

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

4 DATE: Thursday, March 8, 2018
5 TIME: 3:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. NOTE: Due to snow this meeting was held later than originally
6 scheduled.
7 PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT
8

9
10
11 **Members Present**

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

Staff

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

12 **1. Welcome and Introductions**

Regina Mahony called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

13
14 **2. Approve Minutes**

Andrea Morgante made a motion, seconded by Jim Donovan to approve the minutes of January 11, 2018. Jim Donovan stated that he should be noted as in attendance at the top; and that there are a number of questions and things that need clarification. Regina Mahony noticed that they are just notes without any refinement. Regina Mahony will work to improve these minutes.

Jim Donovan made a motion, seconded by Andrea Morgante to table the minutes of January 11, 2018. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23 **3. Review of the Second Public Hearing Draft of the 2018 ECOS Plan**

Staff has prepared a spreadsheet of all of the comments received on the first public hearing draft, and Staff's recommendation on how to address the comment. Staff handed out an updated spreadsheet with Deb Sachs and Hans Ohanian's comments added. In addition, Staff has already made edits to the document to address the majority of the comments (as indicated in the second to last column of the spreadsheet). In addition, the Energy sub-committee's recommendations are included here where relevant. Staff can also provide input from the TAC and the Executive Committee as they have now seen these comments as well. The yellow highlighted rows are the comments that Staff would specifically like to discuss with the LRPC, to gauge direction on how to address these comments.

24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33 Row 6 – this comment is socioeconomic level and its connection to physical activity and tobacco use. Heather has provided references to this evidence, and Staff has added that into the document. Staff wanted to point this comment out to the LRPC because this comment is on the introduction to Health (Strategy 5), which the LRPC did not see before the first public hearing draft went out. But it was included in that draft that the Board saw.

34
35
36
37 Row 19 – this comment is on forest integrity. We received comments at the Board and from ANR on forest integrity. We've addressed many of these comments (including adding a map), but will also make some additional edits based on a conversation with Jens Hilke (ANR) on Tuesday. Andrea Morgante asked that we not only help the municipalities refine the local data for themselves, but that we then aggregate that information into one County map so that we can show the true regional priorities and how they relate from one municipality to the next rather than the data the State is suggesting as a starting point. Staff will add this as an action.

38
39
40
41
42
43 Row 20 – This is one of two broad statements from VT Gas that attempts to indicate that the Plan is not intended to support or oppose any specific project. Staff didn't talk with the Energy Sub-Committee about because we felt it was more appropriate for the LRPC to discuss as it deals with the entire plan. Regina Mahony added that we also discussed this with the Executive Committee last night and they felt that it was too broad of a statement. Staff also feels that the Plan already states that it specifically doesn't use the term "shall" on purpose, however, that doesn't

1 mean that we might not find something that isn't in conformance with our Plan. Regina Mahony added that when
2 Charlie, Melanie, Emily and I met with VT Gas they were concerned about extensions to existing neighborhoods
3 and new industrial buildings. Staff thought about those types of projects and don't feel the Plan would prevent that
4 from happening and isn't the intent. The LRPC agreed to not add this statement.

5 Row 21 – This is a simple addition of energy systems to a variety of infrastructure that we want to support in the
6 areas planned for growth. This concept wasn't added to the location where VT Gas originally asked for it, but it was
7 added to an action.

8 Row 23 – this is the first of many comments (and highlighted rows) where VT Gas has asked for “renewable natural
9 gas” to be added to the Plan. The Energy Sub-committee felt very strongly that this is not an appropriate phrase to
10 add to the Plan as there is no industry standard around this yet (as did Board members at our last meeting), and they
11 do not feel that the Plan as currently written, precludes VT Gas from shifting to renewable natural gas. The LRPC
12 agrees with not including “renewable natural gas” here and in all other comments (except for Row 28 – see below),
13 particularly because biogas is included and is all encompassing.

14 Row 28 – this is another request for adding renewable natural gas from VT Gas. Staff looked into what Northwest
15 RPC said about this in their Plan (after the Energy Sub-committee meeting); and Staff suggests that adding this
16 same statement into Supplement 2 Regional Analysis could be useful to keep track of it next time around: “Vermont
17 Gas Systems is currently working to deploy renewable natural gas in their service territory. The economic viability
18 of renewable natural gas, its impacts on climate change, and its classification as a “renewable” resource should be
19 analyzed in future updates to this plan.” The LRPC had an extensive discussion about this statement including
20 concern about adding it into the Plan at all, and whether CCRPC really is going to analyze it or not (more than
21 likely the state would), however most felt it was an accurate statement that opens the door to working with VT Gas
22 into the future and recognizes the uncertainty of this fuel source. The LRPC agreed to add the sentence.

23 Row 30 – This is the second broad statement suggested by VT Gas that the LRPC agreed to not add for similar
24 reasons as stated for the comment in Row 20 (see above).

25 Row 39 – This is a summation of comments from VTrans on the MTP. These comments have been addressed in the
26 Plan. Of particular note is the comment from VTrans that many of the projects on the list in the short-term category
27 are not on VTrans' radar, making them difficult to implement within the stated timeframe. This is a particular issue
28 for Burlington who has many projects in the short-term category. There was a healthy discussion about this at the
29 TAC meeting as this project list is an opportunity to influence what is on VTrans' radar, but also that some of the
30 projects are unrealistic and have been re-categorized to medium or long-term. Staff also added the Active
31 Transportation Plan and the ITS Plans as “incorporated by reference”.

32 Row 41 – No need to discuss this comment, but we just wanted to make the LRPC aware that ANR asked us, and
33 we added more information on biomass resources.

34 Row 46 – Jim Donovan asked if we are updating the analysis reports as suggested in this comment from ANR.
35 Regina Mahony stated that we are not updating the Analysis Reports. Those were done in 2011-12 with the help of
36 consultants and we don't have the capacity to update them with this 2018 Plan. Staff will add this to the response
37 for this comment.

38 Row 53 – Jim Donovan asked if we are going to provide this exact response to Julie Macuga or something more,
39 since she put a great deal of effort into her comments. Staff indicated that this is just the response for this
40 spreadsheet that will ultimately become a part of the Plan itself (as attached to Supplement 1).

41 Row 54 & 55 – These are a summation of the comments received at the first public hearing on the MTP. The
42 comment spreadsheet also includes 17 specific comments from Deb Sachs. Many of these comments are
43 worthwhile, however they are more likely things that we would do outside of the plan as we implement it, or out of
44 our purview altogether.

45 Row 57 – These are comments on CCRPC's Top Ten Action list from the Board at the first public hearing. Staff
46 showed the LRPC edits made to Action 7 to address the social health comment; and edits to Action 8 to address the
47 question about autonomous vehicles. The LRPC edited the statements to read: “7. Support local and regional efforts
48 to improve population health, such as...” And list the organizations we do work with (which are the ones already
49 included). Also, “8. ...to ensure the ECOS goals are met (or achieved).” And stop after that.

50 Row 65 – Staff had an opportunity to review a solar project on an existing parking lot, in an area that also includes
51 natural resource constraints. Staff have made a small edit to ensure that existing parking lots and rooftops are ‘okay’
52 places for these projects regardless of natural resource constraints considering they are already built. The LRPC
53 agreed with the edit, without the word “any”.

54 Row 67 – Underhill voters approved zoning changes at Town Meeting Day, so Staff will make an edit to the
55 Underhill's Village Center district on the Future Land Use Map to match their new zoning.

1 Row 75 – We’ve had multiple requests for a glossary; however, Staff is not intending to add a glossary to this Plan
2 because we have one on the website. The LRPC suggested that we add a link to the glossary in the Plan.

3 Row 85 – 107 – These are comments received from Hans Ohanian from Charlotte on the Energy piece. He does not
4 agree with the State’s and CCRPC’s methodology, however, there isn’t anything we can do about that at this stage.
5 However, there are some comments that Staff have been able to address as stated in the response column. Jim
6 Donovan suggested a clarifying statement to the response in Row 107: clarify that CCRPC has worked extensively
7 with Town staff to make this determination.

8
9 Additional LRPC recommendations include:

- 10 • CEDS and water quality – acknowledge how good our water quality is and it’s a strength to our economy.
11 Also, don’t put blame on the regulators (re. TMDL).
- 12 • There was a discussion about local v. regional economy. We should play on the strengths of each individual
13 municipality rather than compete. Add as an opportunity: regional services and economic growth.

14
15 **4. Recommendation to the Board**

16 Andrea Morgante made a motion, seconded by Jim Donovan to recommend that the Board accept the March 19th or
17 21st draft as the second public hearing draft and warn it for the second public hearing on May 16, 2018. The March
18 19th or 21st draft will include all edits as discussed today by the Committee, including edits staff still needs to make
19 to address the comments as described in the response column of the spreadsheet. Staff will send the draft to the
20 Board and the LRPC on March 14th, the LRPC will provide Staff with any final comments by March 16th. Staff will
21 incorporate any final edits if necessary by March 19th or 21st. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED. Justin
22 Rabadoux and Edmund Booth left prior to the vote.

23
24 **5. Next Meeting**

25 The next meeting will be on Thursday, April 12, 2018 or May 10, 2018 from 8:30am to 10:00am *if needed*.

26 **11. Adjourn**

27 The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

28
29 Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony