

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

4 DATE: Thursday, October 12, 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
Jim Donovan, Charlotte – Board Rep
Edmund Booth - ECOS Steering Committee Rep
Alex Weinhalten, Hinesburg – PAC Rep

Staff

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

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

11 Jim Donovan called the meeting to order at 8:36 a.m.
12

13 **2. Approve Minutes**

14 Justin Rabidoux made a motion, seconded by Ken Belliveau, to approve the minutes of September 14, 2017
15 with the following amendments: clarify line 40 on page 2 – the intent was that the map doesn't reflect Silver
16 Street congestion issue in the morning, and traffic on 116 in the evening isn't congested as it was a year ago;
17 last bullet on page 1 – be consistent in how you describe who said what (either quote everyone or no one);
18 Page 2, line 4 - add wetlands reference; and Page 2, line 13 explain what Scenario A is. No further discussion.
19 MOTION PASSED.
20

21 **3. Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy**

22 Emily Nosse-Leirer provided an overview of the draft CEDS that was in the packet. Changes made since the
23 last time the LRPC saw this include:

- 24 • An emphasis on workforce development and particularly the large number of 19 to 24-year old's who
25 aren't going on to secondary education (including trade schools) or working. Additional data has been
26 added and there is a place holder action for work that will come out of the state Workforce
27 Development Committee.
- 28 • There was some clarification on employment diversity - we are getting more diversified as Global
29 Foundries loses employees, and other businesses grow and start. Global Foundries losses are
30 unfortunate, but we are getting more diverse.
- 31 • The Economic Resilience section was improved.
- 32 • A number of clarifications and edits to the SWOT.
33

34 LRPC Comments/Questions:

- 35 • Mention "Global Foundries (formerly IBM)" consistently – page 7 & 25.
- 36 • The language has been edited to remove the subjectivity and opinion, which is good.
- 37 • Have we heard from GBIC on the questions in the draft? Emily Nosse-Leirer indicated that we have
38 heard from them and the following edits were made accordingly:
 - 39 ○ Moved the quality of the tech programs to the opportunities
 - 40 ○ "Economically disconnected VTers" refers to the 19-24 year old's that aren't entering the
41 work force or educational opportunities.
- 42 • Page 11, third bullet from the bottom - A lack of industrial land being the reason why industrial
43 growth will be inhibited isn't the whole story. We are losing industrial manufacturing in the whole
44 country, not just here, and the lack of growth is more likely a result of no demand. Explain that it may
45 be a factor, but not a direct causality. Charlie Baker explained that he thinks GBIC is seeing some

1 businesses going up to Franklin County because they can't find space in Chittenden County; or at least
2 they were at some point. Staff will find out if that is still the case. The LRPC asked for examples of
3 these businesses, and further understanding of why they didn't find a space here. There was also some
4 discussion about whether we need to do something about this. The text currently reads like we need to
5 do something about it; but we may not be building large industrial parks going forward. There was a
6 suggestion that perhaps the push toward smart growth mixed use development for the last 20-years has
7 resulted in a lack of industrial type locations. For example, some home occupation businesses in
8 Hinesburg need to be able to move into other locations, and a downtown/village mixed-use location is
9 not a good fit for all business types. The LRPC was saying that we should have conclusions or
10 statements in the Plan based on facts and unsupported claims or opinions. We either needed more
11 facts to back up the claim of the need for more industrial space, or the claim should be removed. Staff
12 will look into this further.
13

14 Staff will address these edits today (at least the ones that are possible to address), and send the draft to the
15 Board for their meeting next week. We will circle back with GBIC on these questions. We will also send this
16 draft out to the municipalities for feedback (Economic Development Committees and Planning Commissions).
17

18 **4. Transportation Plan Update - Scenarios**

19 Jason Charest explained the basis behind the scenarios that we've analyzed, and began to explain the
20 comparative results in terms of vehicle miles travelled, number of trips, mode share, etc. The scenarios
21 include:

- 22 • **Scenario A:** Vehicle capacity scenario that focuses on roadway projects
- 23 • **Scenario B:** Technology Intensive scenario that includes connected and autonomous vehicles (CAV)
24 by 2050.
- 25 • **Scenario C:** TDM scenario that includes a robust increase of transit and bike/pedestrian facilities and
26 travel.
- 27 • **Scenario D:** The two land use scenarios included in this packet are: **D1** – 90% of the household (HH)
28 growth is allocated to TAZs that correspond to the center and village planning areas for all towns; and
29 **D3** – 10% increase in overall HHs in Chittenden County. Additional growth is allocated proportionally
30 to TAZs so that roughly 95% of HH growth falls within our areas planned for growth as specified in
31 the ECOS Plan. (see attached charts)
32

33 There was a question about the vehicle reduction percentage that went into the TDM assumption in
34 comparison to the VTrans work that explains that it is possible to reduce trip ends by 20% with TDM
35 strategies employed at a site level? Staff doesn't have that answer right now, but will do a little further
36 digging.
37

38 There was a question about whether this includes the Exit 12 Park & Ride and a commuter bus route? Staff
39 indicated that the model does this in a rough way. It was suggested that the Plan support the connection of
40 Williston's Park & Ride to the Montpelier Link route, and to make sure GMT is aware of this request.
41

42 Jason Charest continued to explain the CAV scenario and the assumptions that are built into it. It assumes 80%
43 of the vehicles are connected so we don't see 100% efficiencies that we'd see with 100% connected. Of the
44 80% connected, it assumes that half operate as shared mobility and half operate as private ownership. There
45 are a lot of layered assumptions within that higher-level context. There was a discussion about how this
46 scenario shows that we'll be much more mobile. Staff indicated that the latest research does seem to show that
47 we'll see more travel, rather than less.
48

49 There was a discussion about how each of these scenarios aren't intended to be realistic or practical in and of
50 themselves; the intent is to compare the results from one scenario to another to help inform us on what 'levers'
51 we'd like to include in the MTP scenario.
52

1 There was a discussion about how the model outputs don't address a number of other outcomes, and
2 particularly health related outcomes such as injury, air quality, equitable access to mobility, etc. Some of the
3 model results don't show big changes between the tested scenarios, but they could have very different
4 outcomes for these health factors. Unfortunately, we don't have a great way to measure these, but it would be
5 helpful to discuss them within the text and they should be considered in making choices about what goes in the
6 MTP scenario. Because it is likely that more walking and biking means more physical activity, less chronic
7 disease (and that comes with benefits to the economy).

8
9 Do the vehicle miles travelled (VMT) charts include just motor vehicles? Or all trips? Walking, biking,
10 busses? Staff believes it is only vehicle trips, but we will double check this.

11
12 The land use scenarios were explained. The D3 bar is hard to compare to the rest because the others are all
13 based on the same population, but this one is based on a different assumption. It needs to be very clear that the
14 population assumption is different for this one.

15
16 The LRPC felt that it would be very helpful to develop some context and conclusions for the next presentation,
17 including a cost amount for each scenario so you can figure out the value/dollar.

18
19 There was a question about why there is no difference between the 2050 w/ TIP and MTP and 2050 w/ TIP?
20 Staff indicated that the last three charts show a difference; but the bigger reason is that the MTP projects are
21 going to fix local safety and congestion problems, but you won't necessarily see those benefits at the county
22 scale in the model.

23
24 There was further discussion that our model shows us that we are going to drive more. And particularly in the
25 CAV scenario; which Joe Segale also reported at the Municipal Day.

26 **5. Review Energy Summary**

27 Regina Mahony explained that your packet included a two-page energy plan summary. The purpose is to get
28 the word out to the general public about the energy plan. Melanie Needle added that we have a version with
29 the data as well. Staff asked if the LRPC has any initial comments. Comments included:

- 30 • State that if the Regional Plan is approved, we can then do local energy planning.
- 31 • Regarding the constraints we should be clear about which constraints are state level constraints that we
32 have no control over.

33 **6. Next Meeting**

34
35 The next meeting will be on November 9, 2017 from 8:30am to 10:00am.

36 **10. Adjourn**

37 The meeting adjourned at 10:04 a.m.

38
39 Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony
40