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

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

1. Changes to the agenda; Members’ Items. There were none.

2. Approval of June 7, 2017 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BRIAN BIGELOW, TO APPROVE THE JUNE 7, 2017 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES WITH ANY EDITS. Mike suggested on page 2, line 6 that we soften the language. We will change it to read “…had indicated that they believe they would maintain a more positive working relationship with Sullivan Powers & Co. Barbara Elliott noted a change on page 3, line 4 to change “these” to “there”. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THE MINUTES WITH EDITS.

3. Act250/Section 248 Applications:
   a. Cambrian Rise, Burlington, #4C1301. This project is on the former Diocese property on North Avenue. There is a pre-hearing and site visit set for next week, but no hearing is scheduled yet, but she wanted members to know what’s coming. She did just email District #4 to see why this isn’t exempt under the new rules. We have no traffic comments yet.
   b. O’Brien Farm Road, LLC; South Burlington, application #4C1106-3. This is for a development of 39.16 acres of land adjacent to Old Farm Road/Kennedy Drive/Eldredge Street & Kimball Avenue into a PUD with 118 residential units on footprint lots, along with six large residential/mixed use development lots, park space, and open space. This project seeks review of the residential units and associated infrastructure, and only partial findings for the six large residential/mixed use lots. The project has received master plan approval from the South Burlington Development Review Board, but each individual phase will be subject to site plan approval. The only issue we found was the LOS at Hinesburg Rd./Kimball intersection was quite different in a traffic engineering study done by Lamoureux & Dickinson dated August 2016 for this project showing LOS “D”; and the study done by Green International Affiliates in August 2015 for VTrans in conjunction with the culvert reconstruction currently underway just north of the intersection on Rt. 116 showing LOS “E”. A brief discussion about LOS “F” not always being equal – depending on the location-urban vs. rural. Regina noted we had this discussion in the ECOS plan development and we wanted to come up with a policy, but VTrans was working on a policy to address this issue. This issue remains unresolved. It was noted that LOS “F” is not always a bad thing and doesn’t mean the intersection is failing. Chris Roy suggested that we inform a municipality, but leave it up to them as to whether they feel LOS “F” is a bad thing. Regina said we could not be so negative about LOS “F” in the letter. JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE LETTER TO THE D.E.C. #4 WITH CHANGES AS DISCUSSED. MIKE O’BRIEN
SECONDED. Mike noted that he has worked on property in both applications, B & C, but the work was totally unrelated, so he will vote on these letters. VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

c. Allen Brook Development, Essex, Application #4C0329-21. This is a development off of Allen Martin Drive in Essex. We find the project is in the area defined for growth, it meets requirements for Criterion 9(L), and going forward we suggest that the fee structure for additional development in this area should be reexamined in light of the town’s preferred alternative of a traffic signal at VT 15/Allen Martin Drive. JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE LETTER TO D.E.C. #4 AS DRAFTED. BRIAN BIGELOW SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. Energy Planning. Regina noted that we’ve refined and gathered additional information regarding the siting policy for the ECOS Plan. Regina, Emily and Melanie have been reviewing the natural resources constraints that towns do not feel would be appropriate for wind or solar. The original spreadsheet in your packet includes known constraints in nine municipalities; further inspection reduces that to about four or five towns that have zoning that 100% protects areas from all development. We know we can meet the renewable generation targets with the constraints as the municipalities originally asked for them; and we’ve pulled more out of the known/100% no-build category so we should still be able to meet the targets. We also received feedback from the municipal energy committees/planning commissions in response to this question (referred to as Question 4 on your spreadsheet): Do you want your regional plan (ECOS plan) to prohibit energy generation in areas with state and local known constraints? In other words, should we have a strong “shall” statement? Half of the municipalities did not provide a response to this question. One said they don’t want to answer until we get feedback from DPS. The other half said yes, we should do this. Regina and Melanie talked to staff at DPS. They will be comparing our plan to the Act 174 guidelines. They won’t care about whether we say “shall” or “should” or “maybe”. They will be checking to be sure we’re treating all development equally. Regina said what we think that means is we’d have to identify areas that are no-build zones for everything, not just wind and solar. Charlie said the question to the board is whether we should say “shall” or “should” not. We have maps that show the constraints and then we need policy statements to describe how to use the maps. Discussion continued. Charlie said if we adopt the “should” course, the town will have to develop an energy plan to protect the resources. If we say “shall” based upon the Town having done strong zoning work we would be supporting their local regulations at the Public Utilities Commission (new name for the Public Service Board). Lengthy discussion continued. Having a regional energy plan is a pre-requisite to municipal energy plans. John asked how far we have to go if we put in these constraints. Mike O’Brien is in favor of having this be guidance and not put in roadblocks. He feels we should use “should” language and let the towns decide for themselves. Town energy plan has to be consistent with the regional plan for CCRPC to certify their plan after we have a certified regional plan. Towns can go to DPS with a plan through June 2018. We should have a certified regional energy plan by July 2018 and then the towns come to RPC’s for certification of their local energy plan. Regina – do you want the full board to discuss this, or would you like us to get comments from the municipal elected officials first (vs. the planning commissions and conservation committees we already heard from)? Chris Roy said we should give members a choice of A or B. Should board members be asked direction or do we check with legislative bodies? Chris feels we as an RPC need to decide this. We should have discussion at the July meeting and give staff direction since we don’t meet in August. We are reviewing the work the municipalities did to protect a resource such as zoning work. Did a municipality do a good job on the natural resource regulations? Regina noted it is pretty difficult to regulate regionally when it’s really town-by-town
or site-by-site. Discussion continued about whether we use “shall” and if we’re ready to hire experts to deal with this. Chris feels that constraints for renewable energy sources are very different for wind turbines vs. solar farms. Regina said in the discussion with DPS, they said we could talk about scale and what makes sense in certain areas. She noted that all the maps are GIS data layers subject to inaccuracies. So they will provide a visual aid in the plan, but not site level information. The list of restrictions must be defined and then they’d have to be site verified. Lengthy discussion continued. If we want to say “shall,” we’re not putting anything in our plan that hasn’t been included in the local plans or zoning regulations. Plans can be just inspirational documents without being regulatory, it is a matter of what tone the town or region wants to take. Staff will prepare information for the Board packet.

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

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

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

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

9. Agenda Review – July 19th meeting. Members reviewed and made changes to the draft agenda.
10. Other Business. There was none.

11. Executive Session. None needed.

12. Adjournment. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN AT 7:18 P.M. BARBARA ELLIOTT SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc