

CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

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 Dextrateur  
Ex-Officio: BIA: Absent FHWA: Absent  
GMT: Absent

Others: Scott Moody, CCTV cameraman  
Staff: Charlie Baker, Executive Director Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager  
Eleni Churchill, Trans. Program Mgr. Bryan Davis, Senior Transportation Planner  
Christine Forde, Senior Trans. Planner Peter Keating, Senior Transportation Planner  
Melanie Needle, Senior Planner Emily Nosse-Leirer, Planner  
Bernadette Ferenc, Trans. Business Mgr.

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

1 PAC and the guidelines developed for reviewing town plans. Jeff expressed concern that the old  
2 process allowed for discussion between parties outside of a public hearing setting. Regina said one  
3 thing we can do is two years before a municipal plan expires when we provide a letter to the  
4 community we could notify commissioners in neighboring communities that the process is about to  
5 begin. MIKE O'BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CATHERINE McMAINS, THAT CCRPC  
6 APPROVES THE WILLISTON 2016-2024 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND CONFIRMS THE TOWN OF  
7 WILLISTON'S MUNICIPAL PLANNING PROCESS. ONLY MUNICIPAL REPRESENTATIVES VOTED AND THE  
8 MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Since Dan Kerin had not yet arrived and Jeff Carr is Essex  
9 Junction Alternate, Jeff voted in favor of the motion for Essex Junction.

10  
11 6. ECOS Plan Update

12 a. Energy Element Policy Review. Chris Roy noted that there was a lengthy discussion at the July  
13 board meeting and since then staff has worked with several committees and came up with a  
14 new approach to Constraint and Strategy Policies for siting renewable energy generation  
15 facilities. Melanie Needle distributed a new version that includes input from the Energy  
16 Subcommittee last night. She reviewed what happened since July. We've restructured the  
17 policy statement and broke them up into two distinct constraint policies we've noted as Strategy  
18 3 (water quality) and 4 (working lands and significant habitats). By moving the policy to that  
19 section we're giving this more weight based on Article 174 standards. Strategy 2 is where we  
20 discuss growth. So, the suitability policy is to talk about where and at what scale we want  
21 renewable energy generation in areas that don't have a constraint. Staff has been working with  
22 PAC, LRPC, Executive Committee, and Energy Sub-committee to review these ideas.

23  
24 Melanie then reviewed the policy statement as of today. These are by no means a final product  
25 and we will continue to refine them. Page 1 – these policy statements have not changed and  
26 says what we can do with our partnerships. The meat of the changes begin on page 2 under b.  
27 where we talk about Constraint policies. "Energy generation is constrained in certain areas due  
28 to state and local restrictions on development." Site renewable energy generation to avoid  
29 state and local known constraints and to minimize impacts to state and local possible  
30 constraints. This is an education piece for any applicant. Suitability Policies: Unconstrained  
31 areas have different levels of suitability for renewable energy generation. In unconstrained  
32 areas, locate energy generation facilities to meet as many of the following guidelines as possible  
33 and relevant. It lists seven, which Melanie reviewed. Discussion ensued. When asked if these  
34 were weighted, Melanie said no but we want applicants to do as many of these as possible.  
35 Lengthy discussion continued. Jeff expressed concerns that we don't want ground mounted  
36 solar in the designated growth centers. Policy needs to be clearer and the relationship between  
37 all the policies needs to be clearer, but they're on the right track. Chris Roy reiterated that he  
38 likes this format and the suitability policies generally since they are just guidance, not mandates  
39 or restrictions. There was quite a bit of discussion about how these policies relate to one  
40 another. For example, does Policy vii accidentally trump all of the other ones because it's much  
41 more specific than the others? Also, there appear to be locations or scales that aren't currently  
42 covered. For example, turbines between 30m and 50m; and ground mounted small scale  
43 residential? Jeff suggested that we need to be more explicit that we're pro-renewable energy  
44 where it's effective in meeting our energy demands and affordable. Regina stated that this may  
45 have been more obvious in previous versions and we'll take a look to see how we can address  
46 this. There was a discussion regarding the wind energy map, and its relevancy. It is useful to  
47 show where the resource areas are, especially in light of the constraints. Jeff asked if there are

1 any subsidy cliffs that may limit the applicability of some of this work. Chris Roy suggested not  
2 getting into it in the plan as the programs change frequently.

- 3
- 4 b. MTP Financial Plan. Peter Keating reviewed the financial plan for the next 35 years, starting  
5 with some background. The Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) is required to be updated  
6 every five years because of federal law. The RPC is required to update the regional plan every 8  
7 years. One of the things we have to do in the transportation element (MTP) of the plan, is the  
8 financial plan which includes: Here is what we want to do, this is what it'll cost to do, and how  
9 much we estimate we'll have available to do whatever we want to do. MPO's have to do this,  
10 but state DOTs do not. Three elements of the MTP Financial Plan are: 1) funding "reasonably  
11 expected to be available." 2) Level of funding needed to operate and maintain the existing  
12 system. 3) The difference between 1 and 2 and how this will be allocated to improvement  
13 projects/strategies. In determining available funds, we reviewed the trend in statewide  
14 obligation history; the region's historic share of state funding; we assume that both continue  
15 into the future and forecast funding in constant and year of expenditure dollars. We have had  
16 discussions with VTrans and they agree with this approach. Peter then reviewed the FHWA &  
17 FTA funds to Vermont between FY2010 and FY2016, which we converted to constant 2016  
18 dollars. The average is \$211,609,103, which we are assuming Vermont will receive annually  
19 over the next 35 years. To determine what percentage of the pie will come to Chittenden  
20 County, we were able to go back to 1999 to show how much has come to Chittenden County vs.  
21 rest of the state. The high was 40% in 2005 and the low was 7.5% in 2014, but the average has  
22 been 19.4%. In our last plan we estimated we'd get 17%. We then had to estimate what we'll  
23 have available, so the next table shows the estimated total federal funds which we expect to be  
24 even funded over the next 35 years assuming a 3% annual inflation rate per the Engineering  
25 News Record The total cumulative dollars is estimated to be \$2.55 billion. At constant 2016  
26 dollars it is estimated to be \$2.43 billion. We then had to estimate what it'll take to maintain the  
27 current system. We looked at the TIP (Transportation Improvement Plan) to develop average  
28 annual costs for paving and bridges; and CCTA maintenance and operations. Peter then  
29 reviewed the comparison of Chittenden County obligation history by project use category. Over  
30 the 16 years we've spent about 55% on maintenance. Between 2005-2016 it averaged 65.4%;  
31 and 2010-2016, 73.6%. All charts have shown only federal funds which is 80%. This chart shows  
32 total funds available (federal, state and local). One column shows 70% or \$1.257 billion  
33 allocated for preservation and \$418 million for new transportation needs; and the other 55% or  
34 \$987.82 million for preservation with \$687.7 million for new transportation needs. Charlie  
35 noted that we will have some large projects in the next couple of years – Champlain Parkway,  
36 Circ Alternative projects so in the next plan horizon we may be getting higher share of new  
37 projects because of these larger projects. Discussion ensued. Andrea asked if stormwater  
38 facility maintenance should be included in preservation. Charlie said in the near term we are  
39 anticipating these to be improvements because they don't exist yet. We don't have those  
40 projects as preservation, but we have to build it into our future. Christine said when we do the  
41 next five-year update we'll have more information on that. Next steps for the financial plan  
42 includes developing the MTP project list that takes into account the fiscal constraint limit; and  
43 consider funding targets by project sue category (e.g. roadway, bridges, etc.) Charlie noted we  
44 will be meeting with municipal staff (public works, managers/administrators) to help get to the  
45 prioritized project list. We'll start this discussion here in October with a more complete list in  
46 November.
- 47 c. CEDS (Community Economic Development Strategy) Status Update. Regina said the process is  
48 moving. Emily is drafting it with input from GBIC. CEDS has to be updated every five years as

1 well. After GBIC's review, we'll send it to the municipalities. So, for October and November  
2 board meetings, expect to spend more time reviewing these parts of the plan.  
3

4 7. Legislative Breakfast Topics. Charlie said every year in early December we have a breakfast for the  
5 Chittenden County legislators. We're refining how to do this each year. This is a heads up to get  
6 topics we should be discussing with the legislators this year. Suggestions included:

- 7 a. Transportation needs, because once we get the MTP financial plan we have to stress the  
8 amount of funding Chittenden County should get as the economic engine of the state.
- 9 b. Act 250 Commission and what they're being tasked to do.
- 10 c. Stormwater funding will be potential discussion item and are there other ways of funding  
11 the stormwater. Fees vs. taxes so you can charge those not on tax rolls.
- 12 d. Airport governance.
- 13 e. Let legislators know that RPC is a resource for our communities as well as the legislators.  
14

15 8. Chair/Executive Director Update.

- 16 a. Charlie has been asked to serve on the Airport Technical Advisory Committee regarding  
17 noise study. They'll meet October 16<sup>th</sup>. Andrea read with interest what South Burlington is  
18 proposing to do and wondered why this wasn't a regional issue. It is important to  
19 Chittenden County and the state. It's good that Charlie is being asked to serve on this. Chris  
20 Roy said some of us met with representatives of the airport and they were looking to  
21 expand communication with us. He noticed that there seems to be more exchange of  
22 information between BIA and CCRPC. Lengthy discussion continued.
- 23 b. Clean Water initiatives update. Charlie noted that the state is working on pushing water  
24 quality funds through various agencies. 1. There is Grants-in-Aid program from DEC through  
25 the RPCs – 10 of our municipalities have applied for this funding. There was \$2 million in  
26 road maintenance funds and statewide 187 out of 250 towns are participating; 2. There are  
27 construction funds available through Clean Water Block grant. The RPCs have a contract  
28 with DEC and right now we've started discussion with municipalities about projects they  
29 have that are almost ready for construction; 3. Better Roads inventories and work with  
30 municipalities on priorities on road projects. The state is moving the cycle to  
31 October/November to line up with the municipal budgeting cycle; 4. Transportation  
32 Alternatives Program – Eleni noted there is \$5-7 million available for this program that we  
33 had seen traditionally used for bike/ped and other transportation enhancements, but the  
34 state has decided to use these funds for the next two years on stormwater improvements.  
35 Charlie asked to hear any feedback members hear on this. We also have UPWP funds  
36 available for developing projects.
- 37 c. Executive Directors' report. Will be sent later.  
38

39 9. Committee/Liaison Activities and Reports. Minutes of various committee meetings are included in  
40 the meeting packet. Questions can be directed to staff.  
41

42 10. Members' Items; Other Business. There was no other business.  
43

44 11. Adjournment: CHRIS SHAW MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY TIME BAECHLE, TO ADJOURNE THE  
45 MEETING AT 7:50 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.  
46

47 Respectfully submitted,  
48 Bernadette Ferenc