

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

4 DATE: Thursday, November 9, 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
Alex Weinhagen, Hinesburg – PAC Rep
Andrea Morgante, Hinesburg – Board Rep

Staff

Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
Melanie Needle, Senior Planner
Emily Nosse-Leirer, Planner
Christine Forde, Senior Transportation Manager
Jason Charest, Senior Transportation Engineer

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 Ken Belliveau made a motion, seconded by Justin Rabidoux to approve the minutes of October 12, 2017 with
15 the following amendments: Page 1: line 24/25 needs fixing; Line 31 – needs a verb; Page 2: Line 7 – add “for
16 Example” in front of “some home occupation businesses in Hinesburg ...”, and add - The LRPC was saying
17 that we should have conclusions or statements in the Plan based on facts and unsupported claims or opinions.
18 We either needed more facts to back up the claim of the need for more industrial space, or the claim should be
19 removed. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED. Andrea Morgante abstained.
20

21 **3. Transportation Plan Update**

22 Jason Charest provided an overview of the results and benefits of the ‘pure’ scenarios that we tested
23 previously. The main benefits that we saw included an increase in non-auto trips under the concentrated land
24 use, and TDM scenarios; and localized congestion improvements from the road project improvements. There
25 was a discussion about how the model results are based on travel behavior as we know it today, and the
26 model’s outputs are largely auto oriented. The LRPC asked if we track other data so that we could eventually
27 work more of this into a scenario exercise. For example, do we track data on pedestrian miles travelled and/or
28 bicycle miles travelled? Currently we track transit ridership, and the amount of bike/walk infrastructure added
29 every year. We do track some bike/ped data when conducting turning movement counts. We have also started
30 counting bike activity on paths. There was a suggestion to add these types of counts to our to-do list; and a
31 suggestion to talk with UVM Transportation Research Center to see if they can play a role here.
32

33 Jason Charest explained the components in the Draft MTP Scenario. Which includes:

- 34 • All TIP Projects
 - 35 • Third Lane on I-89 between Exits 14 and 15
 - 36 • Exit 12B placeholder
 - 37 – Future I-89 Interchange Scoping Study
 - 38 • ITS Investments
 - 39 • Transit enhancements
 - 40 – 20 minute headways
 - 41 – New Colchester loop
 - 42 • Increases in walking/biking
 - 43 • Land-use concentration
 - 44 – 90% of HH growth in areas planned for growth
- 45

46 There was some discussion regarding the interchange options, and where Exit 14N would be located in order
47 to access the airport. This would be near the Patchen Road overpass.
48

1 There was some discussion about the land use scenario. Staff choose to include this particular land use
2 component due to the increases in non-auto trips as a result of increased development concentration. After
3 80% of the growth was allocated to all of the areas planned for growth; 10% was allocated to the urban center
4 and village planning areas; and 10% was allocated to the rural planning areas. In the last five years we have
5 seen about 86% of the housing growth in the areas planned for growth, so this is close to what we've been
6 seeing.

7
8 There was a comment that it is difficult to know if the financial program allocations are right in the MTP
9 scenario without knowing what the value/benefits were in each of the original 'pure' scenarios. For the Plan
10 content, Staff is working on a spreadsheet that shows the benefits of the original 'pure' scenarios, with our best
11 guess at the costs of those (some are nearly impossible to know the real cost), in comparison to the draft MTP
12 scenario. We will share this spreadsheet with the LRPC.

13
14 There was a discussion about CAVs and whether they've been incorporated into the MTP Scenario. Staff
15 explained that we don't have a clear enough handle on where exactly this is going to go, so it isn't included in
16 the MTP scenario per say, but a concentrated land use policy and ITS improvements will help to prepare for
17 the coming of these vehicles. We will definitely look at this again in five years for the next MTP.

18
19 Jason Charest described the results of the MTP scenario on the delay and congestion maps. Jason Charest
20 explained that we included the addition of lane capacity on I-89 between Exit 14 and 15 because it becomes
21 over capacity in 2050. There were some suggestions to help clarify what the maps are describing.

22
23 There was some discussion about investing in capacity expansions on the interstate, and how an investment
24 like that should only be added with some consideration for influencing mode choice. For example, making the
25 extra lane an HOV lane, or transit only express lane to compel folks to use the link busses more. The LRPC
26 also discussed that the capacity needs may not be an issue if CAVs become the norm and they can travel much
27 closer together than we currently drive.

28
29 There was a question about marijuana production and the associated land use issues; and whether these uses
30 will be considered agriculture and exempt from municipal zoning. There are concerns about water quality,
31 electricity being used, size of buildings, effect on industrial parks. Currently these uses are not legal, so it is all
32 speculation, however, these are issues that VPA and VAPDA should consider weighing in on at the legislature.

33
34 Regina Mahony added that Jim Donovan (via email before the meeting) asked who will be responsible for
35 making the final call on the projects that get removed from the MTP list. He would like to see the potential rail
36 bikepath south of Burlington stay on the list in case this is possible in the future. Regina Mahony indicated that
37 we are talking with the municipalities now, and the list will ultimately come to the LRPC for recommendation
38 to the Board.

39 40 **4. Plan Organization & Implementation Table**

41 Regina Mahony quickly explained the two items that were in the packet; both are intended to help make the
42 ECOS Plan more readable. In addition, the implementation table may help us prioritize the actions. The LRPC
43 indicated that these seem helpful.

44 45 **5. Other Business**

46 Regina Mahony explained that the energy plan is out for public comment until November 22nd. These items
47 are available for review and comment at <http://www.ecosproject.com/2018-ecos-plan>. Regina Mahony briefly
48 explained the ratio of land area needed for solar facilities to meet the target. We currently have about 3 to 8x
49 the amount of land area needed to meet the target. There was a question about whether rooftop solar is
50 included in this, or if this is above and beyond what can be accommodated on rooftops. Regina Mahony stated
51 that she believes this includes what could be accommodated on rooftops.

52
53 Staff has started to reach out to Town staff regarding the MTP and CEDS project lists.

1

2 **6. Next Meeting**

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

4 **10. Adjourn**

5 The meeting adjourned at 10:15 a.m.

6

7 Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony