DATE: Thursday, March 9, 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
Alex Weinlagen, 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

1. Welcome and Introductions
Chris Shaw called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m.

2. Approve Minutes
Ken Belliveau made a motion, seconded by Alex Weinlagen, to approve the minutes of February 9, 2017. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED. Jim Donovan abstained.

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

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

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

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

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

4. Transportation Schedule, Initial Project List and Fiscal Constraint

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

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

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

Peter Keating described the fiscal constraint process. In planning the last MTP we used 17% of the State’s pot of federal funding as our estimated share. That was the historic average over the previous seven years. It looks like the federal funding looking out into the future will remain flat. But we are meeting with VTrans to talk about Chittenden County’s share of the funding. In the last five years it has only been about 13%, but if you look back over 20 years it was closer to 20%. Once we know the final fiscal constraint figure, we will
break it down into the categories. Christine Forde added that the County has never had a consistent share of
the state’s federal funding because it is depends on the projects in the pipeline.

5. Energy Planning Maps and Data Analysis
Melanie Needle described the methodology for identifying the wind and solar goals.

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

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

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

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

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

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

7. Next Meeting
April 13, 2017 from 8:30am to 10:00am

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

Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony