

1 CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
2 REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
3 DRAFT
4

5 Date: Wednesday, April 19, 2017

6 Time: 6:00 p.m.

7 Place: CCRPC offices; 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404

8 Present: Bolton: Absent Buel's Gore: Absent
9 Burlington: Andy Montroll Charlotte: Jim Donovan
10 Colchester: Marc Landry Essex: Jeff Carr
11 Essex Junction: Dan Kerin Hinesburg: Andrea Morgante
12 Huntington: Barbara Elliott Jericho: Catherine McMains
13 Milton: Absent Richmond: Bard Hill
14 St. George: Absent Shelburne: John Zicconi
15 So. Burlington: Chris Shaw Underhill: Brian Bigelow
16 Westford: Dave Tilton Williston: Chris Roy
17 Winooski: Mike O'Brien VTrans: Matthew Langham
18 Socio/Econ/Housing: Justin Dextradeur Cons/Env: Absent

19 Bus/Industry: Absent

20 Ex-Officio: FHWA: Absent GMT: Mark Sousa, Gen. Manager

21 FTA: Absent

22 Staff: Charlie Baker, Executive Director Dan Albrecht, Senior Planner
23 Eleni Churchill, Trans. Program Manager Forest Cohen, Business Manager
24 Bernie Ferenc, Trans. Business Manager Christine Forde, Sr. Trans. Planner
25 Regina Mahony, Planning Program Mgr.
26

- 27 1. Call to order; changes to the agenda. The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by the chair, Chris
28 Roy. There were no changes to the agenda.
29
- 30 2. Public Comment Period on items not on the agenda. There were no members of the public present.
31
- 32 3. Action on the Consent Agenda. There were minor TIP amendments: add construction funds for
33 Pearl Street Improvements in Essex Junction; add 2017 Transportation Alternatives Program awards;
34 add funds for design and construction of I89 U-Turn Widening in Milton; and, Better Roads Category
35 A awards. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MARC LANDRY, TO APPROVE THE CONSENT
36 AGENDA. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
37
- 38 4. Approval of March 22, 2017 CCRPC meeting minutes. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY
39 JIM DONOVAN, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MARCH 22, 2017 WITH CORRECTIONS, IF ANY. It was
40 noted that on page 7 in the motion to adjourn that we correct the spelling of "meeting." MOTION
41 CARRIED WITH CATHERINE MCMAINS ABSTAINING.
42
- 43 5. Approval of Bylaw Amendments. Charlie distributed a revised version of the Bylaws because he
44 missed an edit from the Executive Committee. There are three kinds of edits to the bylaws. The
45 first relate to the municipal services agreements. The second is adding the Clean Water Advisory
46 Committee (CWAC) as a standing committee. The third type are other minor changes, such as:
47

- 1 a. changing term of office to “four” years in any one office, instead of “two” and
 - 2 b. adding “dba Green Mountain Transit” after CCTA to the board membership.
- 3 The draft Bylaws were sent to municipalities on January 19th. This version includes clarifying changes to
4 address questions raised by Milton and the Executive Committee. These include:
- 5 a. On page 10, clarifying that the municipal agreements discussed here are “with the CCRPC”
6 and not between municipalities.
 - 7 b. Page 11, line 29 – change from ...with other governmental organizations or non-profit
8 entities... to “with other entities and governmental organizations.”
 - 9 c. Page 11, line 36, change board members are “encouraged” to participate... to “expected”.
10 Chris Shaw wondered if “required” is too strong. Members didn’t see how we could require
11 someone to participate in a committee.
 - 12 d. Page 16, under CWAC, line 46, remove “up to 24” members and representatives of
13 organizations, but then add a new bullet saying: “Other voting or non-voting members as
14 may be determined appropriate by the CCRPC after a recommendation by the CWAC.”
 - 15 e. Page 17, item 1.c. reword to say: “coordinating assistance to municipalities considering
16 (~~planning and adoption or implementation of~~) municipal development regulations to better
17 meet State water quality policies and investment priorities, at the option of the
18 municipality;”

19 When asked about quorums for voting on the committees, Charlie noted that a simple majority of
20 the committee membership constitutes a quorum. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION,
21 SECONDED BY JEFF CARR, TO ADOPT THE BYLAWS AS AMENDED. MOTION CARRIED
22 UNANIMOUSLY.
23

- 24 6. Transportation Capital Program Project Prioritization (MPO Business). Christine Forde presented
25 project prioritization. She noted we do this because the Vermont legislature required VTrans to
26 prioritize projects and VTrans and the legislature requires RPCs to have input. VTrans scores are
27 80% of the total and RPC scores are 20%. There is specific language from the legislature about how
28 the RPCs should review this because they have better local knowledge of projects. There is a
29 process going on right now to review this whole process at the state as well as regional levels. The
30 list of projects comes from VTrans Capital Program. We approve the TIP (Transportation
31 Improvement Program) which is a federally required document for planning purposes. The Capital
32 Program Project Categories:

33 **Front of the Book –**

- 34 • Preliminary plan development completed
- 35 • Expected to have construction spending during the budget year and/or the following
36 three years

37 **Development & Evaluation –**

- 38 • Preliminary plans within 12 to 24 months
- 39 • Preliminary engineering and/or right-of-way spending expected in the budget year.

