CCRPC Long Range Planning Committee

Minutes

Wednesday, October 14, 2015

4:00 p.m. to 6:00 pm

Location: CCRPC Office, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT.

Attendees: Justin Dextrauder (Chair), Bob Henneberger, Jeannine McCrumb, Edmund Booth, Andrea Morgante, Heather Danis, and Lisa Falcone

CCRPC Staff: Melanie Needle, Emily Nosse-Leirer, Regina Mahony and Charlie Baker

1. Welcome and Introductions. The LRPC introduced themselves and explained their affiliations.

2. The Task Ahead and ECOS Plan Organization 101. Regina Mahony gave an explanation of the Regional Plan evaluations that were done state wide, and explained the sections of the ECOS Plan that were found be inadequate: Earth Extraction, Utilities and Facilities, Child Care, Growth Relative to Adjacent Regions and Flood Resiliency. These sections of the Plan need to be amended and adopted by June 2016. Regina Mahony then provided the LRPC with an overview on the organization of the ECOS Plan and explained that many of the suggested edits are within Chapter 2 (goals, trends/issues and indicators) and a few are located in Chapter 3 (strategies and actions).

3. ECOS Plan Amendments. Staff review the proposed amendments to the following sections and the LRPC provided comments:

   a. Earth Extraction – The LRPC provided a number of comments to try to bring this information more up to date than the data we have from a study done in 1993 including taking a look at the Hinesburg Sand and Gravel Co./CSWD lawsuit over the Redmond Road sand pit area and adding Whitcomb stone in Colchester (not just sand and gravel in the County). There was also a suggestion to mention that we have a lot of small grandfathered pits that are lacking reclamation plans. It may also make sense to look at the issue from the perspective of how much sand and gravel municipalities are using on their roads. Regarding action 3.c we should recommend
that reclamation plans include a diversity of plants for revegetation.

b. Utilities and Facilities – Regarding schools the LRPC suggested that we had some basic numbers about how many supervisory unions, schools and students there are. It may make sense to include how much our schools contribute to employment in the County. It was suggested to simply include a reference to where information on school facility needs can be found rather than including a laundry list in the Plan. Regarding libraries the LRPC recommended that we mention the reciprocal agreements, look at whether Shelburne is another municipality that may need a library expansion or improvement, and ask the three municipalities that don’t have libraries if they have plans for one and describe accordingly. Regarding energy the LRPC suggested that the capital project included in the draft text doesn’t relate to the paragraph before. Regarding communications infrastructure the LRPC recommending removing the reference to T-1 capability as this is old, broadband is newer and better. No changes were recommended for the solid waste section. The LRPC discussed what to include for the government/administrative facilities – it was recommended that we think about this from an accessibility standpoint (what public buildings are accessible), as well as reciprocal agreements and shared facilities. Staff will look into this further. Regarding recreation facilities the LRPC suggested that we add in some language about the lake, boats and marinas. Regarding hospitals the LRPC recommended that we don’t list specific facilities but the numbers of them that exist (i.e. # of primary care providers, # of long-term care facilities) as well as more general descriptions of the other direct care facilities.

c. Child Care – This section needs to be cut-down quite a bit. Melanie Needle provided an overview of the Child Care section and the LRPC identified a few other issues that should be mentioned: no child care whatsoever for third shift, not a lot of center based rural programs and home care, lack of quality care (and high licensing requirements), and lack of availability. There was general consensus to make this section more about issues than the data. We can simply refer to Child Care Resources for the data as it changes quite frequently. Also mention generally the importance of locating these facilities in appropriate locations (next to parks, away from busy streets, etc.). The goals should be based on Building Bright Futures top priorities and what correlates appropriately to the ECOS Plan. There were also specific recommendations to combine actions 1, 2 and 5, and delete #3.

4. **Next Meetings.** The following list includes the proposed timeline for the remaining LRPC meetings:
   - **Wednesday, December 9, 2015 from 4 to 6 pm**
   - **Tuesday, January 12, 2016 from 4pm to 6pm**
   - **Wednesday, April 13, 2016 from 4pm to 6pm**

5. **Adjourn.** The meeting adjourned at 5:45pm.