REGULAR MEETING & PUBLIC HEARING AGENDA
Wednesday, March 21, 2018, 6:00 pm
CCRPC Offices at 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202
Winooski, VT 05404

CONSENT AGENDA:  Minor TIP Amendments*

DELIBERATIVE AGENDA
1. Call to Order; Changes to the Agenda
2. Public Comment Period on Items NOT on the Agenda
3. Action on Consent Agenda (MPO Business) (Action: 1 min)
4. Approve Minutes of February 21, 2018 Meeting * (Action: 2 min)
7. Review changes to Draft ECOS Plan and Warn Public Hearing #2 for May* (Action: 5 min.)
8. FY2020 Transportation Project Prioritization* (Action: 20 min)
9. Vermont Climate Pledge Coalition* (Action: 10 min.)
10. CCRPC Comment Letter on MS4 draft permit* (Action: 10 min)
11. Chair/Executive Director’s Updates (Information; 15 min)
   a. Clean Water
   b. ECOS Annual Report
   c. Regional Dispatch
   d. Legislative Updates
   e. Green Ride – Bikeshare Kickoff
12. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports (Information; 2 min)
   a. Finance Committee (draft minutes February 21, 2018)*
   b. Executive Committee (minutes Feb. 21, 2018 & draft minutes March 7, 2018)*
      i. Act 250/Sec 248 letters *
   c. UPWP Committee (draft minutes February 22, 2018)*
   d. Transportation Advisory Committee (draft minutes March 7, 2018)*
   e. Clean Water Advisory Committee (draft minutes March 7, 2018)*
   f. MS4 Subcommittee of CWAC (draft minutes March 7, 2018) *
   g. Long Range Planning Committee (Draft minutes March 8, 2018)*
13. Member’s Items
14. Adjournment

*Attachment

The March 21st Chittenden County RPC meeting will air on Tuesday, March 27, 2018 at 8:00 p.m. and repeat on Wednesday, March 28th at 1 a.m. and 7 a.m. It will also be available online at: https://www.cctv.org/watch-tv/programs/chittenden-county-regional-planning-commission-75

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.
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@ccrpvcvt.org, no later than 3 business days prior to the meeting for which services are requested.

Upcoming Meetings - *Unless otherwise noted, all meetings are held at our offices:*
- Unified Planning Work Program Committee – Thursday, March 22, 2018; 5:30 pm
- Finance Committee – Wednesday, March 28, 2018; 5:30 p.m.
- Transportation Advisory Committee – Tuesday, April 3, 2018; 9:00 a.m.
- Clean Water Advisory Committee – Tuesday, April 3, 2018; 11:00 a.m.
- MS4 Subcommittee – Tuesday, April 3, 2018; 12:30 p.m.
- Executive Committee - Wednesday, April 4, 2018; 5:45 p.m.
- Long Range Planning Committee – Thursday TBD, 2018; 8:30-10 a.m.
- CCRPC Board Meeting - Wednesday, April 18, 2018; 6:00 p.m.
- Planning Advisory Committee – Wednesday, May 9, 2018; 2:30 p.m.

Tentative future Board agenda items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Agenda Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 18, 2018</td>
<td>South Burlington City Center presentation&lt;br&gt;Warn Draft UPWP public hearing&lt;br&gt;National Highway System update&lt;br&gt;Board Development Committee to develop officer nominations for the May meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 16, 2018</td>
<td>University of Vermont presentation&lt;br&gt;ECOS Plan Update Public Hearing #2&lt;br&gt;FY19 UPWP and Budget Public Hearing and Vote&lt;br&gt;Guidelines and Standards for Reviewing Act 250 and Section 248 Applications Review&lt;br&gt;Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 20, 2018 – Joint Annual Meeting with GBIC @ ECHO</td>
<td>Election of Officers&lt;br&gt;ECOS Plan Update adoption&lt;br&gt;Warn FY19-22 TIP Public Hearing for July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 18, 2018</td>
<td>FY19-22 TIP Public Hearing and Adoption&lt;br&gt;Guidelines and Standards for Reviewing Act 250 and Section 248 Applications Action&lt;br&gt;Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO AUGUST MEETING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
March 21, 2018
Agenda Item C1: Consent Item

FY2018 Transportation Improvement Program Amendments

Issues:
Make the following change to the FY18 TIP:

- FY19 Vermont Better Roads Grant – Federal Funding
  - Essex Road Erosion Inventory (Project OT038, Amendment FY18-11) $7,680 in federal funds was awarded to Essex.

- FY19 Vermont Better Roads Grants – State Funding
  - The following projects were awarded Better Roads Grants by VTrans. These projects do not use Federal Funds so do not need to be included in the TIP. This list is provided for information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Type of Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHARLOTTE</td>
<td>Lime Kiln Rd</td>
<td>Stone Lined Ditch</td>
<td>$19,200</td>
<td>Bond Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESSEX JCT.</td>
<td>Juniper Ridge Rd.</td>
<td>Stone Lined Ditch</td>
<td>$11,566</td>
<td>Bond Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINESBURG</td>
<td>Lavigne Rd</td>
<td>Stone Lined Ditch</td>
<td>$15,408</td>
<td>Transportation Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNTINGTON</td>
<td>Fielder Rd</td>
<td>Culvert - Upgrade / Stone Lined Ditch</td>
<td>$19,274</td>
<td>Transportation Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNTINGTON</td>
<td>Texas Hill Rd/ Texas Hill Circle</td>
<td>Culvert - Upgrade / Stone Lined Ditch</td>
<td>$41,203</td>
<td>Bond Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILTON</td>
<td>Cadreact Rd</td>
<td>Stone Lined Ditch</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>Transportation Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILTON</td>
<td>McMullen Rd</td>
<td>Stone Lined Ditch</td>
<td>$18,360</td>
<td>Transportation Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHMOND TOWN</td>
<td>Wes White Hill Rd</td>
<td>Stone Lined Ditch</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>Transportation Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. GEORGE</td>
<td>Ayer Rd.</td>
<td>Stone Lined Ditch</td>
<td>$12,537</td>
<td>Transportation Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. GEORGE</td>
<td>Willow Brook Lane</td>
<td>Culvert - Upgrade</td>
<td>$12,576</td>
<td>Bond Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERHILL</td>
<td>Irish Settlement Rd.</td>
<td>Culvert - Upgrade</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>Bond Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTFORD</td>
<td>Rogers Rd.</td>
<td>Stone Lined Ditch</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>Transportation Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTFORD</td>
<td>Old #11</td>
<td>Culvert - Replacement / Stone Lined Ditch</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>Transportation Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTFORD</td>
<td>Rubaud Rd</td>
<td>Stone Lined Ditch</td>
<td>$18,840</td>
<td>Transportation Funds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TAC Recommendation: Recommend that the Board approve the proposed TIP amendments.

Staff Recommendation: Recommend that the TAC approve the proposed TIP amendment.

For more information, contact: Christine Forde
cforde@ccrpcvt.org or 846-4490 ext. *13
1. Call to order, changes to the agenda. The meeting was called to order at 6:05 p.m. by the Chair, Chris Roy.

2. Public Comment Period for items NOT on the agenda. There were none.

3. Action on the Consent Agenda. There were no items on the consent agenda.

4. Approve minutes of January 17, 2018 Board meeting. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 17, 2017 WITH CHANGES IF ANY. JIM DONOVAN SECONDED. Catherine McMains asked for clarification on the bottom of page 4 to say “The Legislature did receive long-term funding recommendations...” THE MOTION CARRIED WITH BARBARA ELLIOTT ABSTAINING.

Members heard comments from Julie Macuga a recent graduate of UVM. A full page of comments were submitted; this is just a subset: "The ECOS Plan states that Chittenden County will continue efforts to avoid development in particularly vulnerable areas, and Vermont Gas has been careless in these areas, as evidenced by their pending investigation in the Clay Plains Swamp in New Haven. Not only that, but emphasis on fossil fuels like natural gas, which the industry has tried to brand as “sustainable,” has no place in Vermont’s energy future in the first place; especially with our ambitious plans to reduce emissions." "We should keep in mind that VGS has a monopoly on natural gas in the state, so they don’t make money on the actual fuel, and in turn they have to keep building infrastructure to make money, and at a rate that is too fast to bother with cost overruns or permit compliance." "Allowing a company who seeks dividends over the safety of their customers to work on the planning and future of the state would be a mistake. They’ll try to lull us into a false sense of security with press releases about staying safe in winter, or planting a few hundred trees in summer. A few hundred trees are a moot point when this pipeline, which threatens to leak or explode, continues to pump methane into our air. The newest scientific research tells us that methane is more potent of a greenhouse gas than previously thought—and is comparable with CO2." "As we move into the future, with or without VGS, please consider the public stakeholders which VGS often gives less than 24 hours notice to come to public hearings like the recent one in Bristol. They are not interested in engaging with stakeholders like myself. I’m not here to vilify the people working at Vermont Gas, the rank-and-file are just doing their jobs, but I don’t want their clever PR team to pull the wool over our eyes when it comes to our future as a county and as a state."

This is a summary of the comments presented at the 4/21 public hearing by Deb Sachs of Charlotte:

We can’t get to 90x2050 with the goals as currently stated in this plan. If you have a glossary, add rail to the public transportation definition. I absolutely disagree with widening I-89 which is a 20-minute problem. Instead invest the $74 million in public transit/commuter rail. Consider the use of salt on our roads which eats away at the infrastructure and lowers the life expectancy of it. Revisit the vision and really look at a future where we shift from cars to transit. Increase investment in TDM programs to address climate change. Consider a regional transportation authority to oversee transportation investments.

This is a summary of the comments presented at the 4/21 public hearing from David Blittersdorf of Charlotte: This Plan is absolutely not going to work. We have a CO2 problem that is going to destroy our civilization and this is a ‘business as usual’/’status quo’ plan. Autonomous cars are not going to save us. Everything needs to shift to electric, though we may use diesel in the meantime. Infrastructure around the car is our biggest problem; and continuing to build in and invest in more fossil fuel infrastructure is a total disaster. Chris Roy noted that we are constantly revisiting the plan even though it covers 50 years; and it will continue to be an interactive process.

We then had comments and discussion from board members on the draft plan and the top 10 actions. Rob Fish the new alternate from Burlington said he reviewed the comments and a lot of them are from Vermont Gas. They are talking about “renewable fossil fuel”, which he feels is an oxymoron. He feels that Vermont Gas just wants us to lessen the language in the plan. Chris Shaw agreed and likened “renewable fossil fuel” to “clean coal”. Chris Shaw said he and Charlie reviewed the plan at the So. Burlington City Council meeting and the feedback from one councilor seemed to focus on family housing (or what he calls cottage housing) being a distinct type of housing that should be addressed in the plan. Catherine said at the Energy Subcommittee meeting last night they talked
a lot about the comments from Vermont Gas and “renewable fossil fuel”. Bard Hill said in focusing
on the top 10 actions – in #2 there is some reference to transit. He bought a house in Richmond 25
years ago, and at the time thought there would be a train in the next 25 years. However, he’s not
sure there will be a train in the next 25 years. There is a similar reaction in housing where it is silent
on energy efficiency and affordability. #8 autonomous vehicles – he doesn’t think this should have
the prominence it seems to have. In terms of health care, we seem to be talking about the current
system. We should include language about a health care system that includes health and human
service providers. John Zicconi feels that the reason we included autonomous vehicles so
prominently is because we don’t know what autonomous vehicles will do in the future and we’re
hoping it’ll improve our quality of life and environment, but we just don’t know that. It is potentially
significant, and we should keep an eye on it and see how we can use that to our advantage. Bard Hill
said some typically say that technology will improve everything and others don’t agree. Jeff Carr
noted that 15 years ago the MPO met in Winooski where we killed the Burlington/Essex commuter
rail; and he had predicted that we’d regret that in 20 years. Andrea Morgante echoed some of the
comments. One thing she noted is a brief descriptive discussion about heat pumps vs. natural gas;
and she feels the technology of heat pumps has been getting better exponentially over the last 10
years and will continue to do so in the future. With more renewable electric sources these types of
systems are what we want to go to. She then talked about Act 171 – Forest Integrity Act. It is
mentioned in the plan, but she’d like to see it strengthened. She suggested adding “over the coming
years CCRPC will be working to be compliant with Act 171 with enhancing materials and assist towns
to do so as well.” We have some of the most diverse forests in the state and it’s up to us to protect
those forests. We have completely different geologic formations that support these forests and they
should be preserved. She also noted that the green lines on some of the maps are not dotted and
they just end – we need better legibility. Chris Shaw said an observation from S.B. City Council was
the number of dead ends on sidewalks. We’re doing a lot, but we need to make better connections
to make a contiguous regional bike path. Chris feels that rather widening I-89, we should connect the
dead-end sidewalks.

Regina reviewed the schedule for what happens after this first public hearing. We will review the
comments, suggest edits and warn the 2nd public hearing at the March 21st board meeting or the April
Executive Committee meeting for a May 16th public hearing. We hope to adopt the ECOS Plan
updates at the June 20th annual meeting. For folks with subsequent comments, we need them by
March 1st to be included in the process. The sheet of comments members received tonight did not
include those from VTrans, FHWA or others we expect to hear from. Regional enhanced energy plans
have been approved for Northwest RPC, Bennington Co. RPC and Two Rivers-Ottawaquechee RPC.
Municipal energy plans have been approved in Highgate, Benson and Richford. When asked if June
20th was the absolute deadline, staff noted that the regional plan update time—period ends June
30th. The Regional Plan, MTP and CEDS are on a five-year renewal plan. Charlie also noted that we
are required to have an enhanced energy plan done by June as well. Andrea suggested that we
strengthen our relationship with the Solid Waste District and be tracking the solid waste along with
energy usage. Jeff Carr wants to be sure we are in sync or that it doesn’t create issues with other
regions when they are required to update their plans every eight years. Charlie noted that it does
not because some RPCs update an element of their plan each year. When Deb Sachs asked if all of
the comments received on this draft are accessible to the public, Regina said yes, we track the
comments and as we work through the committees we have indicated how we addressed each
comment; and they are posted on our website. The Long-Range Planning Committee (LRPC) will
meet March 8th to discuss proposed changes.
JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 6:55 P.M., SECONDED BY CATHERINE MCMAINS. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

7. Transportation Performance Measures – Safety Targets. Peter Keating gave a presentation on the performance measures required by the most recent Federal Transportation Acts. The following areas will be required to have performance measures: Safety; Infrastructure Condition (pavement and bridges); Congestion; System Reliability (NHS performance); Freight Movement (interstate); and Environmental Sustainability. The first one we must act on is Safety. Rulemaking set performance measures, identified roles and responsibilities and set target deadlines. It requires coordination among key parties: VTrans, CCRPC and GMT. CCRPC has 180 days after VTrans sets targets for specific measures to either: agree to support VTrans’ targets, OR establish our own targets. VTrans target deadline for safety measures was August 31, 2017 and CCRPC deadline is February 27, 2018. VTrans has developed some targets, and staff and the TAC are recommending the board accept the VTrans targets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VTrans Safety Performance Management Targets (5-Year Averages)</th>
<th>2018 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Fatalities</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Fatalities per 100M VMT</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Serious Injuries</td>
<td>280.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Serious Injuries per 100M VMT</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Non-Motorized Serious Injuries</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After some discussion, BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ROB FISH TO ACCEPT THE VTRANS STATEWIDE SAFETY TARGETS AS REPORTED IN THE 2017 HSIP REPORT AND NOT SET REGIONAL (MPO) TARGETS THIS CALENDAR YEAR (2018). THE MOTION CARRIED WITH NO VOTES FROM ESSEX AND ESSEX JUNCTION AND AMY BELL ABSTAINED.

It was noted that later this year (November) CCRPC will be asked to approve measures for Infrastructure Conditions, and System Reliability and Freight. Congestion Reduction and Environmental Sustainability measures under these goals do not apply to Vermont or Chittenden County as we do not meet the minimum population threshold or air quality status.

8. Chairman’s/Executive Director Update.
   a. **Clean Water.** Last month we talked about long-term funding and the Senate Natural Resources committee spent hours on this, but we can’t predict the outcome. They have decided not to do parcel fees for now. They will appoint a committee to take this up again this summer. (Bard Hill left the meeting.) There may be things in the bill that have some implications for us. River Basin Coordinating Councils are being discussed as a conduit for block grants to go to each town.
   b. **Economics of Housing.** Charlie noted we held a workshop at the end of January that was attended by about 50 people and we’ve been requested to sponsor more.
   c. **ECOS Annual Report.** The report is being reviewed by our partners.
   d. **Regional Dispatch.** Charlie noted that 7 towns have the question on their town meeting ballot. There are yard signs going up to vote no. He is not sure why because no money or personnel issues are involved. The vote is only to form a Union Municipal District to continue the
discussions and work out the details. There was a brief discussion about previous attempts for regional dispatch.

e. **Legislative updates.** The request for the third year of funding to assist us help our communities with energy planning is in committee now. Sen. Government Operations committee is also discussing requiring towns to include new public safety sections in the municipal plans and it would stop state police from working for towns. They did approve a little bill that makes it clear that towns and regions can post notices electronically.

9. **Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports.** Chris noted that minutes were included in the board packet. Charlie noted that in an effort to be sure our minutes are posted within 5 days, we propose to do minimalist minutes to include attendees, topics and motions. We will then expand the draft minutes so the committees will receive more descriptive minutes they are used to seeing prior to their next meeting.

10. **Members Items.** There were none.

11. **Adjournment.** JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CHRIS SHAW TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:40 P.M. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
March 21, 2018
Agenda Item 5: 2018 Milton Comprehensive Plan, Approval and Confirmation

Issues: The Town of Milton has requested, per Title 24 V.S.A §4350, that the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (1) approve its 2018 Comprehensive Plan, and (2) confirm its planning process.

Attached is the proposed Resolution of approval and the staff report to the Planning Advisory Committee. The Planning Advisory Committee met on November 8, 2017 and recommended that the Plan, and the municipal planning process, should be forwarded to the CCRPC Board for approval. There was not enough time between draft plan completion and the Planning Advisory Committee meeting to warn a hearing. Therefore, this CCRPC Board meeting is serving as CCRPC’s public hearing on the Plan and was warned as such.

The Plan was adopted by the Milton Selectboard on February 5, 2018. Staff is recommending approval by the CCRPC Board at this time.

Please note that municipal planning process confirmation and plan approval decisions shall be made by majority vote of the commissioners representing municipalities, in accordance with the bylaws of the CCRPC and Title 24 V.S.A.§ 4350(f).

Planning Advisory Committee Recommendation: The Planning Advisory Committee reviewed the Plan on Wednesday, November 8, 2017 at the CCRPC Offices and made the following motion:

The PAC finds that the draft 2018 Milton Comprehensive Plan, as submitted, meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC approval, and that the municipality's planning process meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC confirmation.

Upon notification that the Plan has been adopted by the municipality, CCRPC staff will review the plan, and any information relevant to the confirmation process, for changes. If staff determines that changes are substantive, those changes will be forwarded to the PAC for review. Otherwise the PAC recommends that the Plan, and the municipal planning process, should be forwarded to the CCRPC Board for approval.

Executive Committee Recommendation: N/A

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the CCRPC Board approve the 2018 Milton Comprehensive Plan and confirm the Town of Milton’s planning process in accordance with the attached resolution.

For more information contact: Emily Nosse-Leirer, Planner 846-4490 ext. *15; enosse-leirer@ccrpcvt.org
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC)

Resolution

Milton’s 2018 Comprehensive Plan & Planning Process

WHEREAS, Title 24, V.S.A.§ 4350 in part requires that CCRPC shall review the municipal planning process of our member municipalities including review of plans; that each review shall include a public hearing which is noticed as provided in 24 V.S.A.§ 4350(b); and that before approving a plan the Commission shall find that it:

1. is consistent with the goals established in Section 4302 of this title;
2. is compatible with its Regional Plan;
3. is compatible with approved plans of other municipalities in the region;
4. contains all the elements included in § 4382(a)(1)-(12) of this Title.

WHEREAS, the CCRPC at its October 19, 2016 meeting approved the CCRPC Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans dealing with local plans and CCRPC action; and

WHEREAS, The Town of Milton, Vermont is a member municipality of this Commission; and

WHEREAS, The Town of Milton formally requested CCRPC to approve its 2018 Comprehensive Plan and confirm its planning process; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Advisory Committee reviewed the 2018 Comprehensive Plan and planning process; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Advisory Committee reviewed the records and recommended that the Commission approve Milton’s 2018 Comprehensive Plan as meeting the requirements of 24 V.S.A.§ 4350 and the Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans and confirms the community’s planning process as consistent with Title 24, Chapter 117.

WHEREAS, The Town of Milton Selectboard adopted the 2018 Milton Comprehensive Plan at a warned public hearing on February 5, 2018;

WHEREAS, the CCRPC held a warned public hearing at the CCRPC, located at 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, Vermont to receive comments on the Plan;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION, that, in compliance with 24 V.S.A.§ 4350 and the Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans, CCRPC approves the 2018 Milton Comprehensive Plan and the Commission finds that said Plan:

1. is consistent with the goals established in Section 4302 of Title 24;
2. is compatible with the 2013 Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the ECOS Plan, adopted June 19, 2013;
3. is compatible with the approved plans from other adjacent Chittenden County municipalities; and
4. contains all the elements included in § 4382(a)(1)-(12) and/or is making substantial progress toward attainment of the elements of this subsection;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION, that, in compliance with 24 V.S.A.§ 4350 and the Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans, CCRPC confirms the Town of Milton’s municipal planning process.

Dated at Winooski, this 21st day of March, 2018.

CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

________________________________________________
Christopher D. Roy, Chair
The Town of Milton has requested, per 24 V.S.A §4350, that the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (1) approve its 2018 Milton Comprehensive Plan; and (2) confirm its planning process.

This draft 2018 Milton Comprehensive Plan is an update and re-adoption of the 2013 Milton Comprehensive Plan. In accordance with statute, re-adoption means that this is a fully compliant plan that will expire eight years after adoption by the Selectboard. CCRPC reviewed the 2013 plan and met with Milton staff to discuss it in November 2016 as part of an informal review and consultation process. The 2018 Milton Comprehensive Plan addresses several new required elements and provides updated data. Staff have completed this formal review of the plan in advance of the Planning Commission’s December 5, 2017 hearing on the plan.

Following the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission’s (CCRPC’s) Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans (2013) and the statutory requirements of 24 V.S.A. Chapter 117, I have reviewed the draft 2018 Milton Comprehensive Plan to determine whether it is:

- Consistent with the general goals of §4302;
- Consistent with the specific goals of §4302;
- Contains the required elements of §4382;
- Compatible with the 2013 Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan (per §4350); and
- Compatible with approved plans of other municipalities (per §4350).

Additionally, I have reviewed the planning process requirements of §4350.

Staff Review Findings and Comments

1. The 2018 Milton Comprehensive Plan is consistent with the general goals of §4302. See the attached Appendix A submittal that describes how the Plan is consistent with these goals.

2. The 2018 Milton Comprehensive Plan is consistent with the specific goals of §4302. See the attached Appendix A submittal that describes how the Plan is consistent with these goals.

3. The 2018 Milton Comprehensive Plan contains the required elements of §4382. See the attached Appendix A submittal that describes how the Plan is consistent with these goals.

4. The 2018 Milton Comprehensive Plan is generally compatible with the planning areas, goals and strategies of the 2013 Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan.

5. The 2018 Milton Comprehensive Plan is compatible with the municipal plans for Georgia, Fairfax, Westford, Essex and Colchester.

6. Milton has a planning process in place that is sufficient for an approved plan. In addition, Milton has provided information about their planning budget and CCRPC finds that Milton is maintaining its efforts to provide local funds for municipal and regional planning.
Additional Comments/Questions:

CCRPC staff understands that the town intends this update to address new statutory requirements and to update the data included in the plan while maintaining the community vision and most of the goals and objectives of the 2013 plan. We understand that while town staff and the planning commission plan to conduct new community engagement and update the plan more thoroughly in the near future, they want to ensure that the town has an adopted plan by the February 2018 expiration date.

We find that the plan meets all the statutory requirements of 24 V.S.A. Chapter 117. While we appreciate the effort that has been put into updating the data charts throughout the plan, there are a few additional updates that we ask the planning commission to consider before the 2018 plan is finalized.

1. Several times throughout the plan, population, employment and housing forecasts from 2001 and 2002 are referenced. The CCRPC board has recently approved new population, household and employment forecasts for our 2018 ECOS Plan. These projections differ significantly from the 2001 forecasts, reflecting the county’s slowing growth rate. Consider updating the 2018 draft plan to reflect this more recent work. The forecasts can be found on our website: https://www.ccrpcvt.org/our-work/our-plans/ecos-regional-plan/#2018-update This was not updated, but was not necessary for adoption. Milton will be updating their plan to address data issues before the eight year expiration date.

2. There are transportation studies referenced in the transportation chapter and an appendix containing the titles and summaries of transportation studies, but these listings appear to reflect only studies completed by 2007. Consider updating this list with the titles and summaries of studies completed since then, and updating the reference to the 2005 MTP with the 2013 ECOS Plan. This was not updated, but was not necessary for adoption. Milton will be updating their plan to address data issues before the eight year expiration date.

3. While the introduction to the housing chapter correctly states that CCRPC’s 2004 housing targets are no longer accurate and that CCRPC no longer provides housing targets for our municipalities, the targets are mentioned multiple times elsewhere in the chapter. Consider eliminating Goal 6.1.3, as this goal states that the town should “continuously compare the housing stock to the CCRPC’s housing targets.” This was updated before plan adoption.

4. While the plan addresses all 14 state planning goals, the list on page 12 of the plan omits Goal 14: To encourage flood resilience communities. Consider adding this to the list to clarify that the plan is consistent with all 14 goals. This was updated before plan adoption.

When the town completes another update of the plan after the 2018 adoption, there are outdated statements that will need to be addressed. For example, the plan states that Georgia Mountain Community Wind is still being constructed and that the last amendment of the zoning regulations was in 2007. However, we do not consider these issues to affect the plan’s compliance with statute.

Proposed Motion & Next Steps:
PROPOSED MOTION: The PAC finds that the draft 2018 Milton Comprehensive Plan, as submitted, meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC approval, and that the municipality's planning process meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC confirmation.

Upon notification that the Plan has been adopted by the municipality, CCRPC staff will review the plan, and any information relevant to the confirmation process, for changes. If staff determines that changes are substantive, those changes will be forwarded to the PAC for review. Otherwise the PAC recommends that the Plan, and the municipal planning process, should be forwarded to the CCRPC Board for approval.
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
March 21, 2018
Agenda Item 6: 2018 Charlotte Town Plan, Approval and Confirmation

Issues: The Town of Charlotte has requested, per Title 24 V.S.A §4350, that the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (1) approve its 2018 Town Plan, and (2) confirm its planning process.

Attached is the proposed Resolution of approval and the staff report to the Planning Advisory Committee. The Planning Advisory Committee met on November 8, 2017 and recommended that the Plan, and the municipal planning process, should be forwarded to the CCRPC Board for approval. The Planning Advisory Committee meeting on November 8, 2017 served as CCRPC’s public hearing on the plan and was duly warned as such.

The Plan was adopted by the Voters of the Town of Charlotte on March 6, 2018. Staff is recommending approval by the CCRPC Board at this time.

Please note that municipal planning process confirmation and plan approval decisions shall be made by majority vote of the commissioners representing municipalities, in accordance with the bylaws of the CCRPC and Title 24 V.S.A.§ 4350(f).

Planning Advisory Committee Recommendation: The Planning Advisory Committee reviewed the Plan on Wednesday, November 8, 2017 at the CCRPC Offices and made the following motion:

The PAC finds that the draft 2018 Charlotte Town Plan, as submitted, meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC approval, and that the municipality's planning process meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC confirmation.

Upon notification that the Plan has been adopted by the municipality, CCRPC staff will review the plan, and any information relevant to the confirmation process, for changes. If staff determines that changes are substantive, those changes will be forwarded to the PAC for review. Otherwise the PAC recommends that the Plan, and the municipal planning process, should be forwarded to the CCRPC Board for approval.

Executive Committee Recommendation: N/A

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the CCRPC Board approve the 2018 Charlotte Town Plan and confirm the Town of Charlotte’s planning process in accordance with the attached resolution.

For more information contact: Emily Nosse-Leirer, Planner 846-4490 ext. *15; enosse-leirer@ccrpcvt.org
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC)  
Resolution  
2018 Charlotte Town Plan & Planning Process

WHEREAS, Title 24, V.S.A.§ 4350 in part requires that CCRPC shall review the municipal planning process of our member municipalities including review of plans; that each review shall include a public hearing which is noticed as provided in 24 V.S.A.§ 4350(b); and that before approving a plan the Commission shall find that it:

1. is consistent with the goals established in Section 4302 of this title;
2. is compatible with its Regional Plan;
3. is compatible with approved plans of other municipalities in the region;
4. contains all the elements included in § 4382(a)(1)-(12) of this Title.

WHEREAS, the CCRPC at its October 19, 2016 meeting approved the CCRPC Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans dealing with local plans and CCRPC action; and

WHEREAS, The Town of Charlotte, Vermont is a member municipality of this Commission; and

WHEREAS, The Town of Charlotte formally requested CCRPC to approve its 2018 Town Plan and confirm its planning process; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Advisory Committee reviewed the 2018 Town Plan and planning process; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Advisory Committee reviewed the records and recommended that the Commission approve Charlotte’s 2018 Town Plan as meeting the requirements of 24 V.S.A.§ 4350 and the Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans and confirms the community’s planning process as consistent with Title 24, Chapter 117.

WHEREAS, The Voters of the Town of Charlotte adopted the 2018 Charlotte Plan at Town Meeting Day on March 6, 2018;

WHEREAS, the CCRPC held a warned public hearing on November 8, 2017 at the CCRPC, located at 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, Vermont to receive comments on the Plan;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION, that, in compliance with 24 V.S.A.§ 4350 and the Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans, CCRPC approves the 2018 Charlotte Town Plan and the Commission finds that said Plan:

1. is consistent with the goals established in Section 4302 of Title 24;
2. is compatible with the 2013 Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the ECOS Plan, adopted June 19, 2013;
3. is compatible with the approved plans from other adjacent Chittenden County municipalities; and
4. contains all the elements included in § 4382(a)(1)-(12) and/or is making substantial progress toward attainment of the elements of this subsection;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION, that, in compliance with 24 V.S.A.§ 4350 and the Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans, CCRPC confirms the Town of Charlotte’s municipal planning process.

Dated at Winooski, this 21st day of March, 2018.

CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

__________________________________________________
Christopher D. Roy, Chair
The Town of Charlotte has requested, per 24 V.S.A §4350, that the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (1) approve its 2018 Town Plan; and (2) confirm its planning process.

This draft 2018 Charlotte Town Plan is a full rewrite of the 2013 Plan. (The 2008 Charlotte Town Plan was readopted in 2013 with some changes, and then amended on 3/1/2016 to include a consideration of Village Designation and a revised energy section.) This plan is intended to be presented to voters for adoption on Town Meeting Day in 2018.

CCRPC staff and the PAC previously completed a formal review of the Draft 2016 Charlotte Town Plan in advance of the Charlotte Selectboard’s 9/29/2016 public hearing on it. The PAC provided suggestions for strengthening the Plan’s compliance with state requirements, and wished to review the plan again before recommending that the CCRPC Board approve it. Those recommendations and their status can be seen in the attached memo, and this draft includes many of those changes. The Charlotte Planning Commission held another public hearing on the plan on October 12, 2017. This review is in advance of the Charlotte Selectboard’s public hearing on the plan, which has not been scheduled.

Following the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission’s (CCRPC’s) Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans (2013) and the statutory requirements of 24 V.S.A. Chapter 117, I have reviewed the draft 2018 Charlotte Town Plan to determine whether it is:

- Consistent with the general goals of §4302;
- Consistent with the specific goals of §4302;
- Contains the required elements of §4382;
- Compatible with the 2013 Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan (per §4350); and
- Compatible with approved plans of other municipalities (per §4350).

Additionally, I have reviewed the planning process requirements of §4350.

Staff Review Findings and Comments

1. The 2018 Charlotte Town Plan is consistent with all of the general goals of §4302. See the attached Appendix A submittal that describes how the Plan is consistent with these goals.

2. The 2018 Charlotte Town Plan is consistent with the specific goals of §4302. See the attached Appendix A submittal that describes how the Plan is consistent with these goals.

3. The 2018 Charlotte Town Plan contains the required elements of §4382. See the attached Appendix A submittal that describes compliance with these required elements.
4. The 2018 Charlotte Town Plan is generally compatible with the planning areas, goals and strategies of the 2013 Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan.

5. The 2018 Charlotte Town Plan is compatible with the municipal plans for Shelburne, Hinesburg, Monkton and Ferrisburgh.

6. Charlotte has a planning process in place that is sufficient for an approved plan. In addition, Charlotte has provided information about their planning budget and CCRPC finds that Charlotte is maintaining its efforts to provide local funds for municipal and regional planning.

Additional Comments/Questions:
CCRPC staff and the PAC have reviewed the Charlotte Town Plan several times in the last few years (see description above). While Staff does not find that any changes are necessary for approval and confirmation of the process by the CCRPC, the following recommendations are offered to improve the efficacy of plan implementation:

1. Terminology at the state level has recently changed from using Fluvial Erosion Hazard (FEH) areas to using River Corridors and River Corridor Protection Areas. In some places in the plan the new terminology is used (Map 4, Utilities and Facilities Strategy 17.g) but this should be used throughout.

2. While an implementation table is included in the back of the plan, it does not appear to have all the strategies from the plan in it. Are only priorities included? It would be easier to tell what is included if numbering was added. If that is because it is tracking the implementation of the last iteration of the plan, then it would be useful add all the latest strategies and to have more status reports (ex. completed, in progress, eliminated or new).

These changes were not made, but were not necessary for the approval and confirmation of the plan.

Additionally, for the next update of the plan, we suggest the following:
3. It would be helpful to have stronger linkages drawn between Chapter 1 and Chapter 2 of the plan. For example, water quality is discussed in Chapter 1, but there are no references to Tactical Basin Plans until Chapter 2. While this format makes sense, could the introduction explain the split more clearly, or could each section in Chapter 1 have a callout box stating what extra information can be found in Chapter 2?

Proposed Motion & Next Steps:
PROPOSED MOTION: The PAC finds that the draft 2018 Charlotte Town Plan, as submitted, meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC approval, and that the municipality's planning process meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC confirmation.

Upon notification that the Plan has been adopted by the municipality, CCRPC staff will review the plan, and any information relevant to the confirmation process, for changes. If staff determines that changes are substantive, those changes will be forwarded to the PAC for review.
Otherwise the PAC recommends that the Plan, and the municipal planning process, should be forwarded to the CCRPC Board for approval.
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
March 21, 2018
Agenda Item 8: Action Item

2020 Transportation Project Prioritization and Town Highway Bridge Pre-Candidate Prioritization

TAC/Staff Recommendation:
Approve the 2020 Regional Project Scores and Town Highway Bridge Pre-Candidate Regional Project Scores, with changes if any, and forward to VTrans.

Issues:
Each year the Vermont Legislature requires that projects in the Transportation Capital Program be prioritized. Specifically, they directed VTrans to develop a numerical grading system to assign a priority ranking to all paving, roadway, safety and traffic operations, state bridge, interstate bridge, and town highway bridge projects. The rating system was to consist of two separate, additive components as follows:

1. One component shall be an asset management-based factor which is objective and quantifiable and shall consider, without limitation, the following:
   - the existing safety conditions in the project area and the impact of the project on improving safety conditions;
   - the average, seasonal, peak, and nonpeak volume of traffic in the project area, including the proportion of traffic volume relative to total volume in the region, and the impact of the project on congestion and mobility conditions in the region;
   - the availability, accessibility, and usability of alternative routes;
   - the impact of the project on future maintenance and reconstruction costs.

2. The second component of the priority rating system was to consider the following factors:
   - the functional importance of the highway or bridge as a link in the local, regional, or state economy; and
   - the functional importance of the highway or bridge in the social and cultural life of the surrounding communities.

A prioritization methodology was developed as a collaborative effort between VTrans and the regional planning commissions (RPCs). VTrans provides technical input on projects to determine the first part of the project score and the RPCs provide input on the second part of the score.

VTrans Methodology Overview

Prioritization methodologies were developed for each program category listed in the Transportation Capital Program. The methodologies are summarized below.

Paving
   - Pavement Condition Index – 20 points (more points are given for higher levels of pavement deterioration)
Benefit/Cost – 60 points (output comes from a Pavement Management System software which considers the type of pavement treatment, traffic volumes and percentage of trucks)

Regional Priority – 20 points

Bridge

Bridge Condition – 30 points (considers the condition of components of the bridge such as the deck, superstructure and substructure)

Remaining Life – 10 points (considers the rate at which the bridge is deteriorating)

Functionality – 5 points (adequacy of the alignment and the width)

Load Capacity and Use – 15 points (considers if there is a weight restriction and the traffic volumes)

Waterway Adequacy and Scour Susceptibility – 10 points (characteristics of the waterway the bridge crosses, if applicable)

Project Momentum – 5 points (considers right-of-way and permit issues)

Benefit Cost Factor – 10 points (considers the benefit to the traveling public of keeping the bridge open)

Regional Priority – 15 points

Roadway

Highway System – 40 points (looks at highway sufficiency rating and network designation)

Cost per vehicle mile – 20 points

Project Momentum – 20 points (considers right-of-way and permitting issues)

Designated Downtown project – 10 bonus points

Regional Priority – 20 points

Traffic Operations

Intersection Capacity – 40 points (based on level of service)

Accident Rate – 20 points

Cost per Intersection Volume – 20 points

Project Momentum – 10 points (considers right-of-way and permitting issues)

Regional Input – 20 points

CCRPC Priority Methodology

CCRPC developed a methodology for regional priority scores in 2005. The methodology is based on planning factors MPOs are required to consider in their planning process, as stated in ISTEA and reiterated in subsequent Federal legislation. The methodology scores projects in each of the following categories: Economic Vitality; Safety and Security; Accessibility, Mobility and Connectivity; Environment, Energy and Quality of Life; Preservation of Existing System; and, Efficient System Management.

The methodology uses a project scoring sheet that identifies project characteristics that result in a score of High, Medium-High, Medium, Low or No Impact for each of the six scoring criteria. Each project receives one score for each planning factor. The score is determined by finding the highest scoring project characteristic that applies
to each project. Necessary information for scoring projects is derived from existing studies and data collected/processed by CCRPC, VTrans, consultants or towns. Only one score is applied to the project for each planning factor even though multiple characteristics may apply to the project.

In addition to the six scoring categories, projects receive points if the project is in the current TIP according to the following schedule:
  - 10 points for construction funds in the TIP
  - 8 points for right-of-way in the TIP
  - 6 points for engineering in the TIP

Projects receive only one score for the TIP Status item corresponding to the highest scoring project phase even if there are multiple phases listed in the TIP for the project.

The list of projects to be scored comes from the annual Transportation Capital Program and is supplied by VTrans. The list includes all projects in the Capital Program except rail projects, aviation projects, interstate projects, bridge maintenance projects, projects funded with federal safety funds, bike/ped and Transportation Alternatives awards and projects expected to be under construction in the near future.

Preliminary project scoring sheets were sent to TAC members having projects in their towns for review and comment.

The attached table lists projects in rank order by program category, from high score to low score. Ties between projects are broken in the following way: higher functional classes are place before lower functional classes. Functional class order is: Interstate, Principal Arterial, Minor Arterial, Major Collector. If ties still remain higher traffic volumes are place before lower traffic volumes.

**2020 Town Highway Bridge Pre-Candidate Prioritization**

VTrans also requests that all Regional Planning Commissions prioritize up to 10 town highway bridges as pre-candidate projects. This list queues projects to be added to the VTrans Town Highway Bridge Program in the future.

CCRPC scored town highway bridges using our Project Prioritization methodology described above. The prioritization methodology was applied to the 20 worst-condition town highway bridges, as ranked by VTrans, in the county. The prioritized list is attached.

**Additional Information**

All transportation projects funded by VTrans, with state or federal funds, must be included in the Transportation Capital Program. This program is developed by VTrans and approved by the Vermont Legislature.

Chittenden County projects funded with Federal transportation funds must also be included in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). However, inclusion in the TIP does not replace inclusion in the Capital Program – Chittenden County projects funded with federal transportation funds must be included in the Capital Program and the TIP.
The Capital Program includes three categories of projects, Candidate projects, Development & Evaluation project and Front of the Book Projects. These project types are defined below.

- **Candidate** - A project gets on the Candidate list after it has completed the planning process. Candidate projects are not anticipated to have significant expenditures for preliminary engineering and/or right-of-way during the budget year, and funding for construction is not anticipated within a predictable time-frame.

- **Development & Evaluation** - A project moves from the Candidate list to the Development and Evaluation list when the Project manager anticipates the project will proceed to preliminary plans within 12 to 24 months. Development and Evaluation projects are anticipated to have preliminary engineering and/or right-of-way expenditures during the budget year.

- **Front of the Book** - A project moves from the Development and Evaluation list to the front of the book when it has completed preliminary plan development. Front of the book projects are anticipated to have construction expenditures during the budget year and/or the following three years.

**TAC Recommendation:** Approve the 2020 Regional Project Scores and Town Highway Bridge Pre-Candidate Regional Project Scores, with changes if any, and forward to VTrans

**Staff Recommendation:** Approve the 2020 Regional Project Scores and Town Highway Bridge Pre-Candidate Regional Project Scores, with changes if any, and forward to CCRPC Commission

**For more information contact:** Christine Forde
cforde@ccrpct.org or 846-4490 ext. *13

**Attachments:**
- CCRPC Prioritized Project Lists – 2020
- CCRPC Project Scoring Sheet
# 2020 CCRPC Prioritized Project List