40 **Candidate –**

- 41 • Scoping likely not initiated
- 42 • No significant spending expected during the budget year
- 43 • Construction year unknown

44 Christine then reviewed the VTrans program categories: roadway; safety & traffic operations;
45 paving; park and ride facilities; state highway bridge; town highway bridge & town highway bridge
46 pre-candidate. The prioritization methodology overview includes: physical condition of the asset;
47 cost per user of improvement; project momentum; and regional priority. Christine then described
48 CCRPC’s scoring categories and explained how projects get points including: economic vitality;

1 safety & security; accessibility, mobility & connectivity; environment, energy and quality of life;
2 preservation of existing system; and efficient system management. Our score is added to VTrans
3 score, which is more quantitative, and the total is the rank that goes to the legislature. The list
4 this year is very similar to last year's. The board is being asked to approve the 2019 project
5 ranking and submit them to VTrans. Marc Landry suggested the US 2 bridge on I89 should say Exit
6 17. Andrea Morgante suggested each project should list the municipality it's in. When asked if
7 this ranking is done statewide or regionally, Matthew Langham said it is statewide. Justin
8 Dextrateur questioned the Harbor Road in Shelburne and noted it didn't make it in. Christine said
9 it's not in the Capital Program, but because of the strong support, it'll probably move forward.
10 JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO FORWARD THE LIST TO VTRANS
11 WITH THE COUPLE OF EDITORIAL CHANGES. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
12

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

45 The TAC took a couple of months to review it and did approve it two weeks ago. We are now
46 asking for board approval. Ultimately this will be a part of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan
47 (MTP). Peter feels we had a very strong public process. Jim Donovan wants to be sure that the
48 four E's are included in this plan (as they were in the last.). He also suggested that we use local

1 photographs rather than generic. Peter noted that the consultant is finalizing the layout of the plan
2 and are trying to do just that. Jim noted that Peter was very responsive working with Charlotte and
3 incorporating their comments. Jeff Carr asked how distracted driving figures into our planning.
4 Peter said it is not addressed in this plan. Jim Donovan said it's somewhat addressed in that you
5 encourage separation of bike lanes from roadways. Justin Dextrateur noted that the online
6 mapping generated a lot of data and asked if we can continue to use that tool for other efforts.
7 Peter thinks that's a good idea. JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY DAN KERIN, TO
8 APPROVE THE CHITTENDEN COUNTY ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN. MOTION CARRIED
9 UNANIMOUSLY.

10

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

25

26 9. Lake Champlain Byway Chittenden County Corridor Management Plan Update. John Zicconi will
27 recuse himself as the Transportation Board regulates byways. He left the meeting at 6:58 p.m. Dan
28 Albrecht gave an update on the project giving background, and why we're updating this plan. It's a
29 state designated byway since 2002 with 22 communities (8 in Chittenden County). State byways are
30 based on the federal scenic byways program. He reviewed the Chittenden County Corridor. Since
31 designating the byway they have focused on management and projects. Purpose of the corridor
32 plan is the protection of intrinsic qualities and character. He reviewed the objective of the 2002
33 corridor management plan. Promoting attractions that might not get noticed. Why update it?

34

- 35 a. State byways program requires it;
- 36 b. The plan roads will be updated to reflect the current state of the intrinsic resources;
- 37 c. The byways must take account of the elimination of federal NSB grant opportunities and
38 program support that started in FFY13; and
- 39 d. A new Corridor Management Plan needs to incorporate what the Byway and its supporting
40 organizations have learned as they have implemented various projects and collaborated on to
41 "manage" the Byway over the last several years.

42

43 We're trying to show what's been done and lessons learned. We've developed and placed 40
44 interpretive panels, brochures, posters and story map website. He reviewed update objectives.
45 Key elements of the 2017 Plan include: Transportation improvements; Intrinsic resources and
46 partnerships; and, sustainable tourism and economic development. There is a Byway Council made
47 of 3 RPC's, 2 chambers, LCBP, LCB and five at-large members. He reviewed responsibilities: We
48 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:

48

- Page ii: Overall Byway Goals and Strategies

- 1 • Section 4.1. 2017 CMP Objectives
- 2 • 4.3. Organizations involved in management of the Byways' intrinsic resources.
- 3 • 4.4. Overall responsibility of organizations that coordinate and/or manage the Byway's
- 4 intrinsic resources.
- 5 • 4.4.1. Responsibilities of the Byway Council.
- 6 • 4.4.2. Responsibilities of the Chittenden County Corridor Planning and Implementation
- 7 Committee.
- 8 • 4.4.3. Responsibilities of the CCRPC.
- 9 • 4.4.4. Responsibilities of the municipalities.
- 10 • 4.4.5. Responsibilities of the non-profit and private sectors.

11 Dan then reviewed next steps and future. Jeff Carr asked if this is part of ACCD work. Charlie
12 said these are older Federal Highway grants through VTrans. It was noted that the Byway
13 website is down as it has been hacked, but when it was working well we were getting 4,000 hits a
14 month. The plan update is one of the last requirements of the federal grants to close them out.
15 Bard Hill suggested we include a little more about Lake Champlain's importance to the region
16 since that's why the scenic byway is there. This will be an action item on the May agenda.
17

18 10. FY18 Unified Planning Work Program & Budget. Charlie noted that this will be an action item next
19 month when we hold the public hearing. He reviewed the UPWP document tasks. We received 35
20 requests for projects. The cells shaded pink are changes since the last version and are still under
21 review as we get better budget numbers on specific projects; green shaded rows indicate new
22 projects; and, green text indicates updated descriptions or deliverables. We were able to
23 accommodate most projects that were eligible for federal transportation planning funds. A couple
24 were delayed to reconsider at the mid-year. Charlie asked members to let him know if they have
25 any questions. He then reviewed the budget. On the income side, the gray lines are
26 projects/grants that have been completed and won't have funding in FY18. The yellow highlighting
27 indicates pending grants that we're not sure of yet. We may know more by the May meeting. Line
28 51 - Water Quality Project Development & implementation Is funding that DEC may provide the
29 RPCs to help implement water quality projects. Line 52 - The last round of Better Roads grants for
30 the remaining Chittenden County municipalities is pending. On the expense side, lines 83 and 84
31 (Salaries and Benefits) are our major costs. On line 121 – surplus(deficit) – we're looking at a deficit
32 of \$125,340. This is directly related to our indirect rate. He directed members to the chart at the
33 bottom showing the approved indirect rates over the past 5-6 years and the audited income for
34 those same years. We have over collected in previous years so it'll cover this projected deficit in
35 FY18. Because the overhead rate is determined using audited numbers from two years prior, we'll
36 have some years with positive revenue and some negative. Chris Roy said we have talked about
37 getting our reserve funds up a little and with the regulations we really can't. He feels one thing that
38 might help is if we could cap the delta in the indirect rate in any given year or perhaps take two
39 years to pay back. The FY18 approved indirect rate is 67.42%. Charlie noted that we are going to
40 discuss a change in methodology with the VTrans chief auditor to mitigate these swings. Charlie
41 noted that ACCD grant is supplemented with local dues, and a couple grants do not allow us to
42 recover indirect costs. Jeff Carr noted it's not cheap to run this organization and we have strived to
43 have three months of costs in reserve, which we have not been able to achieve. As part of capital
44 planning, Charlie asked about whether we needed a sound system in the main conference room,
45 which we would add to the capital equipment purchase line. Members did not feel a need for it.
46
47

- 1 11. Chair/Executive Director's Report.
2 a. Board Development Committee to develop slate of officers for the May meeting. Andy Montroll
3 has already spoken with the current members of the Executive Committee. If anyone is
4 interested in serving on the EC, please let Andy or Charlie know.
5 b. Annual Meeting. The annual meeting will be held on Wednesday, June 21, 2017 at the
6 Catamount Country Club in Williston. Julie Moore, ANR Secretary will be the guest speaker.
7 c. MTP Update. The update process has gotten underway and this fall we will be looking at the list
8 of projects to include in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan.
9 d. Regional Dispatch Update. Data collection is ongoing to try to determine costs.
10 e. Executive Director's report. This was sent out earlier this week.
11
12 12. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports. Minutes of various committees were included in the
13 meeting packet.
14
15 13. Members' Items. There were none.
16
17 14. Adjournment. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JIM DONOVAN, TO ADJOURN THE
18 MEETING AT 7:45 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
19
20 Respectfully submitted,
21
22 Bernadette Ferenc