

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

5 Date: Wednesday, July 5, 2017
6 Time: 5:45 p.m.
7 Place: CCRPC Offices; 110 W. Canal Street; suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404
8 Present: Chris Roy, Chair Mike O'Brien, Vice-Chair
9 Brian Bigelow, Secretary-Treasurer Barbara Elliott, At-Large
10 John Zicconi, At-Large
11 Staff: Charlie Baker, Executive Director Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
12 Forest Cohen, Senior Business Mgr. Bernie Ferenc, Trans. Business Manager
13

14 The meeting was called to order at 5:45 p.m. by the Chair, Chris Roy.
15

- 16 1. Changes to the agenda; Members' Items. There were none.
17
18 2. Approval of June 7, 2017 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes. MIKE O'BRIEN MADE A MOTION,
19 SECONDED BY BRIAN BIGELOW, TO APPROVE THE JUNE 7, 2017 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
20 MINUTES WITH ANY EDITS. Mike suggested on page 2, line 6 that we soften the language. We will
21 change it to read "...had indicated that they believe they would maintain a more positive working
22 relationship with Sullivan Powers & Co. Barbara Elliott noted a change on page 3, line 4 to change
23 "these' to "there". MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THE MINUTES WITH EDITS.
24
25 3. Act250/Section 248 Applications:
26 a. Cambrian Rise, Burlington, #4C1301. This project is on the former Diocese property on North
27 Avenue. There is a pre-hearing and site visit set for next week, but no hearing is scheduled yet,
28 but she wanted members to know what's coming. She did just email District #4 to see why this
29 isn't exempt under the new rules. We have no traffic comments yet.
30 b. O'Brien Farm Road, LLC; South Burlington, application #4C1106-3. This is for a development of
31 39.16 acres of land adjacent to Old Farm Road/Kennedy Drive/Eldredge Street & Kimball Avenue
32 into a PUD with 118 residential units on footprint lots, along with six large residential/mixed use
33 development lots, park space, and open space. This project seeks review of the residential units
34 and associated infrastructure, and only partial findings for the six large residential/mixed use
35 lots. The project has received master plan approval from the South Burlington Development
36 Review Board, but each individual phase will be subject to site plan approval. The only issue we
37 found was the LOS at Hinesburg Rd./Kimball intersection was quite different in a traffic
38 engineering study done by Lamoureux & Dickinson dated August 2016 for this project showing
39 LOS "D"; and the study done by Green International Affiliates in August 2015 for VTrans in
40 conjunction with the culvert reconstruction currently underway just north of the intersection on
41 Rt. 116 showing LOS "E". A brief discussion about LOS "F" not always being equal – depending
42 on the location-urban vs. rural. Regina noted we had this discussion in the ECOS plan
43 development and we wanted to come up with a policy, but VTrans was working on a policy to
44 address this issue. This issue remains unresolved. It was noted that LOS "F" is not always a bad
45 thing and doesn't mean the intersection is failing. Chris Roy suggested that we inform a
46 municipality, but leave it up to them as to whether they feel LOS "F" is a bad thing. Regina said
47 we could not be so negative about LOS "F" in the letter. JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION TO
48 APPROVE THE LETTER TO THE D.E.C. #4 WITH CHANGES AS DISCUSSED. MIKE O'BRIEN

- 1 SECONDED. Mike noted that he has worked on property in both applications, B & C, but the
2 work was totally unrelated, so he will vote on these letters. VOTE: MOTION CARRIED
3 UNANIMOUSLY.
- 4 c. Allen Brook Development, Essex, Application #4C0329-21. This is a development off of Allen
5 Martin Drive in Essex. We find the project is in the area defined for growth, it meets
6 requirements for Criterion 9(L), and going forward we suggest that the fee structure for
7 additional development in this area should be reexamined in light of the town's preferred
8 alternative of a traffic signal at VT 15/Allen Martin Drive. JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION TO
9 APPROVE THE LETTER TO D.E.C. #4 AS DRAFTED. BRIAN BIGELOW SECONDED AND THE MOTION
10 CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
- 11
- 12 4. Energy Planning. Regina noted that we've refined and gathered additional information regarding
13 the siting policy for the ECOS Plan. Regina, Emily and Melanie have been reviewing the natural
14 resources constraints that towns do not feel would be appropriate for wind or solar. The original
15 spreadsheet in your packet includes known constraints in nine municipalities; further inspection
16 reduces that to about four or five towns that have zoning that 100% protects areas from all
17 development. We know we can meet the renewable generation targets with the constraints as the
18 municipalities originally asked for them; and we've pulled more out of the known/100% no-build
19 category so we should still be able to meet the targets. We also received feedback from the
20 municipal energy committees/planning commissions in response to this question (referred to as
21 Question 4 on your spreadsheet): Do you want your regional plan (ECOS plan) to prohibit energy
22 generation in areas with state and local known constraints? In other words, should we have a
23 strong "shall" statement? Half of the municipalities did not provide a response to this question.
24 One said they don't want to answer until we get feedback from DPS. The other half said yes, we
25 should do this. Regina and Melanie talked to staff at DPS. They will be comparing our plan to the
26 Act 174 guidelines. They won't care about whether we say "shall" or "should" or "maybe". They
27 will be checking to be sure we're treating all development equally. Regina said what we think that
28 means is we'd have to identify areas that are no-build zones for everything, not just wind and solar.
29 Charlie said the question to the board is whether we should say "shall" not or "should" not. We
30 have maps that show the constraints and then we need policy statements to describe how to use
31 the maps. Discussion continued. Charlie said if we adopt the "should" course, the town will have to
32 develop an energy plan to protect the resources. If we say "shall" based upon the Town having
33 done strong zoning work we would be supporting their local regulations at the Public Utilities
34 Commission (new name for the Public Service Board). Lengthy discussion continued. Having a
35 regional energy plan is a pre-requisite to municipal energy plans. John asked how far we have to go
36 if we put in these constraints. Mike O'Brien is in favor of having this be guidance and not put in
37 roadblocks. He feels we should use "should" language and let the towns decide for themselves.
38 Town energy plan has to be consistent with the regional plan for CCRPC to certify their plan after we
39 have a certified regional plan. Towns can go to DPS with a plan through June 2018. We should have
40 a certified regional energy plan by July 2018 and then the towns come to RPC's for certification of
41 their local energy plan. Regina – do you want the full board to discuss this, or would you like us to
42 get comments from the municipal elected officials first (vs. the planning commissions and
43 conservation committees we already heard from)? Chris Roy said we should give members a choice
44 of A or B. Should board members be asked direction or do we check with legislative bodies? Chris
45 feels we as an RPC need to decide this. We should have discussion at the July meeting and give staff
46 direction since we don't meet in August. We are reviewing the work the municipalities did to
47 protect a resource such as zoning work. Did a municipality do a good job on the natural resource
48 regulations? Regina noted it is pretty difficult to regulate regionally when it's really town-by-town

1 or site-by-site. Discussion continued about whether we use “shall” and if we’re ready to hire
2 experts to deal with this. Chris feels that constraints for renewable energy sources are very
3 different for wind turbines vs. solar farms. Regina said in the discussion with DPS, they said we
4 could talk about scale and what makes sense in certain areas. She noted that all the maps are GIS
5 data layers subject to inaccuracies. So they will provide a visual aid in the plan, but not site level
6 information. The list of restrictions must be defined and then they’d have to be site verified.
7 Lengthy discussion continued. If we want to say “shall,” we’re not putting anything in our plan that
8 hasn’t been included in the local plans or zoning regulations. Plans can be just inspirational
9 documents without being regulatory, it is a matter of what tone the town or region wants to take.
10 Staff will prepare information for the Board packet.

11
12 5. Resolutions to recognize employee service & board recognition. Staff has prepared resolutions
13 recognizing three staff members who celebrate their 10th anniversary at CCRPC: Eleni Churchill,
14 Bryan Davis and Jason Charest. Marc Landry has been replaced as Colchester’s RPC representative,
15 so we also want to recognize his twelve years of service. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION TO
16 RECOMMEND THE BOARD ADOPT ALL FOUR RESOLUTIONS. MIKE O’BRIEN SECONDED AND THE
17 MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

18
19 6. Recommend FY18 Meeting Schedule to Board. Staff presented a schedule of meeting dates for the
20 Board and Executive Committee meetings for FY18. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION,
21 SECONDED BY MIKE O’BRIEN, TO RECOMMEND THE BOARD APPROVE THE FY18 MEETING
22 SCHEDULE. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

23
24 7. Review Commission Committees/members. Members reviewed current list of board members on
25 various committees. It was noted that Sandy Dooley and Marc Landry are no longer rep or
26 alternate, so we need new board members on the Board Development Committee and Long Range
27 Planning Committee respectfully. We will solicit board members who are not currently serving on
28 any committee to serve. We will ask Bard Hill to serve on Long Range Planning Committee and Jeff
29 Bartley of Colchester to serve on FY19 UPWP Committee.

30
31 8. Chair/Executive Director’s Update.
32 a. Priorities for the next year. Include water quality funding and various grants. RPCs statewide
33 got \$1.5 million for Water Quality block grant. Southern Windsor RPC is the lead RPC for
34 construction projects on the capital eligible list. We will also be updating our ECOS Plan with a
35 new Energy section, the MTP (Metropolitan Transportation Plan) and CEDS (Community
36 Economic Development Strategy). Charlie noted that a consultant was here a couple of week
37 ago – Urban3 out of North Carolina. They are looking at data around how we use land. There is
38 a conversation with several folks to try to do this analysis statewide since it might be helpful for
39 decision-making. He will send members the link to a video.
40 b. Shared Dispatch Services update. This effort is going well. Aaron Frank of Colchester has been
41 doing a lot of number crunching on project costs. We are still on track to have this put on town
42 meeting agendas for March.
43 c. Building Homes Together Campaign. It was noted that we have 600 new residences in each of
44 the last two years; and it’s looking like 962 for last year. This is the first year they have included
45 demolitions. John Zicconi suggest we show trends in this spreadsheet.

46
47 9. Agenda Review – July 19th meeting. Members reviewed and made changes to the draft agenda.
48

- 1 10. Other Business. There was none.
- 2
- 3 11. Executive Session. None needed.
- 4
- 5 12. Adjournment. MIKE O'BRIEN MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN AT 7:18 P.M. BARBARA ELLIOTT
- 6 SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
- 7
- 8 Respectfully submitted,
- 9
- 10 Bernadette Ferenc
- 11

DRAFT