REGULAR MEETING & PUBLIC FORUM AGENDA
Wednesday, January 17, 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 November 15, 2017 Meeting * (Action: 2 min)
5. FY2019 UPWP Public Forum (Information: 15 min)
6. FY2018 Mid-year UPWP & Budget Adjustment* (Action: 10 min)
7. UPWP Committee Appointments* (Chair Action; 2 min)
8. Draft ECOS Plan presentation and Warn Public Hearing #1 for February 21, 2018* (Action: 40 min)
9. Long-term Water Quality Funding Policy Position* (Action: 20 min)
10. Regional Dispatch Update* (Information; 15 min)
11. Chair/Executive Director’s Updates (Information; 5 min)
   a. Clean Water
   b. Executive Director’s Report (to be sent separately)
12. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports * (Information; 2 min)
   a. Executive Committee (draft minutes December 6, 2017 & January 3, 2018)*
      i. Act 250/Sec 248 letters *
   b. Transportation Advisory Committee (draft minutes December 5, 2017 & January 9, 2018)*
   c. Clean Water Advisory Committee (draft minutes December 5, 2017)*
   d. MS4 Subcommittee of CWAC (draft minutes December 5, 2017)*
   e. Planning Advisory Committee (draft minutes December 6, 2017)*
   f. Brownfields Committee (draft minutes January 8, 2018)*
   g. Long Range Planning Committee (draft minutes December 14, 2017)*
13. Member’s Items
14. Adjournment

*Attachment

The January 17th Chittenden County RPC meeting will air on ___________________ at ____ p.m. and It will also be available online at:

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@ccrpctvt.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:
- Transportation Advisory Committee – Tuesday, February 6, 2018; 9:00 a.m.
- Clean Water Advisory Committee - Tuesday, February 6, 2018; 11:00 a.m.
- MS4 Subcommittee – Tuesday, February 6, 2018; 12:30 p.m.
- Executive Committee - Wednesday, February 7, 2018; 5:45 p.m.
- Long Range Planning Committee – Thursday, February 8, 2018; 8:30-10 a.m.
- Energy Sub-Committee - Tuesday, February 20, 2018; 5:00 p.m.
- CCRPC Board Meeting - Wednesday, February 21, 2018; 6:00 p.m.
- Planning Advisory Committee – Wednesday, March 14, 2018; 2:30 p.m.

Tentative future Board agenda items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 21, 2018</td>
<td>ECOS Plan Update Public Hearing #1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| March 21, 2018   | Review changes & Warn ECOS Plan Update Public Hearing #2 *(or at April 4th Executive Committee, if needed)*
|                  | National Highway System update                                       |
|                  | Town Highway Bridge FY20 pre-candidate list prioritization            |
| April 18, 2018   | Warn Draft UPWP public hearing                                       |
|                  | VTrans Project Prioritization Process (Tentative)                    |
| May 16, 2018     | ECOS Plan Update Public Hearing #2                                    |
|                  | FY19 UPWP and Budget Public Hearing and Vote                         |
|                  | Review Guidelines and Standards for Reviewing Act 250 and Section 248 Applications |
|                  | Review Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans |
| June 20, 2018 –  | Election of Officers                                                 |
| Joint Annual     | ECOS Plan Update adoption                                            |
| Meeting with GBIC|                                                                     |
| @ ECHO           |                                                                     |
| July 18, 2018    | Action - Guidelines and Standards for Reviewing Act 250 and Section 248 Applications |
|                  | Action - Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans |
CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
DRAFT

Date: Wednesday, November 15, 2017
Time: 6:00 p.m.
Place: CCRPC Offices; 110 W. Canal Street; Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404

Present: Bolton: Sharon Murray  Buels Gore: Absent
Burlington: Andy Montroll  Charlotte: Jim Donovan
Colchester: Absent  Essex: Jeff Carr
Essex Jct: Dan Kerin  Hinesburg: Andrea Morgante
Huntington: Absent  Jericho: Catherine McMain
Milton: Tony Micklus  Richmond: Bard Hill (6:10 p.m.)
St. George: Absent  Shelburne: John Zicconi
So. Burlington: Chris Shaw  Underhill: Brian Bigelow
Westford: Vacant  Williston: Chris Roy
Winooski: Mike O’Brien  VTrans: Amy Bell
Business/Industry: Tim Baechle  Cons/Environ: Don Meals
Socio/Econ/Housing: Justin Dextraudeur
Ex-Officio: GMT: Mark Sousa, Gen. Mgr.  FHWA: Absent
FTA: Absent  BIA: Absent
Staff: Charlie Baker, Executive Director  Pam Brangan, IT, GIS, Data Manager
Forest Cohen, Sr. Business Manager  Bernie Ferenc, Trans. Business Manager
Christine Forde, Sr. Trans. Planner  Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
Melanie Needle, Senior Planner
Charlie Giannoni, CCTV  Michael Bissonette, Hinesburg Alternate
Jon Moore, GMT

1. Call to order; changes to the agenda. The meeting was called to order at 6:00 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 some minor amendments to the FY18 TIP including Stormwater Mitigation Grants; bike/ Ped Program Grants and US 7 signal upgrades in Shelburne & So. Burlington. CHRIS SHAW MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JOHN ZICCONI, TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. Approval of minutes from October 18, 2017 Meeting. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CATHERINE McMAINS, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 18, 2017, WITH CORRECTIONS, IF ANY. Catherine noted that on Page 2, line 19, it should read “Marty” Illick, not Mary. MOTION CARRIED WITH ABSTENTIONS FROM DON MEALS, JIM DONOVAN AND CHRIS ROY.

5. Review and Accept FY17 Audit. Fred Duplessis of Sullivan Powers & Company reported that they have issued a final audit report. It’s a multipurpose audit reviewing general accepted accounting practices as well as federal single audit guidelines because we receive over $750,000 in federal
funding. Our financials are in full conformance with generally accepted accounting standards and there have been no changes in the last year and nothing on the horizon that will affect us. He referred members to the Management’s Discussion and Analysis that begins on page 4 to get the picture of what’s been happening. Then he went to the last page – Summary of Auditor’s Results, which is what the state and feds go to. There are no findings and no compliance findings at all, so we continue to qualify as a low-risk auditee. Which means we have good processes in place to meet the guidelines. The other deliverable is the Management Letter. There was one suggestion in last year’s letter which was dealt with so this year the Management Letter is clean. Jeff Carr thanked staff for the clean audit for the 4th or 5th year. He thanked Fred because they changed the lead auditor at our request since it’d been the same one for several years and we felt fresh eyes would be a good idea. Charlie echoed the thanks to the admin staff. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION TO ACCEPT THE FY17 FINAL AUDIT REPORT. JIM DONOVAN SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

6. GMT Next Gen Transit Plan. Mark Sousa, GMT General Manager, said this is a comprehensive service analysis of the whole system, which they decided to do since they are in five counties now. They hired Nelson Nygaard and they’re in the last quarter of that study. Jon Moore, Director of Maintenance and Planning at GMT has been the lead on this study. [Bard Hill arrived.] Nothing has been finalized yet and they anticipate a final report in February. Jon noted they wanted to report the results to date. He reviewed the goals and objectives – Goal 1 – Make service more convenient; Goal 2 – Connect people to life’s activities; Goal 3 – Improve the region’s quality of life; and Goal 4 – Provide financially and environmentally sustainable service. He then reviewed the trade-offs since we can’t afford to do everything to serve everyone. (e.g. increased frequency vs fewer routes). In developing the various scenarios, they held stakeholder interviews, did a market analysis, evaluated existing services, developed scenarios, and will make service recommendations. The scenarios will be presented to us and the public to see which ones should be recommended. He then reviewed the Chittenden County Service Improvement major themes: simplified service (schedule and route alignments); core network of major local roads (increased frequency); more evening service; better weekend service; minimum service frequency standards and one seat ride between downtown Burlington and Burlington International Airport. They developed three service scenarios and will ask what everyone likes about each scenario - not to pick one.

Scenario 1– Major Expansion (20% service increase) – major focus on improvements in area that are already served – based on findings from market analysis and evaluation of existing services; low focus on geographical expansion – based on market analysis findings; and, unconstrained – as long as potential services can meet VTrans “acceptable” thresholds for productivity and cost-effectiveness.

Scenario 2: Moderate Expansion (10% service increase) – Attempts to achieve much of the same as Scenario 1 with more modest approaches.

Scenario 3: Cost neutral - major focus on addressing issues with existing services and resources.

Jon then reviewed summary of service improvement options by scenario for each route and then asked for questions. Mike O’Brien asked if they had taken this to the municipalities about funding. Jon said not yet – they’ll address that in the second round of public hearings. Andrea Morgante asked if there was any marketing being done to young people such as high schools, etc. to encourage ridership. Jon said they do in Burlington and they need to bring that out into the county. Mark noted
that their marketing person has been sitting at all of these meetings to know how to address that.

Sharon Murray asked if they’d been in discussion with municipalities about zoning for bus stops. Jon said they need to do their planning with land use planners. We have to determine what density is needed to support a regular bus route. Discussion continued. Andrea was happy to hear that major employers were included in the stakeholder interviews. Jon noted that at the end of the month along with CATMA and CCRPC, they will make this presentation to major employers. Lengthy discussion ensued about 20-minute headways in Scen. 1 vs. 15-minute headways in Scen. 2. It was noted that the industry standard is 20-minute headways and 15-minute headways would be the gold standard. Jon said they will do more ridership analysis, but he feels reliable 20-minute headways will increase ridership. The consultant is working on that now. It was noted that the 20% increase in Scenario 1 is for cost not ridership, but our goal is to increase ridership. Mark said there is a 6% drop in ridership across the country and the industry feels it’s because of low gas prices. Chris Roy thanked Jon for his presentation and members were asked to present service improvement ideas on their blog at www.ridegmt.com/nextgen/.

7. ECOS Plan Update - MTP Scenario. Charlie noted that the MTP (Metropolitan Transportation Plan) is the 3rd section of the ECOS Plan currently being updated. Jason Charest presented the draft MTP scenario for the draft MTP that includes multimodal projects and land use strategies from Scenarios A through D, which were presented in October. We viewed this both from congestion and safety perspective. The MTP is the principal transportation planning document for the movement of people and goods. It’s a requirement that we look out at least 20 years. Jason then reviewed the major projects and general categories of projects that are included in the MTP scenario (they’re listed in the memo in the board packet.) Amy Bell noted that there will only be one interstate interchange proposed – it just isn’t pinned down yet. Jason then reviewed the demographic data for 2015 and projections for 2050, and the proposed 2050 program allocations for new MTP improvements. Total funding (2050) is $1,744.72 million with 70% being proposed for preserving the system, 24% for new improvements; and 6% for TIP/Capital Program Front of the book projects. Charlie noted that this was built on the projects that are in the pipeline. The transit costs in here are for capital and not operations. Members were then showed the various charts showing Countywide daily VMT; Daily vehicle trips; VMT per capita; daily transit, walking & biking mode split and daily delay per capita – in 2015; using 2050 base and Draft MTP scenario. He then reviewed various maps showing AM & PM peak hour congestion; AM & PM peak hour delay for 2015 base, the 2050 base and the MTP Scenario and the changes between each. Lengthy discussion ensued. Jeff Carr said in the last two MTPs we estimated an increase in transit and bike/ped – how did we do in actuality? Members asked for explanation of the difference between congestion and delay to help them understand. Dan Kerin is less concerned about VMT than he is with the volume of vehicles on the road. Discussion continued. When asked about autonomous vehicles, Charlie noted that we felt we had to stick with what we know vs. what might happen in the future. We asked RSG to review this and they thought autonomous vehicles might actually increase VMT, but we really don’t know. Although they should be safer because they won’t allow the vehicle to hit something. Lengthy discussion continued. We will update the MTP every five years, and there will be discussion in the plan regarding new technology. Jason then explained the Delay Changes Map from 2050 Base to 2050 Draft MTP Scenario. Jason then reviewed the main points in various committee discussions: increase length of I-89 widening vs. local road improvements; pursue alternative ways to reduce congestion; increase transit, HOV lanes; connect autonomous vehicles; increase funding share for alternative modes. Next steps: Dec/Jan – TAC and LRPC; VTrans coordination; January board meeting to warn draft ECOS Plan/MTP public hearing with public hearings in March and May. Charlie said the TAC spent some time on the big road projects vs. local road projects. After
discussion the TAC generally agreed with what staff proposed. The list of projects in our MTP is $120-130 M more than meets this financial constraint. There are a lot of projects that may be outdated. We’re meeting with town staffs (managers, planners) to look at projects in those municipalities. Sharon Murray said in terms of Energy Plan is there any correlation between the 2050 date in the two plans. Charlie said yes and we’re making sure the two plans are coordinated.

8. Legislative Breakfast Preview. Charlie noted the breakfast is scheduled for Tuesday, December 12th at 7:30 a.m. at the DoubleTree. Unfortunately, the Vermont Bankers Association is having a legislative breakfast on the same day, same time and same place. We are coordinating our program with them. Our talking points will be based on implementing the ECOS Plan. We’ll focus on our economy, transportation investment, housing, long term funding of water quality, and an update on Regional dispatch. We’re getting requests from town managers to also talk about mental health issues. The suburban towns are working with Howard Center and the Medical Center to expand and integrate mental health services with police services. We also want to emphasize that CCRPC is a resource to the legislators. We’ll work out the details with the Executive Committee. Chris Shaw asked whether there should be discussion with legislators to say how to attract people to Vermont, and what we can do to retain those who are educated here and have them stay here. Bard Hill said the state agencies were asked to report to the Governor on that and his department suggested interns. Chris Roy said UVM is having some of the same issues with housing for employees, etc.

Discussion continued. More Champlain students stay here than UVM students who go there.

9. Chair/Executive Director’s Update.
   a. Clean Water Initiatives Update. Charlie distributed copies of the Report of the Working Group on Water Quality Funding that was released today. Sec. Moore included a two-page Executive Summary. They’re saying we’ll use existing funding sources through 2021. The treasurer was thinking only two years, but this group is asking the legislature to think about making it a little longer. They got hung up on the parcel fee collection which would cost $5 million annually to collect $20 million. We’re working on getting capital money to towns with project ready to go. Half of our towns participated in Grants-in-Aid Program and we’re hoping for more money next spring. We’re continuing to talk with DEC about getting the right projects ready for funding.
   b. Regional Dispatch Update. The Union Municipal District agreement should be back from AG’s office next week. The Joint Survey Committee will recommend the agreement to municipal legislative bodies to see if municipalities want to put this on the ballot next March. The agreement would establish a public safety authority. All the details are not yet worked out. There is still a lot of process left to do after the authority is approved.
   c. FY19 UPWP Project solicitation. Were sent out today with Marshall as the primary contact.
   d. VTrans project selection process. VTrans has been working to update their project selection process and are looking at the criteria and how to prioritize projects. We’ll keep members updated. They’re close to having a draft, but will review it for a year to test it first.

10. Committee/Liaison Activities and Reports. Minutes of various meetings were included in the board packet.

11. Members’ Items/Other business. There was none.

12. Adjournment. DAN KERIN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JIM DONOVAN, TO ADJOURN AT 7:35 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc
Chittenden County RPC Seeks Planning Project Ideas

Public asked to offer project suggestions for organization’s annual work program

Winooski, VT - The public is invited to offer suggestions to the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC) for regional transportation and land use planning projects in Chittenden County.

The CCRPC is currently preparing next year’s work program and the public is invited to participate in a public forum scheduled as part of the CCRPC’s regular Board meeting on Wednesday, January 17 at 6 p.m. at the CCRPC offices (110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski). Comments will also be accepted until January 19 via email (mdistel@ccrpcvt.org) or by phone (802-861-0122). The CCRPC’s current work plan is available online at https://www.ccrpcvt.org/about-us/commission/annual-work-plan-budget-finances/. Residents are strongly encouraged to discuss project ideas with their municipal staff and officials, as local support and matching funds are typically required for projects.

The CCRPC provides planning and technical assistance in the areas of community development, transportation, agriculture, natural resources, stormwater, housing, economic development, and emergency management to the 19 municipalities of Chittenden County and the public. The collaboration between the CCRPC, Chittenden County municipalities and other related resource agencies results in the development and implementation of plans that support sustainable development and improve the region’s environment and quality of life. For more information about the CCRPC, please visit https://www.ccrpcvt.org/.

Please note that while CCRPC funds cannot be used for construction projects, the organization’s planning helps projects get closer to reality. The final work program will be approved in May 2018. For more information and to view a list of recent and current projects of the CCRPC, visit https://www.ccrpcvt.org/about-us/commission/annual-work-plan-budget-finances/.

Bus service to Winooski is available on the GMT Essex Junction bus line or the Riverside/Winooski bus line. 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 802-861-0114 or evaughn@ccrpcvt.org, at least 3 business days prior to the meeting.

# # #
CCRPC Board  
01/17/2018  
Agenda Item 6: Action Item  

FY2018 Mid-Year UPWP and Budget Adjustment

**Background:** Each year CCRPC reviews the approved work program and budget at mid-year and makes changes where needed. Some consultant projects don’t begin until mid-year so funds are adjusted to reflect how much we believe will be spent by June 30th. Some may require additional funds to complete, and some of those will carryforward into FY18. Staff also makes adjustments to the number of hours they anticipate spending on each UPWP task.

In the Mid-Year Adjustment annual work plan document (posted separately) we have shown the original budget amount, the mid-year projected amount and the difference, whether up or down. The Mid-Year Adjustment to the FY18 Budget is also attached as a separate document in 11x17 format.

Blue highlighted areas indicate that changes were made either in task description or consultant dollars. If the whole line is highlighted it means the task was added at mid-year.

Staff is proposing the following edits to the draft presented to the Executive Committee on January 3, 2018, and included in your packet –

- **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).

**Executive Committee Recommendation**  
CCRPC staff and the Executive Committee recommend approval, with the proposed edits above, of the FY18 Mid-Year UPWP and Budget Adjustment by the CCRPC Board.

**For more information contact:**  
Charlie Baker, Executive Director at cbaker@ccrpcvt.org or at 846-4490 ext. *23
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
January 17, 2018

Agenda Item 7: Chair Action Item

FY2018 UPWP Committee Appointments

From the Bylaws: Article VII.B. “The Chair shall … with concurrence of the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission, establish and appoint committees and their members.”

Unified Planning Work Program Committee (3-5 board members):

Michael O’Brien, Winooski (Chair);
John Zicconi, Shelburne;
Michael Bissonette, Hinesburg;
Jeff Bartley, Colchester; and,
Bard Hill, Richmond.

For questions, contact Charlie Baker, 846-4490 ext. *23 or cbaker@ccrpcvt.org
January 17, 2018
Agenda Item 8: Draft ECOS Plan presentation and Warn Public Hearing #1 for February 21, 2018

Issues: As you are aware we’ve been working on the 2018 ECOS Plan, with specific updates to the MTP, CEDS and enhanced energy planning. We are also responsible for addressing Forest Integrity which is now a new State requirement (though for the most part this was already addressed in the plan, and we addressed it further through the enhanced energy planning process as forest blocks and wildlife connectivity resources where identified as state constraints). As a reminder, the policies/strategies associated with the original 2013 ECOS Plan have largely stayed the same.

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. We will discuss these actions at the Board meeting.

The TAC, Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC), Energy Sub-Committee and Staff have been preparing these amendments for well over a year. We’ve conducted public outreach over the last three months and received approximately 200 comments, that have been incorporated or addressed as appropriate. The TAC and LRPC have reviewed the draft 2018 ECOS Plan and have recommended that the Board accept this as the first public hearing draft and warn a public hearing for February 21, 2018 at 6pm.

The draft Plan will be available for your review by the end of the day on Friday, January 12th in this location:

Executive Committee Recommendation: The Executive Committee recommends that the Board warn the first public hearing for the ECOS Plan amendments for Wednesday, February 21, 2018 at 6:00pm.

TAC Recommendation: The TAC recommends the CCRPC Board warn a public hearing on the MTP for its February 21, 2018 meeting and evaluate the fiscal impact of the proposed 15-minute headway on all GMT routes.

Note: Staff is currently working with GMT to evaluate the fiscal impacts of the 15-min headways. Results of the evaluation will be presented at the Board meeting. Staff will also present revised transit recommendations that include 15-min headways for at least some transit routes.

LRPC Recommendation: The LRPC recommends that the Board accept this as the first public hearing draft and warn a public hearing for February 21, 2018 at 6pm.
Staff
Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Board accept this as the first public hearing draft and warn a public hearing for February 21, 2018 at 6pm.

Staff Contact: Contact Regina Mahony with any questions: rmahony@ccrpcvt.org, 846-4490 ext. *28.
Clean Water Funding  
Policy Positions  
**DRAFT – January 10, 2018**

It is important to our environment and economy that the State develop a long-term funding system that is equitable and is effective in achieving our shared clean water goals. Below are our comments intended to assist the Legislature address the need for long term water quality funding. These positions were reviewed and approved by the CCRPC Board on January 17, 2018.

**Needs**

1. **Commitment.** The State of Vermont made commitments through Act 64 and other mechanisms to the Federal Government and our residents to meet clean water standards. It is critical that the State address the short and long-term funding needed to follow through on these commitments. The environmental, social, and economic costs of not complying with these commitments is high.

2. **Capital Costs.** According to the State Treasurer’s Report from January 2017, the 20-year total clean water compliance costs [for capital investment] are $2.3 billion. Revenues during that time period are projected at $1.06 billion, leaving a 20-year total gap of $1.25 billion. Annual compliance costs are estimated at $115.6 million, revenues at $53.2 million, leaving a gap of $62.4 million per year. Estimates encapsulate all public and private costs, including municipalities, farms, private residences and businesses, and the State [except for operations and maintenance costs].

3. **Operations and Maintenance Costs.** Our municipal MS4 stormwater communities report between 50% to 67% of their budgets being needed for operation, maintenance, and administrative activities. Ongoing operations and maintenance (O&M) costs exist, can be significant, are necessary to realize the water quality benefits of any physical improvements, and should be considered and planned for as part of the overall statewide water quality funding needs. Because municipalities bear these long-term O&M costs, we believe the State should raise 80% of the required capital funding.

4. **Project Development.** Based upon our experiences with other capital projects, we estimate that at least 20% of all funding needs to be non-capital. This level of investment is needed to provide adequate resources for the initial two or three stages of work described in the project life cycle graphic on page 6 of the Act 73 Report. Some of that funding is available for Tactical Basin Planning and through the ERP program, but much more is needed to fully develop projects, or “evaluate options and select approach” and working with sponsors and landowners. This funding is needed now and is critical to building confidence in future investment decisions. Look to VTrans as a model. There is only $300,000 of Clean Water Fund resources proposed for FY2019. This amount should be increased to $3,000,000 in this early period to properly invest in developing a good project list for capital funding.

**Support for Generating Additional Revenue**

5. **Statewide funding.** Raising the majority of needed funding statewide will allow the State to best manage investments that have the greatest cost-effectiveness. The cost to society will be less if
effective investments are made in high-priority locations. We recommend that the State raise enough revenue to cover 80% of capital costs (including federal funds) instead of 50% due to the O&M costs not being included. The recommendation of 50% to be borne by municipal taxpayers is overly onerous and does not take into account the long-term O&M costs that the municipality currently bear and will into the foreseeable future.

6. Parcel Fee/All-in. We support the implementation of a statewide fee and system to provide adequate funding over the next 20 years. A broad-based approach that spreads these costs out among all Vermonters should be implemented. A parcel-based fee of some kind makes the most sense in terms of having a rational nexus and having an “all in” approach. It is essential for all properties, including those that are exempt from property tax such as government facilities, State roads, railroads, and buildings be included. We support the recommendation to implement a parcel-based tiered fee at the beginning of FY19, with a more accurate impervious-based tiered fee to follow when ready.

Governance and Administration

7. Trust Fund. Revenues raised should go into a dedicated trust or enterprise fund.

8. Governance Accountability. The statewide utility/authority/district should be created as a governmental body answerable to the Legislature with representation from state agencies and municipalities on the governing body. At least one municipal representative should be included on the governing body.

9. Management. Funds should be raised in a statewide system with billing, parcel (GIS and impervious) analysis, and consistent determinations regarding billing, trading, credits, and enforcement decisions made at this level. Some capped percentage of the funding should be kept at the state level for administration. High level priorities should be decided by the governing body about priority investments in different categories and/or watersheds. This will facilitate development of trading networks which will provide a mechanism for municipalities with less cost-effective implementation options to meet their regulatory obligations. Investment priorities should be based upon the best available science. Evaluate how municipalities and regions may best participate in the investment prioritization process.

Statewide Collection

10. Provide Credits. Any statewide fee levied for the purpose of water quality should not reduce existing funding of municipal stormwater programs/utilities. A statewide fee should provide for a system of credits.

11. Statewide collection. We believe that the parcel fee should be collected at the state level. This could build upon state efforts to develop statewide parcel mapping (and maybe impervious layer if that is needed).

12. Not municipal collection. Requiring municipalities to collect these funds is problematic because:

   a. Any municipality that does not already have a stormwater utility/program would have to develop a new water quality fee collection system for all properties including tax exempt properties, separate from tax bills.

   b. Property owners will not be able to distinguish the state fee from locally imposed taxes. Municipalities are clearly opposed to adding additional costs to the property taxes.
c. There will be a new cost burden imposed on every municipality to collect and enforce this fee.

13. **Collection generally.** It is important that the collection system address:
   a. How to impose a new fee on tax exempt property.
   b. How residents will be able to easily distinguish this fee from local property taxes.
   c. The cost of administration.
   d. Method of enforcement/penalties when entities do not pay the fee.

14. **If Municipal Collection.** There needs to be State support in:
   a. Educating property owners,
   b. Improving the technology systems,
   c. Enforcement for non-payment, and
   d. Providing for an appropriate percentage of the revenue to cover costs. (The current .225% will only provide $90 for every $40,000 collected.)

If the fee system moves to an impervious-based system, the collection must be done by the state entity that is administering the program including the credits. Municipalities cannot be expected to respond to the set of issues that will arise in this scenario.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Legislative Bodies, Planning Commissions, and Town Clerks
For the Municipalities of Burlington, Colchester, Essex, Milton, Shelburne, South Burlington, Williston, and Winooski

FROM: Aaron Frank, Chair, Joint Survey Committee
Charlie Baker, Executive Director, Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission

RE: Proposed formation of the Chittenden County Public Safety Authority, a Union Municipal District to provide regional public safety dispatch

DATE: November 22, 2017

Following a 2016 study, and a lot of work this year, the Joint Survey Committee appointed by Burlington, Colchester, Essex, Milton, Shelburne, South Burlington, Williston and Winooski is proposing the creation of a new organization to implement regional public safety dispatch service in Chittenden County. Police, fire, and emergency medical services are more efficiently and effectively dispatched to emergencies in a combined 911 and public safety dispatch center.

The 2016 study focused on the implementation of two prior studies completed in 1995 and 2000, both of which determined that regional public safety dispatch was feasible, desirable and worthwhile. Supported by the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission, this effort included evaluating the technical and governmental requirements of implementing regional public safety dispatch service.

The legislative bodies of these municipalities formed a Joint Survey Committee (JSC) to consider and design an appropriate governance structure for regional dispatch. It was determined that the best approach was to form a Union Municipal District, which is the form of government utilized by the Champlain Water District and the Chittenden Solid Waste District.

The JSC has spent considerable time analyzing the value of regional dispatch and the most effective governance structure. In the process of reviewing the data and drafting an agreement, the JSC determined that a regional dispatch center, especially when combined with a regional public safety answering point (911 call center), is worthwhile because it can reduce response time for many 911 calls – by avoiding a transfer to local dispatch – saving about 70 seconds per call. This is a significant improvement in response time for Chittenden County residents, businesses and communities.

Other benefits of a regional public safety dispatch service include:

- Improvement of mutual aid among towns, which happens regularly for fire and rescue services,
- Increased number of dispatchers on duty in a single location, allowing more dispatchers to resource multiple emergencies in a single community,
- Additional resources to contribute to supervision, quality assurance, training, and career advancement opportunities within the field of public safety dispatch, and
- Dedicated oversight to more fire and emergency medical services, increasing responder safety.
The agreement has been approved by the Vermont Attorney General’s Office as required by statute. In the near future, we will be asking each legislative body to pass a resolution enabling the placement of an item on their respective Town Meeting warnings, so that the citizens in each municipality may vote on whether to form this Union Municipal District, to be known as the Chittenden County Public Safety Authority.

Should voter approval be gained, it will authorize the Chittenden County Public Safety Authority (PSA) to form, but will not obligate municipalities to pay for or receive services.

Following the formation of the PSA, additional details will be developed to support the consolidation and operation of services. Municipalities that join the PSA would then need an additional vote of their legislative body to begin to pay for and receive services from the new entity. We anticipate that this will happen over the 12-24 months after the PSA is formed.

Therefore, and pursuant to 24 VSA 121 Section 4861, we are delivering to you a copy of the agreement, entitled, “Agreement to Create the Chittenden County Public Safety Authority.” Also attached is a sample resolution and ballot language. If you would like to place this on your town Meeting Ballot, your Selectboard or Council will need to vote to do so by January 24, 2018.

For more information: http://www.ccrpcvt.org/our-work/emergency-management/regional-dispatch/
Following a 2016 study, a committee appointed by eight Chittenden County municipalities is proposing the creation of a new organization to implement regional public safety dispatch service in Chittenden County: The Chittenden County Public Safety Authority (CCPSA).

If approved, the CCPSA would form as a Union Municipal District — the same structure as other familiar entities in our community like the Champlain Water District and the Chittenden Solid Waste District.

What is Regional Public Safety Dispatch?
Regional public safety dispatch refers to the consolidation of dispatch services for police, fire, and emergency medical across multiple participating municipalities.

What Makes a Regional Approach Better?
A regional dispatch center, especially when combined with a regional public safety answering point (911 call center) can reduce response time for many 911 calls - by avoiding a transfer to local dispatch - saving an average of 70 seconds per call. Other benefits include:

- Improvement of mutual aid and dispatch times among towns by using computer-aided dispatch and improved technology
- Increased number of dispatchers on duty in a single location, allowing more dispatchers to resource multiple emergencies in a single community
- Additional resources to contribute to supervision, quality assurance, training, and career advancement opportunities for our professional dispatchers
- Dedicated oversight to more fire and emergency medical services, increasing responder safety
- Better service for a similar cost

"The benefits to residents throughout our county are clear."
- Taylor Yeates, Public Safety Director, Town of Milton

Which Municipalities are Involved?
Burlington
Colchester
Milton
Shelburne
So. Burlington
Williston
Winooski
Communities in Chittenden County have long explored the potential of consolidating emergency dispatching services.

A Timeline of Regional Dispatch Preparation in Chittenden County

Communities in Chittenden County began exploring the idea of sharing public safety services. The 1995 study, "Vision 2000," determined that a consolidated regional dispatch center and system is feasible but required many steps. The 2000 study resurrected the 1995 study and a committee was formed which determined that regional dispatch was still worthwhile. The 2016 study focused on the implementation of the two prior studies and included evaluating the technical and governmental requirements of implementing regional public safety dispatch.

Who Supports Regional Dispatch in the Public Safety Community?

- Burlington Fire Department
- Burlington Police Department
- Colchester Center Volunteer Fire Company
- Colchester Fire District 2 Prudential Committee
- Colchester Police Department
- Colchester Rescue
- Colchester Technical Rescue
- Lake Champlain Regional Chamber of Commerce
- Malletts Bay Fire Department
- Richmond Police Department
- St. Michael's College Fire & Rescue
- Shelburne Fire Department
- Shelburne Police Department
- South Burlington Fire Department
- South Burlington Police Department
- Williston Police Department
- Winooski Fire Department
- Winooski Police Department
- Lake Champlain Regional Chamber of Commerce

On November 17, 2017, Vermont Attorney General Tj Donovan approved the agreement for voters to consider.

What are the Next Steps?

Residents will have the opportunity to vote on Town Meeting Day on March 6, 2018 to move this effort forward.

If approved, the Chittenden County Public Safety Authority (CCPSA) will be formed to begin looking at further details. Funding for and operation of dispatch services for each City/Town will not begin before a subsequent City Council/Town Selectboard vote to approve the funding agreement. Operations for each community are anticipated to begin in 12-24 months of CCPSA formation. When the CCPSA has enough information to move forward with detailed implementation efforts to provide dispatch service, it will ask for City/Town Councils/Selectboards to ratify a funding agreement. The ratification of the funding agreement would commit the community to providing funding for and receiving dispatch service.

Where Can I Find More Information?

Visit the Regional Dispatch webpage to learn more about this effort, including background information, meeting materials, media coverage and more:


Contact

For questions, feedback or media inquiries, contact your municipal representative:

Rick McGuire
rmcguire@willistontown.com
The meeting was called to order at 5:46 p.m. by the Chair, Chris Roy.

1. Changes to the Agenda; Members’ Items. Charlie added an item under his report regarding the Airport TAC. Regina added an update on the Green Line Section 248 project.

2. Approval of November 1, 2017 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes. ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O’BRIEN TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 1, 2017 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES, WITH CORRECTIONS IF ANY. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS WRITTEN.

3. Act 250 & Section 248 Applications.
   a. Acabay Sign, Colchester, #4C0757-23B. This application is for the mounting of an internally illuminated external sign at a project at 105 Westview Road in Colchester. We have sent the letter and are asking members to ratify that action. A discussion ensued about whether this is considered billboard advertising. It was noted that we would think Colchester’s sign ordinance would comply with billboard law. Regina noted that one of the party respondents is the VTrans Travel Information Council, so they will address that issue. [Note - No action was taken. Will be included on the January agenda.]
   b. Exit 16 DDI appeal. Regina noted that we submitted letters for this project in 2014 and now the application is being appealed. We have been asked by VTrans to help participate in the response to the deposition they got about the original plan and the project and how this meets our regional plan. Our MOA with VTrans does say we will assist in these matters. Eleni mentioned that we had done a scoping study. The day before Thanksgiving we received a subpoena from the appellant. It does have a broad reach and we talked to Joe McLean to narrow the scope. They want to address bike/ped projects near Exit 16. Discussion ensued. We are providing everything we can. Regina noted that the deposition is scheduled for December 13th and 14th. The parties include Costco, Vallee, CLF and the Town of Colchester. It was noted that Costco gas pumps are in the ground, but they can’t start selling gas until Mountain View Road improvements are completed. Discussion continued. There will be some legal fees involved for us.
   c. Green Line. Regina noted this was for the second electric transmission line going through the lake. They have withdrawn their application saying they hope to do this in the future.

4. ECOS Plan Update. MTP Draft Review. Charlie noted that the Energy Plan and CEDS are out for public comments and we hope to have the MTP draft out to the public next week by December 15th.
Eleni noted that we are not changing our transportation goal from the ECOS Plan. She reviewed the contents of the MTP which includes:

- **a.** introduction and background (new);
- **b.** transportation goal, issues and performance measures – by spring of 2018 FHWA is requiring VTrans to set up target for performance measures and we may want to have a separate document to comply with federal regulations;
- **c.** existing metropolitan transportation system;
- **d.** financial plan;
- **e.** scenario planning review and future conditions;
- **f.** MTP corridors will be aligned with VTrans’ approach to corridor planning,
- **g.** MTP investments and project list – is a work in progress; and
- **h.** environmental impacts and mitigation report.

The ECOS Plan will be updated and restructured and the MTP will be a supplement to the plan. Members have previously reviewed existing conditions and the financial plan – 70% will be spent on operations and maintenance including paving, bridges and transit. The remaining funds are focused and separated into 7 categories. Eleni reviewed the Draft MTP Scenario highlights. The corridor approach is a new concept in the MTP. Because of VTrans focus on corridor management, we feel we should look at it that way as well. MTP investment – we are meeting with municipalities and this list is a work in progress. John Zicconi asked if Route 7 through Shelburne village is in there. Eleni noted that we met with Shelburne and agreed we need to add it. It’s on the TIP with no funding, but we will add that. New content is Environmental Consultation and is a federal requirement. We met with staff of VTrans’ environmental section, Dept. of Environmental Conservation and Agency of Natural Resources. There are environmental impacts with all of our projects and we’ll have to discuss mitigation strategies in a general way. Eleni then reviewed the schedule and next steps. She asked for comments from TAC and Exec. Comm. on this draft by December 15th. We’ll revise the draft for the January TAC meeting and ask the board to warn a public hearing at their January meeting for the February board meeting. John Zicconi suggested using a more visually pleasing format for the MTP document. Charlie said we’re using Word for the drafts, but we’ll use another format once we have a final draft.

5. **Legislative Breakfast preview.** Charlie reviewed a draft of his presentation for the Legislative Breakfast on December 12th at 7:30 a.m. Members gave suggestions of what to include and what to delete.

6. **Chair/Executive Director Report.**
   - **a. CC Opioid Alliance update.** This effort will be moved to United Way beginning January 1st with new staff and the money will go with it. It’s really more in line with their health and human services work.
   - **b. Regional Dispatch update.** The Union Municipal District agreement is in front of the town selectboards and city councils to see if they’ll put it on the ballot for town meeting in 2018. The dispatchers union had been in contact with Charlie.
   - **c. Clean Water Update.** The biggest chunk of capital money will be going to four projects in Williston, Burlington and Jericho. We’re working through contracting for this work and the towns will work on the contractor procurement. Basin planning – we have been the statewide funnel for all the RPCs and there is a challenge getting to an acceptable scope and budget. Bolton has asked our help in dealing with General Roads Permit implementation. We may have more conversations about how to help the small towns.
d. **Burlington International Airport – TAC.** Charlie said the airport asked him to serve on the Noise Compatibility Plan Technical Advisory Committee. There is a lot of process and he’s not sure what they expect from the RPC. In January and March this group will be talking about noise mitigation measures. They may be coming up with ideas to help existing homes such as insulation, and new doors and windows for residences. Charlie is not sure if he should be getting input from the representatives in the affected communities. His inclination is to leave it to them. Discussion ensued. Members suggested he stay as far out of this as possible in deference to the individual municipalities. Charlie said we have committed to having better communication lines with BIA. Members agreed to facilitating the communication factor. Charlie will put an item for the Airport TAC on the Board agenda.

7. **Agenda Review.** There is no December board meeting.

8. **Other Business.** There was no other business.

9. **Executive Session.** There was no need for an Executive Session.

10. **Adjournment.** BRIAN BIGELOW MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JOHN ZICCONI, TO ADJOURN AT 7:04 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc
The meeting was called to order at 5:45 p.m. by the Chair, Chris Roy. It was noted that Charlie was not here because of illness. Barbara Elliott is also ill and unable to attend.

1. Changes to the Agenda; Members' Items: Regina asked to add a project to the Act 250 item.

2. Approval of December 6, 2017 Executive Committee Minutes. BRIAN BIGELOW MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O'BRIEN TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 6, 2017 WITH CORRECTIONS IF ANY. Brian had sent three grammatical corrections to Bernie which will be incorporated in the final minutes. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. Act 250 & Section 248 Applications.
   a. Acabay Sign, Colchester, #4C0757-23B. This is on the agenda again since we did not take action to ratify the letter last month. We had a discussion, but no motion. MIKE O'BRIEN MADE A MOTION TO RATIFY THE LETTER TO D.E.C. ANDY MONTROLL SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
   b. GMP MicroGrid-Milton LLC, Case #17-5003-PET. Regina noted that there is a site plan in the packet. The one thing we hadn't confirmed prior to this packet, was whether Milton had any issues, but they are fine with it. It is in the Rural Planning Area; and there are no transportation concerns as this is a renewable energy project. MIKE O'BRIEN MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE LETTER WITH THE HIGHLIGHTED PHRASE REMOVED. BRIAN BIGELOW SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
   c. East Allen Street. Regina noted that we just received notice of a project in Winooski on E. Allen Street to remove 4 existing residential lots and construct a new building with 66 units. We haven't had a chance to prepare a letter yet, but the hearing is two days prior to our next Executive Committee meeting. Staff will prepare a letter and send it via email for review.

4. ECOS Plan Update. Regina noted that members received a link to the FTP site for the draft First Public Hearing Draft. There will be much more work done on it. She explained the reorganization of the plan. In the current plan, Chapter 3 is the ECOS Plan Priorities and Implementation. We moved that up to be the main part of the plan and everything else are supplements. We added CCRPC's Top Ten Actions for the Next Five Years at the beginning of the document. This was suggested by Alex Weinhalgen to have municipalities really talk about what they'll do in their communities and put it in their plans. When asked where these ten actions came from, Regina indicated that they she made up the list, but they already exist within the full list of actions in the Plan. Andy said there are a couple of things we've talked about over the years that he'd like to see included: 1) dealing with aging population in the state and Chittenden County and therefore finding ways to attract young
families to the area. He thinks that’s in the ECOS plan and he thinks calling it out would be good to do. 2) We’ve talked about the region being a high-tech corridor and different groups are doing things, but no one is coordinating that effort. We need to say that this is a good place to do this because there is so much going on in technology – such as Champlain College’s gaming program that is highly regarded nationally. Chris said we should be prepared to deal with the top ten actions because as soon as we do that, folks will have input. In Williston they kept their list at the bottom of their agenda that kept the five top things on people’s minds. Regina then reviewed the comments we’ve received to date. There are 195 comments and the comment period is still open until Friday for the MTP. They are divided into Energy/CEDS/MTP. She highlighted comments on Page 2 regarding Energy. Regina said these have been discussed by the LRPC and PAC. One deals with carbon tax and our recommendation is to not take a stand on it at this time. Another question was about taking specific steps to get us off our addiction to (cheap) natural gas. We do not think this needs to be addressed beyond what is already in the plan. Sharon Murray feels we are still a little weak on location of renewable energy generation. Our response notes that we encourage location of renewable energy generation projects following the guidelines, but don’t want the suitability policies to limit potential locations if technology changes.

General comments on the CEDS was for better broadband throughout the county. This is already addressed in other areas of the plan, but we have only sent out the three new sections so those connections aren’t clear. Another thing on CEDS is that in the 2013 plan it talks about the lack of industrial land that is permitted and ready to go. This is an issue for startup businesses when they’re looking to move in. GBIC doesn’t think it’s as much of an issue as it was in 2013, but there are still some businesses going to Franklin County. GBIC will do studies to see if we do need to deal with that in the future. Next week the LRPC will be discussing the comments before it goes to the board. Mike O’Brien feels that most of the industrial land and parks are built up. Canadian companies wanting to locate in U.S. tend to go to either Plattsburg or Franklin County rather than Chittenden County. Brief discussion.

Eleni reviewed MTP comments. We just added these today, and we’ll be adding responses before this goes to the board. A general consensus seems to be we need more transit and some are asking for 15-minute headways. Mike O’Brien expressed confusion over GMT’s presentation a couple months ago. If the goal is to have 15-minute headways shouldn’t we include that. Eleni said we went with 20-minute headways because that was one of the alternatives in the Next Gen plan; and we are recommending 20-minute headways for all routes, although GMT thinks it should be only on some routes. This would increase the capital investment needed for transit. Mike said if the goal is to increase public transportation, we should put a goal of 15-minute headways. Discussion ensued. Eleni said there is a big difference between providing the faster service for all routes all day, or only peak hours and only on some routes. She will look to see how much capital is needed for 15-minute headways. Discussion continued. When Mike asked about Next Gen, Eleni noted that this is actually GMT’s short-term plan. The long-term plan will be done after this study. Andy feels we should put in that goal even if we can’t make it. Eleni said another comment was about the third lane on the interstate. The TAC discussed this in great detail and they are comfortable leaving the third lane because our model shows that the interstate fails from a capacity perspective between Exits 14 & 15, and we can’t ignore that in the Plan. Even though we’d like to spend the $74M on downtown and local roads, it’s important to look at the interstate as well. Chris said our job is to have a broader perspective and we have to balance everything. The fact is that the small increase in capacity will not keep up with traffic. He feels this will have the biggest bang for the buck. We have to keep in mind that the interstate is part of an integrated network. He noted that one of the
benefits of coming to Vermont is less traffic and if we lose that, what do we have. Mike feels the third lane is a safety issue. The third lane at Exit 15 was added because cars exiting had been backing up onto the interstate itself. He questioned the proportion of the trips that are cars, transit, etc. We have to accommodate cars, but we have to look at the broader picture and the goal of reducing cars on the road. Discussion continued. Mike then said we will not move 50% of the people from their cars. Eleni said we’ll make a note that technology will change our driving, but we don’t know how. We got a lot of comments about roundabouts. Regina said there is one more thing for Energy – we have done a little work to see whether we can meet the goal for reducing energy consumption. Every community can meet its goal except Essex Junction where Global Foundries (GF) is a huge energy user. What we decided to do is be clear that there is a heavy use in Essex Junction, but collectively we could meet the county goal. Andy suggested we point out that this is a unique situation. He suggested taking GF out of there. We can’t really see why Essex Junction is skewed so we should show them without GF. Chris said there has to be some out language there because we don’t want to discourage new industry like GF. There is a difference between wasting energy and using more of it responsibly. Lengthy discussion ensued.

5. FY18 UPWP Mid-Year Adjustment. Regina noted that the blue highlighted lines/cells are changes or new projects:
   a. Line 13 – byways grant that has not yet been completed.
   b. Line 20 – So. Burlington DRB assistance is new.
   c. Line 26 – Charlotte zoning assistance while they look for new zoning administrator.
   d. Line 27 – Shelburne Rural Build-out analysis.
   e. Line 28 – Essex Zoning regulations audit for housing.
   f. Line 30 – This is a specific deliverable in our ACCD contract.
   g. Line 36 – SB STAR assistance.
   h. Line 48 – adds FY17 carryover funds for CCTA task.
   i. Line 75 – We reduced the consultant estimate since VTrans will be scoping some of the signals on Route 7. We will be doing Shelburne Street from I-189 to Prospect Parkway.
   j. Line 92 – Winooski Main Street Revitalization Scoping is new project to add $50,000. This study will focus on developing and evaluating multi-modal transportation alternatives.
   k. Line 94 – Separates the MTP Model Scenario work from the Model Update.
   l. Line 108 – adds consultant dollars for water quality transportation work.
   m. Line 115 – Vermont Municipal Clean Streets Phosphorus credit. Is new grant that is essentially pass-through.
   n. Line 116 - Water quality block grant.
   o. Line 117 – Grants in aid Pilot Program
   p. Line 134 – GIS Programming – added $10,000 for Urban 3 Smart Growth and infrastructure valuation. To develop real cost of improvements over its lifespan. Chris suggested we get creative ways the towns can provide affordable housing by subsidizing infrastructure.

Forest then reviewed the Budget P&L. We continue to show a pretty significant loss, which we expect due to the lower indirect rate this year. We are removing CCOA funding because they will be moved over to the United Way of Northwestern Vermont. This will reduce $150,000 on the revenue side, but will also reduce the expense side by $156,000. Members agree we understand the situation this year. FY19 will be another tough year.

6. Legislative Breakfast debrief. Since Charlie isn’t here, we will discuss this in February. Regina will send members the survey results from the event.
7. **Chair/Executive Director Report.**
   a. **Legislative Preview.** A major effort will be water quality funding.
   b. **CC Opioid Alliance update.** Effort moving to United Way.
   c. **Regional Dispatch Update.** We will be providing public outreach assistance for towns who will be voting on this at town meeting.

8. **Agenda Review – January 17, 2018.** Members reviewed the agenda and made suggestions. Members suggested reviewing major comments only on the ECOS draft presentation and spend more time on the Top Ten Actions for the Next Five Years. Mike also suggested that in presenting the mid-year adjustment budget, we explain up front the $93,000 expected deficit, which we predicted when we developed the UPWP.

9. **Other business.** There was none.

10. **Executive Session.** None needed.

11. **Adjournment.** MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:07 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc
November 29, 2017

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

RE: Acabay, Inc.; Colchester; Application #4C0757-23B

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 mounting a 3-foot-high by 27-foot-long, internally illuminated “Morgan Stanley” exterior sign on the top of the westerly facade of the building. The Project is located at 105 Westview Road, in Colchester, VT. The building upon which the sign will be located has already been permitted by the District Commission and the Town of Colchester, and has already been constructed. The only new development being reviewed in this hearing is the sign. We understand that the scope of this hearing will be limited to Criterion 8 (aesthetics). We further understand that the proposed sign was approved by the Colchester zoning administrator in 2016. We offer the following comments:

The project is located within the Metro 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
December 19, 2017

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. Any local comments?

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
CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE - MINUTES

DATE: Tuesday, December 5, 2017
TIME: 9:00 a.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal St. Winooski, VT

1. Consent Agenda
No items this month.

2. Approval of Minutes
The November 7th minutes were approved without changes.

3. Public Comments
Tony Redington distributed a flyer from Burlington’s Pine Street Coalition. He spoke to the group’s efforts to reopen the design discussion around the Champlain Parkway. He noted that using OECD data, the US has fallen behind many other countries when it comes to road safety and that the current Champlain Parkway design with six new signalized intersections will only worsen safety. He also noted that the project hinders water quality. He feels there is a need to redesign the project to, among other things, maintain the Pine St. connection and improve the City Market entrance. Charles Simpson also spoke in opposition to the current Champlain Parkway design by first referring to a recent film on Jane Jacobs and her efforts to stop freeways from entering Manhattan. He noted the current design reduces connectivity, limits stormwater retention, and will likely adversely impact safety. He feels the design is archaic and needs to be reexamined.

4. MTP Update
Peter Keating noted that this is the first completed draft of the full MTP and that while the TAC had previously seen various pieces of it over the past six months, this is the first time all of the content has been assembled together. Peter also stressed that this draft is a work in progress and will see considerable improvement before it comes back to the TAC in January. The points he planned to cover in this presentation included:
  • MTP Background information on why we do this
Here are the MTP sections in sequence:

- Introduction and Background – Federal regulations and guidelines; the MTP in context with other responsibilities
- Transportation Goal, Issues, and Performance Measures – newly drafted but same goal from ECOS plan with updated issues discussion and new performance target information and charts; coordination with VTrans on targets.
- Existing Metropolitan Transportation System – first presented back in June but updated, especially crash data and maps; some content still in progress – travel patterns and congestion discussion.
- Financial Plan – seen before; how much we expect to have and where it’s budgeted to go (three fourths to system maintenance).
- Scenario Planning Review and Future Conditions – also new content describing all of the modelled scenarios and the MTP scenario. Still needs text on the scenario analysis and performance metrics.
- MTP Corridors – new but similar to last MTP – a description and discussion of the main travel corridors and the projects identified with each.
- MTP Investments and Project List – more detail on strategic priorities; the still in-process project list under review/revision from local government staff.
- Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Report – Similar to last MTP but shortened to make less specific regarding individual projects, as allowed under federal regulations.

Peter concluded by asking the TAC to get any comment back to staff by 12/15. Another draft will then be circulated to the TAC before its January meeting. At that meeting we will look for a TAC recommendation to ask the Board to warn a public hearing.

Following the presentation, the discussion featured several comments and questions, including:

- Dennis Lutz asked about the specificity of the MTP funding categories regards to stormwater projects. Chris Jolly responded by saying that there is no issue with having more general project categories with their own funding allotments.
- Jason Van Driesche asked why VMT for 80% connected vehicles would be higher than having 100% connected vehicles. Jason Charest replied that a 100% shift includes the assumption that there would be more shared vehicle ownership, which could in turn, reduce VMT.
- Dean Bloch suggested that the MTP should address the storage of rail cars with hazardous materials. Maryanne Michaels stated that rail storage is federally regulated and that there is a need to be cognizant of federal regulatory preemption. Amy Bell stressed that the MPO and VTrans don’t have authority related to rail storage. Dean Pierce interjected that federal regulations provide a subsidy to rail that could be dedicated to issues related to storage. Dean Bloch said that it is not forward thinking to leave this issue out of the MTP. He also stated that if we can’t make recommendations related to rail storage, then he would like to see federal planning funds used to explore this issue. Staff will propose additional text to address this.
- Jason Van Driesche asked about the congestion implications related to the interstate expansion. Jason Charest replied that an expansion would increase congestion between I-89 Exits 15 and 16, but is not projected to increase congestion elsewhere. There is a need to address capacity problems between Exits 14 and 15.
- Jason Van Driesche asked why the MTP would be recommending system-wide 20-minute headways for transit rather than a preferable 15-minute headway. Peter replied that the decision for 20-minute headways was made as a compromise to bring all transit routes into an improved industry standard and would be less costly than implementing 15-minute service.
• Dennis Lutz questioned how statewide transportation safety targets will impact Chittenden County. Staff will look into this and add information within the MTP.

• Jason Van Driesche inquired about the mechanism that would be used to drive down non-motorized injuries/fatalities. The CCRPC will work to identify locations that are deemed most unsafe for bicyclists and pedestrians.

5. Stormwater Programs Update
Chris Dubin brought the TAC up to date on the various programs funding stormwater activity (planning, design, construction) and the status of which towns have received how much funding from which sources. He used a series of maps to display grant awards for planning and design/construction as well as pending applications for design/construction activity. CCRPC staff will continue working with towns on FY18 projects and will be preparing a solicitation to towns for planning work in FY19. Considerable discussion followed on the time/effort/expertise of local governments, and RPC staff, to manage all of this stormwater work. While RPCs can and will help, and the larger towns likely have their own staff resources to contribute, there was concern that statewide, in small towns, managing these projects will be challenging.

6. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports
Peter referred members to the project list on the back of the agenda and encouraged members to inquire on project status if interested.

7. CCRPC November Board Meeting Report
Peter mentioned that the Board received an update on the MTP scenario and heard a presentation on GMT’s NextGEN Transit Plan.

8. Chairman’s/Members’ Items
N/A this month.

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted, Peter Keating
DATE: Tuesday, December 6, 2017
TIME: 11:00 a.m. to 12 Noon
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>Bolton:</th>
<th>Hinesburg: Merrily Lovell</th>
<th>St. George:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buels Gore:</td>
<td>Huntington: Darlene Palola</td>
<td>Underhill: Brian Bigelow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington: Jenna Olson</td>
<td>Jericho:</td>
<td>Westford: John Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte:</td>
<td>Milton: Lindsey Beaudoin</td>
<td>Williston: James Sherrard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester: Karen Adams</td>
<td>Richmond: Geoff Urbanik</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</td>
<td>South Burlington:</td>
<td>VANR: Christy Witters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington Airport: Polly Harris (Stantec)</td>
<td>University of VT: Claire Forbes</td>
<td>CCRPC Board: Don Meals, Co-Chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Attendees:** Blue®: Juliana Dixon; UVM-EPSCOR: Patrick Bitterman

**CCRPC Staff:** Dan Albrecht, Charles Baker

---

1. **Welcome:** Annie Costandi called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

2. **Changes to the Agenda** – none

3. **Review and action on draft minutes of November 7, 2017**

After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, Jenna Olson made a motion, seconded by James Sherrard to approve the November 7, 2017 minutes. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED. Polly Harris, Don Meals and Chris Robinson abstained.

4. **Develop CCRPC legislative talking points on Act 73/Clean Water funding**

Dan Albrecht recappped the first draft proposed here. It essentially duplicates previous comments developed by the CCRPC and submitted in November. Dan said he then looked at a similar letter developed by several municipalities and then added elements of that letter to this draft that were not duplicative. Charlie requested feedback on the document especially any suggestions to shorten it. Feedback offered which were not objected to by members were as follows:

- The legislative debate is at the level of “discussion drafts” right so its okay for our talking points to be high-level at this point.
- It’s good to have the RPC involved, to be a voice for us in the legislature.
- Re, #15, yes, emphasize spending $5 million to collect $20 million is wasteful.
- As proposed in Senator’s draft bill, having the Public Utility Commission run a statewide water utility is problematic. Concerns were expressed about administrative costs, transparency, lack of oversight board, too much authority given to them to set fees
- Re, #8, beef up this section a bit
- Re, #9, more analysis needs to be done on other administrative options

The discussion concluded with a recommendation to have staff prepare an updated version of the talking points for finalization at the CWAC’s January meeting.

5. **Approve CWAC comment letter on Northern Lake Champlain Direct Drainages TBP incorporating Lake Champlain Phosphorus TMDL Phase II information**

Charlie Baker started off by noting that based upon conversations with Ethan Swift at DEC this document is not considered to be a revision of the Basin Plan but DEC was obligated to produce the applicable TMDL Phase II content. A comment letter by the CWAC would still prove useful however to reemphasize how projects should be prioritized and to make additional points about allowing for sufficient time for RPC and
municipal feedback on basin plans. Dan Albrecht noted that the recommendations concerning project
prioritization mimics previous CCRPC comments on the Lamoille Tactical Basin Plan.

Discussion ensued on numerous points and various revisions were suggested and agreed upon in the bulleted
section on the second page, as follows:

➢ In general, CCRPC recommends that for project implementation, priority be given to those projects
that reduce the most phosphorus per dollar spent regardless of permit requirements..... and that
address a permit requirement (i.e. MS4 permit, Flow Restoration Plan, Phosphorus Control Plan,
MRGP, Developed Lands).

➢ Additional weight should be given to projects located in Critical Source Areas as well as to projects
that provide co-benefits such as other TMDLs (i.e. Flow Restoration Plans, e.coli, mercury, etc.) hazard
mitigation, transportation improvement, aquatic organism passage, and/or listed in municipal
comprehensive plans and capital plans.

➢ CCRPC recommends that the State for phosphorus reduction investments to be made in the most cost-
effective manner possible. Provide mechanisms (such as via phosphorus credit trading) for
municipalities and other property owners with permits to invest in Natural Resource or Agriculture
sector phosphorus reduction would clearly provide for much more phosphorus reduction per dollar
spent. Trading across municipalities should be promoted.

➢ State continue analysis between municipalities and ag sector

Motion made by Don Meals, seconded by James Sherrard to approve submission of the CWAC letter
as edited. Motion approved unanimously. UVM and the Airport representatives abstained.

6. Next Meeting Agenda
- Approve final version of CCRPC Legislative Talking Points on Act 73 / Clean Water funding

7. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Dan Albrecht
I. Welcome: Chelsea Mandigo called the meeting to order at 12:15 p.m.

2. Changes to the Agenda – none

3. Review and action on draft minutes of November 7, 2017
   Dan Albrecht provided a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, Karen Adams made a motion, seconded by Claire Forbes to approve the November 7, 2017 minutes with corrections as follows: strike attendees inadvertently copied over from CWAC 11/7 minutes; correct time start of meeting and correct call to order to reference Chelsea Mandigo. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED. Polly Harris abstained.

4. Survey update and approve survey letter
   Dan Albrecht provided an overview of the successful bid of Castleton University’s Polling Institute which the Subcommittee approved at its last meeting. A kickoff meeting was held on November 15th. The only tweak to the scope of work will be to move the start of the survey to the first week of January so as to avoid the holidays when most people would tend to ignore a survey.
   The Subcommittee reviewed the initial letter to be mailed to the random sample set of potential respondent households. A few minor edits were recommended for Dan to forward to Castleton. Dan displayed the proposed final survey questions --which have previously been distributed to members in the preceding months-- noting which ones were continuations of questions asked in 2013 and which were new. A minor correction was suggested on one question.

5. Updates
   MS4 Permit, Draft Framework update: Christy Witters thanked the members for their previous individual comments. She’s still accepting comments on the “pre-draft.”
   - The formal draft will be released at the end of December or early January for a 60-day review period.
   - She affirmed that PCPs will focus on “municipally-owned and controlled impervious.” She will check with DEC staff in the 20% required reductions only applied to hydrologically-connected parcels and road segments. She stressed that towns can work together on projects to meet PCP targets.
   - Chris Robinson of Shelburne asked if PCPs will be a municipal government responsibility or is it a geographic goal such that if the Town encouraged the agriculture sector to make P-reductions that would reduce the need for the Town (via road management and wastewater treatment) to shoulder 100% of the burden. Christy said that a clear answer to that question is not in the draft at this point but in general DEC is supportive of such an approach.
   - Jenna Olson asked about compliance for roads. Christy indicated that MS4s will be required to meet the applicable road standards in the MRGP for hydrologically-connected segments.
James Sherrard noted that with the expansion of the MS4 permit to municipal boundaries some systems (for which the town is a co-permittee) will now be included in the permit. Christy said that’s true however DEC will waive the 2nd fee for those co-permitted systems and she noted that those ones are considered “operational permits.”

James, Jenna and Christy noted that MOUs were an effective way to keep track of who pays renewal fees for expired permits.

Developed Lands Permit: Karen Adams asked when DEC would publish a list of which parcels would fall under this pending permit. Christy indicated that is still under development.

6. Next Meeting Agenda
The next meeting will be January 9th instead of January 2nd. Agenda items will include:
- stream flow monitoring report
- review of draft of MS4 permit
- Quarterly report from WNRC on Stream Team

7. Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 12:55 p.m.  

Respectfully submitted, Dan Albrecht
1. Welcome and Introductions
Paul Conner called the meeting to order at 3:36 p.m.

2. Approval of November 8, 2017 Minutes
Everett Marshall made a motion, seconded by Victor Sinadinoski, to approve the November 8, 2017 minutes with a correction from Essex under the Act 250 projects: the address should be 251 River Road (not 281). No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.

3. Richmond Town Plan - Final Review
The public hearing was opened. No one from the public was in attendance.
Alex Weinhagen made a motion, seconded by Victor Sinadinoski to close the public hearing. No discussion. MOTION PASSED.

Emily Nosse-Leirer provided an overview of the Staff report. She stated that the public engagement for this Plan was excellent; and the format is really interesting. She found the Plan meets statutory requirements with the exception of three required edits: 1. Basin Planning reference – need to specifically mention the Winooski Tactical Basin Plan. 2. Forest Blocks and wildlife connectors – make some edits in that chapter. 3. Define the River Corridor and River Corridor Protection Area.

The PAC provided the following comments:
- State designation areas need to be mapped and discussed in the Plan.
- Elderly & housing needs?
- Like the format.
- Having targets is great. Though some of these seem impossible to measure. Is there baseline data and data on how to measure them? No consensus that a lack of baseline data at this point is a problem. Great to work towards this.
- Lots of action items, with direction on what to do next to prioritize these. Richmond was encouraged to at least identify a lead responsible party.
- Recommended a top 10 list of implementation items.
- 100-year flood plain – current nomenclature is the Special Flood Hazard Area. Could put 100-year flood plain in parenthesis if that helps.
- Future Land Use map – two properties are labeled with landowners instead of land use/business type. No consensus on this being a problem. You could do both, like “Severance Corners Growth Center”.

Members Present:
Victor Sinadinoski, Milton
Everett Marshall, Huntington
Andrew Strniste, Underhill
Ken Belliveau, Williston
Paul Conner, South Burlington
Robin Pierce, Essex Junction
Jess Draper, Richmond
Sarah Hadd, Colchester
Alex Weinhagen, Hinesburg

Staff:
Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
Emily Nosse-Leirer, Planner (via phone)
- Natural and Working Lands is confusing – what is intended? It isn’t clear if this is intended for protection or development. Similarly, what’s encouraged and what’s allowed in Rural Agricultural and Residential Areas? There is a concern regarding how this plan is meeting the state planning goal of village development surrounded by rural country-side. Emily Nosse-Leirer explained that she thought the Plan meets this goal by many of the action items described in the other sections of the Plan (i.e. natural resource conservation v. land use section). Perhaps Richmond could reference some of that in the Land Use section to be clear that there is an intent to address the 1-acre zoning.

- Renewable energy targets – Energy Technical Plan Goal #1 and 3. Try to get more aggressive because the State goals are much more aggressive.

- Working Lands/Forest Fragmentation – decrease forest fragmentation rate by 2%? Try to mitigate the loss by reducing the rate of loss, not the actual amount of loss.

- The PAC would like to see some of these suggestions addressed before the plan is adopted, since this review is before the PC public hearing.

- Make sure to leave the door open to better address the fragmentation issues and land use.

- Really great public engagement.

[Sarah left at 4:10pm.]

- Perhaps the Rural Agriculture and Working Lands are too much in one category.

Jess Draper explained their timeframe, and explained that they only have one day between the Planning Commission public hearing and submitting this to the Selectboard. The plan needs to go on the Town Meeting day ballot so they don’t have much time.

Ken Belliveau made a motion, seconded by Robin Pierce, that the PAC finds that the draft 2018 Richmond Town Plan, as submitted and with the statutory edits described above (and in bold font in the Staff Report), meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC approval, and that the municipality’s planning process meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC confirmation. Upon notification that the Plan has been adopted by the municipality, CCRPC staff will review the plan, and any information relevant to the confirmation process, for changes. If staff determines that changes are substantive, those changes will be forwarded to the PAC for review. Otherwise the PAC recommends that the Plan, and the municipal planning process, should be forwarded to the CCRPC Board for approval.

There was a lot of discussion regarding strengthening the protection of the countryside surrounding the village. Paul Conner made a friendly amendment to add a stronger connection* between the land use and resource pieces to ensure this state goal is adequately addressed in the Plan. This amendment was accepted by Ken Belliveau, and Robin Pierce. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED. Jess Draper abstained.

*This stronger connection can be made in two specific locations:

Page 13 has a section called “Constraints and Possibilities” which states that some areas in Richmond are already constrained, but says that the town “needs to identify ideal future land uses” for the rest. This could be a good place to explain that actions elsewhere in the plan set up a basis for this, especially the Natural and Cultural Resources technical plan and Economic Development technical plan.

Page 17 has the “Taking Action” section for the Future Land Use technical plan. There aren’t any actions listed here because all the Future Land Use actions are in other parts of the plan (Natural and Cultural Resources, etc.). It would be helpful to communicate where those actions are in the plan.

4. Municipal Plans and the New 8-year Requirement

Regina Mahony explained that she’d like to discuss what the PAC wants to see in new municipal Plans now that they won’t expire for 8-years, instead of 5-years. There was discussion regarding what was promised to the Legislature when this change was requested: need more time implement the plans rather than create the plans; the plans will get more strategic/implementable; and within 8-years we won’t ‘re-adopt’ plans like we used to (just re-adopt the exact same plan without updating it). Therefore, should the Plans that are now approved for 8 years be completely up to date, including data, data analysis and includes all new statutory requirements?
The other part of it is the implementation requirement. The municipalities now need to show how the Plans are being implemented. Regina Mahony suggested that CCRPC needs to confirm the planning process twice in the 8-year period. We will do the first one about 18 to 24 months before the Plan expires; and we think this is when we’ll ask how the previous plan has been implemented so far.

The PAC decided that this should be added to another agenda, with a bit more information about what exactly will be required so that municipalities can react to that. Regina Mahony will add this to another agenda.

5. Other Business
   a. CENSUS – LUCA. If you want CCRPC’s help you need to fill out the forms to tell the Census that by December 15, 2017.
   b. ECOS Plan Update – Regina gave an update on where all the ECOS Plan pieces are. The public comment period for the CEDS is still open, and the MTP will go out for public comment in the next two weeks.
   c. Regina Mahony asked for two UPWP Committee volunteers, Ken Belliveau is interested. Regina Mahony will send a note to the full PAC.
   d. Great Resource: Censusreporter.org. It is an interface between the Census and people who want to use the data. Lots of helpful charts that you can embed in other things. Just put our County or your municipality in to see how easy it is.

9. Adjourn
   The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony
Brownfields Advisory Committee  Draft Meeting Minutes

Monday, January 8, 2017 3:00 p.m. - 4:15 p.m.

CCRPC Main Conference Room, 110 West Canal St., Suite 202 Winooski, VT

To access various documents referenced below, please visit:
http://www.ccrpcvt.org/our-work/economic-development/brownfields/#advisory-committee

1. **Call to Order, Introductions and Changes to the Agenda**

   The meeting began at 3:05.

   Committee Members:
   - Curt Carter, GBIC (chair)
   - Justin Dextradeur, Redstone*
   - Kirsten Merriman-Shapiro, CEDO*

   CCRPC Staff:
   - Dan Albrecht, CCRPC

   Others:
   - Paul and Lori Hayes, Champlain Chiropractic
   - Leisa Pollander, Sara Holbrook Center
   - Steve LaRosa, Weston and Sampson

   *Attended via phone

2. **Public comments on items not on the Agenda**

   None.

3. **Review and action on November 20, 2017 meeting summary**

   Justin moved to approve the minutes, and Razelle seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. **Action on Site Nominations/Assistance Requests**

   Hayes Chiropractic, 2031 Roosevelt Highway, Colchester, Weston & Sampson

   The property owners requested additional funding for two issues:

   a. An additional $4,000 was requested to pay for Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) costs. GPR of the whole site will show where all the underground storage tanks on the property are located, and will make tank removal, sampling and cleanup much easier. The committee supported this request.

      *Curt made a motion seconded by Kirsten that CCRPC approve of this additional funding of $4,000. The motion passed unanimously.*

   b. In 2017, the property owners received a letter telling them they had 30 days to address brownfields contamination on their property. They hired ATC to complete sampling on the property, which led to a $4,128 lab bill from Endyne. They are seeking reimbursement from CCRPC for these costs.

   The committee discussed the issue of whether or not these costs are eligible for reimbursement. Jessica confirmed that the EPA is not able to reimburse costs paid for projects before the site is determined to
be eligible, because a site-specific quality assurance project plan (SSQAPP) is necessary. Since the site did not have a SSQAPP at the time the lab work was conducted, and the site was not determined to be eligible, the lab bills cannot be reimbursed.

*Given this determination by EPA, the Committee could not support the request.*

Michael explained that once the assessment is completed, the property owners will be able to access money from the state’s Petroleum Cleanup Fund (PCF). Some of the work that is completed with CCRPC funding will count towards the PCF’s $10,000 deductible (pulling the tanks, groundwater sampling and other monitoring outside of tanks are possible examples).

Steve asked if these tanks could be considered “unknown” tanks, but Michael explained that the record of them in town documents is too thorough for this.

Steve detailed the tank removal process, and explained that the Phase I will be completed in the next few weeks.

*Sara Holbrook Center, North Avenue, Burlington, KAS*

Jeremy explained that the Phase I showed two RECs: a garage with two drains and urban fill throughout the property. The Phase I report has been reviewed by CCRPC and DEC and edits are being made.

Razelle asked if there are concerns about exposure to soil vapors or groundwater contamination. Jeremy replied that groundwater is located about 80 feet below grade at this site and it’s unlikely that any groundwater contamination will occur, unless they find something unexpected during the Phase II testing. Razelle also asked if the soil will be tested in the area that is proposed for a playground, and Jeremy confirmed that it will be.

Dan explained that because this isn’t a housing project, staff would like to see if there is money available from other sources before fully funding the request. Kirsten Merriman-Shapiro noted that CEDO has some funds available but if they were used it would trigger numerous Federal requirements. Committee members noted that that would be an undesirable situation. Committee members were very supportive of the project given the numerous services provided by the Center as well as the fact that the Phase II costs can be split between Petro and Haz funds, and expressed their interest in fully funding it.

*Curt made a motion that the CCRPC fully fund the $22,230 request and the committee agreed.*

5. **Project Updates**

Dan explained that the 314 North Winooski (Champlain Transmission) project for a Phase I has been assigned to Stone Environmental but was still going through the process of obtaining needed approvals and documentation, and therefore the contract is not up and running yet.

6. **Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 3:50. The next meeting will be at the call of the chair.
DATE: Thursday, December 14, 2017  
TIME: 8:30 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.  
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT  

Members Present  
Ken Belliveau, Williston – PAC Rep  
Heather Danis – ECOS Steering Committee Rep  
Justin Rabidoux, South Burlington – TAC Rep  
Andrea Morgante, Hinesburg – Board Rep  
Edmund Booth – ECOS Steering Committee Rep  

Staff  
Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager  
Melanie Needle, Senior Planner  
Emily Nosse-Leirer, Planner  
Christine Forde, Senior Transportation Planner  
Peter Keating, Senior Transportation Planner  
Eleni Churchill, Transportation Program Manager  
Jason Charest, Senior Transportation Engineer  
Charlie Baker, Executive Director  

1. Welcome and Introductions  
Regina Mahony called the meeting to order at 8:36 a.m.  

2. Approve Minutes  
Heather Danis made a motion, seconded by Edmund Booth to approve the minutes of November 9, 2017. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.  

3. Metropolitan Transportation Plan Draft  
Peter Keating provided a presentation on the full draft of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). Peter Keating explained the purpose of the MTP and the required components. There was some discussion regarding the requirements and what Staff would do if any requirements change, such as a removal of the environmental mitigation review. These are minimum requirements and we can do more.  

Peter Keating explained the new safety performance measure for the fatalities/100 mile roads. There will be more performance measures added over the next few years. We can use the performance measures the State will use, or as the MPO, we can use something different if needed.  

The project list is still being worked on but a draft of it will be posted to the website by the end of this week.  

Peter Keating provided the components of the MTP Scenario that have been presented before.  

He also explained the environmental consultation and mitigation report section. This section largely describes the people or agencies that we would need to talk to when projects move forward. At this level it is not logical to do a full environmental analysis for every project on the MTP list.  

Heather Danis and Ed DeMott have drafted some language to make a better connection to public health and will provide that to Staff.  

Andrea Morgante asked about evaluating the work that we do, and how projects move from this Plan to scoping (what we put in the UPWP) to actual implementation. Also, what is our success rate, or lack of, in getting projects through the whole MTP, to UPWP (scoping), to TIP, to construction. Christine Forde mentioned that she tracks this and Andrea thought that presenting this to the Board would be interesting/valuable. For the ECOS Plan, Staff will add a section that describes the general progression of project development from the MTP to implementation.  

4. Energy Plan Public Comments  
Melanie Needle informed the LRPC that we are not having any trouble meeting the County wide renewable energy generation target; however there are some issues at the municipal level. Global Foundries uses about 3 to 4x the amount of energy of all of Burlington; it is a big outlier. There was some discussion regarding the location of this
actual demand; it is more than likely from the manufacturing component which is on the Junction side rather than
the Williston side. Andrea Morgante explained that this could be a good example of how we deal with issues at a
County level. The Energy sub-committee will discuss this further next week.

Melanie Needle provided an overview of the comments received on the Energy Plan, and specifically discussed:

- Line 10 – the commenter is asking for CCRPC to take a position on a carbon tax in the Plan. Staff finds that
  this is premature because there is a Governor’s Committee working on this, and CCRPC may want to wait
  on those results before taking a position. There was some discussion about how our role is more to
  implement the State’s energy goal rather than setting the State’s priorities. However, there was some
discussion that we could take a more proactive approach and suggest that the State take this step. However,
we won’t be able to have a policy discussion about a carbon tax within the timeframe of when we need to
get this Plan adopted. Therefore, the prepared Staff response is the right approach.
- Line 11 – this is a comment about getting off of natural gas. The LRPC discussed that this is outside of the
  authority of the region and is in the hands of a State entity. It currently exists and while the fuel itself is
  relatively cheap, there is a significant value in the existing infrastructure that we won’t abandon easily.
- Line 16 – this is a comment about grid resilience and the need for back-up generators. VT is vulnerable to
  outages and resiliency is an important thing. However, fossil fuel generators are not the best answer.
Storage is more likely the future solution. In fact, Tesla power walls from Green Mountain Power are now
available for $15/month. This technology is already here, and this is a great solution. There was some
discussion about explaining the terms used in the comment so readers can understand what we are talking
about. We can also include a link to GMP’s website regarding the power wall program.
- Line 32 – same carbon tax issue as discussed above.
- Line 38 – this is a comment about the suitability language and lack of clear direction for the Public Utility
  Commission. Jim Donovan’s sent comments in before the meeting to indicate that he is still on board with
  “encourage” despite its flaws. There was some discussion regarding how much of a regulatory role we want
to take. Other RPC’s do take more of a regulatory role, however we have not done that traditionally and
conversations thus far with the Board don’t appear to be leaning in that direction. The LRPC thought that
the current language is generally okay as is; though perhaps the energy sub-committee and Staff can come
up with an alternative to “encourage” as it isn’t a particularly useful word.

5. Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) Comments
Emily Nosse-Leirer provided an overview of the CEDS comments that we’ve received. Some large themes we
heard about:

- Wage gap issues;
- Need for better broadband throughout the County;
- Investing in downtowns and Villages doesn’t seem obvious in the CEDS component on its own however
  this is in the ECOS Plan. We need to make the connection stronger.

Specific lines:
- Line 44 – this is a comment about whether we really have an under supply of industrial space? Emily
  Nosse-Leirer explained the additional conversations she has had with GBIC about this: there is a relatively
  good amount of square footage available; however a good number of businesses are not necessarily
interested in re-configuring space. It’s GBIC’s experience that this is the case. Blodgett’s building, for
example, is only set up well for a business that needs 150,000 sq.ft., rather than for 3 separate businesses
that need 50,000 sq.ft. The LRPC discussed that adding more land isn’t necessarily going to help solve the
problem of vacant space. We should not set up the market as a disincentive to re-use the vacant spaces.
Williston already has plenty of industrial zoned land at Global Foundries that they haven’t done anything
with; so why would we continue to re-zone more land for industrial? The LRPC discussed that the language
should discuss use of existing vacant industrial land, and not call for additional industrial zoning.

Next steps for Staff on the CEDS piece is to reconfigure it to match the new format; and re-organize for better
readability.
Heather Danis suggests that we make it clear that income and education are critical indicators for public health. Emily Nosse-Leirer indicated that the Plan already includes this language. Heather Danis will look at that section to see if this can be strengthened.

6. **Other Business**

   a. CEDS & MTP Project Lists – We are still collecting information from the municipalities and updating these lists.

   b. Planning Area Map Changes. Melanie Needle provided an overview of a few minor future land use map changes including some color changes:
      - Hinesburg- Modified the Village Planning Area to match the Village Growth Area
      - Westford-Modified the Village Planning Area to align with the Village Zoning District
      - Colchester- Modified the Village Planning Area along Mallets Bay Ave. to align with recent rezoning to the R2 District.
      - Update the colors to make it easier to discern the Metro Planning Area from the Suburban Planning Area
      - There may be an Underhill Village Planning Area change *IF* they pass some zoning changes on Town Meeting day. The village planning area will decrease.

   c. Act 171, Forest Integrity – Regina Mahony indicated to the LRPC that the ECOS Plan already meets a lot of the new requirement; and the data is included in the work that we did for the energy planning land use constraints. Staff will continue to look into this and make edits accordingly for the January LRPC meeting.

7. **Next Meeting**

   The next meeting will be on January 11, 2017 from 8:30am to 10:00am.

8. **Adjourn**

   The meeting adjourned at 10:06 a.m.

Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony