

1 CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
2 LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE - MINUTES  
3

4 DATE: Thursday, December 14, 2017  
5 TIME: 8:30 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.  
6 PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT  
7

**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

8  
9  
10 **1. Welcome and Introductions**

11 Regina Mahony called the meeting to order at 8:36 a.m.  
12

13 **2. Approve Minutes**

14 Heather Danis made a motion, seconded by Edmund Booth to approve the minutes of November 9, 2017. No further  
15 discussion. MOTION PASSED.  
16

17 **3. Metropolitan Transportation Plan Draft**

18 Peter Keating provided a presentation on the full draft of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). Peter  
19 Keating explained the purpose of the MTP and the required components. There was some discussion regarding the  
20 requirements and what Staff would do if any requirements change, such as a removal of the environmental  
21 mitigation review. These are minimum requirements and we can do more.  
22

23 Peter Keating explained the new safety performance measure for the fatalities/100 mile roads. There will be more  
24 performance measures added over the next few years. We can use the performance measures the State will use, or as  
25 the MPO, we can use something different if needed.  
26

27 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.  
28

29 Peter Keating provided the components of the MTP Scenario that have been presented before.  
30

31 He also explained the environmental consultation and mitigation report section. This section largely describes the  
32 people or agencies that we would need to talk to when projects move forward. At this level it is not logical to do a  
33 full environmental analysis for every project on the MTP list.  
34

35 Heather Danis and Ed DeMott have drafted some language to make a better connection to public health and will  
36 provide that to Staff.  
37

38 Andrea Morgante asked about evaluating the work that we do, and how projects move from this Plan to scoping  
39 (what we put in the UPWP) to actual implementation. Also, what is our success rate, or lack of, in getting projects  
40 through the whole MTP, to UPWP (scoping), to TIP, to construction. Christine Forde mentioned that she tracks this  
41 and Andrea thought that presenting this to the Board would be interesting/valuable. For the ECOS Plan, Staff will  
42 add a section that describes the general progression of project development from the MTP to implementation.  
43

44 **4. Energy Plan Public Comments**

45 Melanie Needle informed the LRPC that we are not having any trouble meeting the County wide renewable energy  
46 generation target; however there are some issues at the municipal level. Global Foundries uses about 3 to 4x the  
47 amount of energy of all of Burlington; it is a big outlier. There was some discussion regarding the location of this

1 actual demand; it is more than likely from the manufacturing component which is on the Junction side rather than  
2 the Williston side. Andrea Morgante explained that this could be a good example of how we deal with issues at a  
3 County level. The Energy sub-committee will discuss this further next week.  
4

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

- 6 • Line 10 – the commenter is asking for CCRPC to take a position on a carbon tax in the Plan. Staff finds that  
7 this is premature because there is a Governor’s Committee working on this, and CCRPC may want to wait  
8 on those results before taking a position. There was some discussion about how our role is more to  
9 implement the State’s energy goal rather than setting the State’s priorities. However, there was some  
10 discussion that we could take a more proactive approach and suggest that the State take this step. However,  
11 we won’t be able to have a policy discussion about a carbon tax within the timeframe of when we need to  
12 get this Plan adopted. Therefore, the prepared Staff response is the right approach.
- 13 • Line 11 – this is a comment about getting off of natural gas. The LRPC discussed that this is outside of the  
14 authority of the region and is in the hands of a State entity. It currently exists and while the fuel itself is  
15 relatively cheap, there is a significant value in the existing infrastructure that we won’t abandon easily.
- 16 • Line 16 – this is a comment about grid resilience and the need for back-up generators. VT is vulnerable to  
17 outages and resiliency is an important thing. However, fossil fuel generators are not the best answer.  
18 Storage is more likely the future solution. In fact Tesla power walls from Green Mountain Power are now  
19 available for \$15/month. This technology is already here, and this is a great solution. There was some  
20 discussion about explaining the terms used in the comment so readers can understand what we are talking  
21 about. We can also include a link to GMP’s website regarding the power wall program.
- 22 • Line 32 – same carbon tax issue as discussed above.
- 23 • Line 38 – this is a comment about the suitability language and lack of clear direction for the Public Utility  
24 Commission. Jim Donovan’s sent comments in before the meeting to indicate that he is still on board with  
25 “encourage” despite its flaws. There was some discussion regarding how much of a regulatory role we want  
26 to take. Other RPC’s do take more of a regulatory role, however we have not done that traditionally and  
27 conversations thus far with the Board don’t appear to be leaning in that direction. The LRPC thought that  
28 the current language is generally okay as is; though perhaps the energy sub-committee and Staff can come  
29 up with an alternative to “encourage” as it isn’t a particularly useful word.  
30

### 31 **5. Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) Comments**

32 Emily Nosse-Leirer provided an overview of the CEDS comments that we’ve received. Some large themes we  
33 heard about:

- 34 • Wage gap issues;
- 35 • Need for better broadband throughout the County;
- 36 • investing in downtowns and Villages doesn’t seem obvious in the CEDS component on its own however  
37 this is in the ECOS Plan. We need to make the connection stronger.  
38

39 Specific lines:

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

51 Next steps for Staff on the CEDS piece is to reconfigure it to match the new format; and re-organize for better  
52 readability.  
53

1 Heather Danis suggests that we make it clear that income and education are critical indicators for public health.  
2 Emily Nosse-Leirer indicated that the Plan already includes this language. Heather Danis will look at that section to  
3 see if this can be strengthened.  
4

5 **6. Other Business**

- 6 a. CEDS & MTP Project Lists – We are still collecting information from the municipalities and updating  
7 these lists.
- 8 b. Planning Area Map Changes. Melanie Needle provided an overview of a few minor future land use map  
9 changes including some color changes:
- 10 • Hinesburg- Modified the Village Planning Area to match the Village Growth Area
  - 11 • Westford-Modified the Village Planning Area to align with the Village Zoning District
  - 12 • Colchester- Modified the Village Planning Area along Mallets Bay Ave. to align with recent  
13 rezoning to the R2 District.
  - 14 • Update the colors to make it easier to discern the Metro Planning Area from the Suburban  
15 Planning Area
  - 16 • There may be an Underhill Village Planning Area change *IF* they pass some zoning changes on  
17 Town Meeting day. The village planning area will decrease.
- 18 c. Act 171, Forest Integrity – Regina Mahony indicated to the LRPC that the ECOS Plan already meets a lot  
19 of the new requirement; and the data is included in the work that we did for the energy planning land use  
20 constraints. Staff will continue to look into this and make edits accordingly for the January LRPC meeting.  
21

22 **7. Next Meeting**

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

24 **8. Adjourn**

25 The meeting adjourned at 10:06 a.m.

26  
27 Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony