaughan</td>
<td>LCBP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirsten Merriman-Shapiro</td>
<td>VT DOH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Wernsdorfer</td>
<td>City of Winooski</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Others in attendance: Brett Long, VT Dept. of Economic Development (via phone)

**CCRPC Staff:** Dan Albrecht; Emily Nosse-Leirer

* Arrived after agenda item #4

2. **Public comments on items not on the Agenda**

There was no public comment.

3. **Review and action of December 12, 2016 meeting summary**

After a recap by Nosse-Leirer, on a motion made by Hoffman-Contois, seconded by Wernsdorfer, the summary of the December 12, 2016 meeting was approved.

4. **Review and Action on Revised Conflict of Interest Policy**

Nosse-Leirer recapped the proposed edits which were discussed at the December 12th meeting. After a brief discussion and a minor grammatical edit, on a motion by Wernsdorfer, seconded by Vaughan, the proposed revisions to the Conflict of Interest Policy were adopted.

5. **Presentation and Q & A on DEC Statewide Soil Report**

Members briefly discussed the draft report which was issued by DEC for comment in mid-December. [the report can be accessed here: http://dec.vermont.gov/waste-management/contaminated-sites/statewide-soil-report](http://dec.vermont.gov/waste-management/contaminated-sites/statewide-soil-report). The current standards compared with those proposed as follows:

### Residential Soils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Lead (ppm)</th>
<th>Arsenic (ppm)</th>
<th>PAHs -B[a]P TEQ (ppb)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current RSLs (May 2016)</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>16 (RSL) 10 (VDOH std)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 VTDEC proposed</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Industrial Soils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Lead (ppm)</th>
<th>Arsenic (ppm)</th>
<th>PAHs -B[a]P TEQ (ppb)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current RSLs (May 2016)</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 VTDEC proposed</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Carter noted, however, that based upon a recent conversation between CCRPC staff and DEC staff, the current thinking is that the Lead RSLs may not change from its current values of 400 ppm in soil for the residential scenario and 800 PPM for the industrial scenario by the time state soil standards are adopted or updated RSLs are issued. Hoffman-Contois noted that the EPA Regional Screening Level (RSL) tables are generally issued twice a year. She explained her understanding of how the current residential RSL of 400 ppm for Lead was developed noting that it is based on a blood lead level of concern of 10 micrograms per deciliter and a default run of the original version of an EPA model, revision of which has been under discussion for some time. She noted that the state of Vermont by law defines an elevated blood lead level as having blood lead level of at least 5 micrograms per deciliter. Dextradeur noted that further clarification is needed on what constitutes urban vs. real as well as clarifications on what is the driving determinant: the proposed use or the proposed site. **In conclusion, the Committee voted - on a motion by Dextradeur, seconded by Vaughan- to ask CCRPC to request of DEC an extension to the comment period. Hoffman-Contois abstained.**

6. **Site Nominations/Assistance Requests**
   
   a. **Burlington: Redstone 316 Flynn Avenue, Mixed Use (Request for additional funds of $4,220 for Phase 2 ESA)**

   Nosse-Leirer, Albrecht and Dextradeur (Redstone) noted that the initial $6,330 request, approved by the Committee at its December meeting, was based on an old quote and did not include QAPP preparation as required when Federal funds are used. The request for an additional $4,220 would pay for this QAPP along with recommended additional sampling. Vaughan noted that the project scores very high on our Site Evaluation matrix given its proposed housing element. **[In consideration of the Committee’s Conflict of Interest policy, Mr. Dextradeur disconnected from the conference line]. In conclusion, the Committee voted unanimously (with Dextradeur abstaining) - on a motion by Merriman-Shapiro seconded by Vaughan- to approve the request for an additional $4,200 to support the project.**

   b. **Other Projects** Nosse-Leirer noted that she is working with Eleni Churchill of the CRRPC staff as well as staff of the DEC, EPA and the City of Burlington to potentially develop a Scope of Work related to hydrogeological studies at the 339 Pine Street property as part of the Railyard Enterprise Project. Wernsdorfer reported that the City of Winooski will soon issue a request for bids for redevelopment of the City’s “Lot D” property located on Abenaki Way (the empty lot used for parking just down the hill from CCV).

7. **Adjourn**

   The meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.  

   *Respectfully submitted, Dan Albrecht*
DATE: Wednesday, November 10, 2016
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 Weinlegen, Hinesburg – PAC Rep
Justin Rabidoux, So. Burlington – TAC REP
Andrea Morgante, Hinesburg – Board Rep Marc
Jim Donovan, Charlotte – Board Rep
Heather Danis – ECOS Steering Committee Rep

Staff
Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
Melanie Needle, Senior Planner
Eleni Churchill, Transportation Program Manager

Members Present
Edmund Booth – ECOS Steering Committee Rep (9:50am)
Chris Shaw, South Burlington – Board Rep

1. Welcome and Introductions
Regina Mahony called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m.

2. Elect Chair and Vice Chair
Marc Landry made a motion, seconded by Heather Danis, to approve elect Jim Donovan as Chair, and Chris Shaw as Vice Chair. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.

3. Plan Update Schedule & Overview
Regina Mahony stated that we need a draft of the ECOS Plan amendment done by December 2017 so that we can start the official public hearing process and adopt by June 2018. Regina Mahony stated that we are hoping to keep the goals and strategies the same as in the existing plan, as we don’t anticipate the need for any policy change. The Committee reviewed the schedule and Regina Mahony explained the specific sections that we’ll need to update. This includes the Metropolitan Transportation Plan and the transportation model with a new demographic forecast (we’ll discuss later in the agenda). The MTP will be updated by the TAC and presented to the LRPC for recommendation to the full Board. While energy planning is incorporated into the current Plan, we are currently working on a much more in depth energy planning effort under Act 174. There is an energy sub-committee working on that effort and they’ll also report to the LRPC. The Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy will also need to be updated as it is on a 5 year cycle. We are not yet clear on what needs to be updated in this section. There have been some CFR changes for this and we’ll work with GBIC on updating this. The LRPC asked that we also engage with the local economic development committees. Ken Belliveau also suggested that we develop this section so that it can be helpful to municipalities in developing their economic development elements. Andrea Morgante also suggested that the RPC consider playing a role of tech assistance for municipalities. Charlie Baker stated when we developed this Plan we had a consultant on board for about $100,000 and even then we couldn’t get them to disaggregate data to the local level. So we aren’t sure how much we’ll be able to do. Regina Mahony then went over the various sections throughout the rest of the Plan that will need to be updated. Heather Danis indicated that the Social Community section really isn’t that well fleshed out with the exception of health. Perhaps United Way could take ownership of the other components of that section, or we should be more clear about what that section actually contains. Charlie Baker indicated that we have very few resources in comparison to the last update so we’ll have to see what we can actually do. Jim Donovan asked what public engagement we plan on doing. Regina Mahony explained that we weren’t planning to do as much considering we don’t anticipate policy level changes. Charlie Baker asked if the Committee agrees that there isn’t a need for policy changes? The Committee generally agreed, but perhaps there should be some topic based public engagement – particularly around transportation, energy and economic development. The Committee also discussed that the plan should have a long-term horizon (2050), and then have a strategic 5 year implementation component.
4. **Plan Update Organization**
Regina Mahony reviewed a variety of potential re-organization options:

1. Keep the same but refer to online indicators.
3. Full online integration: http://www.vtfarmtoplate.com/plan/
4. Move to appendices for Chapter 4.

Regina Mahony explained that we’d like to be able to bring the strategies and actions to the front so the implementation section of the plan is most prominent, and perhaps get better at explaining the cross-sector implications of the Plan, and make the Plan live more online than in print form. The Committee discussed the audience of the Plan and what it is mainly used for – generally used by municipalities for grant applications and consistency with municipal plans, used by developers for development applications and by the general public’s use for or against development applications. Otherwise it is mostly used by CCRPC to help set our workplan. There was also a discussion about whether we have the capacity to really do something different. Staff will think more on the capability of our existing website and scorecard. There was consensus to present the implementation section in more of a quick executive summary type product, with the availability to print it as a pdf, with links to more detail and background online. Staff will provide a recommendation in December.

5. **Future Population Projections**
Melanie Needle provided an overview of why we are doing the projections, and what the forecasts are that we are working with. Melanie Needle explained that we need forecasts for the metropolitan transportation plan (MTP), and the energy plan. The transportation model, used to help update the MTP, requires control totals for households and employment. Forecasts are also needed for modeling associated with energy planning. Because the energy plan work is part of a statewide effort, VEIC is using the high ACCD forecast for the modeling. Melanie explained that the consultant (from EPR) forecast that we got for the transportation model was developed for the State Transportation Plan for the Shumlin administration. This was a statewide projection that was disaggregated to the County. The LRPC reviewed the graphs that showed the differences between the various forecasts. There were some questions about the methodology EPR used, and a suggestion that the cohort survival method is the gold standard. There was also discussion about making sure we use the same forecast for the transportation model and the energy model. Melanie indicated that we may have a window to change the forecast in the energy model.

6. **Next Meetings**
   - Thursday, December 8, 2016 from 8:30am to 10:00am
   - Thursday, January 12, 2016 from 8:30am to 10:00am

11. **Adjourn**
The meeting adjourned at 10:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony
1. **Welcome**: Charlie Baker called the meeting to order at 8:03 a.m. No changes were made to the agenda.

2. **Review current information/comment form from the State Treasurer and DEC**
   


   Members expressed concern about the lack of cost per pound information and whether money be spent wisely early on. Don Meals noted that urban practices have better information on performance compared to rural but still wide ranges in terms of percent effectiveness in removing phosphorus. Members also expressed concern about the need for long-term monitoring of that effectiveness of the performance measure and the eventual phosphorus loading into sub-basins and Lake overall.

   Members agreed that it would be good to have more allowance for trading across sectors but hampered by various factors such as the likelihood that Phosphorus Control Plans will likely specify percent reduction in each sector rather than one actual tonnage number requirement per catchment/sub-basin.


   Included in packet. No discussion.

4. **Discussion of strategy and when best to provide comments to the State Legislature**

   The Committee agreed that they should review the State Treasurer’s report (expected January 15<sup>th</sup>) and prepare comments for review by the CWAC on February 7<sup>th</sup> with final approval by the CCRPC Board at their February 15<sup>th</sup> meeting.

5. **Discussion of major themes to be included in comments**

   **GENERAL COMMENTS**

   - Per acre fee on farms seems a bit unfair especially if they are being asked to also implement fixes.
   - Also problematic if per parcel fee is so low that administrative costs imposed on Town clerks negate the benefits.
   - Nail salon fee seems like a stretch. There are other types of businesses that pollute.
   - PCPs: four 5 year plans spread over 20 years 2017-2018 (PCPs and MRGPs will be added to MS4 permits)

   **CONSENSUS POINTS**

   1. **% of funding gap the State should be trying to raise**: 80% of needed capital funding should come from the State whether the funds go to municipalities, farmers, or private landowners. It should be noted that the funding has only been focused on capital costs and that there are significant maintenance and...
operating costs that will still be maintained by the impacted property owners and municipalities that are not captured in the cost estimates.

2. **Cost effectiveness:** It is critical that the State develop defensible phosphorous reduction estimating tools so that project investments benefits can be evaluated in a consistent way. This is the only way we will all be able to achieve the “biggest bang for the buck” implementation. Guiding these investments to the right places/projects will be easier the more of the revenue is generated by the State.

3. **Nexus:** We believe it is important that there be some nexus between the revenue source and water quality.

4. **Reward/Incentivize best practices:** Any revenue generation mechanism should also provide an ability to reward or incentivize desired behavior. For instance, in a municipality that has established a stormwater utility, if there is a property-based feed, property owners should get a discounted fee. The same idea could be applied to farmers or owners with 3+ acres of impervious if they obtain and fully comply with permit requirements.

5. **Use of funds:** It is important that there be assurances in place that the new revenue will be used for water quality. It would be ideal to have a trust fund that is funded with these new revenues to ensure this result. On a related note, we anticipate that the Clean Water Board will still be the body deciding on how these revenues are used. We would ask that there be a representative for municipalities on that board.

6. **Ramp up:** Based upon the timing of new permit requirements going into effect, it is important to realize that water quality project implementation will be ramping up over the next 3 three years. Therefore, more funding for project planning and development is needed in the short term with even more funding needed for bigger capital project implementation starting in 3 years. Early stage funding could be invested in agricultural RAPs in the early years since they are likely to be less capital intensive. Essentially, we are saying that revenue generation could be done in a way that it ramps up over a few years.

7. **This session:** We believe it is important that the Legislature take action on generating new revenue in 2017. It will take time to develop any new administrative fee collection systems and if decisions are not made this year, we will not be fulfilling our obligations under Act 64 or the TMDL.

Charlie said he will work to put these into an email which he will send today to the State Treasurer. That letter will then be a building block for a formal CCRPC Board comment letter for consideration at its February 15th meeting.

6. **Set Next Meeting Date**

To be set by Doodle poll.

7. **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 9:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted, Dan Albrecht