

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

4 DATE: Thursday, August 17, 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
Andrea Morgante, Hinesburg - Board Rep
Justin Rabidoux, South Burlington – TAC Rep
Lisa Falcone – Alt. Socio Economic Board Rep
Jim Donovan, Charlotte – Board Rep
Alex Weinhagen, Hinesburg – PAC Rep

Staff

Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
Emily Nosse-Leirer, Planner
Eleni Churchill, Transportation Program Manager
Peter Keating, Senior Transportation Planner
Christine Forde, Senior Transportation Planner
Jason Charest, Senior Transportation Engineer

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

11 Regina Mahony called the meeting to order at 8:34 a.m.
12

13 **2. Approve Minutes**

14 Justin Rabidoux made a motion, seconded by Andrea Morgante, to approve the minutes of July 13, 2017.
15 MOTION PASSED. Jim Donovan abstained.
16

17 **3. Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy**

18 Emily Nosse-Leirer provided an overview of the draft that was sent out in the packet. Andrea Morgante asked
19 whether programmatic work should be added back into the CEDS project list, to try to bring relevance and
20 importance to health and social related work that is important to our economy, especially since they also create
21 jobs. Heather Danis stated that she felt that the action lists in Chapter 3 adequately captured the work of the
22 Health Department and other social service agencies, and that there was not a need for these projects to be in
23 the CEDS list.
24

25 There was extensive discussion about the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) section,
26 which was brand new. Emily Nosse-Leirer explained that she recategorized issues identified in the 2012
27 analysis reports to fit into these categories, and also added issues identified by the LRPC, other committees
28 and other CCRPC work. SWOT analysis compares Chittenden County to both the rest of Vermont and the rest
29 of the county. Several changes were suggested:

- 30 • Discussing a “livable wage” instead of a “minimum wage,” and adding it into the strength and
31 weaknesses section. There is still a lot of debate about the benefits and consequences.
- 32 • Adding the lack of affordable workforce housing as a weakness. Fifteen highest cost for rental housing
33 in the country – which is a real issue.
- 34 • Clarifying that although the quality of public schools is high compared to the rest of the country, the
35 quality is uneven throughout the county, and STEM skills are not as good as employers need.
- 36 • Making sure that the opportunities section lists things that are actual opportunities, not just needs.
- 37 • Clarifying that VTC is Vermont Technical Council, and adding in other similar organizations to
38 general that strength
- 39 • Adding Creative Economy, UVM and aesthetics to the strengths section.
- 40 • Differentiating between low unemployment (strength) and labor shortage (bad) need to be
41 differentiated
- 42 • Adding equity issues to weaknesses – there is income inequality across economic classes and New
43 Americans are especially affected. However, it is important to clarify that income inequality is a
44 weakness, while the county’s relatively high incomes compared to Vermont and the country are
45 strengths.

- 1 • Adding aging infrastructure and limited funds for replacing this infrastructure (water, sewer,
2 stormwater, etc) to the threats section.
- 3 • Uncertainty about health insurance was removed from the weaknesses list, as it is a federal issue and
4 not unique to Chittenden County
- 5 • Adding chronic disease as a threat. Heather can help with language. Chittenden County is very healthy
6 compared to the rest of the state and country, but our trends are in the wrong direction. Heather
7 argues that being the best of the worst is still a problem, and it should be discussed. We also have
8 higher teenage drinking rates.
- 9 • Adding lack of diversity to the weakness section. We are more diverse in our County than the state,
10 but we are not at all diverse in comparison to the rest of the country.
- 11 • Adding refugee resettlement area is strength / opportunity. We are socially tolerant, which is a
12 strength.
- 13 • Adding the declining workforce age population as a threat.
- 14 • Adding expansion of high speed internet to the opportunities section.

15
16 Our strengths are often our weaknesses. One reason why housing market is so tight is b/c it is a good place to
17 be; and attractive to retirees (at least for half the year). There was discussion on the degree to which Vermont's
18 ambitious energy goals and the Clean Water Act are weaknesses or strengths. Do they grow jobs, or are they
19 just costs?

20
21 Emily explained that she didn't add much new information to the Economic Base Analysis, and just updated
22 the data. The committee made a number of suggestions:

- 23 • Strengthen references to affordable housing
- 24 • Again, explain the distinction between unemployment and labor supply. Low Unemployment is not
25 necessarily a bad thing.
- 26 • Examine whether it's good, bad or neutral that UVM and the Medical Center is the largest employer
27 and non-profits.
- 28 • Link food insecurity with high risk of obesity and chronic conditions
- 29 • Instead of discussing the federal poverty level as an indicator, examine the Basic Needs Budget.
- 30 • The committees asked to include renewable energy in the working lands section, since it can co-exist
31 with agriculture and help farms stay profitable.

32
33 The Economic Resilience section is brand new, and must be included to meet CEDS requirements. The
34 committee agreed that equity issues should be discussed here. Also, specific examples for Chittenden County
35 and the ECOS Plan are needed. Perhaps AHMP content can be added here.

36
37 The committee agreed to add outdoor recreation and food systems to the strategic industry sectors discussion,
38 but not to the target sectors list.

39
40 Actions need to be added to discuss funding for adequate public infrastructure and housing affordability. The
41 discussion of permit streamlining must be more nuanced.

42
43 New indicators to show economic resilience were discussed. Emily will investigate data on economic diversity
44 (percentage of population in various income brackets and NAICS sector diversity); housing available at
45 various price points, and wages (minimum wage over time, married with average starting wage within the
46 County by sector, and historical trends of starting wages in low wage jobs to see if that has changed over
47 time).

48 **4. Transportation Plan Update**

49 Peter explained the financial plan, which is a required component of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan.
50 Three elements: (1) How much money will we reasonably have? (2) How much is needed for preservation and
51 maintenance? (3) The difference can be used for new projects. Alex asked whether CCRPC has to show we
52

1 have money to maintain the new projects we proposed. We don't, but we do show and look at the history of
2 our maintenance costs. Peter explained how we've determined how much money we can reasonably expect to
3 have - \$211 million for the State, and we've gone with 19.5%, which VTrans has signed off on. Discussion
4 ensued, because the percentage of state funds to Chittenden County has been lower since 2007. However, staff
5 feels that 20% is appropriate for Chittenden County considering our percentage of the population and economy
6 in Chittenden County.

7
8 The committee talked about the maintenance percentage and which percentage (54% vs. 70%) is appropriate.
9 Jim feels the 70% makes the most sense. Andrea asked why stormwater maintenance looks like it is staying
10 steady. Staff explained that the category allocation is based on a trend, but perhaps we want to increase that
11 category. Justin stated that the gray area is a good idea, because we haven't had any macro projects that will
12 fix the global problem. Alex stated that a conservative approach makes sense, with the flexibility to go below
13 the line. It's important to understand the long-term maintenance costs down the line, and we should think
14 about this as we decide what projects get above the line.

15
16 Jason showed two maps of congestion issues in 2015 and 2025. These are congestion issues regarding lane
17 capacity, not operational capacity; and these are based on a no build scenario. These maps show volume to
18 capacity ratio: Yellow: 70 to 79% at capacity; Orange: 80 to 89% at capacity; Red 90 to 100% capacity; and
19 Purple is over capacity. Jason explained the difference between operational capacity v. lane capacity, and said
20 that we also need to see the congestion points, married with these in order to be able to see the real problem
21 and help us figure out where to identify priority projects. He clarified that this maps shows that even if we
22 make operational changes to the intersections, such as different signaling, we'd need new lanes in these areas.
23 There was extensive discussion regarding the local congestion issues verse what the model shows (such as the
24 North Williston Road bridge), because the map appears different than what most people experience on the
25 ground. It may be that the experience is similar near Rte. 116, and 189, but the number of cars is so much
26 greater at 189 and potentially more of a regional priority.

27
28 The committee suggested using the term intersection control rather than signalization so that round-abouts are
29 included.

30 31 **5. Next Meeting**

32 The next meeting will be on September 14, 2017 from 8:30am to 10:00am.

33 **10. Adjourn**

34 The meeting adjourned at 10:25 a.m. Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony and Emily Nosse-Leirer.