

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

4 DATE: Thursday, April 13, 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  
Alex Weinhagen, Hinesburg – PAC Rep  
Chris Shaw, South Burlington – Board Rep  
Heather Danis – ECOS Steering Committee Rep  
Jim Donovan, Charlotte – Board Rep  
Andrea Morgante, Hinesburg - Board Rep  
Justin Rabidoux, South Burlington – TAC Rep

**Staff**

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

8  
9 **1. Welcome and Introductions**

10 Jim Donovan called the meeting to order at 8:34 a.m.  
11

12 **2. Approve Minutes**

13 Alex Weinhagen made a motion, seconded by Ken Belliveau, to approve the minutes of March 9, 2017. No  
14 further discussion. MOTION PASSED. Andrea Morgante abstained.  
15

16 **3. Energy Planning**

17 Melanie Needle went over the solar generation maps. The maps and the spreadsheet accounts for the local  
18 known constraints, but not the local potential constraints yet. These will be included by the end of April. The  
19 known constraints will turn the map white, the potential local constraints will turn the red (prime) to orange  
20 (base).  
21

22 Alex Weinhagen explained that they will have a solar array in a white area, and we should assign some level  
23 of potential from the white areas in relation to the target. Melanie Needle stated that we could apply the 1 MW  
24 per 60 acres factor to these areas. Regina Mahony suggested that it isn't necessary to add another  
25 mathematical equation if we can meet the targets in the municipality with the prime and base areas.  
26

27 Ken Belliveau asked about conservation areas, and specifically the Lake Iroquois multi-jurisdictional area.  
28 This should be considered a conserved area and not available for wind and solar generation. There was also a  
29 suggestion to adjust the color of the three-phase power so they don't match water and roads. Staff will make  
30 that edit.  
31

32 Chris Shaw asked how renewable hydro power will be accounted for. Melanie Needle stated that it is included  
33 in the LEAP analysis – the scenario assumes a potential of additional energy from existing dams, but no new  
34 dams.  
35

36 Ken Belliveau asked which constraint caused the removal of the airport from a possible solar generation area?  
37 It seems like it could be a good place to generate, and a logical place. Staff will look into that.  
38

39 Andrea Morgante asked how parking lots are addressed. Melanie Needle explained that the maps are land  
40 based and don't adequately address the built environment on their own. We do have a roof top solar factor  
41 that we are going to apply as another pathway to reaching the targets.  
42

43 A review of the wind maps was tabled.  
44

1 Emily Nosse-Leirer provided an overview of the ECOS Plan text, and noted that this draft text has not yet been  
2 reviewed by the Energy sub-committee. Emily Nosse-Leirer focused the LRPC on the yellow highlighted  
3 areas, where Staff could use some feedback:  
4

5 The Long-range Energy Alternative Plan (LEAP) scenario model shows natural gas going to almost zero in  
6 order to meet the 90x2050 renewal energy target. That scenario seems unrealistic for a variety of reasons so  
7 we've suggested some text to try to address this. Ken Belliveau stated that we may see propane and oil  
8 customers switch to natural gas so we should show the accounting of that. Also, even if you are using natural  
9 gas it doesn't mean that you can't use less. Chris Shaw suggested that we focus more on efficiency than a full  
10 switch. Melanie Needle added that the model does already account for efficiencies, and that it is an  
11 aspirational goal. Jim Donovan suggested that we articulate clearly what the LEAP model is. It is one  
12 example of how we may reach the State goals. We need to be clear about describing it in this way so this VT  
13 Gas statement isn't completely counter to the goal. Ken Belliveau asked if we've included other sources like  
14 sewer plant electricity generation. Will municipalities receive credit for these? Melanie stated these credits  
15 will be used to help each municipality meet their target. Ken Belliveau asked if Williston can get 1/3 of the  
16 Essex plant credit? Melanie Needle stated that the credit goes to the location in which it is generated. Emily  
17 Nosse-Leirer added that VT Gas has plans to add renewable natural gas to their portfolio; while this is a very  
18 small percentage we should still point that out.  
19

20 The LRPC discussed that the language on natural gas in the 90X2050 as currently drafted is unclear. It needs  
21 to either say that the 90X2050 scenario is aspirational or that it is a goal that we aren't going to meet. Andrea  
22 Morgante added that this is a State issue, so what can we say? We are powerless. Alex Weinhausen suggested  
23 that we be much more proactive and go above and beyond on the transportation side. We have a responsibility  
24 to switch over to electric vehicles to reduce the dependence on gasoline in the transportation sector. There was  
25 a good amount of discussion about this switching to electricity in the transportation sector. It would be good  
26 for this plan to be clear that we are more suited to switch to electric vehicles than other regions of the State due  
27 to our more clustered land use pattern and density. Perhaps our approach should be more holistic than whether  
28 we can reach each State energy goal independently.  
29

30 Emily Nosse-Leirer quickly reviewed the other yellow highlighted sections with the LRPC – the energy  
31 actions under the Strategy 2 goal, and the use of the word “shall”. We will discuss these in further detail at the  
32 next meeting.  
33

#### 34 **4. Transportation**

35 Jason Charest provided an overview of the transportation model. There were some questions about how the  
36 model determines mode choice for the trips. Justin Rabidoux provided an example of a neighborhood that is  
37 adjacent to transit, but still an hour-long bus trip. The model determines mode shift based on location but also  
38 existing data, so it won't assume more transit users than exist now (unless we run that as a scenario).  
39

40 We will be asking municipalities to help allocate the households and employment to the TAZ level out to  
41 2030. The TAZs are based on Census blocks. Those have changed quite a bit and there are now ~550 TAZs  
42 (we used to have ~ 335).  
43

44 The model assumes households produce trips; and employment attracts trips. The model marries these two.  
45 Chittenden County is a net importer of productions because many folks commute in for work. There are three  
46 trip types: home based work; home based other; and non-home based. The model makes sure the trips are  
47 properly generated within each TAZ based on demographic data and from there it distributes based on mode  
48 choice, and assigns the route (shifts based on congestion). Model outputs: are VMT, network capacity  
49 (volume to capacity), delay, travel times, land use (for the growth from 2030 to 2050, b/c we'll be using the  
50 municipal input up to 2030).  
51

1 Alex Weinhagen asked if the output is what we think is going to happen, rather than what we want to happen?  
2 The 2030 base build model will tell us what we think is going to happen (includes all TIP projects). But we  
3 can also run different scenarios to test various transportation futures that will provide different outcomes.  
4

5 Peter Keating described the proposed scenario options: base, all in on technology, all in on TDM/energy,  
6 capacity expansion, and we anticipate a final MTP scenario that is likely a hybrid. Alex Weinhagen  
7 questioned the change in land use to 90% for only one scenario. He thinks that will muddle the results of the  
8 other inputs in that scenario. Alex Weinhagen also asked why we would run a capacity expansion when we  
9 aren't going to do that? Justin Rabidoux stated that it makes sense to have a counter balance and it helps to  
10 show why you can't do it. Staff stated that we will consider cost in the output; so it would be clear that we  
11 can't do all the expansion projects. Alex Weinhagen added that at the very least we should be realistic. Ken  
12 Belliveau asked if we would include Exit 12B? Staff indicated that we don't yet know what the specific  
13 projects will be. We'll come back to you with the specifics for feedback.  
14

15 Heather Danis asked if there are ways to consider health impacts for each of these scenarios? We could look  
16 at greenhouse gas emissions (using the MOVES model - need to figure out if Staff or RSG will run this model)  
17 and number of walk/bike trips. But we are limited with our current tools to do any more than that. Perhaps  
18 there are other tools out there that could use the transportation model outputs and translate them to reduced  
19 numbers in diabetes, heart disease, etc. Perhaps a health index exists already? Heather Danis will talk with  
20 their data analyst.  
21

22 Andrea Morgante asked if either of the scenarios will consider a mode shift based on our expected shift in  
23 elderly demographics? Reduction of 2 cars to 1, reduction of VMT? Staff will think about this further, but the  
24 actual demographic shift is reflected in the population forecast and number of households.  
25

26 We have a late May deadline to decide on the scenarios.  
27

## 28 **5. Comprehensive Economic Development Project List**

29 Regina Mahony explained that the CEDS project list in the packet included comments received from the  
30 Committee via email. With an additional edit from Chris Shaw to leave in the South Burlington's City Center  
31 parking garage. Regina Mahony explained that there was consensus on most of the comments except for  
32 Champlain Water District (CWD) and Chittenden Solid Waste District (CSWD). Jim Donovan noted that  
33 CSWD's last three projects seem the most relevant, while the top two seem more local. The LRPC suggested  
34 Staff get in touch with CSWD to see what their big projects are now, as this list is old. They've got a lot of big  
35 new responsibilities, compost especially. Also, the UVM Medical Center inpatient is already under  
36 construction. There was a question about whether CWD needs more funding for these projects. Justin  
37 Rabidoux explained that they are in their capital plan with proposed future revenues but the money doesn't  
38 necessarily exist. The LRPC decided that we should include CWD projects that are more expansion based and  
39 less maintenance. Regina Mahony will follow-up with these partners.  
40

## 41 **6. Next Meeting**

42 May 11, 2017 from 8:30am to 10:00am.

## 43 **10. Adjourn**

44 The meeting adjourned at 10:05 a.m.  
45

46 Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony