ANNUAL MEETING AGENDA  
Wednesday, June 21, 2017, 7:00 pm 
Catamount Golf & Country Club  
1400 Mountain View Road 
Williston, VT 05495  

5:30 p.m.- Social Hour, hors d’oeuvres, cash bar, driving range access  
(Weather permitting.)  
6:30 p.m. - Buffet Dinner  
7:00 pm - Opening remarks, CCRPC Business Meeting

CONSENT AGENDA: Minor TIP Amendments

DELIBERATIVE AGENDA
1. Call to Order; Changes to the Agenda
2. Public Comment Period on Items NOT on the Agenda
3. Approve Minutes of May 17, 2017 Meeting *  
   (Action; 1 min.)
4. Warn Public Hearing for FY18-21 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) *  
   (Action: 2 min.)
5. Election of Officers and Executive Committee for FY18 *  
   (Action: 5 min.)
6. Chair/Executive Director’s Updates  
   a. Executive Director’s Report (to be sent separately)
7. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports *  
   a. Planning Advisory Committee (draft minutes May 10, 2017)*
   b. Energy Sub-Committee (draft minutes May 16, 2017)*
   c. Transportation Advisory Committee (draft minutes June 6, 2017)*
   d. Clean Water Advisory Committee (draft minutes June 6, 2017)*
   e. MS4 Subcommittee (draft minutes June 6, 2017)*
   f. Executive Committee (draft minutes June 7, 2017)*
   g. Long Range Planning Committee (draft minutes May 11, 2017)*
8. Adjournment

7:15 p.m. – Guest Speaker -Agency of Natural Resources Secretary, Julie Moore

*Attachment

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 Emily Nosse-Leirer, CCRPC Title VI Coordinator, at 802-846-4490 ext. *15 or enosse-leirer@ccrpcvt.org, no later than 3 business days prior to the meeting for which services are requested.
**Upcoming Meetings** - Unless otherwise noted, all meetings are held at our offices:

- Energy Sub-committee – Tuesday, June 20, 2017; 5:00 p.m.
- Transportation Advisory Committee - Wednesday, July 5, 2017; 9:00 a.m.
- Clean Water Advisory Committee - Wednesday, July 5, 2017; 11:00 a.m.
- Executive Committee - Wednesday, July 5, 2017; 5:45 p.m.
- Planning Advisory Committee - Wednesday, July 12, 2017; 2:30 p.m.
- Long Range Planning Committee – Thursday, July 13, 2017; 8:30 a.m.
- CCRPC Board Meeting & TIP Public Hearing- Wednesday, July 19, 2017; 5:15 p.m.
- Energy Sub-committee – Tuesday, July 18, 2017; 5:00 p.m.

**Tentative future Board agenda items:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Agenda Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| July 19th     | Board training @ 5:15  
FY18-21 TIP Public Hearing & Approval  
Final Draft Municipal Roads General Permit comments |
| NO AUGUST BOARD MEETING | ---                           |
| September 20th | Draft MTP, CEDS, Energy ECOS Plan Updates review       |
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission  
June 21, 2017  
Agenda Item C.1: Consent Item

FY2017 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment

Issues  
Make the following change to the FY17-2020 TIP:

I-189 Culvert, South Burlington (Project BR056, Amendment FY17-16):

> Description of TIP Change: Add $206,325 to the TIP in FY17 for upgrades to a culvert on I-189 in South Burlington. Funding to come from Regional Project BR033 Bridge Preventative Maintenance.

> Reason for Change: This project will provide necessary upgrades to an existing culvert.

TAC Recommendation: Recommend approval of the proposed TIP amendment.

Staff Recommendation: Recommend approval of the proposed TIP amendment.

For more information, contact: Christine Forde  
cforde@ccrpcvt.org or 846-4490 ext. *13
CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARINGS
MINUTES
DRAFT

Date: Wednesday, May 17, 2017
Time: 6:00 p.m.
Place: CCRPC Offices; 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404
Present:

Bolton:Absent
Buel’s Gore:Absent
Burlington:Andy Montroll
Charlotte:Marty Illick, Alternate
Colchester:Absent
Essex:Jeff Carr
Essex junction:Dan Kerin
Hinesburg:Andrea Morgante
Huntington:Absent
Jericho:Catherine McMains
Milton:Absent
Richmond:Bard Hill
St. George:Absent
Shelburne:Absent
So. Burlington:Chris Shaw
Underhill:Brian Bigelow
Westford:Absent
Williston:Chris Roy
Winooski:Mike O’Brien
VTrans:Amy Bell
Business/Ind.:Absent
Cons/Env.:Absent
Socio/Econ/Housing:Justin Dextradeur
Ex-Officio:

CCTA/GMT:Absent
FHWA:Absent
FTA:Absent

Staff:
Charlie Baker, Executive Director
Pam Brangan, GIS/IT Manager
Forest Cohen, Business Manager
Melanie Needle, Senior Planner
Others:
Matthew Langham, VTrans
Scott Foley, CCTV cameraman

Ex-Officio:

CCTA/GMT:Absent
FHWA:Absent
FTA:Absent

Staff:
Charlie Baker, Executive Director
Pam Brangan, GIS/IT Manager
Forest Cohen, Business Manager
Melanie Needle, Senior Planner
Others:
Matthew Langham, VTrans
Scott Foley, CCTV cameraman

1. Call to Order; Changes to the Agenda. The meeting was called to order at 6:04 p.m. by the Chair, Chris Roy, upon arrival of a quorum. There were no changes to the agenda.

2. Public Comment Period on items NOT on the agenda. There were no members of the public present.

3. Consent Agenda. There were no consent agenda items.

4. Minutes April 19, 2017 CCRPC Board Meeting. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CHRIS SHAW, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 19, 2017 BOARD MEETING WITH EDITS. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS WRITTEN.

5. Public Hearing and Adopt FY18 UPWP & Budget.

a. Public Hearing on Draft FY18 UPWP & Budget. Chris Roy opened the public hearing at 6:05 p.m. There were no members of the public present. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 6:06 P.M. CHRIS SHAW SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
b. Action on Transportation Portion of FY18 UPWP & Budget. (MPO Business.) JEFF CARR MADE A 
MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O’BRIEN, TO APPROVE THE TRANSPORTATION PORTION OF THE 
FY18 UPWP AND BUDGET AS PRESENTED. MPO VOTE:
Bolton: Absent Burlington (4): Yes Charlotte: Yes
Colchester: Absent Essex: Yes Essex Jct: Yes
Hinesburg: Yes Huntington: Absent Jericho: Yes
Milton: Absent Richmond: Yes St. George: Absent
Shelburne: Absent So. Burlington (2): Yes Underhill: Yes
Westford: Absent Williston: Yes Winooski: Yes
VTrans: Yes
MOTION CARRIED WITH 16 of 24 VOTES; AND 11 OF 18 COMMUNITIES VOTING IN FAVOR.

c. Action on entire FY18 UPWP & Budget. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CHRIS 
SHAW, TO APPROVE THE ENTIRE FY18 UPWP AND BUDGET. Charlie noted that we were able to 
reduce the negative bottom line from the last version, as we found an error. Jeff Carr asked if 
there was any way to keep from the large swings back and forth in the overhead rate creating 
the over collecting and deficits. Charlie said we will look at it to see where we are over-
collecting and try to reduce the rate at mid-year. Amy said VTrans is setting up a meeting with 
RPCs to discuss this to encourage the RPCs to use the flexibility to adjust the rate. They’re 
hopeful that we can work this out. She also said the mid-year adjustment in rate will probably 
not bode well with VTrans as it would affect the entire year. Charlie is a part of that committee 
and will keep us informed. VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY TO ADOPT THE ENTIRE 
FY18 UPWP AND BUDGET.

6. Public Participation Plan Amendments.
   a. Public Hearing for Public Participation Plan Amendments. Chris Roy opened the public hearing 
at 6:11 p.m. There were no members of the public present. DAN KERIN MADE A MOTION, 
SECONDED BY CATHERINE MCMAINS, TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 6:12 P.M. MOTION 
cARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
   b. Action on Public Participation Plan Amendments. Chris Roy noted there were some changes to 
the amendment at the last Executive Committee meeting. We used to have a 15-day warning 
period for public hearings. When we adopted the Public Participation Plan, that was changed 
to a 30-day warning period. However, often we don’t have 30 days between board meetings 
and end up warning hearings before we have a final document, so the amendment was 
proposed to bring it back to 15 days. However, the Executive Committee felt that 25 days 
might work better to give the public more time to respond. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION 
TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENTS TO THE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN AS DISCUSSED. ANDY 
MONTROLL SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

7. Regional Stormwater Education and Involvement Agreement. Charlie noted that we first saw this in 
the spring of 2016. The Stream Team and RSEP (Regional Stormwater Education Program) wanted 
to merge. Then the legislature adopted regulations permitting RPCs to enter into municipal services 
agreements, but we had to amend our bylaws for that to happen. We adopted bylaw amendments 
last month. We have been working with these two groups for many years. JEFF CARR MADE A 
MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGREEMENT WITH THE PROVISION THAT IF ANY OF THE SIGNATORIES 
MAKE SIGNIFICANT CHANGES THAT IT COME BACK TO THE BOARD FOR APPROVAL. CATHERINE 
MCMAINS SECONDED. Charlie said hopefully there won’t be any significant changes. THE MOTION 
cARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
   a. Public Hearing. Chris Roy opened the public hearing at 6:17 p.m. There were no members of
      the public in attendance. ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY DAN KERIN, TO
      CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 6:18 PM.
   b. Action on Bolton 2017 Town Plan & Planning Confirmation. Regina Mahony noted that Emily
      Nosse-Leirer had worked with the town to prepare this plan following the new state guidelines.
      ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CHRIS SHAW, TO APPROVE THE
      RESOLUTION TO ADOPT THE BOLTON TOWN PLAN AND APPROVE THE PLANNING PROCESS.
      MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. (Only municipal representatives voted on the plan.)

9. Draft Lake Champlain Byway Chittenden County Corridor Management Plan. Dan Albrecht noted
   that he gave a pretty thorough presentation at the last meeting. A few minor additions have been
   made to the draft, mostly descriptions, as well as the addition of a new short section, “10. Future
   Updates to the Plan.” He noted one minor change to add a site to Table 9, Page 14 – Intrinsic
   Resources -Milton. The Stannard House is being considered to be added as soon as he hears from
   Milton and the historical society. Gen. Stannard commanded a Vermont unit at Gettysburg. We will
   add it to the map as well. We are asking the board to approve this plan. BRIAN BIGELOW MADE A
   MOTION, SECONDED BY CHRIS SHAW, TO APPROVE THE PLAN AND ADOPT THE RESOLUTION.
   MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

    presentation on the Energy Elements of the ECOS plan. We need to update the ECOS Plan because
    of Act 174 passed in 2016 which establishes a new set of municipal and regional energy planning
    standards for regional plans, which if met allow those plans to carry greater weight – substantial
    deference – in the Section 248 siting process for energy generation. We’re in the second phase, as
    three RPC’s piloted new energy plans last fall. Melanie reviewed the contents of the presentation
    which includes: enhanced energy planning; process; pathways and analysis & targets. Enhanced
    energy planning includes RPC’s and the Department of Public Service (DPS) working together to
    advance the State’s Comprehensive Energy Plan’s goals while being consistent with local and
    regional needs and concerns. The goals of the Vermont Comprehensive Energy Plan are to:
    Weatherize 80,000 Vermont homes by 2025 (with an intermediate goal of 60,000 homes by 2017);
    Get 90% of Vermont’s energy from renewable sources by 2050 (with intermediate goal of 25% by
    2025, including 10% of transportation energy; and intermediate goal of 40% by 2035); Reduce total
    Vermont energy consumption by more than 1/3 by 2050 (intermediate goal of 15% reduction by
    2025). The purpose of this work is to gain a “Determination of Energy Compliance” from DPS, which
    will give more weight to the Regional Plan in wind and solar generation facility applications. CCRPC
    has been working with our member municipalities to gain input on siting concerns for these types of
    facilities. Melanie reviewed the history of this process which began in July 2016. In May 2017, we
    held the second training session on Act 174; municipalities review the Municipal Data Energy Guide
    and present the 1st Preliminary Draft of ECOS Plan Energy Elements. Marty Illick noted that she is on
    the Charlotte Planning Commission and doesn’t remember seeing anything on this. Melanie said we
    sent emails to selectboards, planning commissions, and planners; and, Emily visited the Charlotte
    Planning commission to talk about this. Charlie noted that we have tried to find the restrictions
    where these sites could NOT be located. Melanie then reviewed the land use & transportation
    actions to achieve the targets, including striving for 80% of new development in areas planned for
    growth, which amount to 15% of our land area; and reduce transportation energy through –
    intelligent transportation system (ITS), Transportation Demand Management (TDM), driving electric
and transit. We want to encourage conservation and efficient use of energy and will work with partners to promote: weatherization and increases in energy efficiency of housing stock and other buildings; state energy codes; and, alternatives to fossil fuels for heating (heat pumps, wood heating, geothermal systems). Chris Shaw asked how we will determine whether we reach the weatherization goals. Melanie said we worked with VEIC and utilized the Long-range Energy Alternative Planning (LEAP) tool which assumes an increase of overall building efficiency going forward. We’re assuming that buildings in the future will be more efficient. Melanie noted that the easy part is developing the targets. The hard part is changing behaviors and people’s actions. Discussion ensued about ways of promoting weatherization. Charlie added that there is pressure on the utilities to ramp up weatherization programs. Catherine added that the energy sub-committee has talked about ways to promote weatherization, one way is through energy standard labeling on homes. Efficiency VT will provide us data with what has been weatherized in communities and we will be tracking this going forward. Marty asked if the towns will have to do anything. Charlie didn’t think so as data will come from Efficiency VT, Green Mountain Power and Vermont Gas. Discussion continued that the point here is to reduce energy consumption. Charlie said CCRPC will be working with municipalities. Andy said energy efficiency programs worked with Burlington Electric because they’ve spent money to do efficiency improvements and it has reduced the amount of power BED needs to purchase elsewhere. Justin mentioned that heat pumps will increase electric utilities stake in the thermal side and rates may be affected. He also said we need to have a policy in the ECOS Plan that makes a connection between Act 250 and the energy stretch codes and the land use implications that could occur if developers are building smaller projects to avoid building to the stretch code, which do add an increased cost to a project. If we are serious about this the State should adopt a more aggressive energy code instead of having geographic differences in who needs to comply with the stretch code. Melanie noted that Act 174 requires us to have a statement for development and siting of renewable energy resources. Our language includes:

- While it may not be feasible for energy generation facilities to be bound by this plan’s goals of 80% of new development in areas planned for growth, it is this Plan’s policy to strongly encourage solar generation on previously developed sits wherever possible, as this promotes distributed generation and lessens greenfield development. This Plan also strongly encourages energy generation on preferred sites.
- Renewable energy generation shall not take place in areas with field-verified state or local known constraints, unless a location on preferred sites.
- Impacts to renewable energy generation on areas with field-verified state or local possible constraints, shall be minimized, and further investigation may deem the site unsuitable.

State and Local Constraints and Preferred Sites are identified in section 4.1.1 (page 177). The Energy Sub-committee feels this language is clear given the ECOS Plan will have greater weight in PSB process. We’ll get reaction from DPS on this language. Charlie noted that this is the only “shall” statement in our regional plan and asked for the Board’s comments. Marty said if we are not comfortable with the shall statement we could say development may not have “undue adverse impacts”. Catherine noted that the committee spent an hour discussing this yesterday, but felt they should go forward with stronger language rather than weaker. Chris Shaw shared that the Long-Range Planning Committee was in general agreement with the sub-committee’s approach. Chris Roy asked what is the purpose of submitting this now and what we might do for future drafts. Charlie said we have a contract with DPS that says we’ll get a 1st Draft to them by May 31, 2017. He noted the Energy Committee has looked at this, as well as the Long Range Planning Committee and Planning Advisory Committee. We’re trying to see where the board is on this and then we’ll get DPS

...
comments and work on a final draft later this year. This is really the first cut on where to start on
this conversation. Chris Roy asked to what extent did the committee have a discussion on areas
where we feel comfortable making policy recommendations that aren’t in the scope of what we’ve
handled more traditionally. Secondly, to what extent do we need to make policy prescriptions for
our plan to be utilized with respect to generation projects. He noticed that there are a number of
text recommendations. For example, one statement says, “The entire fleet should be electric”. To
what extent was there a conversation to decide whether we want to get into this area? Catherine
said the maps don’t necessarily show every site. This allows municipalities the opportunity to say
where they want energy generation facilities. Charlie said some of these ideas are in there to show
what kinds of things would have to happen to reduce the energy consumption by 30%. He
acknowledged that state and other parties are going to need to create incentives for this shift.
Lengthy discussion continued about what recommendations are in here and whether we’ll have
additional opportunity to refine. Melanie added that the specific policy about electric vehicles is in
chapter 3 and that the data is one scenario that would get us to the State’s goals and we are not tied
to the data as a policy perspective. Chris Roy expressed concerns about policy we have not had to
make in the past. Marty asked why only solar is encouraged in developed areas. Melanie said we
didn’t think wind generation would be appropriate in developed areas. Jeff recommended we say
renewable energy vs. solar. Jeff Carr is very uncomfortable with “shall” but is okay with “should.” If
we go in with the most restrictive language are we undermining our credibility because the PSB
overssees Section 248. He’s uncomfortable putting the push for local control, because the state will
never let it happen. Chris Roy said when the state sees these he hopes the state will come up with
guidance. Justin feels that if the intent is to rubber stamp any current and future constraints and
make them binding then it is antithetical to the role he was hoping we’d play and is this mediating
legitimate local concerns on siting and the state imperative to get off fossil fuels. He’s fine with shall
as long as we are clear on what we are doing. He’s not sure on the intent of this. This language is
not clear because he reads it as we are a rubber stamp for local siting regulations. Regina said we
included local constraints only if we can meet the solar and wind targets. Justin said there needs to
be a provision to factor in new constraints that haven’t been factored and evaluated. Lengthy
discussion continued about whether this really says what our intent is. Chris added that this is a risk
because after this is implemented, town X can identify a constraint and as long as it is field verified
and given the language proposed it pulls that in. The mandatory nature of shall does not leave any
leeway for the political ups and downs either for or against what may occur in towns. Justin added
that language needs to be added to be representative of scale. Chris Roy asked given the fact that
there is range of opinions on how to approach shall vs. should, what is subject to shall vs. should,
and how you define constraints now and going forward; what is the way forward? Charlie suggested
that staff develop some alternative language statements and ask for feedback on each idea from the
DPS. That way we’ll get their opinion of how they determine substantial deference. Andrea said
this would be the opportunity to put aside our local concerns and work to see what’ll work at the
county regionally. We should really take a hard look at how we can change this for the entire
county and not individual towns. Chris Roy noted local energy plans have to be consistent with the
regional plan if they want substantial deference in Section 248. Charlie add that if we mapped local
known constraints in the regional plan then we are taking the burden off the towns from having to
obtain substantial deference and argue at the PSB themselves. This is the implication of this
language and it seems like there is some thought to pull back from this notion. Jeff Carr said there is
a big difference between small scale operation and a merchant generation project and there’ll be
more restrictions than an individual doing something on his home. Lengthy discussion continued
about small generating project for oneself vs. merchant generation project where someone wants to
sell power to the grid. We need to differentiate between the two types of projects. Chris Roy said then the question becomes if the town wants to be restrictive whether we can achieve that in a general way with the regional plan and let the town run with it instead of us or whether the RPC is going to dictate how the towns address energy planning. How activist do we want to be in opposing policies or do we develop a framework that allows towns to develop their own policy and let it shake out in the 248 process? Justin said this organization should understand our role and we need to clarify that. Andy said if the next step is to present it to the DPS. Charlie had a good outline on how to proceed that reflects the discussion this evening. He agreed with Charlie about how we could give DPS several options that reflect what we talked about tonight; and, once we get their feedback we can move forward. Chris Roy said in the meantime we should speak to the municipal selectboards to see what they think. Charlie noted there is nothing in here that would dictate something that isn’t already in town plans. The question is, do we carry the burden in section 248? Justin agreed with getting DPS reaction, but asked everyone to look at the map in the documents and see the location of local known or possible constraints. Known is most restrictive where we know they can’t be built. Gray is local known constraints. Possible constraints are less restricted. Justin suggested staff use an overlay to show known constraints and areas with good solar or wind potential and show what we’re taking off the table. Melanie then showed the map showing solar and wind base and prime areas. The prime solar area is based on GIS topographic analysis and the removal of state known constraints (i.e. FEMA floodways, river corridors, Class 1 and 2 wetlands, etc.) At the end of April, we sent the Municipal Data Energy Guide to municipalities and included this map for their input. Melanie then reviewed the Solar and Wind Targets: 1) County's share of the state population and energy resource areas; 2) Applied local known and possible constraints to energy resource areas. Justin said one thing we should do is highlight the differences in the town policy. If there are considerations that are debatable and leading to the grey areas let’s highlight them because so much area is needed for solar and wind generation. Discussion ensued about how much acreage is needed to generate 1 megawatt of power, etc. Lengthy discussion ensued. Charlie thanked staff and the committee for all of their work in developing this. Chris Roy said that is a difficult task and we have to figure out all the details. Staff will develop alternatives for DPS.

11. Report from the Board Development Committee on FY18 Nominations. Andy Montroll noted that every year the Board Development Committee meets to come up with the slate of officers for the new fiscal year. He checked with the current officers and asked who was interested in continuing to serve and at the last meeting he asked other board members to let him know if they were interested. The Committee (Andy, Jeff Carr and Catherine McMains) met a couple of weeks ago and unanimously agreed to recommend the current officers serve again: Chair: Chris Roy; Vice-Chair: Mike O'Brien; Secretary-Treasurer: Brian Bigelow; At-Large for communities under 5,000: Barbara Elliott; At-Large for communities over 5,000: John Zicconi; Immediate Past Chair: Andy Montroll. We will hold the election at our annual meeting in June.

12. Executive Director’s Updates. Charlie asked if any members were interested in playing golf before the annual meeting on June 21st, which will be held at the Catamount Country Club in Williston.

a. Legislative Update. Charlie noted the legislature is still in session. The transportation budget went through, but we’re still waiting to hear about funding the housing bond which was the recommendation for the Building Homes Together campaign. Another thing still tied up is the capital bill because there is water quality money in there to fund water quality projects. DEC will be looking to RPCs to help get the money through to towns for road erosion and stormwater
projects. The Commission on Act 250 which is not just focusing on Act 250, but also the whole permitting process.

b. **Chittenden County Opioid Alliance (CCOA).** Charlie noted the CCOA leadership is going through changes since Martha Maksym took a job at the state and Harry Chen left the state and this gives the opportunity to review how they’d like to see this effort work. An unrelated piece is that Cathy Aikman who was directing that effort has decided not to renew her contract with us. So, it’ll be an opportunity to reorganize and decide where to house the effort.

c. **Regional Dispatch.** All communities have appointed someone to the Joint Survey Committee. There is a lot of work and a challenge to get something to the towns this fall, especially trying to figure out budgeting not knowing how many towns will be in. The managers, police, fire & rescue departments are all working together on this issue.

d. **Monthly report.** Charlie noted the report will be sent soon.

13. **Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports.** Minutes of various committees were included in the meeting packet.

14. **Members’ Items; Other Business.** There were none.

15. **Adjournment.** JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY AMY BELL, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:50 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission  
June 21, 2017  
Agenda Item 4: Action Item  
FY2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program

**Issues:**  
Federal regulations require the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC), as the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for Chittenden County, to develop and maintain a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The TIP contains funding information for transportation projects proposed to spend federal transportation funds in Chittenden County. Projects must be listed in the TIP to spend federal transportation funds. The TIP includes all modes of transportation including highways, bicycle and pedestrian facilities and transit.

The TIP covers a four-year period and it must be fiscally-constrained. It is typically updated every year with the assistance of the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC), the Vermont Agency of Transportation (VTrans), Green Mountain Transit (GMT) and Burlington International Airport.

The TIP lists federal funding amounts in the federal fiscal year when they are expected to be needed. It should be noted that the TIP is a planning and not a budget document. The TIP represents the intent to construct or implement a specific project and the anticipated flow of federal funds. Funds correspond to the following project development phases:

- Scoping – a process that develops safe and effective alternatives based on documented rational that meet the stated purpose and need while minimizing environmental impacts
- Preliminary Engineering – detailed design of the preferred alternative
- Right-of-Way - process of determining if land rights are needed for construction and negotiation of appropriate compensation
- Construction

The Draft Fiscal Year 2018–2021 Transportation Improvement Program is available on CCRPC’s website [http://www.ccrpcvt.org/our-work/our-plans/transportation-improvement-program/](http://www.ccrpcvt.org/our-work/our-plans/transportation-improvement-program/). Please contact Christine if you wish to receive a paper copy.

**TAC Recommendation:**  
Recommend that the Board warn a Public Hearing for the FY2018-2021 TIP.

**Staff Recommendation:**  
Recommend that the TAC approve the FY2018–2021 TIP.

**For more information contact:**  
Christine Forde  
846-4490 ext. *13 or cforde@ccrpcvt.org
Election of officers for Fiscal Year 2018

Issues: The procedures for the Election of Officers as articulated in the Bylaws of the CCRPC are as follows (please note that Article VII, Section C. articulates the inclusion of the Immediate Past Chair as a member of the Executive Committee):

ARTICLE VII. OFFICERS & EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

A. Election of Officers and Executive Committee
   The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission shall annually elect three officers: a Chair, Vice-Chair, and Secretary/Treasurer. In addition, the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission shall annually elect two municipal Board members to the Executive Committee. One municipal Board member of the Executive Committee shall represent a community of 5000+ population; the other, a community of less than 5000 population, based on information from the latest census or population estimate completed by the US Census Bureau.

   The Board Development Committee shall render its report of nominations to fill ensuing vacancies prior to the June meeting. The Board Development Committee may nominate one or more candidates for each office. Candidates may also be nominated from the floor.

   The officers of the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission shall be elected by a two-thirds majority of the Board members present and voting pursuant to 24 V.S.A. § 4343(b). The results of the voting shall be announced at the June meeting of each year. In the event a majority for any office is not reached, the top two vote getters will have a run-off election and the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission will continue to vote until a majority is reached.

Board Development Committee

Recommendation: That the Commission consider the following slate of officers for Fiscal Year 2018 (July 1, 2017-June 30, 2018):

   Chair: Chris Roy (Williston)
   Vice-Chair: Mike O’Brien (Winooski)
   Secretary-Treasurer: Brian Bigelow (Underhill)
   At-Large for Towns over 5,000: John Zicconi (Shelburne)
   At-Large for Towns under 5,000: Barbara Elliott (Huntington)
   Immediate Past Chair: Andy Montroll (Burlington)

   Additional nominations may be offered from the floor.

Questions: Contact Andy Montroll – andym@montrolllaw.com
Members Present
Joss Besse, Bolton
Jacob Hemmerick, Milton
Paul Conner, South Burlington
Dana Hanley, Essex
Alex Weinhagen, Hinesburg
Everett Marshall, Huntington
Karen Purinton, Colchester
Daryl Benoit, Charlotte
Clare Rock, Richmond
Ken Belliveau, Williston
Katherine Sonnick, Jericho

Others (for Building Code presentation):
Jennifer Green, Burlington Electric Department
Ray Belair, South Burlington ZA
Ned Daly, Essex Planning Commission

Staff
Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
Charlie Baker, Executive Director
Emily Nosse-Leirer, Planner
Melanie Needle, Senior Planner
Lee Krohn, Senior Planner

1. Welcome and Introductions
Joss Besse called the meeting to order at 2:37 p.m.

2. Approval of March 8, 2017 Minutes
Paul Conner made a motion, seconded by Alex Weinhagen, to approve the March 8, 2017 minutes, with the following amendment: JAM Golf, not Gulf. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.

3. Bolton Town Plan
Lee Krohn noted that all previous comments were addressed, and he suggests approval to the Board. Joss Besse wanted to add one note about West Bolton regarding density. It has historically been much more dense, has lessened over time, and is looking to re-establish its previous density. Lee Krohn stated that CCRPC agrees with that goal, but just needed to make note of it for the record. Lee Krohn added that we will host the public hearing at the Board meeting, as we didn’t have time to warn it at the PAC meeting.

Alex Weinhagen made a motion, seconded by Ken Belliveau, that the PAC finds the 2017 Bolton Town Plan, as submitted and as adopted by the Bolton Selectboard on April 26, 2017, meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC approval, and that the municipality's planning process meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC confirmation.

The PAC further recommends that the Plan, and the municipal planning process, be forwarded to the CCRPC Board for approval. Further discussion: Paul Conner added that he checked with CCRPC Staff to confirm the Town has been paying their CCRPC dues. Alex Weinhagen asked if the Planning Commission budget will likely stay as is in the future, and noted that it is low. Joss Besse indicated that it will likely remain in the annual budgets and may not be much room for expansion. Lee Krohn added that Bolton is a small town. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED. Joss Besse abstained.

4. Regional Energy Planning Update
Melanie Needle provided an overview of the municipal data that was sent out to the municipalities on 4/30. The data helps explain the level of change that is needed in the energy sectors in order to meet the State’s energy goals. Melanie Needle reiterated that the data profiles are just a draft, and is intended to begin the conversation. Melanie Needle stated that she will ask if anyone has any questions first, then Emily Nosse-Leirer will go through the data, and Melanie Needle will go through the mapping.
Clare Rock asked how the Department of Public Service (DPS) will look at something in the Town Plan that is not consistent with the Regional Plan. Melanie Needle stated that we are trying to anticipate that with a caveat in the ECOS Plan; but we are also hoping to get alignment as best as possible now so please let us know now if something doesn’t look right on the maps. Had a discussion that our intent is to allow for greater flexibility at the local level, so that CCRPC can approve the Plans as they come forward. However, we’ll have to monitor that each municipality is still meeting their local solar target and that we are collectively meeting the county wind target.

Joss Besse asked how the targets were calculated at the County level; and suggested that there aren’t many viable sites in Bolton outside of areas where housing already exists. Melanie Needle responded that is what is left after the restraints were mapped.

There was a lot of discussion regarding the accuracy of the base layers. Melanie Needle asked the PAC whether the ECOS Plan Policy for prohibiting energy generation in areas with state and local known constraints makes sense and is the right approach. Melanie Needle was specifically asking about this statement “Renewable energy generation shall not take place in areas with state or local known constraints, unless located on an existing structure or impervious surface.” Alex Weinhagen stated that yes, it does make sense. Karen Purinton asked about defining impervious surface because Colchester considers compacted soils as impervious surface. There was a suggestion to change “…unless located on an existing structure or impervious surface” to “…unless located on a preferred site.” Ken Belliveau asked if that would then mean that the Plan isn’t going to actually dictate where something will go? Staff confirmed and added the generation maps are helpful in setting goals and targets, rather than defining good areas for wind and solar generation because we’ve seen applications in areas that don’t show up as good generation areas on these data layers.

Paul Conner asked about the known constraints and possible constraints; specifically, he noted that the state significant species data layer is taking out the entire airport and part of Essex – and this is a site specific issue that might be a plant that needs protecting in one particular location not the entire swath. There was also discussion about the usefulness of including prime ag soils and forests as possible constraints since it adds most of the land area, thereby not helping solve the ultimate question of where these facilities should and shouldn’t go. It leaves just as much of a question mark as we have today. Perhaps the language should focus on site assessment and require the reduction of impact as much as possible. Paul Conner suggested that we set a threshold for X% of impact to a possible constraint area is a problem, while Y% of impact is not. As an example, solar array footings don’t actually result in that much of an impact. It would be very difficult for Staff to set those thresholds.

Dana Hanley asked about protected land and associated easement. In Essex there is a Vermont Land Trust easement that does allow for a solar array. Melanie Needle explained that is why these constraints are listed as a possible constraint because some allow energy generation facilities and some do not. Site by site review is needed. Ken Belliveau asked if we know there is a local easement that restricts solar should we highlight that as a known constraint? Staff stated that yes you can, but you wouldn’t need to because no one will actually get site control for a solar generation facility.

There was a discussion about the maps and the language – the language will dictate the constraints, not the map because the resources need to be identified on a site by site basis.

Question about the technical assistance – Melanie Needle stated that we currently have resources to help three municipalities and this work will occur before July 30, 2017. There may be additional assistance in FY18.

Jacob Hemmerick asked why we have solar targets and not wind targets. Staff explained that we have wind targets but only at the County level. It would be helpful to see the County wide wind target. Discussion about wind target in Milton. Regina Mahony suggested that we need a way to show how each Town can meet their overall target, regardless of the technology they use (solar, wind, biomass, etc). We have not set it up that way currently, but we’ll see if we can.

5. Regional Act 250/Section 248 Projects on the Horizon – tabled.

6. Other Business
a. Regina Mahony handed out an overview of sessions from the APA conference in NYC. She will email this out when the presentations are downloaded.

b. **Town Forest Recreation Planning Community Assistance Program** – Technical Assistance, due 6/1st.

c. **2017 Bike and Ped Grant Program** – due July 14th.

7. **Update on State Residential and Commercial Building Codes and South Burlington’s Experience**

Steve Spatz, Residential Energy Consultant, is here to discuss Act 89. This is an overview of what is required by the Towns and what Towns can do. Currently working under 2015 code; there may be updates in 2018.

There was some discussion about requiring the certification before issuing a CO. Yes, it is required. There was a question about whether there are materials for rehabs and expansions rather than building a whole new home because those aren’t the majority of the permits. Efficiency Vermont is considering an additional program for additions and rehabs.

The code requires nothing drastically different than what folks have been building for a while – it is about how pieces are put together and mitigating risk.

More and more lenders and title attorneys are requiring RBES certificates in order to close loans/mortgages. Lack of a RBES certificate doesn’t necessarily mean that you don’t have a clean title, but it could mean that the buyer is no longer interested in buying it. Also, the homeowner may take civil action against the person certifying the building. A homeowner/builder can opt out of the code because they live their themselves; but when they go to sell it, it is buyer beware.

Steve Spatz can provide this info via pdf; and also has some municipal guides that were emailed out to municipalities. Regina Mahony will send these resources out to the PAC when she receives them from Steve Spatz.

Paul Conner provided a quick overview of what South Burlington has done, and he provided some lessons learned. The City’s energy committee asked the PC to look into requiring solar ready roofs. After gaining some insight on what else is out there, the PC wanted to use something that was predictable, rather than come up with their own standards. In So. Burlington well over 70 to 80% of projects go through Act 250 where the stretch energy code is already required, so they were dealing with an equity issue where few developments weren’t subject to the stretch energy code. So they ultimately decided to adopt the stretch energy code in the City. While this started in the City Center – they decided that they didn’t want to develop a higher standard and disincentive for City Center growth – so this is applicable to the entire Town. The requirement has been in place for a year now, and they have had some issues with the window/glazing requirements in the City Center’s Form Based Code and the stretch energy code. An applicant in their T5 zone just barely thread the needle to meet the stretch code and the glazing requirements. But they had to make the second story windows smaller, and that might be noticeable. They may need to build in a provision about how you address this conflict. Administering the stretch energy code isn’t any different from a Staff perspective than administering the regular code; an important factor in considering the adoption of it. South Burlington only requires this of new construction, not additions.

There was a question regarding the cost of development from the base code to the stretch code. Steve Spatz indicated that the cost of materials isn’t necessarily a large difference, but the R20 insulation (stretch code) v. R15 insulation (base code) adds another inch which can start to get tricky with construction. Foundation insulation is what is going to cost more and make the construction more complicated.

9. **Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 4:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony
CCRPC Long Range Planning Energy Subcommittee

AGENDA
* = attached to agenda in the meeting packet

DATE: Tuesday, May 16, 2017
TIME: 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 pm
PLACE: CCRPC Office, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT.

Attendance
Matt Burke, Charlotte
Keith Epstein, South Burlington
Jeff Forward, Richmond
Catherine McMains, Chair, Jericho
Robin Pierce, Essex
Karen Purinton, Colchester
Irene Wrenner, Essex
Melanie Needle, CCRPC
Emily Nosse-Leirer, CCRPC
Regina Mahony, CCRPC

1. **Welcome + Introductions**
The meeting began at

2. **Review April 18, 2017 Minutes** *(5 Minutes)*
Edits were made to clarify a few points. Irene Wrenner made a motion to adopt the minutes as edited and Keith seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

3. **ECOS Plan Draft Energy Element Revisions** *(60 Minutes)*
Melanie outlined the process for the plan throughout the rest of this month. Staff will be sending the preliminary first draft in to the Department of Public Service for initial comments at the end of May.

**Climate Action Section:**
**Built Environment Chapter and Land Use Section:**
• Melanie explained that no changes were made to this section, but that the section and CCRPC’s actions related to compact development are key to lessened energy use, especially in terms of transportation. This is an area that CCRPC has a lot of influence over and is doing good work in.

**Transportation Section:**
• Emily explained that in most of this section, there aren’t really changes to the content of the plan, but more was added to connect the dots between transportation goals and energy use.
• Keith suggested changing energy “use” to energy “source” in the discussion of natural gas for heavy duty transportation, and making the point that EVs are a decrease in fossil fuel use here because we’re assuming almost 100% renewable electricity.

**Energy Section:**

---

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.
• This section has been edited to reflect all the state’s energy goals.
• Catherine had a question about home weatherization: shouldn’t all the numbers about home weatherization match up with each other? The LEAP model says that 14% of homes will be weatherized by 2025, but the State goal is 25% of homes. So how should we condition this? The committee agreed that the 25% should be reported with a statement that progress on weatherization has been quite low and the goal will likely need to be edited in the future to reflect this.
• Melanie asked the committee to discuss whether the plan does a good job describing the natural gas issue in the 90X2050 LEAP scenario on page 77 and page 85-86.
  o The committee agreed that it is the best that we can do under the current circumstances.
  o The committee asked that “aggressive weatherization” be added to the list of things that will decrease energy use from natural gas in both places, and that page 85 be edited to reflect that Chittenden County can’t meet the whole state goal for energy siting.
  o The committee discussed the challenge of overcoming customer reluctance to shift from natural gas to heat pump, and that the state needs to put either money or regulatory power towards these goals (or both!).
  o Karen said that education is one of CCRPC’s strengths and areas of influence so education on switching fuel types should be listed as well.
• Jeff Forward said that the goal in the biomass advocacy community is to have about 35% of thermal energy use coming from biomass by 2050, compared to the LEAP model which is currently showing about 14% consistently between now and 2050. This is something that we may edit the thermal energy section to reflect in the future, though this was not a conclusive decision.

Strategy 3.2.2 (80% of Growth in 15% of Land)
• Melanie asked the committee to discuss whether they agree with the statement saying that Strategy 3.2.2 does not include energy generation development (see page 98). She reiterated that the energy actions are included here based on the format of the plan, and that it would be extremely difficult to generate our renewable energy goals if we only do it in the 15% of areas planned for growth.
  o Robin restated his point that energy generation should not be trashing the landscape.
  o Karen clarified the point in this language is intended to mean that we know that 80% of renewable generation can’t be contained in 15% of land area. Perhaps we could say that wind and solar “aren’t contemplated” when we discuss this goal?
  o Another option is using the language suggested by Jim Donovan via email that “the particular requirements of solar and wind generation might not always be present in areas planned for growth.”
  o Or could we say that renewable energy generation can probably be done in a lot of areas but it’s not CCRPC’s policy to say that 80% of them has to be in the 15% of land area identified here? Should it say “land based” or “large scale”? 
  o Everyone is in agreement with the intent of this statement and staff will continue to wordsmith.
  o Everyone agrees that it is good that the plan says later that we strongly encourage on-site development—and it’s possible that we could just have the paragraph discussing this on page 101 instead of having a sentence added at the beginning at all.

• Melanie asked the committee to discuss whether the ECOS Plan should use the term “shall” to prohibit renewable energy generation development on known constraints? Is the sentence about mitigation necessary?
  o Melanie mentioned to the committee that the LRPC made edits to the plan after the energy subcommittee packet went out, and that the LRPC is recommending “shall.”
  o Perhaps we should use the phrase “ground-truthing” instead of “site assessment”? Or “specific site assessment”? We want to make sure that it’s clear that we aren’t trying to prohibit any development until an applicant has gone through a full site assessment and actually identified the constraints that are on the ground. The committee decided on “verified by site assessment” in the
end.

- The committee discussed changes in CCRPC’s mapping methodology at length. When the packet for this meeting went out, maps showed potential energy sites and constraints in the same places, and there now are separate maps for constraints and separate maps for potential.
- The committee had an extensive discussion about known constraints that may or may not be appropriate for solar or wind development.
- Regina made the point that the point of all of the work we’ve done here is to get towns and the region substantial deference.
- All the other nicer or more positive-sounding options here (“discourage,” “not suitable,” etc.) don’t have regulatory weight.
- Regina reminded the committee that because this is our very first draft to the Department of Public Service, we will get feedback from them on our language which may inform our edits going forwards. Our strategy right now is to go with “shall not” right now and see what DPS says about it. This is far from the last time we will discuss these issues!
- The committee discussed the strategies of other RPCs. As far as staff knows, most other RPCs are focusing their siting language on the prime and base areas, but we’re not confident enough in the data to have this kind of siting guidance.

f. Does the Plan language on substantial regional impact for energy development seem appropriate? (See page 133)

- Regina explained that CCRPC’s goal with this definition of substantial deference, and our discussion of what “local known constraints” are, is to try to make sure that our regional plan is never in conflict with a local plan. However, we will have to develop a policy going forward to address how we’ll be reviewing local energy plans and changes in local constraints when we approve local plans.

4. Solar/Wind Targets* (10 Minutes)

- Melanie reminded the committee that at the last meeting, the committee decided to use wind and solar targets for the county that take into account Chittenden County’s share of the state’s population and the county’s share of the state’s resource. The committee still thinks this is a good idea.
- The solar and wind goals are going to stay at the municipal level because they’re acreage based so it’s easy to say whether they’re “possible” or not. But a municipality can meet their energy generation goal however they want.
- Matt clarified that the municipal generation targets are only for 50% of energy end use, since the state assumes that 50% will be coming from energy imports. The committee discussed that there are likely to be many municipalities that may not be able to meet their generation goals, but this plan won’t reflect it right now.

5. Next Steps

The meeting adjourned at 7:05. The next meeting is scheduled for June 20 but may be cancelled.
Bryan Osborne called the meeting to order at 9:00AM and asked for a round of introductions.

1. Consent Agenda
A minor TIP amendment change adding funding to a I-189 culvert project was unanimously approved.

2. Approval of Minutes
The May 2nd minutes were approved without changes.

3. Public Comments
There were none.

4. FY2018 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
Christine Forde began by putting the TIP into larger context flowing from the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, through corridor or scoping studies before ending up on the TIP list. She went on, explaining how from the TIP (where funding is identified and obligated) a project leads to design and construction. She then defined the TIP, described how projects get on it, and compared and contrasted the TIP to the State’s Transportation Capital Program. She noted that the TIP is a planning and not a budget document. It represents the intent to construct or implement a specific project and the anticipated flow of federal funds. Using a sample page from the draft TIP Christine described how the document should be read and identified the content of its various sections. Of particular note is the anticipated level of funding expected over the coming 4 years:
• FY2018 -- $78.6 million
• FY2019 -- $58.4 million
Christine explained the ups and downs of year-to-year funding by looking at funding history back to 2007 in a bar chart. She also noted that FY17 was particularly high due to possible major grants awarded to Burlington International Airport and GMT. She then broke down the TIP content in finer detail describing transportation project categories, the amounts of funding in each, and also identified the projects that stem from the three phases of the CIRC Alternatives process. Sources of funding and anticipated construction over the next two years, as well as projects moving out of construction from the coming year’s schedule were described next. Christine concluded by describing the annual report of projects receiving federal funds, recently constructed projects and historic funding levels by various categories. Following short discussion, ROBIN PIERCE MADE A MOTION THE TAC APPROVE THE FY2018-2021 TIP AND FORWARD IT TO THE BOARD FOR ADOPTION. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY KATELIN BREWER-COLIE AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. VTrans Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)

Dave Pelletier of VTrans began by going over what he hoped would come out of his presentation today:

1. Review project schedule, roles and responsibilities
2. Present an overview of Existing Conditions & Future Trends report
3. Listen and document regional perspectives and priorities, and
4. Provide information on how to stay involved

He described the LRTP as a statewide framework to guide transportation decision-making and investments for the next 20 years. He then went into some detail on the Existing Conditions & Future Trends report highlighting information on each of the following:

1. System Overview – data on roads, bridges, transit, park and rides, etc.
2. VTrans System Plans and Policies
3. 2016 Statewide Transportation Public Opinion Survey – Information is available for smaller geographies including northwest VT (Franklin, Chittenden and Addison Counties)
5. Energy & Climate Change
6. Population & Demographics
7. Funding & Finance
8. Land Use & Transportation
9. Technological Change – alternatives fuels and autonomous vehicles

Dave was seeking TAC member comment, and discussion occurred both during and after his presentation, providing input on document content as well as how the presentation might be revised for future audiences. All project documents will be posted on the project website at:

http://vtrans.vermont.gov/planning/long-range-plan

6. Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Update

Peter provided the latest information on MTP development but started with a refresher on what the MTP is. His main topics included: Background information, the MTP elements as proscribed by federal regulations, current conditions highlights and project schedule. He noted that MTPs are integrated and multimodal, addressing both people and goods; are on a 5 year schedule with a 20 year minimum time horizon; are based on current and forecast conditions; and have specified outreach/process requirements. The CCRPC’s MTP elements include:

- Current Transportation Conditions
- Future Demand
- Performance Measures and Targets
- Environmental Mitigation Discussion
- Financial Plan
- Corridor Discussion and Project Recommendations
Peter then briefly went over content from the draft Current Transportation Conditions report and asked the TAC to review it and send us any comments/revisions. He concluded with the project schedule, noting draft completion date, public hearings and final adoption.

7. Accelerated Innovation Deployment (AID) Project

Sai updated the TAC on this project’s progress. It is an Advanced Traffic Monitoring System using Bluetooth technology to detect and record real travel times through 5 different road corridors around the region:

- Corridor 1: I-89 Exit 14, US 2 in South Burlington
- Corridor 2: VT 289, Susie Wilson Rd. & VT 15 in Essex
- Corridor 3: I-89 Exit 12, US 2/VT 2A in Williston
- Corridor 4: I-89 Exit 17 in Colchester
- Corridor 5: I-89 Exit 16, US 2 in Colchester

Sai explained that the project will use BlueTOAD Spectra equipment to collect the data and that data will have applications in several areas, including:

- Arterial Travel-Times (operations, Origin/Destination (OD), message boards, before/after studies, Adaptive analysis)
- Freeway Travel-Times (operations, OD, message boards)
- Work Zones
- 511/Traveler Information Systems
- Planning/Modeling, and
- Incident Management

The remaining tasks and schedule include:

- Pilot Corridor Implementation (Williston Road corridor) – June 2017
- Final Installation, Deployment and Validation - Summer 2017

Dennis Lutz remarked on the importance of following up this phase with the equipment necessary to convey its information to the traveling public e.g. variable message signs. Dick Hosking noted that the VT RT 2A project would be impacted by a construction project in that corridor.

8. TAC Volunteer to Review Consultant Qualifications

Eleni asked for a TAC volunteer to review sets of consultant qualifications coming to the CCRPC and due on June 12th. Justin Rabidoux agreed to assist in this review.

9. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports

Bryan referred members to the project list on the back of the agenda.

10. CCRPC May Board Meeting Report

Peter mentioned the Board approved the UPWP.

10. Chairman’s/Members’ Items

Charlie referred the members to the MRGP communication included in the meeting packet.

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted, Peter Keating
I. Welcome: Annie Costandi called the meeting to order at 11:10 a.m.

2. Review and action on draft minutes of May 2, 2017 (Action):
   After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, James Sherrard made a motion, seconded by Brian Bigelow to approve the May 2, 2017 minutes. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED. Jenna, Christy & Don

3. Upcoming Funding Opportunities, DEC staff & CCRPC staff
   Dan distributed handouts regarding various funding opportunities. Kari Dolan provided an overview of the State’s efforts to provide financial assistance for the municipalities for meeting Act 64. See presentation at: http://dec.vermont.gov/sites/dec/files/wsm/erp/docs/2017-05-25%20Grant%20Webinar%20Presentation.pdf

   a. Ecosystem Restoration Program. These have been overhauled. There is useful information in the appendices. A standardized map is required so the DEC can see if there are any potential environmental constraints for the projects. These grant deadlines will be rolling, with four deadlines throughout the year. Substantial funds in excess of $9.4 million are available:

   b. Clean Water Block Grants. Up to $1.5 million (or $2 million) to target the Go List (construction ready/"Step 3 projects") – a subset of the full projects database. The hope is to quicken the implementation of these. The deadline is now closed. The RPCs and Conservation Groups have applied for this as a state-wide. Jenna added that requests for projects to be included on the “go list” has been very frustrating process. I hope that there is going to be an opportunity to get additional projects on the go list. Kari Dolan – Act 64 and CSO policy adopted in 2016 are priorities. Using the Tactical Basin Plans as a formal structure to manage all of the projects that are needed to meet those two priorities. However the project database is a working database because the basin plans only get updated every five years. While the project database will be formally updated through the TBP process, DEC knows that projects that come out of planning and assessment studies should be added to the database as they are available. Charlie Baker added that the RPCs are offering assistance to get the projects in the database and categorized the right way; similar to what we do know with the transportation projects. James Sherrard asked if we contact the RPC to get the projects on the go list? Charlie added that the system is not yet finalized. The whole process is evolving. Jenna asked if an input form will be provided. Kari is working on a front end data portal in order for users to get projects into the database. However the projects will need to be vetted as DEC will be looking for projects that reduce phosphorus. The prioritization isn’t being done across sectors as they have responsibilities to meet under each...
sector, even though agricultural fixes may have more bang for the buck. Tom DiPietro asked that
DEC circle back in the fall to ask how this process has worked so that we can improve the system
since we’ll be working on this for a number of years. Kari described the reasoning of the timing,
and the predicament that they are in. Tom also added that pre-permitting screening by DEC Staff
is not necessary helpful right now on projects that aren’t yet engineered. Projects that are just in
concept shouldn’t be thrown out because they are near a wetland, because it hasn’t been designed
yet. If it gets thrown out now we won’t be able to construct it next year either. James Sherrard
asked about the 50% match – that makes it very challenging to use the money this year. If it were
80% we could use the money. Is there room to adjust this? Kari explained that the want to ensure
equitable use of the money throughout the state; and a comparison to other sectors. The developed
lands permit is likely to be a 50% match as well. If and when more funds become available they
will consider adjusting the match.

d. Road Grants in Aid. Kari explained that we’ve heard from municipalities multiple times that they
would like to see direct aid support rather than relying on a grant program. We are piloting the
program and you received the information yesterday. We have a cooperative agreement with the
RPC’s to pilot this project. It is voluntary. If you do wish to participate you need to commit to
using this money on sections of roads to meet draft MRGP standards. The RPCs will help
shepherd these projects all the way through. The reporting is a simple one page form. The match
is 20%, but can be in kind. They are highlighting five BMPs. They are hoping to gain experience
from this so they can explain to the Legislature how successful they’ve been. $2.1 million for this
pilot. The formula is based on the amount of connected road miles. If you are using in-kind
match for another project you can’t use it for this as well. Looking for projects that are low lying
and don’t have a lot of potential issues. Kari added that signage will be required for all projects.
Christy added that the draft MRGP is up on the website. They anticipate public comment notice
for August and September. They hope to send it out to all stakeholders by the end of the month.
James asked if the draft standards are what is likely to be added to the MS4 standards? Christy
stated that is still in process.
e. VTRANS: Transportation Alternatives. Dan referred the CWAC to the memo included in the
packet regarding the VTrans funding.
f. CCRPC, FY18, UPWP: Conceptual Design Assistance. Eleni Churchill explained that CCRPC
does have about $100,000 money in the UPWP to help support these efforts. We are meeting in
house today to discuss how those funds will be disbursed. Stay tuned for more information about
this.

**Other Business**

a. Colchester will start a stormwater utility on July 1.

**6. Items for July 5th meeting agenda**

a. Draft MRGP permit.
b. Keep in mind that ERP grants are also due on this day which is a Wednesday.

**7. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 12:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony
1. Welcome: Chelsea Mandigo called the meeting to order at 11:10 a.m.

2. Changes to the Agenda  Dan asked to add two items: 1-Amendment to FY17 budget and 2-May 9th request from Agency of Agriculture. The Committee approved the request.

3. Review and action on draft minutes of May 2, 2017:
   After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, DiPietro made a motion, seconded by Ravin to approve the May 2, 2017 minutes. No further discussion.  MOTION PASSED with Calvi, Witters, and Harris abstaining.

4. Review of 2017 Spring Activities
   Dave Barron recapped the results of the spring campaign. For the time period starting April 19th through June 4th we have 4,039 page views vs 3,024 for the same time period in 2016. Dan noted that these results have been achieved with only spending about $11,000 compared to the typical $20,000 spent in most spring RSEP campaigns. With targeted Google ad word buys, overall costs were down. There is still a plan to conduct a targeted online ad buy once an algae bloom erupts and media interest is triggered. Members were encouraged to contact Dave if they start hearing of potential beach closures in their towns so that he has a heads up. After a brief discussion, the Committee authorized Tally Ho to use the untapped funds from the spring buy to conduct about 2 weeks of media starting June 19th.

   Chelsea read a memo from Holly Kreiner of the Winooski NRCD which provided an update on their spring outreach and events for Stream Team

5. May 9th request from Agency of Agriculture
   Albrecht indicated CCRPC had received a request from Ms. Alison Kosakowski to link their YouTube videos about farmer’s clean water efforts on www.rethinkrunoff.org. After a brief discussion, the Committee directed Albrecht to indicate to her that at this time, the site needs to keep the focus on Minimum Measures #1 and #2 and the efforts of the 12 MS4s.

6. Amendment to FY17 budget
   Albrecht distributed a memo outlining current and projected expenses for FY17. He explained that unanticipated additional work (split equally between the RSEP and CCST accounts) for example on the merger MOU and the launch of Rethink Runoff, led to CCRPC being over budget. After a brief discussion, on a motion by DiPietro, seconded by Calvi, the Subcommittee approved a transfer of $1,300 from the RSEP account to the CCST account to cover this overage.

7. Review and authorization of brief piece on RSEP-CCST for upcoming book
   Albrecht briefed the group on the proposed submission for a book to be produced by the Vermont Clean Water Network. He did the first rough draft based upon the press release for the New England Stormwater
Collaborative Award and Chelsea and Annie improved upon it. After a brief discussion and some minor edits, the Subcommittee approved its submission.

8. **Review and approval of draft FY18 Rethink Runoff budget**

Albrecht recapped the requests from Tally Ho Design and Winooski NRCD as well as estimated lead agency costs. Albrecht noted that he is requesting $300 for incidentals for CCRPC which is different than the draft budget posted on the web a few days ago. Dave noted that his request only showed the $13,000 cost for the new creative work. As noted in the original contract, he would require funds for maintenance level activity such as ad buys, reporting, website maintenance, etc. which for FY18 he estimates would be $10,000. After a brief discussion, on a motion by Calvi, seconded by Sherrard, the Subcommittee approved an overall FY18 Rethink Runoff budget of $101,049.

9. **Items for July 5th meeting agenda**

a. Check-in report from Tally Ho
b. Quarterly report from Winooski NRCD

10. **Updates**

Christy Witters indicated that DEC is working on finalizing the next draft of the MS4 permit. She also reminded members of the meeting on June 14th to discuss MS4 Phosphorus baseload and tracking.

11. **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 1:29 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Dan Albrecht
The meeting was called to order at 5:45 p.m. by the chair, Chris Roy.

1. Changes to the Agenda; Members' Items. There were no changes to the agenda.

2. Approval of May 3, 2017 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes. MIKE O'BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MAY 3, 2017 WITH CORRECTIONS IF ANY. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. Act 250 & Section 248 applications. There were none.

   a. Procurement Policy. Forest noted that we aligned our procedures to address the federal regulations and State rules. We reviewed this with the Executive Committee previously. (Barbara Elliott arrived.) When asked if we had any concerns about the changes, Charlie noted that we tried to follow through and include what we already do. ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O'BRIEN, TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENTS TO THE PROCUREMENT POLICY. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
   
   b. Other amendments. Forest noted that we added a new position of Senior Business Manager and revised the Transportation Business Manager and Finance Assistant positions slightly to include reporting to Senior Business Manager. We updated the salary table; we updated language in our backup procedures and added language regarding computer replacement policy. There was a brief discussion about computer backup. We will ask Pam to revise the language regarding backups. When asked about QuickBooks backup, Forest said it’s backed up in two different places, and there are 5-6 backups to the company file. Charlie noted that this language is a recommendation on the IT side, not the accounting side. When asked if these amendments need to be approved by the board, Charlie said the bylaws give the Executive Committee authority to approve administrative policies. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THESE CHANGES TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATING PROCEDURES AND POLICIES. BRIAN BIGELOW SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. Auditor Selection. Forest noted that we put out annual audit services out to bid, as recommended by this committee. We received three proposals and the Finance Committee, Charlie, Bernie and
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Forest reviewed them. The Finance Committee recommended we hire the incumbent, Sullivan Powers and Company, with the request that we asked SPC to align the cost more closely with the other responders since they weren’t the low bidder. They subsequently reduced the cost by $2,500. We also asked that they have a different audit reviewer oversee our audit this year. Mike noted based on professional interactions with the other two responders, and feedback from the other RPCs, Charlie and Forest had indicated that it would be difficult to work with either of those firms. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O’BRIEN, THAT THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AWARD SULLIVAN POWERS AND CO. THE CONTRACT TO PROVIDE ANNUAL AUDITING SERVICES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017, AND SUBSEQUENT YEARS AS DEEMED APPROPRIATE; AND, THAT A REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS BE ISSUED AGAIN IN NO MORE THAN FIVE YEARS. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

6. CCRPC & ECOS Plan role regarding energy planning. Charlie referred to the memo in the packet and explained that he’d like to propose a different recommendation, which is to hold off on additional outreach to the municipalities until we have feedback from the Department of Public Service and to allow staff to dig into the local constraints a bit further. With this information, we can provide the Selectboards with a much clearer ask. At this stage, an ask about what level of authority we should establish in the regional plan would be a bit too theoretical.

Chris believes there are three fundamental questions the RPC needs to decide about where we want to be and how to get there:

1. Simply provide a framework and defer to the Towns for the specifics?
2. Take more of an advocacy role in the Plan; and if so, in which direction as there are opinions on both sides?
3. Who are we going to take municipal input from? The legislative bodies, our Board members? Our Board members need to represent the opinion of their municipality, unless the legislative body defers to their representative.

Charlie added that another important factor to consider is the specific terminology the legislature used to devise this system. “The Public Service Board shall give substantial deference to the land conservation measures and specific policies contained in a duly adopted regional and municipal plan...” Therefore, to gain substantial deference we likely need to more broadly define land conservation measures that are relevant to all development rather than just wind and solar generation facilities. This would broaden the approach that we’ve taken thus far.

Chris indicated that while identification of “no build” areas may meet a larger public good, discerning the impact on landowners at the municipal level is a challenge and at the regional level we are even farther removed from landowner ramifications. We should be wary of mapping development restrictions across the county unless and until all relevant players are on board with such a designation after adequate public notice and input.

Andy stated that we’ve traditionally supported our municipalities in development review. For us to set up a system where we may oppose one of our municipalities on a proposed development would be a real morass. We ought to avoid that situation. There was some discussion about the challenges in this realm where there may be opposing municipal viewpoints, particularly regarding wind turbines given potentially different financial and aesthetic impacts on host towns and nearby
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1 communities. mike agreed that we should stick with our current practice of supporting our
municipalities on development applications.

3

there was discussion about supporting municipal interests, but not advocating. these was a
suggestion to build upon the concept behind the planning area map and associated policy. in that
example, the planning areas are established based on local zoning, with a regional policy to build
80% within the areas planned for growth. perhaps a similar method could be used for the 90%
renewable goal – build a regional framework from municipal input. there was general agreement
that ccrpc would work regionally to understand how we reach the energy goals and that we would
be supportive of town’s approach and that the regional plan would provide the general framework
for supporting municipalities in their approach to getting to 90% renewable.

7. chair/executive director report.

a. water quality implementation role. charlie will keep members updated as things are
finalized. we’ve been managing the basin planning contract for all of the rpcs. we’ve
received municipal roads grants and there is more capital money in the state budget and
they’re trying to decide how to get the money out there. there will be $2.5 million available
through the rpcs to towns (about $10-20,000 per project) with northwest rpc taking the
lead on administering the funds. there is a third grant program that they constructed that
the rpcs applied for and southern windsor rpc will be the administrator on this one to deal
with the “go lists” of project ready to be constructed. there are also ecosystem restoration
grant fund available now. we will have another compliment of transportation-stormwater
grant programs after july 1st. we’re trying to tell them that this is not the time to have
municipalities complete applications for funding, as they are busy with construction projects
already in the pipeline.

8. agenda review for june 21, 2017 annual board meeting. bernie noted that this is indeed for 2017
and not 2016 as the draft agenda indicates. barbara elliott noted that the invitation that went out
to folks indicated that the social hour would begin at 5:30, with the business meeting at 7 p.m. and
guest speaker at 7:15 p.m. members agreed we should be consistent with what invitees have
already seen. we will also make sure julie moore knows the correct time. so far there has not been
a great response to attend. bernie will follow up with our board members.

9. other business.

a. barbara suggested we make sure the list of upcoming meetings shows the 5:15 start time
for training in july. we will add this as another item.

b. regina asked members if they were all available for the next executive committee meeting
since it’s scheduled for july 5th. members present indicated they could attend.

10. executive session. not needed.

11. adjournment. mike o’Brien made a motion, seconded by andy montroll, to adjourn at
6:50 p.m. motion carried unanimously.

respectfully submitted,

bernadette ferenc
DATE: Thursday, May 11, 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
Alex Weinhagen, Hinesburg – PAC Rep
Chris Shaw, South Burlington – Board Rep
Heather Danis – ECOS Steering Committee Rep
Andrea Morgante, Hinesburg - Board Rep
Justin Rabidoux, South Burlington – TAC Rep
Edmund Booth - ECOS Steering Committee Rep

Staff
Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
Melanie Needle, Senior Planner
Eleni Churchill, Transportation Program Manager
Emily Nosse-Leirer, Planner
Charlie Baker, Executive Director

1. Welcome and Introductions
Chris Shaw called the meeting to order at 8:34 a.m.

2. Approve Minutes
Justin Rabidoux made a motion, seconded by Edmund Booth, to approve the minutes of April 13, 2017. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.

3. Energy Planning
Melanie Needle explained that we’ll be sending this first preliminary draft energy plan to the Department of Public Service by the end of the month. We will go over the discussion questions from the agenda. Also, so you are aware, we’ve provided each municipality with data and maps for their use in meeting the Act 174 requirements. We can also go out and meet with any of the communities that wish for us to do so.

The questions related to the Plan are:

a. Have we best described the natural gas issue in the 90x2050 LEAP scenario? Melanie Needle explained that we asked VEIC to run another LEAP model with natural gas levels consistent into the future, and the results only get to about 55% renewable energy use. Melanie Needle reviewed the draft text. Chris Shaw stated that we are essentially saying we can’t meet the 90x2050 goal, which I he thinks is true. Alex Weinhagen is fine with this as we’ve discussed previously. However, every region has this same issue but with different fuel types. So why is it different for us – is it largely the infrastructure and the level of population. Cost alone is not a good reason because costs of all fuel types are subject to change. Andrea Morgante added that places without natural gas can convert to a renewable resource directly and easily without centralized infrastructure in place; and I wouldn’t want to see natural gas expanded to areas where it doesn’t exist now. Andrea Morgante also questioned the text that identifies natural gas as a win from a greenhouse gas emission perspective. Staff will research this. The LRPC asked that Staff include a source of the information for whatever it is. There was a discussion about the dichotomy between the Department of Public Service approval of natural gas expansion projects and the 90x2050 renewable energy use goal. Staff stated that regardless of the natural gas issue we will work toward meeting the energy goals by more dense development, encouraging more localized systems (i.e. McNeil Generating Plant) and other things within CCRPC’s control. Charlie Baker suggested that we close the loop on this part of the Plan with a statement like: “In order to meet the 90x2050 goal it means customers will be switching to heat pumps, which will require market incentives (and regulatory changes) to make this happen.”

b. Have we adequately covered the opportunity our region has to lay the ground work for making a positive impact on transportation energy? There was a suggestion for funding and incentives to add charging stations in existing homes rather than just new construction to help with the costs of adding a circuit breaker, electricity to the garage, etc. Justin Rabidoux suggested that we expand beyond modal choices, and how we power them. We should describe the energy savings we can capture from improvements to the system more generally such as: moving traffic more efficiently and quickly, better light bulbs,
Intelligent Transportation Systems, etc. A lot of those transportation projects are relatively easy fixes and just need money, and we can influence that. Again, Staff will research natural gas and methane burning ghg – if it is cleaner at all, how much cleaner is it? Add to page 77, single yellow highlight page: Also incentivize TDM strategies with carrots and sticks through legislative changes like excise taxes, etc.

c. Do you agree with the statement saying that Strategy 3.2.2 does not include energy generation development? (see intro to Section 3.2.2) – change “energy generation facilities” to “solar and wind generation facilities”. Otherwise stick with this sentence for now.

d. Should the ECOS Plan language use the term “shall” to prohibit renewable energy generation development on known constraints? Is the sentence about mitigation necessary? Charlie Baker explained that use of shall is a policy shift for CCRPC because our Plan doesn’t include any “shalls” currently. Alex Weinhagen added that use of shall makes sense in this circumstance since you need to be clear in order to get substantial deference, which is the whole purpose of going through this effort. There was discussion about the difference between known constraints and possible constraints. It was suggested that you still use “shall” for possible constraints to require site assessments to ensure your resources are protected or minimized (see page 101). Also need to reference the maps and lists of constraints here; and maybe define “possible” and “known” in footnote or something. Also, potentially pull out “preferred sites” from page 101 – and/or add a sentence or two about what those sites are, if we get any local preferred sites. There was a suggestion to add an action about public investments for rooftop solar on schools. There was some discussion about whether we would or wouldn’t want to see public dollar investment in private buildings. Lastly, does encouraging solar generation on previously developed sites not consider our rural areas? The LRPC decided the language is good as is (last highlight on page 101).

e. If we use the word “shall” to prohibit generation on known constraint areas then do we have a contradiction with using the State’s definition of known constraints? The guidance from the Department of Public Service defines a known constraint as “signals likely, though not absolute, unsuitability for development based on statewide or local regulations or designated critical resources”, however we are intending them to be absolute. Alex Weinhagen suggested that on page 128 we explain the state “known constraint” definition, and add that Chittenden County’s definition is more absolute. Also explain within the definitions that the resources are defined by site investigation, the maps are just a starting point. Discussion evolved to how we map this. Can we combine both state and local known constraints and symbolize it in the same way? Or make a final conclusion map? Also, do we still need to map the generation resource areas at all, because the siting decisions will be made based on the constraint maps rather than the generation areas? Staff will think about this more.

f. Does the Plan language on substantial regional impact for energy development seem appropriate? (See page 24). Discussion about just referring to the maps and whether the maps should be the constraints rather than the generation maps, and/or the shall policy statement. The draft Plan states that the local constraints may change over time as the municipalities do their local planning, and therefore it may not be likely that a conflict will arise between the Regional Plan and a local Plan. Staff will think about whether we have to address this within the SRI at all. If we do include something here about energy, we should simply refer to the constraints not the map. Also had a discussion about “Future Land Use Plan” – it should just be the map and potentially the Section 3.2.2 policy.

4. **Next Meeting**
   June 8, 2017 from 8:30am to 10:00am.

10. **Adjourn**
The meeting adjourned at 10:05 a.m.

Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony