Prior to the board meeting, Charlie Baker held a training session beginning at 5:15 p.m. for any board members and alternates who wanted to get a basic look at what CCRPC is and does.

1. **Call to order; Changes to the Agenda.** The meeting was called to order at 6:20 p.m. by the chair, Chris Roy. There were no changes to the agenda. Chris had everyone introduce themselves since there were several new folks in attendance.

2. **Public Comment Period for Items not on the agenda.** There were none.

3. **Action on Consent Agenda.** There was a minor amendment to the TIP for an I-89 paving project from Colchester to Swanton. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA. SHARON MURRAY SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. **Approve Minutes of June 21, 2017 Annual Meeting.** CATHERINE MCMAINS MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CHRIS SHAW, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JUNE 21, 2017 AS PRESENTED. MOTION CARRIED WITH ABSENCIONS FROM JOHN ZICCONI, ANDREA MORGANTE, DAN KERIN, AND BRIAN BIGELOW.
5. **FY18-21 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) – MPO Business.**
   a. **Presentation & Public Hearing.** Christine gave a presentation explaining what the TIP is, why we need a TIP, how projects get on the TIP and the sections of the document and how to read it. She noted that the TIP is a fiscally constrained document which means these are projects we really believe will be funded in the year given. This authorizes the obligation of federal funds. When a project begins a phase such as design, ROW or construction the money for that phase is obligated at that point which ensures the funds will be there to complete that phase. Projects in the TIP (which is on the federal fiscal year – Oct 1- Sept 30) must be on the Vermont Capital Program (which is on the state fiscal year – July 1-June 30). The TIP lists federal funds only – not state or local dollars that might be part of the cost. The TIP funds for FY18 - $78.8 million; FY19 $48.8 million; FY20 - $53 million; and FY21 - $47.3 million. The TIP includes funding for Burlington International Airport, but those funds are not in our fiscal constraint. We do not have a set number of projects or dollars each fiscal year, because the amount is based on projects ready to go to that phase. She then broke down the TIP projects by use category. Christine then talked briefly about the Circ Alternative projects that were added a few years ago after the Circ itself was cancelled. Phase 1 and 2 of the Circ Alt projects are in the TIP, but Phase 3 projects will have to compete like other projects, but some are in design. This brought up concerns from Chris Roy since Williston had agreed to go along with this process. Discussion ensued.
   b. **Action on TIP.** JEFF BARTLEY MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE TIP AFTER THE WARNING PERIOD ENDS ON JULY 28TH AND HAVE THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE RATIFY IT AT THEIR MEETING ON AUGUST 2ND. MOTION WAS SECONDED BY DAN KERIN. John Zicconi brought up the category of “illustrative” projects which Christine didn’t talk about. Shelburne has a project on Bay Road that leads to the marina and Shelburne Farms and it has been Shelburne’s #1 project for a couple of years. The town had tried to fix it on their own to no avail. He asked that this be put on the TIP as Illustrative with no funding. After a lengthy discussion, it was agreed not to add this to the TIP at this late date as it could set a precedent which we’d rather not get into. Perhaps if they bring it up earlier in the process next year. Amy indicated that VTrans would have to rethink their action on the TIP if we put too many illustrative projects in it. She noted that in 17 years we have not added an illustrative project at this late date. MPO VOTE ON TIP AS PRESENTED:
      Bolton: Yes   Burlington: Yes (4)   Charlotte: absent
      Colchester: Yes (2)   Essex: Yes   Essex Jct: Yes
      Hinesburg: Yes   Huntington: Yes   Jericho: yes
      Milton: Yes   Richmond: Absent   St. George Absent
      Shelburne: Yes   So. Burlington: Yes (2)   Underhill: yes
      Westford: Absent   Williston: (Yes)   Winooski: Yes
      VTrans: Yes
      MOTION CARRIED WITH 20 OF 24 VOTES AND 14 OF 18 MUNICIPALITIES.
   c. **Certification of the Planning Process.** ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION TO AUTHORIZE THE CHAIR TO SIGN THE CERTIFICATION OF THE PLANNING PROCESS AND FORWARD IT TO THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION WITH THE ADOPTED FY18-21 TIP. MIKE O’BRIEN SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
5. **FY18 Schedule of Meetings.** As the cover memo indicated, the Vermont Open Meeting Law requires that public bodies clearly designate the time and place of all regular meetings. Staff is asking the Commission to approve the schedule of meetings. CATHERINE McMAINS MADE A MOTION,
SECONDED BY SHARON MURRAY TO APPROVE THEY FY18 MEETING SCHEDULE. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

7. Solicitation and Appointment of Members to serve on Committees. Each year board members are asked to serve on one or more standing committees. The bylaws were amended earlier this year to add that members are “expected” to serve on at least one standing committee. Chris reviewed the memo that lists the vacancies. The following volunteered to serve: Dan Kerin on Board Development Committee; Michael Bissonette, Jeff Bartley and Sharon Murray on UPWP Committee; and we hope Bard Hill will serve on Long Range Planning Committee. Chris Roy appointed those members and asked the Commission to vote their consensus of these appointments. DAN KERIN MADE A MOTION THAT WE PROVIDE CONSENSUS OF THESE APPOINTMENTS. JOHN ZICONI SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

8. Board and Staff Recognition. The meeting packet included several resolutions. The first is to thank Marc Landry for his 12 years on the CCMPO/CCRPC boards serving many of them on the Executive Committee. The next three resolutions are to honor the three staff members who are celebrating 10 years at CCRPC: Eleni Churchill, Bryan Davis and Jason Charest. There was recognition and applause for each of the honorees. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION TO AUTHORIZE THE CHAIR TO SIGN THESE RESOLUTIONS ON OUR BEHALF. BRIAN BIGELOW SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

9. Energy Plan Review. Chris Roy noted that there are a couple pieces to this – the first is state data for generating renewable energy and the second is to put together a regional energy plan to make that possible. This will help facilitate adopting municipal energy plans and allow RPC to weigh in on siting decisions at the Public Utilities Commission (formerly the Public Service Board). He feels most of our decision should be focused on broad policies as to what we as the RPC want our plan to say. Melanie provided some background information to help the Board weigh in on this question: Should the regional plan (ECOS Plan) prohibit development in state and local constraint areas or act in a more advisory role? Melanie then reviewed the renewable energy targets for the state and for Chittenden County and the acreage needed to achieve that target. Lengthy discussion ensued with the bottom line being that Chittenden County has more than enough acreage outside of natural resource constraints (“known constraints” as currently determined by Staff) to meet either high or low target. Melanie noted that we have received feedback from the Department of Public Service: clear standard is best for the Public Utilities Commission; outline specific areas in your map with supporting text to identify what is and what is not appropriate there; need to be equally restrictive with all types of development; general policy guidance is okay. So, if we’re saying NO to renewable generation, then we need to say NO to all development. Staff explained that these constraints are already in place at the municipal level; nothing is being imposed on a municipality. Discussion continued, and Sharon Murray added that in addition to known constraints you have to address suitability. Lengthy discussion continued about how restricted areas could be depicted on maps or with narrative. Several members expressed concern about restricting all development in known constraint areas. Staff spoke to the siting policy options for the Plan. Option C is the baseline; and the question is whether to add either Option A (shall) or Option B (should). Several members asked how this will be implemented in our Act 250/Section 248 review; and municipal plan approvals. Ultimately Chris Roy asked Staff to draft language associated with a combination of Option C and B, so that the Board has something more substantial to react and respond to in September. In doing so, consider the constraints, suitability and preferred sites; and the associated ramifications for CCRPC’s Act 250 and Section 248 reviews, and municipal plan approvals.
10. **CCRPC comments on State Treasurer’s Clean Water Report.** Charlie noted that comments are due to the state by August 2\textsuperscript{nd}. The Clean Water Advisory Committee (CWAC) talked about this and added some comments to the memo the board had approved previously. Don Meals is concerned that not all of the CWAC members have seen this version and asked that this be on their agenda for the August 1\textsuperscript{st} meeting. That way they entire committee can act on it and then the Executive Committee can take final action at their meeting on August 2\textsuperscript{nd}. It was noted that this is not the only time in the process that we will be asked for comments. After a brief discussion DON MEALS MADE A MOTION TO REFER THIS TO THE CWAC. SHARON MURRAY SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

11. **Chair/Executive Director’s Update.** There were none.

12. **Committee/liaison Activities and Reports.** As always, minutes of various committees were included in the meeting packet.

13. **Member’s Items, Other Business.** There were none.

14. **Adjournment.** CHRIS SHAW MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JOHN ZICCONI TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:35 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc