CCRPC Long Range Planning Committee

AGENDA

DATE: Thursday, January 11, 2017
TIME: 8:30am to 10:00am
PLACE: CCRPC Office, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT.

1. Welcome – 5 minutes

2. Approval of December 14, 2017 Minutes* (Action) – 5 minutes

3. Overview of the Draft 2018 ECOS Plan* (Discussion) – 15 minutes
   The draft 2018 ECOS Plan is drafted, and while we will still be working on more edits we are close. The entire draft Plan can be found here: ftp://ftp.ccrpcvt.org/ECOS/ECOSPlan2018_FirstPublicHearingDraft/. This document is reorganized with the implementation section up front as the main Plan, and 6 supplements: Public Engagement & Process (was Chapter 1); Regional Analysis (was Chapter 2); Regional Plan Requirements (was part of Chapter 4), MTP (was part of Chapter 4), CEDS (was part of Chapter 4), and Enhanced Energy Planning analysis, targets & methodology (new). Staff will also discuss the Top Actions for CCRPC over the next five years as added to the main part of the Plan and attached directly in your packet; and a discussion on the indicators and how they will be presented in the Plan (see the colorful spreadsheet in your packet).

4. Metropolitan Transportation Plan Draft (Discussion) – 20 minutes
   We will review the comments received on the MTP. We’ve included the excel spreadsheet on the ftp site listed above so that you can easily sort or filter for the MTP comments. In addition, we will review the final edits to this section of the Plan.

5. Energy Plan Public Comments (Discussion) – 15 minutes
   Brief review of final edits including the municipal renewable energy generation targets, adjustment to energy code action, and adjustment in main Strategy 2 language (“locate” v. “strive” for 80% of development…).

6. Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) Comments (Discussion) – 10 minutes
   Brief review of final edits including the industrial lands description, the description of Smart Growth as an economic development strategy, and the discussion of freight rail.

7. Act 171, Forest Integrity (Discussion) – 10 minutes
   Explanation of how this requirement is addressed in the draft Plan.

8. Recommendation to the Board (Action) – 10 minutes
   Recommend that the Board accept this draft as the first public hearing draft of the 2018 ECOS Plan, and warn the first public hearing for February 21, 2018.

9. Next Meeting
   Thursday, February 8, 2018 or March 8, 2018 from 8:30am to 10:00am

10. Adjourn

In accordance with provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, the CCRPC will ensure public meeting sites are accessible to all people. Requests for free interpretive or translation services, assistive devices, or other requested accommodations, should be made to Emma Vaughn, CCRPC Title VI Coordinator, at 802-846-4490 ext *21 or evaughn@ccrpcvt.org, no later than 3 business days prior to the meeting for which services are requested.
DATE: Thursday, December 14, 2017
TIME: 8:30 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT

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

1. Welcome and Introductions
Regina Mahony called the meeting to order at 8:36 a.m.

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

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

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

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.

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

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

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

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

4. Energy Plan Public Comments
Melanie Needle informed the LRPC that we are not having any trouble meeting the County wide renewable energy generation target; however there are some issues at the municipal level. Global Foundries uses about 3 to 4x the amount of energy of all of Burlington; it is a big outlier. There was some discussion regarding the location of this
actual demand; it is more than likely from the manufacturing component which is on the Junction side rather than
the Williston side. Andrea Morgante explained that this could be a good example of how we deal with issues at a
County level. The Energy sub-committee will discuss this further next week.

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

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

5. Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) Comments
Emily Nosse-Leirer provided an overview of the CEDS comments that we’ve received. Some large themes we
heard about:

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

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

Next steps for Staff on the CEDS piece is to reconfigure it to match the new format; and re-organize for better
readability.
Heather Danis suggests that we make it clear that income and education are critical indicators for public health. Emily Nosse-Leirer indicated that the Plan already includes this language. Heather Danis will look at that section to see if this can be strengthened.

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

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

8. Adjourn
   The meeting adjourned at 10:06 a.m.

Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony
**CCRPC’s Top Actions for the Next Five Years**

While the next section provides the full implementation program for the ECOS Plan, this is a specific list that CCRPC will focus on in the Unified Planning Work Program in the next five years.

1. Support and educate municipalities in setting the stage for smart, multi-modal development in our areas planned for growth, and protection of our rural planning area, through plan and bylaw assistance, participation in the Act 250 Next 50 Years Committee, brownfields assessments, etc.
2. Maintain our existing transportation system in the county.
3. Invest in and support TDM partners and programs such as GMT, CATMA, CarShare, Local Motion and NeighborRides.
4. Invest in transportation improvements to support our areas planned for growth by expanding bike and pedestrian infrastructure and improving transit services.
5. Address safety and localized congestion issues on our roadways.
6. Invest in Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) to facilitate traffic flows on our arterials and minimize the need for major roadway expansion projects.
7. Promote a shift away from gas/diesel vehicles to electric or other non-fossil fuel transportation options.
8. Assist and educate municipalities with research and technical assistance to support housing development in our areas planned for growth.
9. Assist and educate municipalities in enhanced energy planning.
10. Assist the State and municipalities in implementation of the Lake Champlain TMDL and other water quality improvement efforts through participation in the Tactical Basin Plans, Municipal Road General Permit assistance, Regional Stormwater Education Partnership/Rethink Runoff, etc.
11. Assist municipalities and the state in emergency management planning through implementation of the AHMP, LEPC coordination, LEOP assistance, regional dispatch support, etc.
12. Continue coordination and support roles with public health partners such as Regional Prevention Partnership.
13. Monitor the advancement of autonomous vehicles and work with the state, municipalities, and other partners on preparations for this technology.
14. Continue annual coordination with our municipalities and partners to monitor and report on progress toward our shared goals.
15. Support efforts to attract and support the working age population.
16. Play a coordination role as needed to support and promote the tech sector.

**Note: questions from Joss**

1. no mention of job creation and economic development ... certainly a statewide priority, are we doing well enough in Chittenden County to include this? I appreciate the tech sector support for our overall economy - but I don't think that sector hires alot of lesser-skilled people, and I think our economy has been leaving many of them behind leading to additional demands on social services and affordable housing.

2. regionalization - I've not tried to keep up with the regional dispatch process, but it seemed last year that regional services were something we wanted to focus on in the past few years ... how does that factor in with our current priorities?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>In Scorecard</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population-Chittenden County</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Plan reports this within Figure 2-Projected Population every 10 years, Scorecard reports annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Growth Rate Index of Chittenden County</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Scorecard text breaks impervious area by watershed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Size-Chittenden County</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Scorecard reports annually and Plan is every 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of the Population age 10 and under-Chittenden County</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Graph shows percent of population and plan is every 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of the Population age 85 and older-Chittenden County</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Source unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Residents Born in Chittenden County</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Scorecard reports annually and Plan is every 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Single Person Households in Occupied Units-Chittenden County</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Scorecard reports annually and Plan is every 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of the Population age 5 and older speaking a language other than English at Home</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Scorecard reports annually and Plan is every 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of the Population that is non-white and Hispanic</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Data only available for decennial census?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Youth (Grades 9-12) who report using Marijuana in the last 30 days</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Data is only available for decennial census?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Youth (grades 9-12) who report using Alcohol in the last 30 days</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Data is only available for decennial census?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of adolescents in grades 9-12 meeting physical activity guidelines</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Data is only available for decennial census?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of adults (Champlain Valley) who report non-medical use of pain relievers in the past year</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Data is only available for decennial census?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of regional (Champlain Valley) adults who report it in the annual report</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Data is only available for decennial census?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people treated for opiate abuse</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Data is only available for decennial census?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Total Population-Chittenden County**: Plan reports this within Figure 2-Projected Population every 10 years, Scorecard reports annually.
- **Population Growth Rate Index of Chittenden County**: Scorecard text breaks impervious area by watershed.
- **Average Household Size-Chittenden County**: Scorecard reports annually and Plan is every 10 years.
- **Percent of the Population age 10 and under-Chittenden County**: Graph shows percent of population and plan is every 10 years.
- **Percent of the Population age 85 and older-Chittenden County**: Scorecard reports annually and Plan is every 10 years.
- **Percent of Residents Born in Chittenden County**: Scorecard reports annually and Plan is every 10 years.
- **Percent of Single Person Households in Occupied Units-Chittenden County**: Scorecard reports annually and Plan is every 10 years.
- **Percent of the Population age 5 and older speaking a language other than English at Home**: Scorecard reports annually and Plan is every 10 years.
- **Percent of the Population that is non-white and Hispanic**: Data only available for decennial census?
- **Percent of Youth (Grades 9-12) who report using Marijuana in the last 30 days**: Data is only available for decennial census?
- **Percent of Youth (grades 9-12) who report using Alcohol in the last 30 days**: Data is only available for decennial census?
- **Percent of adolescents in grades 9-12 meeting physical activity guidelines**: Data is only available for decennial census?
- **Percent of adults (Champlain Valley) who report non-medical use of pain relievers in the past year**: Data is only available for decennial census?
- **Percent of regional (Champlain Valley) adults who report it in the annual report**: Data is only available for decennial census?
- **Number of people treated for opiate abuse**: Data is only available for decennial census?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>In Scorecard</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Wages for All Businesses (in thousands)</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>Note: this is not in the Scorecard, will add non-sov to show annual change. Plan reports 3-year running average, Scorecard is annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>Changes due to non-resident. Impact on housing expenses owners and renters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in median price of farm homes</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>Values must have valid values and events running. Plan is based on Table 105 in the Decennial Census. Scorecard is more current with ACS data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in number of farm acres</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>These are in the Plan. Plan is based on Table 105 in the Decennial Census. Scorecard is more current with ACS data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of New Structures in Areas Planned for Growth: 2010 – 2015</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>This is not an indicator in the Plan. Plan reports 3-year running average, Scorecard is annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total new housing units built in Chittenden County</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>Values must have valid values and events running. Plan is based on Table 105 in the Decennial Census. Scorecard is more current with ACS data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of New Residential Development in Areas Planned for Growth</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>Values must have valid values and events running. Plan is based on Table 105 in the Decennial Census. Scorecard is more current with ACS data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Residential Development in the Center Planning Area</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>Values must have valid values and events running. Plan is based on Table 105 in the Decennial Census. Scorecard is more current with ACS data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of New Development in the Center Planning Area: 1950 – 2010</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>Values must have valid values and events running. Plan is based on Table 105 in the Decennial Census. Scorecard is more current with ACS data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Density by Planning Area: 2010</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>Values must have valid values and events running. Plan is based on Table 105 in the Decennial Census. Scorecard is more current with ACS data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net new housing units by municipality</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>Values must have valid values and events running. Plan is based on Table 105 in the Decennial Census. Scorecard is more current with ACS data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months of inventory for rental and single-family homes</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>Values must have valid values and events running. Plan is based on Table 105 in the Decennial Census. Scorecard is more current with ACS data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% households spending over 30% of income on housing expenses</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>犀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of private property investment going into the Areas Planned for Growth</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>Values must have valid values and events running. Plan is based on Table 105 in the Decennial Census. Scorecard is more current with ACS data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>Values must have valid values and events running. Plan is based on Table 105 in the Decennial Census. Scorecard is more current with ACS data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average property taxes per acre for farms</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>Values must have valid values and events running. Plan is based on Table 105 in the Decennial Census. Scorecard is more current with ACS data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% residents that feel positive about the increasing ethnic diversity</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>Values must have valid values and events running. Plan is based on Table 105 in the Decennial Census. Scorecard is more current with ACS data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of residents who spend time in non-work volunteering</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>Values must have valid values and events running. Plan is based on Table 105 in the Decennial Census. Scorecard is more current with ACS data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of eligible voters who vote</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>Values must have valid values and events running. Plan is based on Table 105 in the Decennial Census. Scorecard is more current with ACS data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of residents who feel that there are enough -gathering places</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>Values must have valid values and events running. Plan is based on Table 105 in the Decennial Census. Scorecard is more current with ACS data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of students who spend time on math related activities</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>Values must have valid values and events running. Plan is based on Table 105 in the Decennial Census. Scorecard is more current with ACS data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of students who spend time on social studies</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>Values must have valid values and events running. Plan is based on Table 105 in the Decennial Census. Scorecard is more current with ACS data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of students who spend time on science and technology</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>Values must have valid values and events running. Plan is based on Table 105 in the Decennial Census. Scorecard is more current with ACS data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of students who spend time on arts and cultural events</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>Values must have valid values and events running. Plan is based on Table 105 in the Decennial Census. Scorecard is more current with ACS data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- "Y" indicates that there is a difference between Plan and Scorecard; we will make edits to ensure these match correctly and/or retain decennial census data in the Plan and keep the Scorecard more current with ACS data.
- "N" indicates that there is no difference between Plan and Scorecard; no change needed.
- "No data available" indicates that there is no data available for this indicator.
- "Not updated because indicator has been replaced or data not available; we will delete this from the Plan."