DATE: Wednesday, September 20, 2017
TIME: 6:00 p.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices; 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404
PRESENT:
- Bolton: Sharon Murray
- Buel's Gore: David Scherr
- Burlington: Andy Montroll
- Charlotte: Marty Illick (6:12 p.m.)
- Colchester: Jeff Bartley
- Essex: Jeff Carr
- Essex Jct: Dan Kerin (6:17)
- Hinesburg: Andrea Morgante (6:21)
- Huntington: Barbara Elliott
- Jericho: Catherine McMains
- Milton: Tony Micklus
- Richmond: Bard Hill (6:18)
- St. George: Absent
- Shelburne: John Zicconi
- So. Burlington: Chris Shaw
- Underhill: Brian Bigelow
- Westford: Absent
- Williston: Chris Roy
- Winooski: Mike O'Brien
- VTrans: Matthew Langham
- Business/Industry: Tim Baechle
- Socio/Econ/Housing: Justin Dextraeur
- Ex-Officio:
  - BIA: Absent
  - FHWA: Absent
- GMT: Absent
- Others: Scott Moody, CCTV cameraman
- Staff:
  - Charlie Baker, Executive Director
  - Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
  - Bryan Davis, Senior Transportation Planner
  - Christine Forde, Senior Trans. Planner
  - Peter Keating, Senior Transportation Planner
  - Melanie Needle, Senior Planner
  - Emily Nosse-Leirer, Planner

1. **Call to order; Changes to the Agenda.** The meeting was called to order at 6:05 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 Consent Agenda.** There were no consent agenda items.

4. **Approve Minutes of July 19, 2017 Board Meeting.** JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O'BRIEN, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JULY 19, 2017 WITH CORRECTIONS, IF ANY. Mike noted that Winooski was left off of the vote on the TIP. He also had some grammatical changes which he gave to Bernie. MOTION CARRIED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS CORRECTED. TONY MICKLUS ABSTAINED. Chris Roy introduced Tony who is the new representative from Milton.

5. **Approval of 2016 Williston Comprehensive Plan and Confirmation of Planning Process.** Emily Nosse-Leirer noted that the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) reviewed the Williston Plan on October 12, 2016 and held a duly warned public hearing during the Planning Commission public comment period. The Williston Selectboard adopted the Plan at a public hearing on August 22, 2017. The PAC discussed the Plan and staff’s review memo on September 13 and recommended the Board approve the plan and certify the planning process. Jeff Carr questioned whether there had been discussions between Williston and neighboring communities regarding elements of the plan that might affect those communities as we had done in the past. Regina noted that was prior to the formation of the
PAC and the guidelines developed for reviewing town plans. Jeff expressed concern that the old process allowed for discussion between parties outside of a public hearing setting. Regina said one thing we can do is two years before a municipal plan expires when we provide a letter to the community we could notify commissioners in neighboring communities that the process is about to begin. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CATHERINE McMAMINS, THAT CCRPC APPROVES THE WILLISTON 2016-2024 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND CONFIRMS THE TOWN OF WILLISTON’S MUNICIPAL PLANNING PROCESS. ONLY MUNICIPAL REPRESENTATIVES VOTED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Since Dan Kerin had not yet arrived and Jeff Carr is Essex Junction Alternate, Jeff voted in favor of the motion for Essex Junction.

6. ECOS Plan Update
   a. Energy Element Policy Review. Chris Roy noted that there was a lengthy discussion at the July board meeting and since then staff has worked with several committees and came up with a new approach to Constraint and Strategy Policies for siting renewable energy generation facilities. Melanie Needle distributed a new version that includes input from the Energy Subcommittee last night. She reviewed what happened since July. We’ve restructured the policy statement and broke them up into two distinct constraint policies we’ve noted as Strategy 3 (water quality) and 4 (working lands and significant habitats). By moving the policy to that section we’re giving this more weight based on Article 174 standards. Strategy 2 is where we discuss growth. So, the suitability policy is to talk about where and at what scale we want renewable energy generation in areas that don’t have a constraint. Staff has been working with PAC, LRPC, Executive Committee, and Energy Sub-committee to review these ideas. Melanie then reviewed the policy statement as of today. These are by no means a final product and we will continue to refine them. Page 1 – these policy statements have not changed and says what we can do with our partnerships. The meat of the changes begin on page 2 under b. where we talk about Constraint policies. “Energy generation is constrained in certain areas due to state and local restrictions on development.” Site renewable energy generation to avoid state and local known constraints and to minimize impacts to state and local possible constraints. This is an education piece for any applicant. Suitability Policies: Unconstrained areas have different levels of suitability for renewable energy generation. In unconstrained areas, locate energy generation facilities to meet as many of the following guidelines as possible and relevant. It lists seven, which Melanie reviewed. Discussion ensued. When asked if these were weighted, Melanie said no but we want applicants to do as many of these as possible. Lengthy discussion continued. Jeff expressed concerns that we don't want ground mounted solar in the designated growth centers. Policy needs to be clearer and the relationship between all the policies needs to be clearer, but they're on the right track. Chris Roy reiterated that he likes this format and the suitability policies generally since they are just guidance, not mandates or restrictions. There was quite a bit of discussion about how these policies relate to one another. For example, does Policy vii accidentally trump all of the other ones because it’s much more specific than the others? Also, there appear to be locations or scales that aren’t currently covered. For example, turbines between 30m and 50m; and ground mounted small scale residential? Jeff suggested that we need to be more explicit that we’re pro-renewable energy where it’s effective in meeting our energy demands and affordable. Regina stated that this may have been more obvious in previous versions and we’ll take a look to see how we can address this. There was a discussion regarding the wind energy map, and its relevancy. It is useful to show where the resource areas are, especially in light of the constraints. Jeff asked if there are
any subsidy cliffs that may limit the applicability of some of this work. Chris Roy suggested not
going into it in the plan as the programs change frequently.

b. **MTP Financial Plan.** Peter Keating reviewed the financial plan for the next 35 years, starting
with some background. The Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) is required to be updated
every five years because of federal law. The RPC is required to update the regional plan every 8
years. One of the things we have to do in the transportation element (MTP) of the plan, is the
financial plan which includes: Here is what we want to do, this is what it’ll cost to do, and how
much we estimate we’ll have available to do whatever we want to do. MPO’s have to do this,
but state DOTs do not. Three elements of the MTP Financial Plan are: 1) funding “reasonably
expected to be available.” 2) Level of funding needed to operate and maintain the existing
system. 3) The difference between 1 and 2 and how this will be allocated to improvement
projects/strategies. In determining available funds, we reviewed the trend in statewide
obligation history; the region’s historic share of state funding; we assume that both continue
into the future and forecast funding in constant and year of expenditure dollars. We have had
discussions with VTrans and they agree with this approach. Peter then reviewed the FHWA &
FTA funds to Vermont between FY2010 and FY2016, which we converted to constant 2016
dollars. The average is $211,609,103, which we are assuming Vermont will receive annually
over the next 35 years. To determine what percentage of the pie will come to Chittenden
County, we were able to go back to 1999 to show how much has come to Chittenden County vs.
rest of the state. The high was 40% in 2005 and the low was 7.5% in 2014, but the average has
been 19.4%. In our last plan we estimated we’d get 17%. We then had to estimate what we’ll
have available, so the next table shows the estimated total federal funds which we expect to be
even funded over the next 35 years assuming a 3% annual inflation rate per the Engineering
News Record The total cumulative dollars is estimated to be $2.55 billion. At constant 2016
dollars it is estimated to be $2.43 billion. We then had to estimate what it’ll take to maintain the
current system. We looked at the TIP (Transportation Improvement Plan) to develop average
annual costs for paving and bridges; and CCTA maintenance and operations. Peter then
reviewed the comparison of Chittenden County obligation history by project use category. Over
the 16 years we’ve spent about 55% on maintenance. Between 2005-2016 it averaged 65.4%;
and 2010-2016, 73.6%. All charts have shown only federal funds which is 80%. This chart shows
total funds available (federal, state and local). One column shows 70% or $1.257 billion
allocated for preservation and $418 million for new transportation needs; and the other 55% or
$987.82 million for preservation with $687.7 million for new transportation needs. Charlie
noted that we will have some large projects in the next couple of years – Champlain Parkway,
Circ Alternative projects so in the next plan horizon we may be getting higher share of new
projects because of these larger projects. Discussion ensued. Andrea asked if stormwater
facility maintenance should be included in preservation. Charlie said in the near term we are
anticipating these to be improvements because they don’t exist yet. We don’t have those
projects as preservation, but we have to build it into our future. Christine said when we do the
next five-year update we’ll have more information on that. Next steps for the financial plan
includes developing the MTP project list that takes into account the fiscal constraint limit; and
consider funding targets by project sue category (e.g. roadway, bridges, etc.) Charlie noted we
will be meeting with municipal staff (public works, managers/administrators) to help get to the
prioritized project list. We’ll start this discussion here in October with a more complete list in
November.

c. **CEDS (Community Economic Development Strategy) Status Update.** Regina said the process is
moving. Emily is drafting it with input from GBIC. CEDS has to be updated every five years as
well. After GBIC’s review, we’ll send it to the municipalities. So, for October and November board meetings, expect to spend more time reviewing these parts of the plan.

7. Legislative Breakfast Topics. Charlie said every year in early December we have a breakfast for the Chittenden County legislators. We’re refining how to do this each year. This is a heads up to get topics we should be discussing with the legislators this year. Suggestions included:
   a. Transportation needs, because once we get the MTP financial plan we have to stress the amount of funding Chittenden County should get as the economic engine of the state.
   b. Act 250 Commission and what they’re being tasked to do.
   c. Stormwater funding will be potential discussion item and are there other ways of funding the stormwater. Fees vs. taxes so you can charge those not on tax rolls.
   d. Airport governance.
   e. Let legislators know that RPC is a resource for our communities as well as the legislators.

8. Chair/Executive Director Update.
   a. Charlie has been asked to serve on the Airport Technical Advisory Committee regarding noise study. They’ll meet October 16th. Andrea read with interest what South Burlington is proposing to do and wondered why this wasn’t a regional issue. It is important to Chittenden County and the state. It’s good that Charlie is being asked to serve on this. Chris Roy said some of us met with representatives of the airport and they were looking to expand communication with us. He noticed that there seems to be more exchange of information between BIA and CCRPC. Lengthy discussion continued.
   b. Clean Water initiatives update. Charlie noted that the state is working on pushing water quality funds through various agencies. 1. There is Grants-in-Aid program from DEC through the RPCs – 10 of our municipalities have applied for this funding. There was $2 million in road maintenance funds and statewide 187 out of 250 towns are participating; 2. There are construction funds available through Clean Water Block grant. The RPCs have a contract with DEC and right now we’ve started discussion with municipalities about projects they have that are almost ready for construction; 3. Better Roads inventories and work with municipalities on priorities on road projects. The state is moving the cycle to October/November to line up with the municipal budgeting cycle; 4. Transportation Alternatives Program – Eleni noted there is $5-7 million available for this program that we had seen traditionally used for bike/ped and other transportation enhancements, but the state has decided to use these funds for the next two years on stormwater improvements. Charlie asked to hear any feedback members hear on this. We also have UPWP funds available for developing projects.
   c. Executive Directors’ report. Will be sent later.

9. Committee/Liaison Activities and Reports. Minutes of various committee meetings are included in the meeting packet. Questions can be directed to staff.

10. Members’ Items; Other Business. There was no other business.

11. Adjournment: CHRI SHAW MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY TIME BAECHLE, TO ADJOURNE THE MEETING AT 7:50 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,
Bernadette Ferenc