REGULAR MEETING & PUBLIC HEARING AGENDA
Wednesday, February 21, 2018, 6:00 pm
CCRPC Offices at 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202
Winooski, VT 05404

CONSENT AGENDA:

DELIBERATIVE AGENDA

1. Call to Order; Changes to the Agenda
2. Public Comment Period on Items NOT on the Agenda
3. Action on Consent Agenda (MPO Business) (Action: 1 min)
4. Approve Minutes of January 17, 2018 Meeting * (Action; 2 min)
5. Draft ECOS Plan Public Hearing #1 * (Action; 20 min)
6. Draft ECOS Plan Discussion (Information; 20 min)
7. Transportation Performance Measures – Safety Targets* (Action; 30 min)
8. Chair/Executive Director’s Updates (Information; 15 min)
   a. Clean Water
   b. Economics of Housing
   c. ECOS Annual Report
   d. Regional Dispatch
   e. Legislative Updates
9. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports (Information; 2 min)
   a. Executive Committee (postponed to Feb. 21, 2018)
      i. Act 250/Sec 248 letters *
   b. Transportation Advisory Committee (draft minutes February 6, 2018)*
   c. Clean Water Advisory Committee (draft minutes January 9, 2018)*
   d. MS4 Subcommittee of CWAC (draft minutes January 9 & February 6, 2018) *
10. Member’s Items
11. Adjournment

*Attachment

The February 21st Chittenden County RPC meeting will air on Sunday, February 25, 2018 at 1:00 p.m. and it will also be available online at: https://www.cctv.org/watch-tv/programs/chittenden-county-regional-planning-commission-63

In accordance with provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, the CCRPC will ensure public meeting sites are accessible to all people. Requests for free interpretive or translation services, assistive devices, or other requested accommodations, should be made to Emma Vaughn, CCRPC Title VI Coordinator, at 802-846-4490 ext. *21 or evaughn@ccrpcvt.org, no later than 3 business days prior to the meeting for which services are requested.
In accordance with provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, the CCRPC will ensure public meeting sites are accessible to all people. Requests for free interpretive or translation services, assistive devices, or other requested accommodations, should be made to Emma Vaughn, CCRPC Title VI Coordinator, at 802-846-4490 ext. *21 or evaughn@ccrpcvt.org, no later than 3 business days prior to the meeting for which services are requested.

**Upcoming Meetings - Unless otherwise noted, all meetings are held at our offices:**
- Finance Committee – Wednesday, February 21, 2018; 4:30 p.m.
- Executive Committee - Wednesday, February 21, 2018; 5:00 p.m.
- Unified Planning Work Program Committee – Thursday, February 22, 2018; 5:30 pm
- Energy Sub-Committee – Tentative - Tuesday, March 6, 2018; 5:00 p.m.
- Transportation Advisory Committee – Wednesday, March 7, 2018; 9:00 a.m.
- Clean Water Advisory Committee - Wednesday, March 7, 2018;11:00 a.m.
- MS4 Subcommittee – Wednesday, March 7, 2018; 12:30 p.m.
- Executive Committee - Wednesday, March 7, 2018; 5:45 p.m.
- Long Range Planning Committee – Thursday, March 8, 2018; 8:30-10 a.m.
- Planning Advisory Committee – Wednesday, March 14, 2018; 2:30 p.m.
- CCRPC Board Meeting - Wednesday, March 21, 2018; 6:00 p.m.
- Unified Planning Work Program Committee – Thursday, March 22, 2018; 5:30 pm
- Finance Committee – Wednesday, March 28, 2018; 5:30 p.m.

**Tentative future Board agenda items:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Agenda Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 21, 2018</td>
<td>Review changes &amp; Warn ECOS Plan Update Public Hearing #2 (or at April 4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Executive Committee, if needed)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY20 VTrans Capital Program Project Prioritization and Town Highway Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pre-candidate list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Hearing and Approval of 2018 Milton Town Plan and Confirmation Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 18, 2018</td>
<td>Warn Draft UPWP public hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Highway System update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 16, 2018</td>
<td>ECOS Plan Update Public Hearing #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY19 UPWP and Budget Public Hearing and Vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guidelines and Standards for Reviewing Act 250 and Section 248 Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Approval of Municipal Plans Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 20, 2018</td>
<td>Election of Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECOS Plan Update adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warn FY19-22 TIP Public Hearing for July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 18, 2018</td>
<td>FY19-22 TIP Public Hearing and Adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guidelines and Standards for Reviewing Act 250 and Section 248 Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Approval of Municipal Plans Action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Call to Order; Changes to the Agenda.** The meeting was called to order at 6 p.m. by the Chair, Chris Roy. There were no changes to the agenda.

2. **Public Comment Period for items NOT on the Agenda.** There were none.

3. **Action on the Consent Agenda.** There were no items on the consent agenda.

4. **Approve Minutes of November 15, 2017 Meeting.** MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 15, 2017 WITH CORRECTIONS IF ANY. CATHERINE MCMAINS SECONDED. Jim Donovan requested that Bernie clarify the “we” references in the ECOS plan discussion so we know whether it means “staff” or “board.” MOTION CARRIED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS CORRECTED, WITH ABSTENTIONS FROM GARRET MOTT AND JEFF BARTLEY.

5. **FY19 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Public Forum.** Bryan Davis noted that Friday is the deadline for project submissions from the municipalities and partners. Staff has been meeting with town staff to discuss possible projects. The first UPWP Committee meeting will be held on Thursday, January 25. That committee will meet three times to develop the FY19 UPWP, which will go to public hearing in May.
6. **FY18 Mid-Year UPWP & Budget Adjustment.** Charlie Baker noted there is a memo in the board packet and separate attachments for the work program and budget. Every year at this time we look at where we are in the work program and budget and make adjustments to reflect reality. There are several changes that were not in the Dec. 20th draft that the Executive Committee reviewed that are listed in the memo:

- **All Pages** - Column AR should read GMT instead of CCTA, and on **Pg. 15**, the Task Name for Task #2.3.4.1 (row 48) should be updated the same way.
- **Pg. 15** - Deliverable #3 in Task #2.3.4.1 (row 48) should be deleted.
- **Pg. 22** - The Consultant Costs should be increased to $56,000 from $50,000 for Task #2.3.16.13 (row 90).
- **Pg. 26** – The Consultant Costs should be increased to $120,896 from $118,896 for Task #3.2.3 (row 108).

Since the memo was written a couple of other changes were discovered:

- **Pg. 26** – the Consultant Costs should actually be increased to $123,896 for Task 3.2.3
- **Pg. 13** – We will add funding to the Way To Go task (2.3.3.5) to allow the expenditure of state SPR funds and match for the statewide portion of the WTG program.
- (Bernie also changed CCTA to GMT in Task 8.2.1 to be consistent with changes noted earlier.)

Charlie reviewed the changes from the original UPWP that are highlighted in blue. There are a couple of small projects for town zoning assistance, we amended consultant dollar amounts to be more accurate, as carryover amounts were estimated before the fiscal year end. We added a new task for Winooski Main St. Revitalization project.

Forest Cohen then reviewed the Budget sheet showing Revenue/Expenses. We have removed Chittenden County Opioid Alliance funds going forward since that program has moved to United Way. That also reduces our expenses. There will still be a budget deficit (as predicted when this budget was adopted) because of the lower indirect rate for this fiscal year. Jim Donovan noted that lines 21 and 22 show a negative 100% change, so that needs to be corrected. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JIM DONOVAN, TO APPROVE THE FY18 MID-YEAR UPWP AND BUDGET ADJUSTMENT WITH THE CHANGES IN THE MEMO AND THOSE NOTED TONIGHT. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

7. **UPWP Committee Appointments.** Chris Roy noted the bylaws allow the Chair to appoint committees with board approval. Unless the board disagrees, he will appoint Mike O’Brien (Winooski) as chair, John Zicconi (Shelburne), Michael Bissonette (Hinesburg Alternate), Jeff Bartley (Colchester) and Bard Hill (Richmond) to the FY19 UPWP Committee. Board members did not disagree with the appointments.

8. **Draft ECOS Plan Presentation and Warn Public Hearing #1 for February board meeting.** Regina thanked all of the staff and board members who worked very hard over the past several months on updating the MTP, CEDS and enhanced energy planning element of the ECOS Plan. We have been working on this for 18 months and since September staff and committees have been finalizing the drafts and put them out for public comment. Our hope is to have the first public hearing on February 21st, the second public hearing on May 16th, and adopt it at the June 20th Annual Meeting. Staff is hoping to get any edits done by the March 21st meeting to be able to warn the second public hearing. If not, the Executive Committee may have to warn it at its April meeting. Regina reviewed the Top 10 Actions – there is a greater emphasis in recent statutory updates on local and regional plans to follow-up on implementation items in those plans. This list will help us to report back in the
next plan update as to what we’ve accomplished. The full implementation program includes all of
the Strategies, full list of Actions, and the Project Lists. These actions are elevated so as to provide
more focus over the next five years. They will help inform the development of CCRPC’S annual
UPWP. The CCRPC’s Top 10 Actions suggested by staff (and input from Executive Committee)
include:

a. Support smart, multi-modal development in our areas planned for growth, and protection of our
rural planning areas through municipal plan and bylaw assistance, Act 250 Next 50 Years,
   Brownfields
b. Invest in our transportation system – maintain existing system, address safety & congestion,
   improve ITS, expand bike & pedestrian facilities and transit service, & TDM
c. Support housing development
d. Assist municipalities with enhanced energy planning
e. Implement the Lake Champlain TMDL program
f. Emergency management through AHMP (All Hazard Mitigation Plans), LEPC (Local Emergency
   Planning Committee), LEOPs (Local Emergency Operations Plans), regional dispatch support
g. Support municipal efforts to improve populations health
h. Monitor advancement of autonomous vehicles
i. Annual coordination with municipalities and partners on ECOS Annual Report and the Scorecard
j. Support workforce development through actions above and continue monitoring demographic
   shifts.

These are all talked about in greater detail in the draft plan and we’ll discuss them at the February
21st hearing and board meeting. The 2018 ECOS Plan update is largely the same as the 2013 ECOS
plan, except for updates to energy, economy and transportation. For the most part the goals are
the same, but we were required to do a major update to the Energy Plan. We will be updating the
regional plan on a five-year cycle (rather than 8) since the MTP and CEDS are on five-year cycles.
Other updates include minor edits to the Future Land Use Plan in rural areas, including Hinesburg,
Colchester, and Underhill. Forest integrity is a new requirement to identify forests to protect
wildlife and to note the importance of forestry to the region. We did make some changes and there
was discussion at the LRPC meeting about perhaps adding a separate map. Health introduction to
Strategy 5 – There are no policy changes in this section, but some clarification. The LRPC has not yet
reviewed this. Staff did reorganize the contents of the Plan: The main part of the plan is only
implementation (goals, strategies, actions – including a Top 10 list, monitoring and reporting and
progress on the plan since 2013). Regional analysis – combination of Supplement 2 and online
scorecard. The MTP and CEDS can stand on their own, though they are components of the larger
plan. Regional plan, Enhanced Energy Plan – supplements include extra information.

Regina then reviewed the Enhanced Energy Summary. We need to meet the state energy goals and
by having an enhanced energy plan we will get more status in Section 248 hearings. Bottom line is
we need to use less energy and 90% of energy needs to come from renewable sources by 2050. In
order to reach that target Chittenden County needs to generate 756,250 Mwh of energy to meet the
low target (or 51% increase) and 1,265,134 Mwh to meet the high target (or 153% increase). We’ve
done some analysis work to see if we can meet those goals at the county level and at the municipal
level. We have a target of 89% electric passenger cars. Currently there are 106,936 passenger cars
in Chittenden County and only 601 (less than 1%) are electric/plug-in hybrid. Regina then reviewed
Enhanced Energy comments and edits. We received 40 comments from 20 individuals. Themes
include: Technical in nature and addressed; municipal siting constraints added, natural gas vs. 90%
renewable; weakness of suitability language, goals unrealistic without market changes, consistent and enforceable energy code.

Regina then reviewed the CEDS (Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy). GBIC is our partner in this document for economic development. Chittenden County is the economic engine of Vermont. It makes up over 25% of Vermont’s population, gross domestic product (GDP), tax revenue and private businesses. Median Household Income in Chittenden County has increased from $60,713 in 2009 to $68,843 in 2015. There are opportunities for improvement. In 2002 73% of employees were living in Chittenden County vs. 68% in 2015. Chittenden County is experiencing a decline in workforce population and an increase in over 60 age group. Jeff Carr noted that the state saw an increase in population in 2017. We received 55 comments from 15 individuals on the CEDS plan. Themes include: industrial lands, better broadband, smart growth as an economic development strategy, freight rail and permitting being burdensome. Regina noted that there is a lot of land zoned industrial, but not developed for companies to move in. It was also noted that housing costs in Franklin County are cheaper.

The MTP (Metropolitan Transportation Plan) summary: looks out to 2050, includes a financial plan identifying how it will be paid for, recommends a mix of multi-modal projects and strategies, measures transportation performance by establishing baseline data and comparing it to set targets, discusses environmental mitigation due to transportation project impacts. This document is fiscally constrained so we can’t do everything we want. We have to strike a balance between reducing congestion, fixing high-crash locations, enhancing walking, biking and transit, and increasing livability by investing in areas planned for growth. There were approximately 70 comments from 20 individuals on the MTP. Themes included: more transit, including rail; consider autonomous vehicles; adopt climate action goals that correspond with UN Paris agreement; no new roads; reconsider Champlain Parkway and interstate expansion; more roundabouts, fewer signalized intersections; more and better bike facilities; more ambitious safety targets; adopt Vision Zero.

The Draft MTP includes: 70% of funding invested in preserving the transportation system; land use concentration – with 90% of HH growth in areas planned for growth; All TIP projects; increases in walking/biking; transit enhancements — including new 15 minute headways for four main routes with 20-30 minute headways on the rest, every day and a new Colchester loop; ITS investments; Future I-89 scoping study (Exits 12-16) – for I-89 third lane between 14 & 15 and one interchange improvement – which could be Exit 12B, Exit 14 reconstruction or Exit 14N or another alternative. The transportation model is based on today’s travel behavior and that could change in 10-15 years. Since we’ll update the MTP every five years, we’ll use updated data as well.

Once the ECOS Plan updates are adopted the board will need follow-up actions to: update the CCRPC’s municipal plan review guidelines for determination of municipal energy compliance; update to CCRPC’s Act 250/Section 248 review guidelines for natural resource constraints and preferred sites; and transportation performance measures and targets. Regina reviewed the hearing/adoption schedule again. If members are okay with the first draft plan, we’ll get it out for public review. JIM DONOVAN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CHRIS SHAW, TO WARN THE FIRST PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE ECOS PLAN AMENDMENTS FOR WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 2018 AT 6:00 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

9. **Long-Term Water Quality Funding Policy Position.** Charlie apologized for not having a staff memo for this item. The board had discussions on water quality funding last year when we developed comments on the Treasurer’s report. The Legislature did receive make long-term funding
recommendations, so this issue is still in front of them. The Secretary of Natural Resources reported in November that we don’t need long-term funding right away, but can use existing resources for the next few years. There is also discussion about having a Clean Water Advisory Authority. The CWAC minutes were not included because they were not ready when the packet went out. There is no critical need to vote tonight if you want to take time to review this we can. Charlie reviewed the document noting that the first four paragraphs talk about the great need for this funding. 3 - Our municipalities have indicated that none of these costs include having to operate and maintain these systems in the future. 4 – There is not enough money going into project development. Paragraphs 5 and 6 talk about support for generating additional revenue. The comments are similar to what we said last year that it should be statewide funding and cover 80% of the costs. 6 – discusses parcel fee idea. Items 7-9 deal with governance and administration issues. The last items 10-14 deal with statewide collection of any funding. Discussion ensued about #10 – regarding providing credits, it was suggested to add language so that no one is charged twice. When asked if we wait a month to respond will we miss the dance, Charlie said early is always better. When asked how we feel about Clean Water Authority, Charlie said the CWAC (made up of stormwater professionals) would be glad to see a professional organization in charge. Jim Donovan agrees that we should respond early. In looking at #8 – Governance Accountability – he’d rather see more than one municipal representative. Chris Roy stated that representatives from both inside and outside the Champlain basin would make sense. Andrea asked for clarification as her understanding is this funding is to clean up past messes and not a lot in here for preventing pollution in our clean waterways. She would like more language to deal with preventing waterways from being impaired. She feels there is nothing in here for the rural communities to prevent issues and it should not be just MS4 communities. The other thing is on the management side. She’s been struggling with how to collect it. We want a system around the state that is calculated fairly. Discussion ensued about this being a fee vs. additional taxes. Chris Roy noted that this fee would be paid by all parcels – whether they pay property taxes or not. Andrea feels the management is definitely something that should be done on a statewide basis as well as enforcement. She thinks we need to keep putting on the table that prevention is the most cost-effective way of dealing with this including flood resiliency. Jeff Carr wanted to be sure this would be okay with the MS4 communities. Charlie said most of these ideas came from the MS4 representatives. Lengthy discussion ensued about concern of establishing these authorities that would be taxation without representation. Jeff wondered if we send these comments down and we offer our thoughts and they don’t care about double charges or that it’s only an issue because it’s Chittenden County. Chris Roy said we need to let them know what our position is; and, we should let the Chittenden County delegation as well as municipal officials know that position so they can all be on board with it. Charlie will also be talking to his peers at VAPDA, chambers of commerce, etc. to share our positions. Garret Mott wanted to be sure we include the Addison County representative who covers Buel’s Gore. GARRET MOTT MADE A MOTION THAT WE ACCEPT THIS WITH THE MODIFICATIONS SUGGESTED BY THE GROUP AND GIVE STAFF LATITUDE TO ADD LANGUAGE BASED ON OUR CONVERSATION. #8 SHOULD INCLUDE 2-3 MUNICIPAL REPRESENTATIVES. DON MEALS SECONDED. Garret asked if those making suggestions, are ok with staff adding these in. Andrea said if we want it statewide, we need to recognize that prevention needs to be a part of it. Don noted that can pertain to all waters of the state and not just Lake Champlain. Bard Hill said it came up at his town that this might be perceived as tied to Lake Champlain. Discussion continued. Charlie wants to be sure that members want him to distribute this to legislators and municipalities. Members agreed. Chris Roy noted that parts of the state that are not in the Lake Champlain Watershed do benefit by the revenue generated by this watershed. Jim Donovan asked that when staff sends this to legislators and municipalities, that they also send it to the board representatives. VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
Andrea said we are poised here in Chittenden County with MS4 communities. Let’s not wait 50 years to see this as a regional issue. We could have our own Chittenden County Authority to solve the problem so instead of having four stormwater utilities, we form a group to talk regionally. Charlie noted that last year when we worked on RSEP and MS4 merging, the committees had a healthy discussion to see if there were other opportunities for regionalizing services. There was also discussion about education being prevention.

10. Regional Dispatch Update. Charlie wanted board members to know what’s happening. There was a memo in the packet which was sent in November to legislative bodies in eight communities that have paid dispatch staff. This was notice about the proposed formation of the Chittenden County Public Safety Authority, a Union Municipal District to provide regional public safety dispatch and asked municipal officials to consider putting this item on their town meeting day ballot. As of today, Winooski, South Burlington, Colchester, Milton and Burlington have voted in favor of putting this on the March ballot. Shelburne and Williston are discussing it next week and Essex has decided not to put it on the ballot at this time. Also in the meeting packet was an information sheet Emma did for the Joint Survey Committee about what the effort is. Charlie wanted members to know that the Joint Survey Committee came up with a strategic approach to deal with this. The vote at town meeting day is to really set up an entity, but does not commit any funding or staff at this point. The organization’s budget will not be developed until they know who will be in the organization, how many staff, salaries and benefits, etc. Municipalities will then have an opportunity to vote once they see what the costs will be. A municipality can vote to join, but is not required to continue if they find the funding is not within their means. This process was set up to have a very deliberate approach to joining. Andrea reiterated that the entity should be for all municipalities since they’ll pay a fee one way or another and they’d like to have a vote. Charlie noted that right now Shelburne contracts with many towns in Chittenden County, half of Addison County and all of Grand Isle County for dispatch service.

11. Executive Director’s Update. Clean Water. The state has been asking RPCs to do more clean water work including basin planning work. The state has also asked RPCs to distribute capital dollars, and we have a number of municipalities receiving Grants-in-Aid. There will be another round in the spring to get projects done ($2 million). There are additional funds available in block grant program that will go to Burlington, Jericho and Williston for higher cost projects. He noted that there isn’t enough money to do project development.

12. Committee/Liaison Activities and Reports. Various committee meeting minutes were included in the board packet. Staff is available to answer any questions.

13. Members’ Items: Mike O’Brien reminded UPWP committee members of the first meeting next Thursday, January 25th.


Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission  
February 21, 2018  
Agenda Item 5&6: ECOS Plan Public Hearing & Discussion

**Issues:** As you are aware we’ve been working on the 2018 ECOS Plan and this meeting will be our first of two required public hearings. For your reference, the first public hearing draft can be found here: [http://www.ecosproject.com/2018-ecos-plan/](http://www.ecosproject.com/2018-ecos-plan/)

As of Feb. 14th, we’ve received a handful of comments (3 on the energy section, and 4 on the main document). The comments include requests for additional information, requests to update information and questions about intent and model assumptions. We also anticipate comments from VT Gas, but we have not received them yet. We will review these, and any other comments we receive, at the meeting.

In addition, we will discuss CCRPC’s Top 10 actions at the meeting. **Please come prepared with your thoughts on these.** The draft 2018 ECOS Plan includes a highlighted list of actions, that fall under our 8 strategies, for CCRPC to focus on over the next five years. This does not mean that we will not work on the other actions in the Plan, or pivot if something else becomes more relevant. They will merely help us focus our UPWP efforts over the coming years. Here are the Top 10 Actions for reference:

1. Support and inform municipalities on setting the stage for smart, multi-modal development in our areas planned for growth, and protection of our rural planning area, through plan and bylaw assistance, participation in the Act 250 Next 50 Years Committee, brownfields assessments, etc.
2. Invest in our transportation system by maintaining our existing transportation system, addressing safety and localized congestion issues on our roadways and investing in Intelligent Transportation Systems to facilitate traffic flows on our arterials and minimize the need for major roadway expansion projects; and supporting our areas planned for growth by expanding bike and pedestrian infrastructure, improving transit services, investing in and supporting Transportation Demand Management partners and programs such as Green Mountain Transit, Chittenden Area Transportation Management Association, CarShare, Local Motion and NeighborRides.
3. Assist and inform municipalities with research and technical assistance to support housing development in our areas planned for growth, and continue participation in the Building Homes Together campaign.
4. Assist and inform municipalities on enhanced energy planning for the heating, electricity and transportation sectors including a shift away from gas/diesel vehicles to electric or other non-fossil fuel transportation options.
5. Assist the State and municipalities in implementation of the Lake Champlain Total Maximum Daily Load and other water quality improvement efforts through participation in the Tactical Basin Plans, Municipal Road General Permit assistance, Regional Stormwater Education Partnership/Rethink Runoff, etc.
6. Assist municipalities and the state in emergency management planning through implementation of the All Hazards Mitigation Plan, Local Emergency Planning Committee coordination, Local Emergency Operation Plan assistance, regional dispatch support, etc.
7. Support municipal efforts to support population health by continuing coordination with the University of Vermont Medical Center, United Way of Northwest Vermont, Chittenden Prevention Network, and the Vermont Department of Health.

8. Monitor the advancement of autonomous vehicles and work with the state, municipalities, and other partners on preparations for this technology.

9. Continue annual coordination with our municipalities and partners to monitor and report on progress toward our shared goals through the ECOS Annual Report, ECOS Scorecard and annual performance reports to our municipalities and state funding agencies.

10. Monitor our shifting demographics and support workforce development by focusing on these top actions and continuing coordination with GBIC.

Following this public hearing, Staff will address the comments, and review the edits with the Energy Sub-Committee, TAC and Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC) prior to the Board’s March meeting. We hope to be able to warn the second public hearing (to take place at the May Board meeting) at that time.

**Staff Recommendation:**

No recommendations at this time.

**Staff Contact:**

Contact Regina Mahony with any questions: rmahony@ccrpcvt.org, 846-4490 ext. *28.
Transportation Performance Measures – Safety Targets

Background: The most recent Federal Transportation Acts (MAP-21 and FAST Act) place considerable emphasis on system performance and they direct State Departments of Transportation (DOTs), Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and Transit Providers to evaluate how well the transportation system is doing. At the national level, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) have established a Transportation Performance Management (TPM) program, a strategic initiative, designed to achieve national transportation performance goals. The intent is to measure progress against the national goals through a reliable data-driven process.

FHWA has established measures in the following areas:
- Safety
- Infrastructure Condition (Pavement & Bridges)
- Congestion
- System Reliability (NHS Performance)
- Freight Movements (Interstate)
- Environmental Sustainability

Once the performance measures are established at the federal level, it is up to state DOTs and MPOs to set quantifiable targets to gauge progress towards state and national goals. The schedule to establish targets, varies by measure. Federal regulations generally have state DOTs set performance targets in the various categories and then give MPOs another 180 days to either adopt the State targets or establish their own. Safety targets were the first to be established and reported to FHWA by all DOTs and several MPOs.

VTrans, the CCRPC and other stakeholders have collaborated closely through the winter and spring of 2017 to develop statewide targets for the five performance measures that were established under the Safety category in support of the state’s Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP). VTrans established and reported their safety targets in the summer of 2017 and the CCRPC has a deadline of February 27, 2018 to: 1) Accept the state targets and support them through programming; or 2) Define their own quantifiable targets for the MPO area.

The FHWA safety measures and the VTrans statewide 2018 targets are listed below:
- 5-Year Average Fatalities 2018 Target: 57.0
- 5-Year Fatality Rate 2018 Target: 0.830
- 5-Year Average Serious Injuries 2018 Target: 280.0
- 5-Year Average Serious Injury Rate 2018 Target: 4.0
- 5-Year Average Non-Motorized Fatalities and Non-Motorized Serious Injuries  
  **2018 Target:** 39.4

Moving forward, the CCRPC along with VTrans and GMT (who will be setting FTA targets regarding the condition of their assets) will be coordinating on all future performance target setting and reporting. Proposed targets for all remaining measures will be presented and discussed with the TAC and Executive Committee and approved by the CCRPC Board.

**Staff and TAC Recommendation:** The TAC recommends that the CCRPC Board accepts the VTrans statewide safety targets as reported in the 2017 HSIP Report and not set regional (MPO) targets this calendar year (2018).

Several factors that were considered to reach this recommendation are listed below:

1. The regional level data on fatalities and serious injuries fluctuates (sometimes wildly) from year to year making it difficult to establish a clear, reasonable data-driven target.

2. There are no practical policy or financial consequences for the CCRPC to set (or not set) regional targets.

3. The CCRPC is committed to incorporating the federal safety performance measures into the MPO planning process by adding and tracking these safety measures, annually, as part of the ECOS Scorecard.

4. The CCRPC will have an annual opportunity (February 27th of each year) to set safety targets for the MPO region, if it so chooses.

**Staff Contacts:** Peter Keating, pkeating@ccrpcvt.org and Eleni Churchill, echurchill@ccrpcvt.org
January 29, 2018

Rachel Lomonaco
District #4 Coordinator
111 West Street
Essex Junction, VT 05452

RE: East Allen Street Mixed Use Development; Winooski; Application #4C1309 DRAFT

Dear Ms. Lomonaco:

The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission’s Staff and Executive Committee have reviewed this Act 250 application for a Project described as the redevelopment of four building lots into one lot, demolition or relocation of four existing homes to construct a new four-story mixed-use building with 66 residential units and 2,300 square feet of commercial space. The project is located at 138, 144, 152 and 160 East Allen Street in Winooski, Vermont. The City of Winooski issued a zoning permit for this project on May 25, 2017. We offer the following comments:

The project is located within the Center and Metro Planning Areas as defined in the Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan. We find this project to be consistent with the Planning Areas for the following reasons:

1. The Center Planning Area and the Metro Planning Area are identified in the Plan as areas planned for growth, and therefore this project helps implement Strategy #2 of the Plan, which calls for 80% of new development in the areas planned for growth.
2. The project is proposed in a state-designated Neighborhood Development Area and will be served by municipal water and sewer, existing natural gas infrastructure, and an existing GMT transit route. Additionally, it is within walking distance to many services.
3. The density and uses are consistent with the local regulations.

Therefore, we find this project to be in conformance with the Planning Areas of the 2013 Chittenden County Regional Plan.

Additionally, we find that this project complies with Criterion 9(L), as it is located in a state-designated Neighborhood Development Area.

We concur with the overall findings of the traffic study conducted by RSG dated November 3, 2017.

Due to the detailed level of development review in most Chittenden County municipalities and the environmental permit reviews at the Department of Environmental Conservation, CCRPC will give specific attention in its Act 250 reviews to the type of use and the Planning Areas section of the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan. While there are many other topics covered in the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan, there has been significant analysis at the Regional level regarding transportation impacts. The CCRPC will also focus its attention on transportation, where appropriate, in accordance with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, which is within the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan.

These comments are based on information currently available; we may have additional comments as the process continues. Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions.

Sincerely,
Charlie Baker
Executive Director

Cc: CCRPC Board
Certificate of Service
February 15, 2018

Rachel Lomonaco  
Act 250 Coordinator  
111 West Street  
Essex Junction, VT  05452  

RE: Snyder Hotel; Williston; Application #4C0887-1R-L  

Dear Ms. Lomonaco:  

The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission’s Staff and Executive Committee have reviewed this Act 250 application for a project described the construction of a 100-room hotel with associated site improvements, construction of a portion of Holland Lane between Williston Road and Stillwater Lane, and construction of intersection improvements at Williston Road and Holland Lane. The project is located on Holland Lane in Williston, Vermont. This project received a discretionary permit from the Town of Williston’s Development Review Board on November 28, 2017. We offer the following comments:  

The project is located within the Center Planning Area as defined in the Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan. We find this project to be consistent with the Planning Areas for the following reasons:  

1. The Metro Planning Area is identified in the Plan as an area planned for growth, and therefore this project helps implement Strategy #2 of the Plan which calls for 80% of new development in the areas planned for growth.  
2. The project is located in a state-designated Growth Center, will be served by municipal water and sewer service, and is accessible via GMT transit routes.  
3. The density and uses are consistent with the local regulations.  

Therefore, we find this project to be in conformance with the Planning Areas of the 2013 Chittenden County Regional Plan.  

We also find that this project meets the requirements of Criterion 9(L) as it is located within a state designated Growth Center.  

The Technical Memorandum dated 10/6/2017 written by Lamoureux & Dickinson indicates a decrease in the previously approved cumulative project total pm peak hour trip generation of 344 vehicle trip ends per hour (vte/hr). The new proposed project total is estimated to be 331 vte/hr. We concur with these findings and therefore have no concerns regarding transportation.  

Due to the detailed level of development review in most Chittenden County municipalities and the environmental permit reviews at the Department of Environmental Conservation, CCRPC will give specific attention in its Act 250 reviews to the type of use and the Planning Areas section of the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan. While there are many other topics covered in the 2013 Chittenden
County ECOS Plan, there has been significant analysis at the Regional level regarding transportation impacts. The CCRPC will also focus its attention on transportation, where appropriate, in accordance with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, which is within the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan.

These comments are based on information currently available; we may have additional comments as the process continues. Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Charlie Baker
Executive Director

Cc: CCRPC Board
Certificate of Service
February 21, 2018

Rachel Lomonaco  
Act 250 Coordinator  
111 West Street  
Essex Junction, VT 05452

RE: Hilton Garden Inn Signs; Burlington; Application #4C1253-2

Dear Ms. Lomonaco:

The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission’s Staff and Executive Committee have reviewed this Act 250 application for a project described as an after-the-fact approval of signage at the Hilton Garden Inn at 101 Main Street, in Burlington, Vermont. The building upon which the sign will be located has already been permitted by the District Commission and the City of Burlington, and has already been constructed. The only new development being reviewed in this hearing are the signs, which have been added to the building. We understand that the scope of this hearing will be limited to Criterion 8 (aesthetics). We further understand that the constructed signs were permitted by the City of Burlington in September 2014 and November 2015. We offer the following comments:

The project is located within the Center Planning Area as defined in the Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan. We find this project to be consistent with the Planning Areas for the following reasons:

1. The Center Planning Area is identified in the Plan as an area planned for growth, and therefore the existing building helps implement Strategy #2 of the Plan, which calls for 80% of new development in the areas planned for growth.
2. The project is served by municipal water and sewer.
3. The density and uses are consistent with the local regulations.

Therefore, we find that the existing building is in conformance with the Planning Areas of the 2013 Chittenden County Regional Plan. The addition of signage does not change this finding.

We have no comments on impacts to traffic at this time.

Due to the detailed level of development review in most Chittenden County municipalities and the environmental permit reviews at the Department of Environmental Conservation, CCRPC will give specific attention in its Act 250 reviews to the type of use and the Planning Areas section of the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan. While there are many other topics covered in the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan, there has been significant analysis at the Regional level regarding transportation impacts. The CCRPC will also focus its attention on transportation, where appropriate, in accordance with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, which is within the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan.
These comments are based on information currently available; we may have additional comments as the process continues. Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Charlie Baker
Executive Director

Cc: CCRPC Board
Certificate of Service
January 18, 2018

Jake Marren, Esq., Hearing Officer
Vermont Public Utilities Commission
112 State Street
Montpelier, VT 05620-2701

RE: Petition of GMP MicroGrid – Milton LLC for a Certificate of Public Good (Case #17-5003-PET)

Dear Mr. Marren:

Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission has reviewed the Section 248 application submitted by GMP MicroGrid - Milton LLC to operate and install a 4.99 MW solar electric generation facility and 2 MW battery storage facility to be located off of Mears Road in Milton, Vermont.

This project is located in the Rural Planning Area as defined in the 2013 Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the Chittenden County ECOS Plan (the Plan). The Plan specifically states that “The Rural Planning Area...provides for low density commercial, industrial, and residential development...that is compatible with working lands and natural areas.” The Plan is not intended to prescribe uses and we find that this project – which will not permanently change the use of the land or negatively impact the ability of surrounding lands to remain in agricultural use—is not inconsistent with this planning area. Furthermore, when taking into consideration the energy goals and actions within the Plan that aim to increase renewable energy generation, we find this project to be in conformance with the 2013 Chittenden County Regional Plan.

Due to the detailed level of analysis of renewable energy facilities and its impacts by the Public Service Board, CCRPC will only give specific attention in its Section 248 reviews to the type of use and the Planning Areas section of the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan. While there are many other topics covered in the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan, there has been significant analysis at the Regional level regarding transportation impacts. The CCRPC will also focus its attention on transportation, where appropriate, in accordance with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, which is within the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan. We do not have any transportation related comments for this petition.

These comments are based on information currently available; we may have additional comments as the process continues. Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Charlie Baker
Executive Director

cc: CCRPC Board
    Service List (via upload to ePUC)
Peter Keating called the meeting to order at 9:00AM and asked for a round of introductions.

1. **Consent Agenda**
   No items this month.

2. **Approval of Minutes**
   The January 9th minutes were approved without changes.

3. **Public Comments**
   There were none.

4. **Transportation Performance Measures and Targets**
   The following motion was approved:  *Recommend the Board support VTrans Statewide safety targets and not establish regional targets in 2018.* The vote included two opposed – Essex and Hinesburg, and VTrans abstention.

5. **Project Prioritization**
   This information item was presented and discussed.

6. **Annual List of Projects Receiving Federal Funds**
   This information item was presented and discussed.

7. **Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports**
   This information item was presented and discussed.

8. **CCRPC January Board Meeting Report**
   This information item was presented and discussed.
9. Chairman’s/Members’ Items

General updates and discussion.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted, Peter Keating
DATE: Tuesday, January 9, 2018
TIME: 11:00 a.m. to 12:15 p.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT
DOCUMENTS: Minutes, documents, and presentations discussed accessible at:
http://www.ccrpctxt.org/meetings/clean-water-advisory-committee/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Members in Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bolton:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinesburg: Merrily Lovell (arr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:08 a.m.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buels Gore:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington: Darlene Palola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underhill: Brian Bigelow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington: Jenna Olson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jericho:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westford:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton: Lindsey Beaudoin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williston: James Sherrard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester: Warner Rackley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond: Geoff Urbanik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winooski: Tim Grover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex: Annie Costandi, Co-Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelburne: Chris Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAOT: Jennifer Callahan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Junction: Chelsea Mandigo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Burlington: Tom DiPietro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARN: Christy Witters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington Airport:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of VT: Lani Ravin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(arr. 11:10 a.m.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCRPC Board: Don Meals, Co-Chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Attendees: VTDEC: Jim Pease

CCRPC Staff: Dan Albrecht, Charles Baker

1. Welcome: Chelsea Mandigo called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

2. Changes to the Agenda – none

3. Review and action on draft minutes of December 6, 2017

   After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, Don Meals made a motion, seconded by James Sherrard to approve the December 5, 2017 minutes with corrections as follows: Jennifer Callahan was not at the meeting. MOTION PASSED.

4. Finalize CCRPC legislative talking points on Act 73/Clean Water funding prior to adoption by CCRPC Board

   Charlie Baker walked the Committee through the latest draft which he had circulated via email earlier this morning. Charlie and the committee worked through and made various edits to the points, including but not limited to the following sections: by strengthening the language describing percentage of municipal budgets allocated to Operations & Maintenance; #4- Project Development; #9- Management and #12- Statewide collection and also made various grammatical edits to #11. Members then began to discuss how the various water authority bills might impact the recommendations contained in the talking points as well as the timetable for TMDL implementation and permit issuances.

5. Review draft Clean Water Authority bill

   Albrecht walked through notable sections of the bill which was formally filed as S-260. Sections of the bill are outlined in the memo posted on the Committee’s page. He highlighted that the purpose of the financing plan, to be developed by the proposed Vermont Clean Water Authority is to obtain the funds necessary to achieve compliance with TMDLs, Act 64, and CSO Overflow Rules. The bill sets an initial $40 parcel fee which would eventually vary for each parcel after further analysis of size, location, impervious surface, etc. Fees collected would go into the Vermont Clean Water Fund which the Authority would then use to provide grants or awards based upon a prioritization scheme projects. Members noted the House companion bill is H.564.

   Urbanik expressed concerns on how funds would eventually be disbursed noting that many rural towns may not have projects ready to go and that therefore most of the funds collected would go towards urban areas. Baker acknowledged that areas such as the Northeast Kingdom would have relatively few projects especially since there is no formal Connecticut River TMDL.
10. **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 12:36 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Dan Albrecht
CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

MS4 SUBCOMMITTEE

OF CLEAN WATER ADVISORY COMMITTEE – DRAFT MINUTES

DATE: Tuesday, January 9, 2018
TIME: 12:30 p.m. to 1:15 p.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT
DOCUMENTS: Minutes, documents, and presentations discussed accessible at:
http://www.ccrpcvt.org/meetings/clean-water-advisory-committee/

Committee Members in Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burlington: Jenna Olson</th>
<th>Burlington Airport:</th>
<th>Williston: James Sherrard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colchester: Warner Rackley</td>
<td>Milton: Lindsey Beaudoin</td>
<td>Winooski: Tim Grover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex: Annie Costandi, Co-Chair</td>
<td>Shelburne: Chris Robinson</td>
<td>VAOT: Jennifer Callahan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Junction: Chelsea Mandigo, Co-Chair</td>
<td>South Burlington: Tom DiPietro</td>
<td>University of VT: Lani Ravin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VNAR: Christy Witters; Jim Pease</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Attendees:

CCRPC Staff: Dan Albrecht, Charles Baker

1. Welcome: Chelsea Mandigo called the meeting to order at 12:40 p.m.

2. Changes to the Agenda – none

3. Review and action on draft minutes of December 5, 2017

   After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, Jenna Olson made a motion, seconded by Jennifer Callahan to approve the December 5, 2017 minutes with corrections as follows: Jennifer Callahan was not at the meeting. MOTION PASSED.

4. Consider potential amendment to MS4 MOU to allow CCRPC to charge Indirect Costs

   Albrecht and Baker explained that the MOU only allows CCRPC to charge Personnel, Fringe and other Direct expenses not Indirect. However, House Bill 249 aka the “regional services bill”, passed in spring 2016 regarding Intermunicipal Agreements specifically precludes using municipal RPC dues or State planning funds to cover the cost of providing Intermunicipal services which in this case means the Indirect costs not currently charged to the MS4s signatory to the MOU. Baker apologized that they did not catch this inconsistency as most of the wording for the RSEP-CCST merger MOU was done in early 2016, then the bill passed and then CCRPC was engrossed in revising its bylaws to comply with the legislation. He wants to make the MS4 aware of this issue now so they can decide whether to amend the MOU effective FY19.

   After a brief discussion, the Subcommittee agreed that a need to amend the MOU was likely needed and asked CCRPC staff to draft the necessary language to amend the MOU for discussion at the next meeting.

5. Review and Approve draft FY19 budget and set FY19 dues

   Albrecht walked the committee through the draft budget for FY19. Estimated expenses are $70,911. CCRPC hours would go down but factoring in an Indirect Charge of 65% necessitates an extra $3,500. The stream team effort is proposed to be reduced slightly down to $23,000 while the Tally Ho budget is reduced by more than half as FY19 would be more of a “maintenance” year. If we kept the dues for FY19 at $6,500, based upon 12 members, that would raise $66,500. Our projected surplus at the close of the current FY18 fiscal years is $3,500. This would leave a slight shortfall. However, the annual $3,000 survey set-aside is not a hard cash expenditure and therefore those funds are available if need be.

   Members noted that since we still needed to settle the issue of a CCRPC Indirect Charge as well as have a deeper discussion on the budget it would be best to revisit the FY19 budget at the next meeting.

6. Stream Team Quarterly Update

   Holly Kreiner of the WNRCD provided the update which was posted to the Subcommittee page earlier. In terms of upcoming events, they are planning at tree planting in the Muddy Brook natural area managed by the Winooski Valley Parks District which includes land in both Williston and South Burlington. They are also
planning a tree planting in Winooski on Arbor Day. The outreach towns for 2018 are Shelburne, Burlington and Milton. From July through December, WNRCasd has spent $12,284 of its $24,400 budget.

7. Consideration of RFP for Stream Services starting FY19

Albrecht noted that when the WNRCasd contract was extended through this fiscal year he noted that as it has been since 2011 since the first RFP that CCRPC is obligated to periodically provide opportunities for other firms. That being still the case, he plans to issue an RFP modeled on the 2011 one which he posted to the Subcommittee page.

Members concurred and asked Dan to produce a proposed final RFP which the subcommittee can review and potentially approve at its February meeting.

8. Updates

MS4 Permit, Draft Framework update: Christy Witters provided an update. She sent the draft to EPA last week. They have up to two weeks to review it. She anticipates a formal release in late January followed by a 30-day public comment period. Additional points arising from the discussion included:

- Phosphorus Control Plans will be due in spring 2021. Prior that time, each MS4 will need to report back annually to DEC on their progress on developing these PCPs.
- There is a feasibility standard for road improvements required as part of the Road Stormwater Management Standards, such that municipalities may be able to implement alternative or partial measures due to extenuating circumstances such as the triggering of new permits, impacts to historic features; utilities, etc.
- For those MS4s who have documented their annual street sweeping activity some partial credit may be available on P-removal. Implementation of recommendations for improved street sweeping efficiency via the on-going CCRPC-DEC-USGS “Clean Streets” study may allow for improved credits in the future.
- It was recommended that the language regarding Minimum Measures #1 and #2, specifically, the reference to “July 1, 2017 Stormwater Program Agreement between a group of MS4 permittees and the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission” be expanded or made more generic in case the Lead Agency implementing the agreement ended up being someone besides CCRPC.

Environmental Notice Board: Pease noted to members that the State has created an “electronic environmental notice board” which makes it easy for people to sign up to receive notices on permits, regulations, etc. He added that when signing up to be sure to press the “activate” button to make it work.

Clean Streets Sweeping analysis grant: Pease noted that CCRPC needs to collect the necessary match from the participating municipalities. To make it easy, he asked members present, if they would be okay with CCRPC simply invoicing them. Several members presented indicate that they were fine with this approach.

9. Next Meeting Agenda

The next meeting will be February 6th Agenda items will include:
- stream flow monitoring report
- authorize RFP for Stream Team services
- finalize FY19 budget
- review rough drafts of Annual Reports from Tally Ho Design and Winooski NRCD
- MOU revision

10. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 1:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Dan Albrecht
1. Welcome: Chelsea Mandigo called the meeting to order at 11:30 a.m.

2. Changes to the Agenda – none

3. Review and action on draft minutes of January 9, 2018
   After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, Tom DiPietro made a motion, seconded by Jenna Olson to approve the January 9, 2018 minutes with no corrections. Polly Harris abstained. MOTION PASSED.

4. Review (and consider authorization of CCRPC RFP for Stream Services starting FY19)
   Dan recapped the proposed RFP that was modeled on the first one done in 2011. The proposed scope of work for FY19 is fairly detailed however the RFP notes that scopes in following years may deviate slightly. Jenna Olson made a motion, seconded by Karen Adams to approve issuance of the RFP as presented. Polly Harris abstained. MOTION PASSED.
   After a brief discussion, Annie Costandi, Dave Allerton, Chelsea Mandigo and Jenna Olson agreed to serve on an ad hoc subcommittee to review the proposals received.

5. Finalize FY19 Budget
   Albrecht recapped the proposed budget for FY19 which at $68,911 is slightly less than was discussed at last month’s meeting primarily due to Tally Ho’s anticipated charges being less. Annual dues of $5,500 would stay the same for FY19 yielding a total of $66,000. Coupled with an anticipated FY18 ending of surplus of $3,500, the FY19 budget should be covered. Regarding the long-term, we may need to increase dues in FY20 considering the expenses in FY19 and reduction in reserves.
   Karen Adams made a motion, seconded by Tom DiPietro, to approve the FY19 budget as presented. Polly Harris abstained. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.

6. Proposed revision to MOU, re: indirect rate as required by 24 VSA §4345b
   Dan provided an overview of the proposed change to the MOU. As described at the last meeting, House Bill 249 aka the “regional services bill”, passed in spring 2016 regarding Intermunicipal Agreements specifically precludes using municipal RPC dues or State planning funds to cover the cost of providing Intermunicipal services which in this case means the Indirect costs not currently charged to the MS4s signatory to the MOU. Jenna indicated that the City needs at least 30 days prior to the meeting where it needs to be voted on.
   [Jon Rauscher left the meeting at 11:46 a.m.]
Annie Costandi made a motion, and Jenna Olson seconded, to approve this change to the MOU. Polly Harris abstained. MOTION PASSED. Charlie will prepare a cover memo for MS4 staff to use when they present the proposed change to their governing bodies. He asked for signatures to be gathered within two months.

7. Updates

MS4 Permit update: Christy Witters provided an update. The MRPG permit has been issued. They are working on the framework for incorporating the MRGP permit into the MS4 permit. DEC will not expand the designation to the Town boundary because the impervious surface fee would be extensive. However, any 3 acre developed lands, private system takeovers, and all improvements needed for the MRGP will be covered under the MS4 permits. The permit requirements might be more activity based than geographic based to try to explain what land area is covered under the MS4 component specifically and avoid an increase in permit fees for the MS4 area. Christy indicated that the MS4 permit will go out next week for public comment (for approximately 38 days). The phosphorus control plans will be municipally wide for anything that the municipality’s own. They also have a Feb. 16th EPA scorecard deadline.

[Larry Lackey left the meeting at 12:11 p.m.]

Street Sweeping Project update: Jim Pease and Dan Albrecht reported on the Clean Streets project. The RFP for a GIS analysis of Street Tree Canopy Buffer was issued last week. A vendor should be selected by the end of the month. Jim Pease explained they have 40 UVM students helping with this data collection and analysis. They are working on establishing a more accurate phosphorus reduction for street sweeping. Pease noted that data from Wisconsin has shown an 18% credit can be achieved through a focus on street sweeping in the fall and spring and by doing so before it rains. Its more about when the leaves are picked up rather than the technology used.


a. MS-4 Flow and Precipitation Monitoring Project: Progress Report (Dave Braun, Senior Water Resources Scientist, Stone Environmental)

Dave Braun provided a report on activities carried out by Stone Environmental in partnership with Fitzgerald Environmental to implement the project. [Details can be seen in their presentation posted on the Subcommittee page on the CCRPC website.] Overall the project was successful with rain gauges and flow monitoring pressure transducers installed. Some minor challenges at a few locations included excessive silting, beaver dams causing backwatering or excessively low flows. The monitoring is ongoing using lessons learned from the past year.

Data gathering can be tracked at these two websites:
Standalone rainfall gauges: http://vt-ms4-flow.stone-env.com/Precip/index.html

b. Flow Monitoring and FRP Indicators (Vermont DEC: Blaine Hastings, Hydrologist and Emily Schelley, Environmental Analyst)

Emily and Blaine: [Details can be seen in their presentation posted on the Subcommittee page on the CCRPC website.] Flow Duration Curves for both High Flow and Low Flow were detailed for the impaired streams vs. the “attainment” streams. This comparison helps to set the targets to be achieved for the TMDL and hence for the Flow Restoration Plans (FRPs). These Flow metrics are useful but in the end, streams are “listed” or “delisted” based upon biomonitoring results (aka, “bugs and fish”) typically done every 5 years. While flow targets may be achieved, it may take longer for these biota to establish healthy enough populations to warrant a “delisting.” The DEC will be tracking implementation of FRP projects, however, and these may trigger more frequent biomonitoring.

Biomonitoring data can be tracked on the web in either of two ways:
https://anrweb.vt.gov/DEC/IWIS/ then click on “Site Search”, then type in Stream Name and then click “Monitoring Site Summary.”
http://anrmaps.vermont.gov/websites/anra5/ then turn on Watershed Management Layer then Water Quality Monitoring and then click on sample site of interest and then click “Link to Monitoring Site Summary.”

9. Next Meeting Agenda
The next meeting will be Wednesday, March 7th Agenda items will include:
- approval of MM-1 and MM-2 annual reports from Tally Ho Design and Winooski NRCD, respectively
- MS4 permit
- Vendor recommendation on Stormwater Public Involvement

10. Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 1:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony and Dan Albrecht