

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

4 DATE: Thursday, March 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  
Alex Weinhagen, Hinesburg – PAC Rep  
Edmund Booth – ECOS Steering Committee Rep  
Chris Shaw, South Burlington – Board Rep  
Heather Danis – ECOS Steering Committee Rep  
(via phone)  
Jim Donovan – Board 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

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

11 Chris Shaw called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m.

12  
13 **2. Approve Minutes**

14  
15 Ken Belliveau made a motion, seconded by Alex Weinhagen, to approve the minutes of February 9, 2017. No  
16 further discussion. MOTION PASSED. Jim Donovan abstained.  
17

18 **3. Forecasts**

19 Melanie Needle indicated that we just received the revised forecast yesterday, and presented it to the PAC  
20 yesterday afternoon. Melanie Needle provided some highlights from the revised forecast, taken from the EPR  
21 memo (to be clear the changes as described below are from the previous forecast and the revised forecast):

- 22 • With these population and employment forecasts, Chittenden County is expected to be the leader in  
23 Northwest Vermont and the State of Vermont in population and employment growth.
- 24 • Keep in mind: High confidence in the county forecasts, significant degree of error in the municipal  
25 forecasts given the level of granularity although have taken into account the town perspective and  
26 statistical reliability.
- 27 • Population
  - 28 – The 2010 and 2015 population estimates correspond to the U.S. Census estimate and not the  
29 adjusted estimates.
  - 30 – Normalized population growth in Bolton, Charlotte, Colchester, Hinesburg, Jericho,  
31 Richmond, St. George, and Underhill resulted in a decline, except Charlotte remained steady
  - 32 – Burlington, South Burlington, Williston, Shelburne, Essex, and Milton received residual  
33 population. This reallocation accounted for some of the scale issues that we faced in the initial  
34 forecast, namely that Williston was increasing at levels that might have been unrealistic  
35 especially when compared to other areas like Burlington and South Burlington
- 36 • Households
  - 37 – Change in households in Burlington, to reconsider given the residential development plans
  - 38 – Household levels remain fixed for most of the municipalities in the revised forecast but allow  
39 the population living in households fluctuate
- 40 • Employment
  - 41 – In the initial forecast, Essex’s share of employment was decreasing and not consistent with a  
42 recent GBIC study - we fixed the share of Essex’s employment at its 2015 level through 2050.  
43 This resulted in an increase of nearly 13,000 jobs from 2015 through 2050 for Essex when  
44 compared to the initial forecast.

- 1                   – Bolton, Charlotte, Colchester, Milton, Richmond, St. George, Underhill, Westford, and  
2 Williston decreased; Burlington, Colchester, Milton, South Burlington, and Williston  
3 increased; Hinesburg, Huntington, Jericho, and Winooski, remained steady.  
4

5 There was further discussion regarding the household size and confusion over a chart presented by EPR that  
6 appears to show that ‘Persons in Households’ would increase, and quite drastically from 2040 to 2050. Staff  
7 will get clarification on this. The PAC voted to recommend that the Board adopt the forecast, with  
8 clarification on the household size; however, Colchester voted against the motion.  
9

10 Peter Keating asked if the GBIC study covered more municipalities than Essex and Essex Junction. Melanie  
11 Needle indicated that it does include more. There was some discussion over the bullets in the slides as some  
12 municipalities are shown as both ‘decreased’ and ‘increased’. It was clarified that the memo does indeed  
13 describe the changes both ways, and it is possible do to the re-distribution. Ken Belliveau stated the numbers  
14 in the short run for Williston are going to be off; the long-run they may be right. But I bet the 2020 number is  
15 going to be off. The population over the last 5 years went up by 700 people, and they show an increase of only  
16 300+. Ken Belliveau added that they say about 100 new households in 2016. Ken Belliveau further explained  
17 Williston’s growth management policy – they have a cap of 80 dwelling units per year cap on wastewater  
18 allocation; and those allocations are good for 5 years. So 80 is not necessarily a cap on the actual number of  
19 housing units built per year. Alex Weinhagen referred to the household size spreadsheet for the revised  
20 forecast; and asked specifically about Burlington. The developments Burlington is seeing are not likely to  
21 produce an increase in household size. There was some discussion about the top down methodology (state to  
22 county to municipality) being a potential reason for this. EPR has been very clear about their lower level of  
23 confidence on the municipal forecasts.  
24

25 Jim Donovan made a motion, seconded by Ken Belliveau, to recommend that the CCRPC Board approve this  
26 forecast, with a clarification on the number of persons in household. No further discussion. MOTION  
27 PASSED.  
28

#### 29 **4. Transportation Schedule, Initial Project List and Fiscal Constraint**

30 Eleni Churchill gave an overview of the MTP update schedule. Jim Donovan asked about returning back to  
31 the project list, once we run the model. Eleni Churchill and Christine Forde stated that we will do that. It is a  
32 two phase process – we include committed projects in the model to start, then the model will inform us of  
33 areas where other projects may be needed, and so we will go back and revise the list accordingly.  
34

35 Christine Forde described the project list and explained that it is currently prioritized based on the  
36 methodology we’ve been using for a number of years. We will still need to add the fiscal constraint figure to  
37 the list. The list may not be complete. Christine Forde has reached out to the Towns with yellow highlighted  
38 projects on the roadway list.  
39

40 Chris Shaw asked about the money – do we have separate pots of money for the roadway projects and the  
41 bike/ped projects? The fiscal constraint (total amount of dollars we can expect over the life of the plan) is one  
42 total number. In the current ECOS Plan, we made some decisions based on ECOS goals about what amount of  
43 money went into each funding category. There was a question about the accuracy of the construction cost  
44 estimates, and whether they will be increased to FY16 dollars. Peter Keating stated that we should and will do  
45 that, as some of these figures might be quite out of date and therefore not a true enough reflection of the real  
46 costs.  
47

48 Peter Keating described the fiscal constraint process. In planning the last MTP we used 17% of the State’s pot  
49 of federal funding as our estimated share. That was the historic average over the previous seven years. It  
50 looks like the federal funding looking out into the future will remain flat. But we are meeting with VTrans to  
51 talk about Chittenden County’s share of the funding. In the last five years it has only been about 13%, but if  
52 you look back over 20 years it was closer to 20%. Once we know the final fiscal constraint figure, we will

1 break it down into the categories. Christine Forde added that the County has never had a consistent share of  
2 the state's federal funding because it is depends on the projects in the pipeline.

3  
4 **5. Energy Planning Maps and Data Analysis**

5 Melanie Needle described the methodology for identifying the wind and solar goals.

6  
7 Ken Belliveau stated that we don't want to make this completely additive. If acreage is going to be used for a  
8 solar array, it will likely take it out of the running for wind.

9  
10 Chris Shaw asked if Staff has asked the municipalities for their input on siting location. Yes, we have. Chris  
11 Shaw also asked if the region and the municipalities have to meet the targets. Melanie Needle explained that  
12 this is not a requirement. Regina Mahony added if the municipalities want the elevated level of input in the  
13 PSB process then they have to show how they are meeting the state energy goals and these targets.

14  
15 Alex Weinhagen asked about incorporation of the local constraints in the targets before the low and high range  
16 targets are calculated. Melanie Needle stated that the overall goal should be equal at the start. Alex  
17 Weinhagen asked if the municipal level 2 constraints (agricultural soils as an example), are being calculated  
18 into the targets? Those are real constraints also (in addition to the complete 'no gos') so they should be  
19 subtracted from the usable acreage. In addition, Alex Weinhagen stated that not all 'prime' acreage is going to  
20 actually be developed 100% with solar. We should add a qualifier that takes this into account.

21  
22 There was a discussion regarding state highway ROWs, and whether they are listed as a constraint or not.  
23 Melanie Needle brought up the most recent guidelines and state highway ROWs are not included on the  
24 constraints list. Ken Belliveau stated that we aren't even allowed to put a bike path in the CIRC ROW, so it  
25 shouldn't be in the calculations for solar or wind.

26  
27 There was a discussion about how and when we will account for roof-top solar. Melanie Needle described  
28 how Bennington accounted for it (they assumed a 50% reduction for the amount of rooftops that could be  
29 eligible for solar). That seems high, and the LRPC asked Staff to see if we could get a more accurate 'solar  
30 capable' rate from the solar companies. Alex Weinhagen also asked if we could do a rooftop capability GIS  
31 exercise since we have the footprint data. Staff will look into this.

32  
33 **6. Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy – Project List**

34 Regina Mahony briefly went over the project list that was in the packet. Regina Mahony will follow-up via  
35 email with the list and a rationale for why we are suggesting things for removal. Jim Donovan suggested there  
36 may be some projects that are more regional and maybe should stay. Jim Donovan will share his thoughts  
37 with the LRPC via email.

38  
39 **7. Next Meeting**

40 April 13, 2017 from 8:30am to 10:00am

41 **10. Adjourn**

42 The meeting adjourned at 10:05 a.m.

43  
44 Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony