CONSENT AGENDA – NONE

DELIBERATIVE AGENDA

1. Call to Order; Changes to the Agenda
2. Public Comment Period on Items NOT on the Agenda
3. Consent Agenda (MPO Business) (Action; 2 minutes)
4. Minutes April 19, 2017 CCRPC Board Meeting* (Action; 5 minutes)
5. Public Hearing and Adopt FY18 UPWP & Budget (Draft posted on website)
   a. Public Hearing for FY18 UPWP & Budget (Action: 5 minutes)
   b. Action on Transportation Portion of FY18 UPWP & Budget (MPO Business) (Action: 5 minutes)
   c. Action on FY18 UPWP & Budget (Action: 5 minutes)
6. Public Participation Plan Amendments * (Action: 5 minutes)
   a. Public Hearing for Public Participation Plan Amendments
   b. Action on Public Participation Plan Amendments
7. Regional Stormwater Education and Involvement Agreement* (Action: 5 minutes)
8. Public Hearing for Bolton 2017 Town Plan
   a. Public Hearing (Action: 5 minutes)
   b. Bolton 2017 Town Plan & Planning Confirmation* (Action: 5 minutes)
9. Draft Lake Champlain Byway Chittenden County Corridor Management Plan* (Action: 5 minutes)
10. Preliminary 1st Draft Regional Energy Element of ECOS Plan review (Information: 40 minutes)
11. Report from Board Development Committee on FY18 Nominations* (Information: 5 minutes)
12. Executive Director’s Updates (Information; 5 minutes)
   a. Legislative update
   b. Opioid Alliance update
   c. Regional Dispatch update
   d. Monthly report (to be sent separately)
13. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports (Information; 5 minutes)
   a. Long Range Planning Committee (draft minutes April 13, 2017)*
   b. Transportation Advisory Committee (draft minutes May 2, 2017)*
   c. Clean Water Advisory Committee (draft minutes May 2, 2017)*
   d. MS 4 Subcommittee (draft minutes May 2, 2017)*
   e. Board Development Committee (draft minutes May 2, 2017)*
   f. Executive Committee (draft minutes May 3, 2017)*
      i. Act 250/Sec 248 letters *
14. Members’ Items, Other Business (Information, 5 minutes)
15. Adjourn

*Attachment

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.
The May 17th Chittenden County RPC meeting will air on Thursday, May 25, 2017 at 8 p.m. and repeat on Friday, May 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-68

Upcoming Meetings - Unless otherwise noted, all meetings are held at our offices:
- Energy Sub-Committee - Tuesday, May 16 & June 20, 2017; 5:00-7:00 p.m.
- Transportation Advisory Committee – Tuesday, June 6, 2017; 9:00 a.m.
- Clean Water Advisory Committee – Tuesday, June 6, 2017; 11:00 a.m.
- MS4 Subcommittee –Tuesday, June 6, 2017; 12:30 p.m.
- Executive Committee - Wednesday, June 7, 2017; 5:45 p.m.
- Long Range Planning Committee – Thursday, May 11 & June 15, 2017; 8:30-10 a.m.
- CCRPC Annual Board Meeting - Wednesday, June 21, 2017; at Catamount County Club

Tentative future Board agenda items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Agenda Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| June 21st –   | Guest Speaker – ANR Secretary Julie Moore
| Catamount Country Club | Annual Meeting – Election of Officers
| Mountain View Rd. Williston | Warn TIP public hearing for July |
| July 19th     | Board training @ 5:15
|               | FY18-21 TIP Public Hearing
|               | Final Draft Municipal Roads General Permit comments |
| NO AUGUST BOARD MEETING | --- |
| September 20th| Draft MTP, CEDS, Energy ECOS Plan Updates review |
CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
DRAFT

Date:       Wednesday, April 19, 2017
Time:       6:00 p.m.
Place:      CCRPC offices; 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404
Present:    Bolton:   Absent     Buel's Gore:  Absent
            Burlington: Andy Montroll  Charlotte:  Jim Donovan
            Colchester: Marc Landry    Essex:        Jeff Carr
            Essex Junction: Dan Kerin Hinesburg:  Andrea Morgante
            Huntington: Barbara Elliott Jericho:  Catherine McMains
            Milton:    Absent          Richmond:   Bard Hill
            St. George: Absent         Shelburne:  John Zicconi
            So. Burlington: Chris Shaw Underhill: Brian Bigelow
            Westford:  Dave Tilton    Williston:  Chris Roy
            Winooski:  Mike O'Brien    VTrans:    Matthew Langham
            Socio/Econ/Housing: Justin Dextradeur Cons/Env: Absent
            Bus/Industry: Absent
            Ex-Officio: FHWA: Absent     GMT:         Mark Sousa, Gen. Manager
            FTA:        Absent
            Staff:      Charlie Baker, Executive Director  Dan Albrecht, Senior Planner
                        Eleni Churchill, Trans. Program Manager  Forest Cohen, Business Manager
                        Bernie Ferenc, Trans. Business Manager  Christine Forde, Sr. Trans. Planner
                        Regina Mahony, Planning Program Mgr.

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 no changes to the agenda.

2. Public Comment Period on items not on the agenda. There were no members of the public present.

3. Action on the Consent Agenda. There were minor TIP amendments: add construction funds for Pearl Street Improvements in Essex Junction; add 2017 Transportation Alternatives Program awards; add funds for design and construction of I89 U-Turn Widening in Milton; and, Better Roads Category A awards. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MARC LANDRY, TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. Approval of March 22, 2017 CCRPC meeting minutes. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JIM DONOVAN, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MARCH 22, 2017 WITH CORRECTIONS, IF ANY. It was noted that on page 7 in the motion to adjourn that we correct the spelling of “meeting.” MOTION CARRIED WITH CATHERINE McMAINS ABSTAINING.

5. Approval of Bylaw Amendments. Charlie distributed a revised version of the Bylaws because he missed an edit from the Executive Committee. There are three kinds of edits to the bylaws. The first relate to the municipal services agreements. The second is adding the Clean Water Advisory Committee (CWAC) as a standing committee. The third type are other minor changes, such as:
The draft Bylaws were sent to municipalities on January 19th. This version includes clarifying changes to address questions raised by Milton and the Executive Committee. These include:

a. On page 10, clarifying that the municipal agreements discussed here are “with the CCRPC” and not between municipalities.

b. Page 11, line 29 – change from …with other governmental organizations or non-profit entities… to “with other entities and governmental organizations.”

c. Page 11, line 36, change board members are “encouraged” to participate… to “expected”.

Chris Shaw wondered if “required” is too strong. Members didn’t see how we could require someone to participate in a committee.

d. Page 16, under CWAC, line 46, remove “up to 24” members and representatives of organizations, but then add a new bullet saying: “Other voting or non-voting members as may be determined appropriate by the CCRPC after a recommendation by the CWAC.”

e. Page 17, item 1.c. reword to say: “coordinating assistance to municipalities considering (planning and adoption or implementation of) municipal development regulations to better meet State water quality policies and investment priorities, at the option of the municipality;”

When asked about quorums for voting on the committees, Charlie noted that a simple majority of the committee membership constitutes a quorum. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JEFF CARR, TO ADOPT THE BYLAWS AS AMENDED. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Transportation Capital Program Project Prioritization (MPO Business). Christine Forde presented project prioritization. She noted we do this because the Vermont legislature required VTrans to prioritize projects and VTrans and the legislature requires RPCs to have input. VTrans scores are 80% of the total and RPC scores are 20%. There is specific language from the legislature about how the RPCs should review this because they have better local knowledge of projects. There is a process going on right now to review this whole process at the state as well as regional levels. The list of projects comes from VTrans Capital Program. We approve the TIP (Transportation Improvement Program) which is a federally required document for planning purposes. The Capital Program Project Categories:

Front of the Book –
- Preliminary plan development completed
- Expected to have construction spending during the budget year and/or the following three years

Development & Evaluation –
- Preliminary plans within 12 to 24 months
- Preliminary engineering and/or right-of-way spending expected in the budget year

Candidate –
- Scoping likely not initiated
- No significant spending expected during the budget year
- Construction year unknown

Christine then reviewed the VTrans program categories: roadway; safety & traffic operations; paving; park and ride facilities; state highway bridge; town highway bridge & town highway bridge pre-candidate. The prioritization methodology overview includes: physical condition of the asset; cost per user of improvement; project momentum; and regional priority. Christine then described CCRPC’s scoring categories and explained how projects get points including: economic vitality;
safety & security; accessibility, mobility & connectivity; environment, energy and quality of life; preservation of existing system; and efficient system management. Our score is added to VTrans score, which is more quantitative, and the total is the rank that goes to the legislature. The list this year is very similar to last year’s. The board is being asked to approve the 2019 project ranking and submit them to VTrans. Marc Landry suggested the US 2 bridge on I89 should say Exit 17. Andrea Morgante suggested each project should list the municipality it’s in. When asked if this ranking is done statewide or regionally, Matthew Langham said it is statewide. Justin Dextradeur questioned the Harbor Road in Shelburne and noted it didn’t make it in. Christine said it’s not in the Capital Program, but because of the strong support, it’ll probably move forward. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO FORWARD THE LIST TO VTRANS WITH THE COUPLE OF EDITORIAL CHANGES. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

7. Chittenden County Active Transportation Plan. Peter Keating noted that the board had an update on this plan last fall. We had an advisory committee that really helped get this together. Chris Shaw, John Zicconi, and Jim Donovan all helped. We started this 18 months ago with public workshops around the region. We did an on-line mapping project asking people where they walk or bike or would like to. Over 400 people participated. We used Front Porch Forum to get the word out. He reviewed the Plan outline, which is similar to most plans: vision and goals; benefits of active transportation; public process; existing conditions; regional network analysis; recommendations, implementation; performance measures; conclusions; and next steps. We tried very hard to have this plan follow the ECOS Plan. Peter then reviewed the guiding principles: safe, sustainable, accessible, resilient, viable, connected, convenient, attractive, thoughtfully designed and equitable. Focus areas: improve connectivity/close gaps; corridors vs. facility type; more biking, less walking. They identified corridors that link communities together and not specify shared road facilities, etc. We left it open to what’s going on along the corridor. Biking is a viable inter-municipal activity vs walking. He described how they went about building a regional network. By using a GIS exercise we started with the existing conditions, added public input, reviewed origins and destinations and previous studies that came up with a proposed network, which was displayed on a map. They then prioritized the proposed network using a 9-point matrix of high, medium and low priority and high, medium and low feasibility. The priority is determined by: Population in need (ECOS index), or proximity to transit or schools; Bike/ped crash location >1; and gap for BOTH walking and biking. Feasibility is determined by: Rural – available ROW, existing project, topography; and Urban – retrofit possible, existing project, some/major operational changes likely, e.g. parking impacts. There is now a prioritized network. We worked with local bike/ped committees. He then presented short-term and non-infrastructure recommendations:
   a. Network wayfinding plan.
   b. Upgrade existing bike lanes to separated bike lanes where possible and develop contraflow lanes on one-way streets.
   c. GMT bus stop enhancements.
   d. Continue bike lanes through intersections and bike detection at signals.
   e. Education, Encouragement, Enforcement and Evaluation.
   f. Extra points in evaluation under VTrans programs. One recommendation is that if a community applies for bike/ped funding, we’d like to see them get extra points for using one of the recommended corridors.

The TAC took a couple of months to review it and did approve it two weeks ago. We are now asking for board approval. Ultimately this will be a part of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). Peter feels we had a very strong public process. Jim Donovan wants to be sure that the four E’s are included in this plan (as they were in the last.). He also suggested that we use local
photographs rather than generic. Peter noted that the consultant is finalizing the layout of the plan and are trying to do just that. Jim noted that Peter was very responsive working with Charlotte and incorporating their comments. Jeff Carr asked how distracted driving figures into our planning. Peter said it is not addressed in this plan. Jim Donovan said it’s somewhat addressed in that you encourage separation of bike lanes from roadways. Justin Dextradeur noted that the online mapping generated a lot of data and asked if we can continue to use that tool for other efforts. Peter thinks that’s a good idea. JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY DAN KERIN, TO APPROVE THE CHITTENDEN COUNTY ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

8. Draft Investigation and Remediation of Contaminated Properties Rule (I-Rule) Comments. Charlie noted that we have a new draft distributed tonight. The first draft was reviewed by the Executive Committee and the Brownfields Advisory Committee. After that meeting, Regina captured those comments and concerns that the City of Burlington had expressed. The Department of Health and ACCD are members of the Brownfields Committee, but they did not participate in drafting this memo. We circulated the revised letter on Monday for any final comments. Charlie said we’re interested in this issue because projects like the new transit center cost an additional $300,000 although it really didn’t have any public health concerns. Dan Albrecht noted there are so many unanswered questions that it really does need another review of the proposed standards. The deadline for this letter tonight before midnight. Justin Dextradeur noted that the professionals don’t see how this draft rule really addresses the issues we had and agreed there are many unanswered questions. ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JUSTIN DEXTRADEUR, TO APPROVE THE LETTER BE SENT TO THE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

9. Lake Champlain Byway Chittenden County Corridor Management Plan Update. John Zicconi will recuse himself as the Transportation Board regulates byways. He left the meeting at 6:58 p.m. Dan Albrecht gave an update on the project giving background, and why we’re updating this plan. It’s a state designated byway since 2002 with 22 communities (8 in Chittenden County). State byways are based on the federal scenic byways program. He reviewed the Chittenden County Corridor. Since designating the byway they have focused on management and projects. Purpose of the corridor plan is the protection of intrinsic qualities and character. He reviewed the objective of the 2002 corridor management plan. Promoting attractions that might not get noticed. Why update it?
   a. State byways program requires it;
   b. The plan roads will be updated to reflect the current state of the intrinsic resources;
   c. The byways must take account of the elimination of federal NSB grant opportunities and program support that started in FFY13; and
   d. A new Corridor Management Plan needs to incorporate what the Byway and its supporting organizations have learned as they have implemented various projects and collaborated on to “manage” the Byway over the last several years.
We’re trying to show what’s been done and lessons learned. We’ve developed and placed 40 interpretive panels, brochures, posters and story map website. He reviewed update objectives. Key elements of the 2017 Plan include: Transportation improvements; Intrinsic resources and partnerships; and, sustainable tourism and economic development. There is a Byway Council made of 3 RPC’s, 2 chambers, LCBP, LCB and five at-large members. He reviewed responsibilities: We have multiple organizations involved rather than one organization being responsible. Staff is asking members to review the following sections to see if the intent is appropriate:
   • Page ii: Overall Byway Goals and Strategies
• Section 4.1. 2017 CMP Objectives
• 4.3. Organizations involved in management of the Byways’ intrinsic resources.
• 4.4. Overall responsibility of organizations that coordinate and/or manage the Byway’s intrinsic resources.
• 4.4.1. Responsibilities of the Byway Council.
• 4.4.2. Responsibilities of the Chittenden County Corridor Planning and Implementation Committee.
• 4.4.3. Responsibilities of the CCRPC.
• 4.4.4. Responsibilities of the municipalities.
• 4.4.5. Responsibilities of the non-profit and private sectors.

Dan then reviewed next steps and future. Jeff Carr asked if this is part of ACCD work. Charlie said these are older Federal Highway grants through VTrans. It was noted that the Byway website is down as it has been hacked, but when it was working well we were getting 4,000 hits a month. The plan update is one of the last requirements of the federal grants to close them out. Bard Hill suggested we include a little more about Lake Champlain’s importance to the region since that’s why the scenic byway is there. This will be an action item on the May agenda.

10. FY18 Unified Planning Work Program & Budget. Charlie noted that this will be an action item next month when we hold the public hearing. He reviewed the UPWP document tasks. We received 35 requests for projects. The cells shaded pink are changes since the last version and are still under review as we get better budget numbers on specific projects; green shaded rows indicate new projects; and, green text indicates updated descriptions or deliverables. We were able to accommodate most projects that were eligible for federal transportation planning funds. A couple were delayed to reconsider at the mid-year. Charlie asked members to let him know if they have any questions. He then reviewed the budget. On the income side, the gray lines are projects/grants that have been completed and won’t have funding in FY18. The yellow highlighting indicates pending grants that we’re not sure of yet. We may know more by the May meeting. Line 51 - Water Quality Project Development & implementation is funding that DEC may provide the RPCs to help implement water quality projects. Line 52 - The last round of Better Roads grants for the remaining Chittenden County municipalities is pending. On the expense side, lines 83 and 84 (Salaries and Benefits) are our major costs. On line 121 – surplus(deficit) – we’re looking at a deficit of $125,340. This is directly related to our indirect rate. He directed members to the chart at the bottom showing the approved indirect rates over the past 5-6 years and the audited income for those same years. We have over collected in previous years so it’ll cover this projected deficit in FY18. Because the overhead rate is determined using audited numbers from two years prior, we’ll have some years with positive revenue and some negative. Chris Roy said we have talked about getting our reserve funds up a little and with the regulations we really can’t. He feels one thing that might help is if we could cap the delta in the indirect rate in any given year or perhaps take two years to pay back. The FY18 approved indirect rate is 67.42%. Charlie noted that we are going to discuss a change in methodology with the VTrans chief auditor to mitigate these swings. Charlie noted that ACCD grant is supplemented with local dues, and a couple grants do not allow us to recover indirect costs. Jeff Carr noted it’s not cheap to run this organization and we have strived to have three months of costs in reserve, which we have not been able to achieve. As part of capital planning, Charlie asked about whether we needed a sound system in the main conference room, which we would add to the capital equipment purchase line. Members did not feel a need for it.
11. **Chair/Executive Director’s Report.**
   a. **Board Development Committee** to develop slate of officers for the May meeting. Andy Montroll has already spoken with the current members of the Executive Committee. If anyone is interested in serving on the EC, please let Andy or Charlie know.
   b. **Annual Meeting.** The annual meeting will be held on Wednesday, June 21, 2017 at the Catamount Country Club in Williston. Julie Moore, ANR Secretary will be the guest speaker.
   c. **MTP Update.** The update process has gotten underway and this fall we will be looking at the list of projects to include in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan.
   d. **Regional Dispatch Update.** Data collection is ongoing to try to determine costs.
   e. **Executive Director’s report.** This was sent out earlier this week.

12. **Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports.** Minutes of various committees were included in the meeting packet.

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

14. **Adjournment.** JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JIM DONOVAN, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:45 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc
Chittenden County RPC Executive Committee
May 17, 2017
Agenda Item 5: Action Item

FY18 Unified Planning Work Program & Budget

Background:
Each year the CCRPC undertakes the development and implementation of a Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). The Board of Directors of the CCRPC has established a Committee process for the development of the UPWP. The following FY 18 UPWP Committee members were appointed by the Chair:

- Board: Mike O’Brien, Chair; John Zicconi, Andrea Morgante
- PAC: Ken Beliveau; Joss Besse
- TAC: Barbara Elliott, Justin Rabidoux
- VTrans: Amy Bell
- Ex-Officio: Chris Jolly, FHWA; Leah Sirim, FTA; David Armstrong, GMT

The UPWP Committee met on January 26th, February 23rd, and March 23rd to discuss and evaluate all project applications from Chittenden County municipalities, partner organizations and the public.

At their March 22nd meeting, the CCRPC Board voted to warn a FY 18 UPWP & Budget Public Hearing for Wednesday, May 17, 2017 at 6:00 p.m. The public hearing draft documents were posted on the CCRPC web site (http://www.ccrpcvt.org/about-us/commission/annual-work-plan-budget-finances/), sent to all municipalities and the Burlington Free Press. An updated version of the FY 18 UPWP & Budget was presented to the CCRPC Board on April 19th. Action is requested at the May Board meeting. Per our Bylaws, 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.

Recommendations:

UPWP Committee: The UPWP Committee recommends CCRPC Board approval of the FY18 UPWP and Budget.

Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC): The TAC recommends CCRPC Board approval of the FY18 UPWP.

Staff: Staff recommends approval of the FY18 UPWP & Budget with any minor changes to update carry forward estimates and task descriptions and deliverables related to TPI and ACCD scopes of work.

Executive Committee: The Executive Committee recommends CCRPC Board approval of the FY18 UPWP & Budget with any minor changes to update carry forward estimates and task descriptions and deliverables related to TPI and ACCD scopes of work.

For more information contact: Charlie Baker, cbaker@ccrpcvt.org or 861-0115 or Marshall Distel, mdistel@ccrpcvt.org or 861-0121
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
05/17/17
Agenda Item 6: Action Item

Public Participation Plan Amendment for Public Hearing Comment Period

Issues: In 2014 CCPRC updated the Public Participation Plan. This update explored traditional and innovative outreach methods to meet the needs of our growing and increasingly diverse community. The plan also added consistency to CCRPC’s outreach efforts for our Regional Plan, Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). State law requires a 30-day comment period for regional plans. However, State and Federal law have no specific comment period requirements for the MTP, the UPWP or the TIP. Rather, Federal law requires that “the MPO shall provide all interested parties with a reasonable opportunity to comment.” MPOs must develop a Public Participation Plan and must follow outreach procedures documented in the plan.

Prior to the 2014 Public Participation Plan notice requirements for the MTP, UPWP and TIP were contained in the Bylaws and were 15 days.

The practical impact of increasing the notice period from 15 to 30 days is that there is not enough time for the Board to warn a public hearing one month and hold the public hearing the following month. Staff have addressed this issue by having the Board warn a public hearing two meetings before the hearing date, but frequently there is not complete information on the topic of the public hearing for the Board to make an informed recommendation.

This proposed change would initiate a 25-day public notice requirement for the UPWP and the TIP so the Board can hold the public hearing in the month following the warning.

Executive Committee Recommendation: Recommend that the 2014 Public Participation Plan be revised as attached.

For more information contact: Christine Forde cforde@ccrpcvt.org or 846-4490 ext. *13
8. EVALUATING THE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN

This Public Participation Plan describes the roles and responsibilities of the CCRPC in meeting federal and state requirements, and in honoring our commitment to involving the public and other interested parties in transportation and regional planning in Chittenden County. The Plan also describes the techniques used by the CCRPC to reach and engage the public in its projects and activities. In order to determine the effectiveness of those techniques, a means to evaluate each of them is necessary.

Table 3 identifies evaluation criteria, performance goals, and methods to reach the goals for each public engagement technique. There are several ways to determine whether or not those goals have been achieved. Short surveys of event participants, CCRPC contacts, and other members of the public can assess which outreach techniques are effective or ineffective, and why. Analyzing the time spent by CCRPC staff on each technique and their subsequent success rate can help guide decisions on how to improve outreach methods, or which methods are ineffective and should be discontinued. On an annual basis, CCRPC staff and/or a communications consultant will use the following evaluation table to track the effectiveness of each public engagement technique. A summary report of the results will highlight successful public engagement efforts, note areas that could be improved, and offer recommendations that would benefit the public and the organization alike. The Public Participation Plan Advisory Committee will get together once a year for a review to assess the effectiveness of the PPP and the evaluation methods below.

Table 3: Evaluation Criteria and Performance Goals for Public Participation Techniques

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Public Participation Strategy</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Methods to Meet Goals</th>
<th>Spectrum Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCRPC Contact</td>
<td></td>
<td>Keep database current</td>
<td>Number of returned items</td>
<td>Make immediate corrections when items are returned</td>
<td>Inform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Database</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCRPC website</td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual increase in unique website visitors</td>
<td>Number of hits (monthly Google Analytics report)</td>
<td>Use other public participation tools to increase awareness of the website as an effective resource</td>
<td>Inform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCRPC newsletter</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum of 15% opening rate</td>
<td>Number of persons reached</td>
<td>Update recipient list based on undeliverable email (and/or postal addresses)</td>
<td>Inform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calendar of events</td>
<td></td>
<td>Keep calendar current</td>
<td>Calendar reflects all currently known events</td>
<td>Post on website in a timely manner</td>
<td>Inform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal advertisements</td>
<td>Advertise all required public hearings for 25 ± 30 days in advance unless otherwise required by law</td>
<td>All required public hearings are advertised for 25 ± 30 days in advance unless otherwise required by law</td>
<td>Ensure system is in place to advertise public hearings with enough lead time</td>
<td>Consult</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. SUMMARY OF CCRPC PUBLIC PARTICIPATION POLICIES

The Public Participation Plan describes in detail the major activities of the CCRPC, and the accompanying public participation methods and processes. The following table includes an overview of the CCRPC’s formal Public Participation Policies, including the comment period for each program. We recommend confirming all regular public meetings with CCRPC staff or via the website: www.ccrpcvt.org.

Table 1: Summary of CCRPC Public Participation Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan/Program Adoption</th>
<th>Public Meetings</th>
<th>Public Hearing Comment Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Participation Plan (PPP)</td>
<td>Public can comment at Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC), Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) and Board meetings, as well as via mail, email or phone.</td>
<td>45 Days as per Title 23 U.S.C. Section 134 and 23 CFR Part 450.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Plan and Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)</td>
<td>Two or more public meetings held for proposed plan or amendments. Public can comment at TAC, LRPC PAC and Board meetings, as well as via mail, email or phone.</td>
<td>Regional Plan: 30 Days as per 24 V.S.A. § 4348 and Title 23 U.S.C. Section 134 and 23 CFR Part 450.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)</td>
<td>Public can comment at TAC, PAC and Board meetings, as well as via mail, email or phone.</td>
<td>25 15 30 Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP)</td>
<td>Public can comment at TAC and Board meetings, as well as via mail, email or phone.</td>
<td>25 15 30 Days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan/Program Amendments</th>
<th>Public Meetings</th>
<th>Public Comment Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Participation Plan</td>
<td>Public hearing for major amendments.</td>
<td>45 Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Plan and Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)</td>
<td>Two or more public meetings held for proposed major amendments to Regional Plan. Public hearing for major MTP amendments. No meeting required for minor amendments.</td>
<td>30 Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)</td>
<td>See Appendix D for details.</td>
<td>25 15 30 Days for major amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)</td>
<td>Public hearing for major amendments. No meeting required for minor amendments.</td>
<td>25 15 30 Days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Open Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Meetings/Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCRPC Board</td>
<td>Regular meetings are held at 6:00pm at the CCRPC office on the third Wednesday of every month (except August and November).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC)</td>
<td>Meets on a semi-annual basis or as needed for Regional Plan and MTP updates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC)</td>
<td>Regular meetings are held at 9:00am at the CCRPC office the first Tuesday of every month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Water Advisory Committee (CWAC)</td>
<td>Regular meetings are held at 11:00am at the CCRPC office the first Tuesday of every month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Advisory Committee (PAC)</td>
<td>Regular meetings are held at 2:30pm at the CCRPC office the second/third Wednesday of every month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
<td>Regular meetings are held at 5:30pm at the CCRPC office the first Wednesday of every month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Committee</td>
<td>Meets on a quarterly basis or as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Development Committee</td>
<td>Meets on a semi-annual basis or as needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PRINCIPLES & GOALS

Public participation is a dynamic activity that requires commitment at all levels of the organization. In crafting the Public Participation Plan, we are striving to meet these relevant principles in the ECOS Plan:

**ECOS Principle #6: Cultivate collaboration.** Sustainable communities engage all facets of society in working together for the benefit of the whole. Local governments in these communities bring government representatives, community members and organizations together and create a culture of collaboration that encourages innovation, sharing of resources, and jointly shared accountability for results.

**ECOS Principle #7: Ensure equity.** Sustainable communities allocate resources and opportunities fairly so that all people who do the full range of jobs that a community needs can thrive in it. Local governments in these communities actively eliminate barriers to full participation in community life and work to correct past injustices.

**ECOS Principle #8: Embrace diversity.** Sustainable communities feature a tapestry of peoples, cultures and economies underpinned by a richly functioning natural environment. Local governments in these communities celebrate and foster ethnic, cultural, economic and biological diversity and encourage multiple approaches to accomplish a goal.

To ensure that all constituents are provided with substantive opportunities to participate in CCRPC activities, the organization pledges to follow the federal mandates outlined in the Legal Regulations and Requirements Section, as well as the Principles, Goal and Objectives in the following section.
Regional Stormwater Agreement

Staff briefed the Board on the Plan at its April 19th meeting. The attached agreement has been worked on by CCRPC staff and by the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (“MS4”) municipalities and organizations over the past 18 months. Initial adoption was put on hold while CCRPC worked to amend its bylaws to incorporate language formally authorizing Intermunicipal Service Agreements.

This MOU formally merges the Regional Stormwater Education Program (RSEP) and the Chittenden County Stream Team (CCST), two regional efforts for which CCRPC has acted as the Lead Agency. They operated under two separate MOUs as RSEP started in 2003 and CCST started in 2011. The RSEP MOU was also reauthorized in 2008 and 2013 while the CCST MOU was reauthorized in 2016. After the CCRPC’s Board adoption of the bylaw revision at its April 19th meeting, this Agreement has been circulated to the 9 municipalities and 3 entities for review and action by their governing bodies prior to July 1st.

Staff Recommendation:

At its May 2, 2017 meeting, the Executive Committee recommended Board approval of the Agreement. Staff recommends approval of the Agreement.

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

This Stormwater Program Agreement ("Agreement") is entered into by and between a group of Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System ("MS4") permittees ("MS4 Permittees") and the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission ("CCRPC") to operate an MS4 Stormwater Program ("Program") that conforms with and satisfies the relevant requirements of both Minimum Control Measure One (Public Outreach and Education) and Minimum Control Measure Two (Public Involvement and Participation) of the Phase II NPDES Permit issued by the Vermont Department of Environmental Conservation ("DEC") on December 2012 through General Permit 3-9014 ("MS4 Permit"), as these requirements may be continued, renewed, amended, or otherwise modified during the term of this Agreement.

1. **Prior Agreements** – Effective July 1, 2017, this Agreement

   a. supersedes an MOU signed by the CCRPC and twelve MS4 permittees, effective March 10, 2013 through March 9, 2018, governing the operation of a Regional Stormwater Education Program to satisfy the relevant requirements of Minimum Control Measure One (Public Outreach and Education), and

   b. supersedes an MOU signed by the CCRPC and eleven MS4 permittees, effective July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2016, and an amendment to this MOU extending its effective date through June 30, 2017, governing the operation of a Regional Stormwater Public Involvement and Participation Program to satisfy the relevant requirements of Minimum Control Measure Two (Public Involvement and Participation).

2. **Service Agreement** – This Agreement constitutes a service agreement pursuant to 24 V.S.A. § 4345b (Intermunicipal Service Agreements).

3. **Definitions**—For purposes of this Agreement, the term “MS4 Permittees” includes the Vermont Agency of Transportation, which on December 28, 2016 became eligible for coverage under General Permit 3-9007 for Stormwater Discharges from the State Transportation Separate Storm Sewer System (TS4).

4. **Parties** – The following are the parties to this Agreement:

   a. **MS4 Permittees** – the undersigned MS4 Permittees, and

   b. **CCRPC** – the undersigned regional planning commission.

5. **MS4 Steering Committee**

   a. **Composition** – The Members of the Steering Committee shall consist of one representative from each of the signatory MS4 Permittees to this Agreement. Another MS4 may request to join this Agreement if approved by a two-thirds vote of the Members. The Members shall be appointed
either by the governing bodies of their municipalities at publicly warned meetings or, if a Member representing an MS4 Permittee is non-municipal agency, via a process consistent with that agency’s policies. At its first meeting, the Steering Committee shall elect a Chair by a majority vote. The Chair shall serve until such time as the Chair resigns or the Steering Committee elects a new Chair.

b. **Duties** – The Steering Committee shall direct the CCRPC on the development and performance of Program Services in particular and on all other matters bearing on the administration of this Agreement. All actions of the Steering Committee shall be by majority vote unless otherwise specified in this Agreement.

c. **Organization of Meetings** – The Steering Committee shall meet on a quarterly basis at a minimum. The CCRPC shall provide Steering Committee Members with reasonable notice of meetings. Notice shall include a meeting agenda and draft meeting minutes. In addition, the CCRPC shall post notice of Steering Committee meetings on its website and on the Program website.

6. **CCRPC**

a. **Duties** – The CCRPC shall:

1) Administer this Agreement and agreements with contractors (including executing contracts approved by the Steering Committee, receiving and disbursing funds, and monitoring the provision of services) for the benefit of the MS4 Permittees.

2) Provide other services contributing to the operation of the Program (including, but not limited to, social media management, public relations, grant writing, creating and managing a Program website, organizing meetings as set forth in Section 4.c, above, etc.) as directed by the Steering Committee; and at a level consistent with each year’s Program Budget as described in Section 8.b, below.

3) Provide a quarterly budget report to the Steering Committee detailing expenses the CCRPC incurred and the payments it has received.

4) Pay contractors and vendors for charges consistent with the relevant contract, using funds from the Program Budget, as defined in Section 8, below.

5) Upon approval of the Steering Committee or its designee, reimburse itself for personnel and other expenses for charges consistent with its duties, using funds from the Program Budget.

6) Consult with the Steering Committee prior to authorizing any contractor activities or charges outside the scope of work of a contract.

7) Notify the Steering Committee when 75% of the annual budget (as defined in Section 8, below) for an individual category of expenses (e.g., contractors, CCRPC fees, advertising, etc.) is reached. When these levels are reached, subsequent expenditures by the CCRPC in that category shall be reviewed and approved by the Steering Committee Chair in advance.
8) At the request of the Steering Committee, assign any or all contracts that the CCRPC has entered into pursuant to this Agreement to the MS4 Permittees who are signatories to this Agreement at the time or to another contractor of the Steering Committee's choosing.

9) Comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws, including Burlington's Livable Wage Ordinance as applicable.

b. **Compensation** – Through the Program Budget, the MS4 Permittees shall compensate the CCRPC for the actual costs of performing its duties defined in Section 5.a, above; provided, however, that the CCRPC shall not be entitled to compensation that would exceed ten percent (10%) of the Program Budget as specified in Section 8.b, below, without the prior approval of a majority of the Steering Committee.

c. **Invoices** – The CCRPC shall invoice the Program to cover personnel charges, mileage reimbursement, and other direct expenses necessary to perform its duties. Personnel charges for CCRPC staff shall be calculated at a rate of salary plus fringe. The CCRPC shall not charge the Program an Indirect Rate. As set forth in Section 5.b, above, upon approval of the Steering Committee or its designee, the CCRPC may reimburse itself for charges consistent with its duties, using funds from the Program Budget.

7. **Selection of Contractors**

a. The CCRPC, in consultation with the Steering Committee, shall competitively bid for contract(s) for Program services that collectively satisfy the requirements for Minimum Control Measure One (Public Outreach and Education) and Minimum Control Measure Two (Public Involvement and Participation) of the Phase II NPDES Permit then in effect. The parties to the contracts shall be the contractors and the CCRPC. All contracts shall require the contractor to indemnify and hold harmless the MS4 Permittees from any claims related to the contract and to procure and maintain liability insurance for all services performed under the contract.

b. All contracts shall be awarded based on qualifications, price, and the ability of the entity to provide services that meet the relevant MS4 Permit requirements. The selection of contractors shall comply with the procurement policy of the CCRPC and with applicable state and federal procurement laws and procedures.

c. Contracts shall generally be 1 to 5 years in length and shall include, but not be limited to, a Maximum Limiting Amount and the right of the CCRPC to 1) cancel a contract if services are not being adequately provided, 2) specify that payments to contractors shall be made only for services rendered, 3) specify the annual scope of work and budget as approved by the Steering Committee, 4) allow a contract extension if desired, and 5) assign the contract to the MS4 Permittees that are signatories to this Agreement at the time of the assignment or to a contractor of the Steering Committee’s choosing.

d. Contracting for services under this Agreement shall comply with the Fair Employment Act and Americans with Disabilities Act: the CCRPC shall comply with the requirement of Title 21 V.S.A Chapter 5, Subchapter 6, relating to fair employment practices, to the full extent applicable. The CCRPC shall also ensure, to the full extent required by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, that qualified individuals with disabilities receive equitable access to the services,
programs, and activities provided by the Steering Committee under this Agreement. This provision shall also be included in all contracts and subcontracts executed under this Agreement.

e. The CCRPC and the Steering Committee recognize the important contribution and vital impact which small businesses have on the State’s economy. In this regard, the CCRPC shall ensure a free and open bidding process that affords all businesses equal access and opportunity to compete, except under circumstances where competitive bidding may not be practicable and is not required by applicable procurement policies. The CCRPC and the Steering Committee also recognize the existence of businesses owned by minorities and women, and the CCRPC shall make a good faith effort to encourage these firms to compete for contracts involving state or federal funds and comply with applicable law relating to civil rights and disadvantaged business enterprises.

8. **Program Services** – The Steering Committee, assisted by the CCRPC and its contractors, shall implement a unified Program that satisfies the relevant requirements of Minimum Control Measure One (Public Education and Outreach) and Minimum Control Measure Two (Public Involvement and Participation) of the MS4 Permit.

The Program Content for each Program Year shall be as defined in writing by a majority of the Steering Committee. The Program Year shall be the State of Vermont’s fiscal year. The Program Content shall implement the following deliverables:

a. **Public Education and Outreach** – Elements shall include, at a minimum:

1) operating the Program’s website, www.smartwaterways.org, or its equivalent; and

2) advertising in various media.

b. **Public Involvement and Participation** – Elements shall include, at a minimum:

1) operating the Program’s website, www.ccstreamteam.org, or its equivalent;

2) hosting and/or organizing workshops, projects, and other events to engage the public; and

3) recruiting volunteers to support projects, promote events, and/or engage the public.

c. **End of MS4 permit year annual reporting** – Elements shall include preparation of a narrative report 25 business days prior to the MS4 Permittees’ reporting deadline to DEC.

9. **Program Dues, Budget, Costs, and Payments**

a. **Dues**

1) For State Fiscal Year, FY18, July 2017-June 2018, the annual dues for each of the undersigned MS4 Permittees shall be $5,500.
2) For the following fiscal years, the annual dues shall be set by a two-thirds majority by October 15th of the preceding calendar year. In the absence of agreement, the dues shall remain at $5,500.

3) The CCRPC shall invoice each MS4 Permittee on or about July 1st of each year with payment to the CCRPC due 30 days later.

4) All Members shall pay equal dues.

b. Program Budget

1) The annual Program Budget shall consist of the sum of the annual payments for each Program Year made by MS4 Permittees, plus any funds from other sources made available to the Program by majority vote of the Steering Committee.

2) Prior to the start of each Program Year, the Steering Committee shall adopt a Program Budget governing expenditures for the subsequent Program Year. Budget categories shall include, but not be limited to: CCRPC Duties, Contractual Services, and Expenses.

3) Once the Program Year starts, a majority of the Steering Committee may amend the Program Budget as needed, for example to reflect any surplus or deficits from the prior Program Year, receipt of new sources of funds, or a desired change in the Program Budget, subject to Section 8.a, above.

4) In the event that costs are less than anticipated or that grants or other funding sources become available, a majority of the voting Members of the Steering Committee may decide to reduce each Member’s payment by an equal amount or to credit all or part of the following Program Year assessment to each MS4 Permittee.

c. Maximum Annual Costs and Payments – Except as otherwise provided by this section, each MS4 Permittee shall within 30 days of receipt of an invoice make a single annual dues payment, as provided by Section 8.a, above.

d. Other Funds – Any funds made available to the Program shall be dedicated to reducing the annual costs of each MS4 Permittee participating in the Program, except as a majority of the voting Members of the Steering Committee may decide.

e. Excess Funds – Any funds remaining at the end of a Program Year shall be carried over to the next Program Year, unless a majority of the voting Members of the Steering Committee decides otherwise.

f. Non-appropriation – The obligations of each MS4 Permittee to make payments under this Agreement shall constitute a current expense of the MS4 Permittee and shall not in any way be construed to be a debt of the MS4 Permittee in contravention of any applicable constitutional or statutory limitation or requirement, or the MS4 Permittee’s charter or articles of incorporation; nor shall anything contained in this Agreement constitute a pledge of the credit or tax revenues, funds, or monies of the MS4 Permittee. The decision whether or not to budget and appropriate funds during each fiscal year of the MS4 Permittee is within the discretion of the governing body.
of the MS4 Permittee. The obligations of a MS4 Permittee under the Agreement are subject to 
annual appropriations by the governing body of the MS4 Permittee, except as provided by 
Section 12 of this Agreement. An MS4 Permittee cannot choose to not appropriate funds and 
then withdraw in a manner that shifts prior contractual obligations on to the others. Non-
appropriation will be considered withdrawal and must be prospective in fairness to all 
signatories as per Section 13.

10. **Contract Approval** – All CCRPC contracts shall be conditioned upon approval by a majority of the 
voting Members of the Steering Committee and shall be consistent with Section 6, above.

11. **Termination of CCRPC** – The CCRPC on its own or the Steering Committee by a majority vote of its 
full Membership may elect to terminate the CCRPC’s future participation in this Agreement by 
providing 90 days’ written notice to the other. In the event of termination under this section, the 
CCRPC shall continue to administer and comply with each existing contract, and the MS4 Permittees 
shall continue to reimburse the CCRPC from the Program Budget for the actual costs of 
administering and complying with each contract, as provided by this Agreement, unless and until the 
CCRPC assigns the contract pursuant to Sections 5.a.8 and 6.c of this Agreement.

12. **Termination of Agreement**

a. This Agreement shall become null and void with no further obligation of the parties if:

   1) Two-thirds of the Members of the Steering Committee vote to end participation, or

   2) DEC determines that the Program outlined in this Agreement does not meet the relevant 
   requirements for Minimum Control Measure One (Public Education and Outreach) or 
   Minimum Control Measure Two (Public Involvement and Participation), and the parties to 
   this Agreement are unable to craft a Program to satisfy DEC.

b. In the event of termination, any funds remaining in the Program Budget (after payment of 
obligations to vendors or to satisfy debts) shall be reimbursed to the MS4 Permittees with each 
MS4 Permittee receiving a share proportional to the number of MS4 Permittees at the time of 
termination. For example, if there are twelve MS4 Permittees at the time of termination, each 
MS4 Permittee shall receive a 1/12th share.

13. **Withdrawal of Member** – An MS4 Permittee may withdrawal from participation in this Agreement 
only at the end of a state fiscal year. If an MS4 Permittee wishes to withdrawal from participation, it 
shall provide at least 90 days’ notice to the other MS4 Permittees and the CCRPC. After withdrawal, 
a MS4 Permittee shall remain responsible for its share of the costs of contracts that the Steering 
Committee approved prior to the effective date of the withdrawal.

14. **Effective Date and Duration of Agreement** – The effective date of this Agreement shall be July 1, 
2017, and this Agreement shall terminate June 30, 2022.

15. **Amendment** – This Agreement may be amended only upon unanimous action of all the Members.
16. **Counterparts** – This Agreement may be executed in multiple counterparts, each of which is deemed an original and all of which constitute one and the same document. Each such counterpart may be a facsimile or PDF copy, and such facsimile or PDF copy shall be deemed an original.

17. **Public Records** – Any and all records submitted to the CCRPC or MS4 Permittees - including Bids, Proposals, Qualifications, Contracts, etc.-- whether electronic, paper, or otherwise recorded, are subject to the Vermont Public Records Act.

**Signature of CCRPC**

____________________________________________________________  __________  
Christopher D. Roy, Board Chair, Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission  Date

**Signatures of Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>The Burlington International Airport</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>The City of Burlington</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>The Town of Colchester</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>The Town of Essex</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>The Village of Essex Junction</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>The Town of Milton</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>The Town of Shelburne</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>The City of South Burlington</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>The Town of Williston</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Joe Flynn, Secretary of Transportation, Vermont Agency of Transportation

Date

Linda Seavey, Director, Campus Planning Services, The University of Vermont

Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>The City of Winooski</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>The City of Winooski</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
May 17, 2017
Agenda Item 8: 2017 Bolton Town Plan Public Hearing, Approval and Confirmation

Issues: The Town of Bolton has requested, per Title 24 V.S.A §4350, that the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (1) approve its 2017 Town Plan; and (2) confirm its planning process.

Attached is the proposed Resolution of approval and the staff report to the Planning Advisory Committee. The Planning Advisory Committee met on May 10, 2017 and recommended that the Plan, and the municipal planning process, should be forwarded to the CCRPC Board for approval.

The Plan was adopted by the Bolton Selectboard on April 26, 2017. Staff is recommending approval by the CCRPC Board at this time. This CCRPC Board meeting serves as the public hearing for the Plan and was warned as such.

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

Planning Advisory Committee Recommendation: The Planning Advisory Committee reviewed the Plan on Wednesday, May 10, 2017 at the CCRPC Offices and made the following motion:

The PAC finds that the 2017 Bolton Town Plan, as submitted, meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC approval, and that the municipality's planning process meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC confirmation.

The PAC recommends that the Plan, and the municipal planning process, should be forwarded to the CCRPC Board for approval.

Executive Committee Recommendation: NA

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the CCRPC Board approve the 2017 Bolton Town Plan and confirm the Town of Bolton’s planning process in accordance with the attached resolution.

For more information contact: Emily Nosse-Leirer, Planner
846-4490 ext. *15; enosse-leirer@ccrpcvt.org
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC)
Resolution
Bolton’s Town Plan & Planning Process

WHEREAS, Title 24, V.S.A.§ 4350 in part requires that CCRPC shall review the municipal planning process of our member municipalities including review of plans; that each review shall include a public hearing which is noticed as provided in 24 V.S.A.§ 4350(b); and that before approving a plan the Commission shall find that it:
   1. is consistent with the goals established in Section 4302 of this title;
   2. is compatible with its Regional Plan;
   3. is compatible with approved plans of other municipalities in the region;
   4. contains all the elements included in § 4382(a)(1)-(12) of this Title.

WHEREAS, the CCRPC at its October 19, 2016 meeting approved the CCRPC Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans dealing with local plans and CCRPC action; and

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

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

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

WHEREAS, the Planning Advisory Committee reviewed the records and recommended that the Commission approve Bolton’s Town Plan as meeting the requirements of 24 V.S.A.§ 4350 and the Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans and confirms the community’s planning process as consistent with Title 24, Chapter 117.

WHEREAS, The Town of Bolton Selectboard adopted the 2017 Bolton Town Plan at a warned public hearing on April 26;

WHEREAS, the CCRPC held a warned public hearing at the CCRPC, located at 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, Vermont to receive comments on the Plan;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION, that, in compliance with 24 V.S.A.§ 4350 and the Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans, CCRPC approves the 2017 Bolton Town Plan and the Commission finds that said Town Plan:
   1. is consistent with the goals established in Section 4302 of Title 24;
   2. is compatible with the 2013 Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the ECOS Plan, adopted June 19, 2013;
   3. is compatible with the approved plans from other adjacent Chittenden County municipalities; and
   4. contains all the elements included in § 4382(a)(1)-(12) and/or is making substantial progress toward attainment of the elements of this subsection;

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

Dated at Winooski, this 17th day of May, 2017.

CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

______________________________
Christopher D. Roy, Chair
The Town of Bolton has asked, per 24 V.S.A §4350, that the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission approve its 2017 Town Plan, and confirm its planning process.

This Town Plan is a major rewrite of the current document. It is a thoroughly researched, incredibly encyclopedic presentation of information about the community, and represents a significant and sustained public outreach and drafting effort by the Bolton Planning Commission and CCRPC staff. The foundation for this plan is based upon a foundational construct of “Maintain, Evolve, Transform” – describing those attributes or qualities that the community seeks to keep ‘as is’, modify, or change in one or more significant ways.

Following the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission’s (CCRPC’s) Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans (2016) and the statutory requirements of 24 V.S.A. Chapter 117, I have reviewed the draft 2017 Bolton Town Plan to determine whether it is:

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

Staff Review Findings and Comments:

1. The 2017 Bolton Town Plan appears consistent with all of the general goals of §4302.
2. The 2017 Bolton Town Plan appears consistent with the specific goals of §4302.
3. The 2017 Bolton Town Plan will include the required elements of §4382.
4. The 2017 Bolton Town Plan is generally compatible with the planning areas, goals and strategies of the 2013 Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan. A question has been raised whether increasing density in the West Bolton ‘hamlet’ area is consistent with the ECOS plan. Given circumstances described in the Town Plan, this likely makes good sense on the local level. Further, given the very small land area involved, this will be statistically insignificant at the county level; and given the physical constraints present, is unlikely to create or lead to incremental sprawl or unchecked development that would otherwise be inconsistent with rural planning areas as described in the ECOS plan and map.
5. The 2017 Bolton Town Plan is compatible with the municipal plans for the adjacent Chittenden County towns of Huntington, Jericho, Richmond, and Underhill, as well as the adjoining Washington County towns of Duxbury, Stowe, and Waterbury. As described in Appendix 3, the land use plans for each are fundamentally similar on either side of these borders.

During the drafting of this Plan, a number of suggestions were made during a preliminary review as summarized below. These matters of structure or format would not affect this approval process, and most or all of these have been addressed in the document approved by the Planning Commission and warned for a Selectboard public hearing on April 26, 2017.

Questions related to structure and organization; whether certain goals or actions followed logically from the text in those sections; whether certain goals or actions were internally consistent; what specific actions the Town could take to collaborate with Bolton Valley Resort, and/or to help encourage its success as a four-season resort and major employer; clarity of certain phrases or sections of text; and whether the excellent concepts presented in the beginning (“maintain, evolve, transform”) might be carried through and add great value to the entire plan.

In conclusion, as noted at the beginning, this Plan is an incredibly, thoroughly researched document. It presents a comprehensive description of the history and current circumstances of the Town of Bolton, and follows in very detailed form the long list of required elements in statute and in the state’s planning manual.

The Plan also uses the helpful approach of incorporating by reference a variety of related municipal plans and documents, so that the background information in these documents is noted and linked, without having to actually include them into what would then become an impossibly long and unwieldy Town Plan.

Staff suggests that the PAC accept and affirm the 2017 Bolton Town Plan, and recommend approval by the CCRPC Board.

In addition, Staff suggests that the PAC confirm the Town of Bolton’s planning process. Although a small rural town with limited funds, Bolton’s Planning Commission clearly maintains a sustained planning effort. It meets on a regular basis. It applied for, and was awarded a Municipal Planning Grant from the State to support this major rewrite of the Town Plan, and understands that completing this work is a big step forward, but not the end, of its planning efforts. The Town has allocated funds for Planning Commission work over these past four years, as indicated in the budget summary submitted with its request for Plan approval and process confirmation.

Proposed Motion & Next Steps:

PROPOSED MOTION: The PAC finds that the 2017 Bolton Town Plan, as submitted and as adopted by the Bolton Selectboard on April 26, 2017, meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC approval, and that the municipality's planning process meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC confirmation. The PAC further recommends that the Plan, and the municipal planning process, be forwarded to the CCRPC Board for approval.
CCRPC Board Meeting
May 17, 2017
Agenda Item 9: Action Item

Update to Lake Champlain Byway Chittenden County Corridor Management Plan

Background: Staff briefed the Board on the Plan at its April 19th meeting. A few minor additions have been made to that draft, mostly descriptive as well as the addition of new short section, “10. Future Updates to the Plan”. New maps showing the locations of intrinsic resource sites were also developed. The proposed final plan can be viewed at: http://www.ccrpcvt.org/about-us/commission/agendas-minutes/

The attached Plan is an update to the original 2002 Corridor Management Plan. The Chittenden County Corridor of the Byway consists of the municipalities of Milton, Colchester, Winooski, Essex Junction, Burlington, South Burlington, Shelburne and Charlotte. The designated Byway motor route is U.S. 7 and a portion of U.S. 2. Although not located on the motor route, Essex Junction is also included in the Byway due to its role as a transportation node given that it hosts an Amtrak passenger rail station. The 2002 CMP successfully met the requirements of Corridor Management Planning required for designation. However, a new and revised CMP is needed for a variety of reasons.

First, the State of Vermont’s Byway program requires it;
Second, the plan needs to be updated to reflect the current state of the Byway’s intrinsic resources;
Third, the Byway must take account of the elimination of Federal NSB grant opportunities and program support that started in Federal fiscal year 2013; and
Fourth, a new CMP needs to incorporate what the Byway and its supporting organizations have learned as they have implemented various projects and collaborated to “manage” the Byway over the last several years.

Staff Recommendation: At its May 2, 2017 meeting, the Executive Committee recommended Board approval of the Plan. Staff recommends approval of the Plan via adoption of the attached resolution.

For more information, contact: Dan Albrecht dalbrecht@ccrpcvt.org or 846-4490 ext. *29
Resolution: 2017 Lake Champlain Byway Chittenden County Corridor Management Plan

WHEREAS from November 2001 through January 2002 the governing bodies of the municipalities of Milton, Colchester, Winooski, Essex Junction, Burlington, South Burlington, Shelburne and Charlotte adopted resolutions finding that the Lake Champlain Byways Chittenden County Corridor Management Plan aids in the implementation of municipal planning objectives and supporting the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission’s (CCRPC) “application for state byways designation to the Scenery Preservation Council and the Vermont Transportation Board for formal designation of the Lake Champlain Byways” in their respective municipalities; and

WHEREAS, on December 17, 2001 the CCRPC Board adopted a resolution indicating its intent to work “with its municipal, regional and state counterparts to advance the implementation of the Lake Champlain Byways;” and

WHEREAS, on May 7, 2002, the State Transportation Board approved CCRPC’s request of March 12, 2002 for state byway designation which included submission of a Chittenden County Corridor Management Plan and designated the Lake Champlain Byway (“Byway”) as a Scenic Byway; and

WHEREAS, since 2002 the CCRPC and the eight designated Byway municipalities have worked to implement various projects that balance the promotion, preservation, enjoyment, and stewardship of the Byway’s intrinsic resources; and

WHEREAS, in January 2008, the governing bodies of the eight designated byway municipalities in Chittenden County adopted resolutions fully supporting their continued participation in the Lake Champlain Byway and supporting formal recertification of the Byway; and

WHEREAS, adoption of an updated Chittenden County Corridor Management Plan for the Byway will formally promote the Plan’s objectives of Transportation Improvements, Intrinsic Resources and Partnerships and Sustainable Tourism and Economic Development.

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

1. the CCRPC approves the 2017 Lake Champlain Byway Chittenden County Corridor Management Plan

2. CCRPC staff are hereby directed to carry out the responsibilities detailed in Section 4.4.3 of the Plan

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned have affixed their signature this 17th day of May 2017.

________________________________________
Christopher D. Roy, CCRPC Board Chair

________________________________________
Charles Baker, CCRPC Executive Director
CCRPC Board Meeting
May 17, 2017
Agenda Item 10: Preliminary 1st Draft Regional Energy Element of ECOS Plan review

Background: CCRPC, as well as other regional planning commissions, are working with the Vermont Department of Public Service (DPS) to develop Regional Energy Plans for their regions. These regional energy plans are intended to advance the State’s Comprehensive Energy Plan’s goals while being consistent with local and regional needs and concerns. The goals of the Vermont Comprehensive Energy Plan, are to:

1. Weatherize 80,000 Vermont homes by 2025
   a. Intermediate goal of 60,000 homes by 2017

2. Get 90% of Vermont’s energy from renewable sources by 2050
   a. Intermediate goal of 25% of energy from renewable sources by 2025, including 10% of transportation energy
   b. Intermediate goal of 40% of energy from renewable sources by 2035

3. Reduce total Vermont energy consumption by more than 1/3 by 2050
   a. Intermediate goal of 15% reduction by 2025

The Chittenden County Regional Energy Plan will be a roadmap for Chittenden County to meet those goals of energy consumption reduction, weatherization of homes and in-region renewable energy production.

Additionally, the purpose of this work is to gain a “Determination of Energy Compliance” from DPS, which will give more weight to the Regional Plan in wind and solar generation facility applications. Therefore, CCRPC has been working with our member municipalities to gain input on siting concerns for these types of facilities.

This work is being funded, in part, through a grant from the DPS. A deliverable of the grant is submission of a preliminary draft by 5/31/2017. Ultimately this work will be revised over the coming months and incorporated into the full ECOS Plan update. The timing for the full update is a final draft by December 2017, and adoption by June 2018.

Attached you will find the draft Plan language, the County data energy guide and the associated maps.

LRPC Recommendation:
The LRPC reviewed the draft Plan on May 11th and their comments have been incorporated. They are comfortable with the basic policy direction, and look forward to feedback from DPS.

LRPC Energy Subcommittee Recommendation:
The Energy subcommittee will review the draft Plan on May 16th and we will inform you of their comments at your meeting.

Staff Recommendation:
No Board action is needed at this time, however Staff recommends that the preliminary Draft Plan be submitted to the DPS as is for initial review and feedback.

For more information, contact: Melanie Needle mneedle@ccrpcvt.org or 846-4490 ext. *27
CCRPC Board Meeting  
May 17, 2017  
Agenda Item 11: Information Item

Report on Nominations for FY18

From: Andy Montroll (Board Development Committee Chair)

The Board Development Committee met on May 2nd and recommended the following slate of officers for FY2018.

- Chris Roy, Chair
- Mike O’Brien, Vice-Chair
- Brian Bigelow, Secretary/Treasurer
- John Zicconi, At-large for Towns over 5,000
- Barbara Elliot, At-large for Towns under 5,000
- Andy Montroll, Immediate Past Chair

The Election of Officers will occur at the CCRPC Board’s Annual Meeting on June 21, 2017. The bylaw provisions regarding election of Officers and the Executive Committee are as follows (please note that Article VII, Section C. specifies the inclusion of the Immediate Past Chair as a member of the Executive Committee):

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.
DATE: Thursday, April 13, 2017
TIME: 8:30 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT

Members Present
Ken Belliveau, Williston – PAC Rep
Alex Weinhagen, Hinesburg – PAC Rep
Chris Shaw, South Burlington – Board Rep
Heather Danis – ECOS Steering Committee Rep (via phone)
Jim Donovan, Charlotte – Board Rep
Andrea Morgante, Hinesburg - Board Rep
Justin Rabidoux, South Burlington – TAC Rep

Staff
Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
Melanie Needle, Senior Planner
Eleni Churchill, Transportation Program Manager
Christine Forde, Senior Transportation Planner
Peter Keating, Senior Transportation Planner
Jason Charest, Senior Transportation Engineer
Emily Nosse-Leirer, Planner

1. Welcome and Introductions
Jim Donovan called the meeting to order at 8:34 a.m.

2. Approve Minutes
Alex Weinhagen made a motion, seconded by Ken Belliveau, to approve the minutes of March 9, 2017. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED. Andrea Morgante abstained.

3. Energy Planning
Melanie Needle went over the solar generation maps. The maps and the spreadsheet accounts for the local known constraints, but not the local potential constraints yet. These will be included by the end of the April. The known constraints will turn the map white, the potential local constraints will turn the red (prime) to orange (base).

Alex Weinhagen explained that they will have a 1.2 megawatts solar array in a white area, and we should assign some level of potential from the white areas in relation to the target. Melanie Needle stated that we could apply the 1mW per 60 acres factor to these areas. Regina Mahony suggested that it isn’t necessary to add another mathematical equation if we can meet the targets in the municipality with the prime and base areas.

Ken Belliveau asked about conservation areas, and specifically the Lake Iroquois multi-jurisdictional area. This should be considered a conserved area and not available for wind and solar generation. There was also a suggestion to adjust the color of the three phase power so they don’t match water and roads. Staff will make that edit.

Chris Shaw asked how renewable hydro power will be accounted for. Melanie Needle stated that it is included in the LEAP analysis – the scenario assumes a potential of additional energy from existing dams, but no new dams.

Ken Belliveau asked which constraint caused the removal of the airport from a possible solar generation area? It seems like it could be a good place to generate, and a logical place. Staff will look into that.

Andrea Morgante asked how parking lots are addressed. Melanie Needle explained that the maps are land based and don’t adequately address the built environment on their own. We do have a roof top solar factor that we are going to apply as another pathway to reaching the targets.
A review of the wind maps was tabled.

Emily Nosse-Leirer provided an overview of the ECOS Plan text, and noted that this draft text has not yet been reviewed by the Energy sub-committee. Emily Nosse-Leirer focused the LRPC on the yellow highlighted areas, where Staff could use some feedback:

The LEAP scenario model shows natural gas going to almost zero in order to meet the 90x2050 renewal energy target. That scenario is unrealistic for a variety of reasons so we’ve suggested some text to try to address this. Ken Belliveau stated that we may actually see propane and oil customers switch to natural gas so we should show the accounting of that. Also, even if you are using natural gas it doesn’t mean that you can’t use less. Chris Shaw suggested that we focus more on efficiency than a full switch. Melanie Needle added that the model does already account for efficiencies, and that it is an aspirational goal. Jim Donovan suggested that we articulate clearly what the LEAP model actually is. It is one example of how we may reach the State goals. We need to be clear about describing it in this way so this VT Gas statement isn’t completely counter to the goal. Ken Belliveau asked if we’ve included other sources like sewer plant electricity generation. Will municipalities receive credit for these? Melanie stated these credits will be used to help each municipality meet their target. Ken Belliveau asked if Williston can get 1/3 of the Essex plant credit? Melanie Needle stated that so far the credit goes to the location in which it is generated. Emily Nosse-Leirer added that VT Gas has plans to add renewal natural gas to their portfolio; while this is a very small percentage we should still point that out.

The LRPC discussed that as currently drafted it is a big comma but. It needs to either be aspirational or a goal that we aren’t going to meet. Andrea Morgante added that this is a State issue, so what can we say? We are powerless. Alex Weinhagen suggested that we be much more proactive and go above and beyond on the transportation side? We have a responsibility to switch over to electric vehicles to reduce the dependence on gasoline in the transportation sector. There was a good amount of discussion about that. It would be good for this plan to be clear that we are more suited to switch to electric vehicles than other regions of the State due to our more clustered land use pattern and density. Perhaps our approach should be more holistic than whether or not we can reach each State energy goal independently.

Emily Nosse-Leirer quickly reviewed the other yellow highlighted sections with the LRPC – the energy actions under the Strategy 2 goal, and the use of the word “shall”. We will discuss these in further detail at the next meeting.

4. Transportation
Jason Charest provided an overview of the transportation model. There were some questions about how the model determines mode choice for the trips. Justin Rabidoux provided an example of a neighborhood that is adjacent to transit, but still an hour long bus trip. The model determines mode shift based on location but existing data, so it won’t assume more transit users than exist now (unless we adjust that as a scenario).

We will be asking municipalities to help allocate the households and employment to the TAZ level out to 2030. The TAZs are based on Census blocks. Those have changed quite a bit and there are now ~550 TAZs (we used to have ~300).

The model assumes households produce trips; and employment attracts trips. The model marries these two. Chittenden County is a net importer of productions because many folks commute in for work. There are three trip types: home based work; home based other; and non home based. The model makes sure the trips are properly distributed throughout the system. From there it distributes based on mode choice, and assigns the route (shifts based on congestion). Model outputs: are VMT, network capacity (volume to capacity), delay, travel times, land use (for the growth from 2030 to 2050, b/c we’ll be using the municipal input up to 2030).
Alex Weinhagen asked if the output is what we think is going to happen, rather than what we want to happen? The base model will tell us what we think is going to happen. But we can influence it through the scenario exercise.

Peter Keating described the proposed scenario options: base, all in on technology, all in on TDM/energy, capacity expansion, and we anticipate a final scenario that is likely a hybrid. Alex Weinhagen questioned the change in land use to 90% for only one scenario. He thinks that will muddle the results of the other inputs in that scenario. Alex Weinhagen also asked why we would run a capacity expansion when we aren’t going to do that? Justin Rabidoux stated that it makes sense to have a counter balance and it helps to show why you can’t do it. Staff stated that we will consider cost in the output; so it would be clear that we can’t do all the expansion projects. Alex Weinhagen added that at the very least we should be realistic. Ken Belliveau asked if we would include Exit 12B? Staff indicated that we don’t yet know what the specific projects will be. We’ll come back to you with the specifics for feedback.

Heather Danis asked if there are ways to consider health impacts for each of these scenarios? We could look at greenhouse gas emissions (with another model and we’d need to figure out if Staff or RSG has the capacity) and number of walk/bike trips. But we are limited with our current tools to do any more than that. Perhaps there are other tools out there that could use the transportation model outputs and translate them to reduced numbers in diabetes, heart disease, etc. Perhaps a health index exists already? Heather Danis will talk with their data analyst.

Andrea Morgante asked if either of the scenarios will consider a mode shift based on our expected shift in elderly demographics? Reduction of 2 cars to 1, reduction of VMT? Staff will think about this further, but the actual demographic shift is reflected in the population forecast and number of households.

We have a late May deadline to decide on the scenarios.

5. Comprehensive Economic Development Project List

Regina Mahony explained that the CEDS project list in the packet included comments received from the Committee via email. With an additional edit from Chris Shaw to leave in the South Burlington’s City Center parking garage. Regina Mahony explained that there was consensus on most of the comments except for Champlain Water District (CWD) and Chittenden Solid Waste District (CSWD). Jim Donovan noted that CSWD’s last three projects seem the most relevant, while the top two seem more local. The LRPC suggested Staff get in touch with CSWD to see what their big projects are now, as this list is old. They’ve got a lot of big new responsibilities, compost especially. Also the UVM Medical Center inpatient is already under construction. There was a question about whether CWD needs more funding for these projects. Justin Rabidoux explained that they are in their capital plan with proposed future revenues but the money doesn’t necessarily exist. The LRPC decided that we should include CWD projects that are more expansion based and less maintenance. Regina Mahony will follow-up with these partners.

6. Next Meeting

May 11, 2017 from 8:30am to 10:00am.

10. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 10:05 a.m.

Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony
PHOTOCOPY PROHIBITED

CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE - MINUTES

DATE: Tuesday, May 2, 2017
TIME: 9:00 a.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Office, 110 West Canal St. Winooski, VT

Members Present
Matt Langham, VTrans
Dean Bloch, Charlotte
Dennis Lutz, Essex
Bob Henneberger, Seniors
Chris Jolly, FHWA
Brendan Atwood, CATMA
Bruce Hoar, Williston
Nicole Losch, Burlington
Katelin Brewer-Colie, Local Motion
Barbara Elliot, Huntington
Brian Bigelow, Underhill
Ashley Bishop, VTrans District 5

Staff Present
Dick Hosking, VTrans District 5
Amy Bell, VTrans
Robin Pierce, Essex Junction
Mary Anne Michaels, Rail
Eleni Churchill, Transportation Program Manager
Christine Forde, Senior Transportation Planner
Charlie Baker, Executive Director
Jason Charest, Senior Transportation Planning Engineer
Marshall Distel, Transportation Planner
Peter Keating, Senior Transportation Planner
Chris Dubin, Transportation Planner

Peter Keating called the meeting to order at 9:00 AM and asked for a round of introductions.

1. Consent Agenda
No items this month.

2. Approval of Minutes
The April 4th minutes were approved without changes.

3. Public Comments
There were none.

4. UPWP Update and Action
Marshall provided a brief description of the work program development process noting that the number of project requests was down from last year. This allowed the CCRPC to accommodate nearly all the work asked for. Marshall also reported that the CCRPC Board had warned a public hearing on the UPWP for their May 17th meeting. ROBIN PIERCE MADE A MOTION THE TAC RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE UPWP TO THE CCRPC BOARD. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY BRIAN BIGELOW AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

5. I-89 Exit 14 Bike Red Crossing Study
Christine began by noting that this was the type of project staff felt would be of interest to the TAC as most are familiar with this area. If there are other similar projects members would like to hear more about, please let staff know. Christine then went through a consultant’s presentation first given at a public meeting on April 14th. The presentation offered a number of options to get across the Exit 14 area essentially on a path parallel to Williston Road. Some alternatives featured separate bridges at various distances from the existing bridge on both the north and south sides and another down the center of the bridge. A gondola alternative as well as a circular design were also suggested. Based on the project’s Purpose and Need Statement, four alternatives were recommended for further analysis. The TAC discussion that followed Christine’s presentation included the following:

- The center bike lanes were supported by several members despite the determination that it didn’t meet the Purpose and Need.
• Would the circle idea work better as an oval?
• Will short term ideas flow through to long term alternatives?
• Consider covering a center lane path alternative for additional safety/protection
• Consider how to deal with the traffic impacts of any of these alternatives.

The following are the remaining steps to project completion:
• Review feedback
• Meet with VTrans
• Prepare draft recommendations
• Develop concept plan
• Finalize recommendations
• Present to City Council
• Begin preliminary design and engineering

The project is scheduled to wrapped up in June.

6. Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Update
Peter reported that we are still in discussion with VTrans on how to determine our fiscal constraint levels for the MTP. He also noted that the financial determination is critical to identifying what projects can be expected to get done. The projects are part of a list compiled from the last MTP along with corridor and other studies that have been completed since the last MTP. Each project on that list has a cost with it and that cost information is also being updated. Regarding the long-range planning scenarios discussed at last month’s meeting, we are writing a scope of work to have RSG help define the model parameters and run the analysis of the scenarios. Next steps in the MTP process include drafting the existing conditions report and completing a financial plan. At the next TAC meeting we will plan to review the existing conditions work.

7. VTrans Bike Ped Program
Peter noted that this year’s program was recently announced and that all TAC members should’ve received notice. Peter mentioned that a new element in the process is to not only include a letter of support from the RPC, but to also have the RPC review the application for completeness, before submitting to VTrans. Allowing enough time for this step is something applicants should be attentive to. Applications are due mid-July.

8. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports
Peter referred members to the project list on the back of the agenda. Christine handed out a draft of the proposed FY2018-2021 TIP projects for the various communities in attendance. The version is a mark-up of the current TIP to make clear the changes under consideration. Christine explained that this document is being provided so towns can see what is being recommended in their respective communities and ask questions or make comments on schedules or costs. Any changes to the project information should be sent to Christine. This is preliminary work in finalizing the FY18 TIP.

9. CCRPC April Board Meeting Report
Peter mentioned the Board approved the Active Transportation Plan and project prioritization that the TAC has considered last month.

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

11. MGRP Road Erosion Inventory Results, Analysis, and Prioritization
Chris Dubin began by going over the timeline for this project:
1. Design and build data shell (based on MRGP Inventory form)
2. Build data collection App
May 2, 2017

3. Complete field work
4. QA/QC
5. Draft DEC MRGP standards compliance (Fully Meets/Partially Meets/Does Not Meet)
6. Draft DEC MRGP Prioritization (Low/Medium/High/Very High)
7. CCRPC Scoring design (Fitzgerald Environmental Associates (FEA) Scoring Design)
8. FEA Scoring application

He then went into detail on steps 1 through 6 leaving the last 2 items for Evan Fitzgerald. Chris described the work done in the 5 eastern Chittenden County Towns that represented over 92 miles of roadways and 1,526 segments. He also demonstrated how segment compliance was determined using DEC’s MRGP standards and then went through a series of charts illustrating segment evaluation totals, standards by road surface type, and the mileage of roads not meeting DEC MGRP standards. The next steps include finishing the other 11 Chittenden County Communities which contain 3,019 segments and 183 miles. It was pointed out that the evaluations can show significant differences depending on how soon after maintenance work has taken place, the evaluations occur.

Evan Fitzgerald then went over his consultant tasks and where in the process they currently stood.

(Prioritization methodology):
1. Review and QA/QC Road Erosion Inventory Data
2. Town Maps and Meetings with Road Foremen
3. Draft Prioritization Method
4. Field Assessment & Method Calibration
5. Finalize Prioritization Method
6. Select Sites for Conceptual Designs
7. Final Report

He then described the difference between sediment source and transport and how the two are factored into determining the potential for water quality impacts and illustrated the different scores across road surface type – paved, gravel, class 4. He also addressed the difference in slope calculations between LIDAR and ANR.

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted, Peter Keating
I. Welcome: Annie Costandi called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

2. Review and action on draft minutes of April 4, 2017 (Action):
   After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, corrections were suggested as follows: page 1, line #39, correct spelling of Keurig, page 2, line #44, correct to read “should be adding what…” Sherrard made a motion, seconded by DiPietro to approve the April 4, 2017 minutes as corrected. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.

3. Tactical Basins Plans: Project Prioritization Process
   Neil Kamman of DEC briefed the Committee. Darlene first asked about how uses are addressed in the plans. Neil noted that Chapter 4 addresses Designated Uses and Classification of Water Bodies with an overall theme of “protect the best, restore the rest.” Dan noted that due to a compressed schedule the Lamoille TBP only provided generalized recommendations and that in terms of CCRPC input, again due to the compressed schedule, that input was only able to make a general recommendation that projects with efficient Phosphorus removal coupled with strong co-benefits such as hazard mitigation should receive priority. James felt that projects that are required by permits such as Flow Restoration Plans, Phosphorus Control Plans and Municipal Roads General Permits should get priority.
   Neil outlined how TBPs are structured. A discussion of the Lake Champlain TMDL sets the stage while other sections address what is known. Using the new maps generated by the Clean Water Roadmap, DEC and the public can see the relative impacts of each sector (ag, developed lands, roads, etc.) contribute to phosphorus within a catchment area, i.e. what are the stressors in a given area. Through the accompanying Watershed Projects Database, we can list all of the projects in a given watershed that have been completed or are identified or fully scoped and ready to go.

4. Watershed Projects Database: input of municipal projects
   Albrecht noted that DEC had recently trained RPC staff on how to populate the database so that municipal efforts can be captured. Albrecht expressed concerns about RPC staff time getting bogged down into “scoring” the hundreds of projects identified in a Basin. Charles noted the need for that Plan to clearly state the top projects in a Basin on the basis of DEC prioritization process supplemented by the
recommendations of the RPCs and municipalities. Neil noted the concerns and indicated they would definitely be looking to generate a short list of “ready to go” projects. With regards to projects related to road erosion, initially projects related to MRGP implementation will not be included in the Watershed Projects Database (for example, we don’t want to be tracking each 100-meter road segment) but Emily Bird at DEC will work to build a bridge between the WPD and the regulatory database so that the WPD can capture the benefits of MRGP-related projects. Deb expressed concerns that projects in small towns such as Bolton won’t be addressed. Neil noted that the Plans capture needed projects noting the example of Texas Hill in Huntington. With regards to Flow Restoration Plans required for MS4 communities DEC has already worked with them to generate a list of implementation-ready projects. Daryl asked how DEC measures project efficacy. Neil noted that the Database will only use modelled estimates for now.

Neil continued noting the overall DEC scoring rubric of: #1 – how well does a project address the Stressor (e.g. Phosphorus Removal, Sedimentation, etc.); #2-Readiness, is the municipality in favor of it and #3) Computed P-removal efficiency and cost. After this DEC process, RPCs will then work with the municipalities to put forth its recommendations for priorities. Albrecht then noted that all of the RPCs are working to develop a standardized set of criteria for each RPC to use to prioritize. These criteria are different than those used by DEC and are looking to assess the relative co-benefits of a project such as Hazard Mitigation; Transportation Infrastructure; Social-Cultural Importance; Economic Importance; Community Support, etc. Neil noted that the Plan going forward –modelled somewhat on VTRANS’s transportation project scoring carried out via its Transportation Planning Initiative process with RPCs---- will be to have DEC’s scores count for 70% and RPC-recommendations count for 30%.

5. Upcoming Funding Opportunities
   a. Ecosystem Restoration Program
   b. VTRANS: Transportation Alternatives
   c. CCRPC, FY18, UPWP: Conceptual Design Assistance

Albrecht distributed a handout (see meeting link above) with information on each of these three items. With regards to the CCRPC funds, the RPC plans to issue an RFQ to develop a consultant pool to assist towns with developing conceptual designs and cost estimates for projects to comply with the pending Municipal Roads General Permit.

6. Items for June meeting agenda
   t.b.d.

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

Respectfully submitted, Dan Albrecht
I. Welcome: Chelsea Mandigo called the meeting to order at 12:30 p.m.

2. Review and action on draft minutes of April 4, 2017:
   After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht and correction made to note that Chelsea, not Annie, chaired the meeting,
   Tom made a motion, seconded by James to approve the March 8, 2017 minutes as corrected. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.

3. Consider authorization of CCRPC to apply for grant for “Developing Cumulative Nutrient and Sediment Load Reduction Estimates for Municipal Street Cleaning and other Municipal Street Storm Water Control Measures (SCMs)
   Jim Pease briefed the Committee on the essentials of the planned proposal which are summarized in the materials posted on the website. The CCRPC would be the fiscal agent with USGS doing most of the actual work. The study would prove useful for municipalities who want assess the efficacy of high-efficiency sweepers, more frequent street cleanings and leaf management programs. Tom noted that the City of South Burlington is happy to participate but he’ll have to see the results first before deciding whether to invest more dollars in hopes of receiving an adequate pollutant removal credit from DEC. Tom made a motion, seconded by Chris to authorize CCRPC to apply for the grant. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.

8. Consider authorization of CCRPC to extend Minimum Measure #2 services contract with Winooski NRCD for 1-year through June 30th, 2018
   Albrecht noted that the current CCRPC contract with WNRCRCD expires June 30, 2017. NRCD’s services were originally secured starting in July 2011 when the CCRPC first put out an RFP for “Stream Team” services. The contract previously extended. Given that we are in the midst of the transition to Rethink Runoff, a new RPF would be inappropriate at this time. However, in keeping with its policies, CCRPC plans to issue another RFP in the spring of 2018 but until that time we need to secure Winooski NRCD’s services for another year. Chris made a motion, seconded by James to authorize CCRPC to extend its contract with Winooski NRCD for one year. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.

9. Items for June 6th meeting agenda
   -Rethink Runoff: review spring campaign results; approve budget for Tally Ho Design.

Adjournment
   The meeting adjourned at 12:48 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Dan Albrecht
Date: Wednesday, May 2, 2017
Time: 5:00 p.m.
Place: CCRPC offices; 110 W. Canal Street; Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404

Members present: Andy Montroll (Chair), Jeff Carr, Catherine McMains. Charlie Baker, staff

1. Committee Chair, Andy Montroll opened the meeting at 5:02 pm.

2. Andy provided a summary of his efforts to solicit Executive Committee appointments. Jeff Carr motioned to recommend the slate of officers to the Board for FY 2018 as Chair – Chris Roy; Vice-Chair – Mike O’Brien; Treasurer – Brian Bigelow; Large Town – John Zicconi; Small Town – Barbara Elliott; Past Chair – Andy Montroll. Catherine McMains seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

3. Jeff Carr motioned to adjourn. Catherine McMains seconded. Meeting was adjourned at 5:04 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Charlie Baker
May 2, 2017
The meeting was called to order at 5:47 p.m. by the Chair, Chris Roy.

1. Changes to the Agenda; Members’ Items: There were none.

2. Approval of April 5, 2017 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O’BRIEN, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF APRIL 5TH AS AMENDED.

Barbara noted corrections on page 1, line 33 to add “…more than enough…”; page 2, line 2, change “discussion” to “discuss.”; and page 2, line 9, change “authorizes” to “authorize”. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. Act 250 & Sec. 248 Applications. VTrans Park & Ride, Colchester #4CO471-8. Eleni said this is for the Exit 16 park and ride lot and we’re asking the Executive Committee to approve the letter. It’s on the former Charlebois truck lot on Route 7. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO AUTHORIZE THE LETTER BE SENT TO THE D.E.C. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. FY18 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) and Budget Recommendations. Charlie noted the UPWP document/tasks are the same as what you saw at the April board meeting. The budget changed slightly as there are a few more yellow highlighted items on the income side. There is talk that the Opioid work might be moved from CCRPC to another entity. Since the inception of this effort, there has been an opportunity to better unify the City of Burlington’s and the Opioid Alliance’s work. We are talking about getting a unified effort by merging these two groups. The Regional Prevention Partnership also has the potential to increase revenue in FY18. On the expense side, there are no changes other than removing reference to a sound system. We had updated the estimated income for FY17 since at the end of February we are $63,770 to the good. Eleni noted that we need to add TPI guidance task descriptions and deliverables for the UPWP. She should get those tomorrow. Charlie noted that we have not finalized the ACCD task work scope and hopes we’ll have those before the May board meeting. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION THAT WE RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE UPWP AND BUDGET TO THE BOARD WITH THOSE CHANGES. BARBARA ELLIOTT SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. Public Participation Plan Amendments recommendation. Charlie noted that the main change is to reduce the public hearing warning period for various documents from 30 days to 15 days. John Zicconi is concerned about reducing the time too much if we’re trying to get public input. Charlie
said the main reason was that there isn’t 30 days from one meeting to the next. After a brief discussion, it was agreed to change the warning period to 25 days. In section 8. Evaluating the PPP, in the second line, we will change “involving” to “involve”. Under Organizational Techniques, Legal ads we will add the word “otherwise” to say, “unless otherwise required by law” under both Performance Measures and Evaluation Criteria. We will add the Clean Water Advisory Committee (CWAC) to the Open Meetings table since it is now a standing committee. Under Section 4, ECOS principle #6, third line, we will make “organization” plural. JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BARBARA ELLIOTT, TO APPROVE CHANGES TO THE PPP AS DISCUSSED AND RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE BOARD. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

6. **Stormwater Program Agreement.** Charlie noted that last spring we looked at this and the MS4 committee worked on this over the winter. We sent it out again a couple of months ago and this version is what has been sent to the towns for execution. This is our first municipal services agreement since the legislation passed last year; and we updated the bylaws to allow them. This is the same format that we had used for RSEP and Stream Team agreements, but have merged the two at the request of the MS4 communities. ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE STORMWATER PROGRAM AGREEMENT TO THE FULL BOARD WITH ANY MINOR EDITS. JOHN ZICCONI SECONDED. Mike O’Brien wondered if we should hold off approving this until the communities have approved it. Andy Montroll said if we’re satisfied with it we can approve it and if the communities have changes we can deal with those then. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

7. **Lake Champlain Byway Chittenden County Corridor Management Plan.** John Zicconi is abstaining from any discussion or vote on this plan as the T. Board regulates byways. Charlie noted that Dan reviewed this at the Board meeting and there have been no changes. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BRIAN BIGELOW, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THIS PLAN TO THE FULL BOARD. MOTION CARRIED WITH JOHN ZICCONI ABSTAINING.

8. **Report on Nominations for FY18 officers.** Andy Montroll reported that the Board Development Committee met last evening via teleconference. Since all current EC members agreed to continue to serve, it was a simple task. He did not hear from other board members wishing to serve. The Board Development Committee is recommending the FY18 slate of officers be the same as FY17.

9. **Chair/Executive Director’s report.**
   a. **Regional Dispatch Update.** Charlie has visited every community except St. George to update them on the regional dispatch effort. He will visit with St. George later in May. There are a lot of details to be worked out and work continues. Chris Roy asked what kind of push back we are getting from non-dispatch duties that are being handled by dispatchers. Charlie said town managers have asked police chiefs to put together a list of the activities dispatchers perform other than dispatching; and how much could be done remotely. This is a big issue. Another issue is the technology because everyone uses different systems and equipment; and those are big money items. When John asked if we can realistically get this done in time for budget votes in March 2018, Charlie said we’re still aiming for that. When asked if some municipalities vote yes and others no, what happens. Charlie said if the yes votes include at least Burlington and Shelburne that the effort would probably be able to move forward. Those voting no would continue as is. Discussion continued.
b. **Water Quality Implementation Role.** Charlie said this is still under discussion in the legislature and after they adjourn we can work with Department of Environmental Conservation to see what they really want us to do. We hope this will be advantageous to the towns to be able to build the water quality projects with funds funneled through the RPCs.

c. **Annual Meeting.** Will be held on Wednesday, June 21st at the Catamount Country Club in Williston. Charlie said we may be sending out a note after the May meeting to see if members are interested in golfing before the meeting.

d. **VTrans prioritization.** Charlie and Eleni attended a meeting today where VTrans is working on ways to prioritize projects. He was encouraged to hear that they want to make it a more transparent process. VTrans was concerned about the lack of transparency as to how the list was developed and are striving to change that. Discussion continued. Eleni noted that VTrans is looking at criteria for health, economic development and resiliency. Charlie said we’ll hear more about this in the fall and as we’re updating our MTP we hope we can use the new criteria.

10. **Agenda Review.** Members reviewed the agenda. It was agreed to call the Energy Plan item – the Preliminary first draft Energy Element of ECOS Plan review, since this is needed to go to state by end of May, but we still have a lot of work to do. Charlie noted some RPCs are sending their staff draft, but Charlie feels more comfortable getting input from the board before we send our draft. Discussion ensued about the Opioid Alliance update. Charlie noted the leadership has changed – Martha Maksym left United Way and works for the state. Harry Chen no longer works for the state so the chairs are changing. Charlie suggested they look at this again to reassess and see how this should be managed. The Alliance will decide whether to stay with us or move to the City of Burlington, United Way, or some other solution.

11. **Other business.** Charlie said the Board Development Committee suggested that we have some board training beginning in July at the beginning of the new fiscal year. Rather than spreading it out over 6-8 meetings, that we do a general overview at one time. We could meet at 5:15 for an hour or so before the meeting and invite alternates as well. We could then have dinner before the meeting. It was suggested that we compile a one-year schedule showing our life cycle of when different action happen during the year.

12. **Executive Session.** None needed.

13. **Adjournment.** MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BARBARA ELLIOTT, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 6:40 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc
May 4, 2017

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

RE: VTrans Park and Ride; Colchester; Application #4C0471-8

Dear Mr. Keibel:

The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission’s Staff and Executive Committee have reviewed this Act 250 application for a Project described as the conversion of an existing parking lot to a Park and Ride on Route 7, directly west of the intersection with Hercules Drive. While all criteria will be evaluated, we understand that the hearing will focus on Criterion 4 (Soil Erosion and Drainage) and Criterion 5 (Transportation). This project has been approved by the Colchester 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 as an area where local zoning accommodates a compact development pattern that supports transit service. The establishment of a Park and Ride in this location supports transit service.
2. This use is 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). Criterion 9(L) is intended to prevent strip development. Because this project is not a commercial development, and because it is limited to the improvement of an existing parking lot rather than new construction, it does not contribute to strip development. Further, Park and Rides increase use of public transportation, thus minimizing sprawl and supporting Vermont’s historic settlement patterns.

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. **This project is included in CCRPC’s Transportation Improvement Program for Fiscal Years 2017-2020. We have no comments about traffic impacts at this time.**

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