## Roadway Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>CCRPC Score</th>
<th>Economic Vitality</th>
<th>Safety and Security</th>
<th>Accessibility, Mobility and Connectivity</th>
<th>Environment, Energy and Quality of Life</th>
<th>Preservation of Existing System</th>
<th>Efficient System Management</th>
<th>TIP Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US2/Industrial Avenue, Williston</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>CON-3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit 12 Stage 1, Williston - Shared Use Path Under I-89 and New VT2A Lane from Marshall to I-89 Ramp -- CIRC PHASE III</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>ROW-1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susie Wilson Road Improvements, Essex - CIRC PHASE III</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Circ Alt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prim/West Lakeshore Drive Intersection, Colchester</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>CON-1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Street, S. Burlington</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>CON-1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT2A/James Brown Drive, Williston - CIRC PHASE I</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>CON-1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit 12 Stage 3, Williston - Diverging Diamond Interchange -- CIRC PHASE III</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Circ Alt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit 12 Stage 2, Williston - New Grid Streets and at grade intersection -- CIRC PHASE III</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Circ Alt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT2A Reconstruction, Colchester - CIRC PHASE III</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Circ Alt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT2A Culvert Rehab</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>CON-3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen Brook Stormwater</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>PE-1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit 12 Stage 4, Williston - VT2A Boulevard from grid street to US2 -- CIRC PHASE III</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Circ Alt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT117/North Williston Road Hazard Mitigation, Essex - CIRC PHASE III</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Circ Alt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View Road Improvements, Williston - CIRC PHASE III</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Circ Alt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## New Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>CCRPC Score</th>
<th>Economic Vitality</th>
<th>Safety and Security</th>
<th>Accessibility, Mobility and Connectivity</th>
<th>Environment, Energy and Quality of Life</th>
<th>Preservation of Existing System</th>
<th>Efficient System Management</th>
<th>TIP Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crescent Connector</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>CON-1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champlain Parkway, Burlington</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>CON-1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railyard Enterprise Project, Burlington</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>PE-3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit 12B EIS</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Drive, S. Burlington</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>CCRPC Score</td>
<td>Economic Vitality</td>
<td>Safety and Security</td>
<td>Accessibility, Mobility and Connectivity</td>
<td>Environment, Energy and Quality of Life</td>
<td>Preservation of Existing System</td>
<td>Efficient System Management</td>
<td>TIP Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic Operations &amp; Safety</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit 16 Improvements, Colchester - CIRC PHASE I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>CON-1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severance Corners, Colchester - CIRC PHASE II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>CON-3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT116/CVU Road, Hinesburg</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>CON-1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelburne Road Roundabout, Burlington</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>CON-1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US7/Middle Road/Railroad Street, Milton</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>CON-3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US2/Trader Lane</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>CON-1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT2A/Industrial Avenue, Williston - CIRC PHASE III</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>ROW-1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US7/Ferry Road</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>CON-1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT15/Sand Hill, CIRC PHASE II</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>CON-3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US7/Harbor Road/Falls Road, Shelburne</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blakely Road/Laker Lane, Colchester - CIRC PHASE III</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>CON-1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT117/North Williston Road, Essex - CIRC PHASE III</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>PE-1,2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* US7/Harbor Road/Falls Road has recently completed scoping and CCRPC seeks to have this project added to the Capital Program. The project has been scored, but not ranked because it is not currently part of the transportation program.
## 2020 CCRPC Prioritized Project List
### Paving, State Bridge and Town Highway Bridge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paving</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>CCRPC Score</th>
<th>Economic Vitality</th>
<th>Safety and Security</th>
<th>Accessibility, Mobility and Connectivity</th>
<th>Environment, Energy and Quality of Life</th>
<th>Preservation of Existing System</th>
<th>Efficient System Management</th>
<th>TIP Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VT117, Essex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>CON-1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT117, Jericho-Richmond</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>CON-1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT15, Essex-Underhill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT15, Underhill-Cambridge</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>CON-3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US2, Richmond-Bolton</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Town Highway Bridge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town Highway Bridge</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>CCRPC Score</th>
<th>Economic Vitality</th>
<th>Safety and Security</th>
<th>Accessibility, Mobility and Connectivity</th>
<th>Environment, Energy and Quality of Life</th>
<th>Preservation of Existing System</th>
<th>Efficient System Management</th>
<th>TIP Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Bridge 32 on Camels Hump Road (TH22) - west of Fielder Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underhill Bridge 7 on Pleasant Valley Road - near Deane Road</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Bridge 10 on Main Road - south of Beane Road</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jericho Bridge 15 on Brown's Trace - near Fitzsimonds Road</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Bridge 31 on Dorset Street - south of Carpenter Road</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>CCRPC Rank</td>
<td>CCRPC Score</td>
<td>VTrans Rank</td>
<td>CCRPC Planning Designation</td>
<td>Roadway Functional Class</td>
<td>Condition - Deck/ Superstructure/Substructure (out of 10)</td>
<td>Detour Length (Miles)</td>
<td>Average Daily Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHELBURNE</td>
<td>BR7 on Bay Road over the LaPlatte River</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Major Collector</td>
<td>5/6/5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNTINGTON</td>
<td>BR9H on Main Road over Texas Hill Brook north of Texas Hill Road</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>CCRPC Village</td>
<td>Major Collector</td>
<td>6/6/7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINESBURG</td>
<td>BR6 on Charlotte Road over the LaPlatte River</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>CCRPC Village</td>
<td>Major Collector</td>
<td>Culvert - 5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINESBURG</td>
<td>BR9 on Hollow Road over Hollow Brook - south of Hinesburg Hollow Road</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>Major Collector</td>
<td>6/6/6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERHILL</td>
<td>BR31 on Green Street</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>CCRPC Village</td>
<td>Town Road</td>
<td>6/6/7</td>
<td>No alt route</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINESBURG</td>
<td>BR26 on Leavensworth Road over the LaPlatte River</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Town Road</td>
<td>6/5/8</td>
<td>No alt route</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHMOND</td>
<td>BR9R on Huntington Road over the Huntington River - north of Mayo Road</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Major Collector</td>
<td>7/7/5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURLINGTON</td>
<td>BR2 on Queen City Park Road</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>Town Road</td>
<td>5/7/7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNTINGTON</td>
<td>B14 on Main Road over Huntington River</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Major Collector</td>
<td>8/6/6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINESBURG</td>
<td>BR11 on Silver Street over Lewis Creek - near Monkton Town Line</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Major Collector</td>
<td>7/7/7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERHILL</td>
<td>BR8 on Pleasant Valley Road over Browns River - north of Beartown Road</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>CCRPC Village</td>
<td>Major Collector</td>
<td>6/7/7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JERICHO</td>
<td>BR13 on Nashville Road over Mill Brook - near Bentley Lane</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Rural Minor Collector</td>
<td>6/7/6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOLTON</td>
<td>BR8 on Duxbury Road over Mill Brook</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Rural Minor Collector</td>
<td>6/7/7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLCHESTER</td>
<td>BR14 on Colchester Pond Road</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Town Road</td>
<td>7/8/5</td>
<td>No alt route</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOLTON</td>
<td>BR7 on Cemetery Road over Mill Brook</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Town Road</td>
<td>7/5/7</td>
<td>No alt route</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNTINGTON</td>
<td>B7H on Main Road over Cobb Brook - south of Charlie Smith Road</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Major Collector</td>
<td>8/8/7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JERICHO</td>
<td>BR 17 on Browns Trace over Lee River - north of Lee River Road</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Major Collector</td>
<td>6/7/6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOLTON</td>
<td>BR15 on Joiner Lane over Joiner Brook</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Town Road</td>
<td>5/6/7</td>
<td>No alt route</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JERICHO</td>
<td>BR38 on Macomber Place over Lee River</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Town Road</td>
<td>7/6/5</td>
<td>No alt route</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNTINGTON</td>
<td>BR29 on Charlie Smith Road over Cobb Brook</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Town Road</td>
<td>6/7/7</td>
<td>No alt route</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CCRPC Project Prioritization
### Scoring Criteria

#### Planning Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Vitality</th>
<th>Safety and Security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support the economic vitality especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency</td>
<td>Increase the safety and security of the transportation system for motorized and nonmotorized users</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Characteristics</th>
<th>High Impact (10 points)</th>
<th>Medium-High Impact (7 points)</th>
<th>Medium Impact (5 points)</th>
<th>Low Impact (3 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Project provides new or improved access, including transit and pedestrian/bike access, to or within a Vermont designated Growth Center, Downtown, New Town Center or Village Center or a CCRPC designated Enterprise Planning Area</td>
<td>□ Project provides new or improved access, including transit and pedestrian/bike access, to or within a CCRPC designated Center, Metro or Village Planning area, or a municipal designated growth area</td>
<td>□ Project that provides new or improved access, including transit and pedestrian/bike access, to or within a future activity area identified in a municipal plan or study</td>
<td>□ Other transportation improvement that supports economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Project on an interstate or principal arterial that improves access for freight</td>
<td>□ Project on a minor arterial or major collector that improves access for freight</td>
<td>□ Bus station/stop amenities and shelters</td>
<td>□ Repave a minor arterial or major collector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Project improves airport access</td>
<td>□ Project addresses environmental issues that could impact economic development (stormwater, flood resiliency)</td>
<td>□ Project maintains or improves an access facility important to rural community including town highway bridges</td>
<td>□ Repave a minor arterial or major collector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Project improves access, including transit and pedestrian/bike access, to tourism facility</td>
<td>□ New/expanded Park and Ride Lot</td>
<td>□ Repave interstate or principal arterial</td>
<td>□ Dedicated pedestrian/bike facility in a location with a documented safety problem on a Major Collector roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Project that improves access to the rail network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Safety related transportation project identified in a study/report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                          | □ Safety improvement in a VTrans identified High Crash Location – intersection or section of roadway | □ Bridge improvement for a bridge with critical safety deficiencies (sufficiency rating up to 25) | □ Dedicated pedestrian/bike facility making intermodal linkages or regional connections in a location with a documented existing safety problem | □ Repave interstate or principal arterial                                                                                                                                 |
|                          | □ Bridge improvement for a bridge with serious safety issues (sufficiency rating of 25.1 to 50) | □ New median barriers, guardrails or shoulders                                                | □ Intersection/roadway safety improvement in a location with a documented safety problem | □ Dedicated pedestrian/bike facility with a documented safety problem on a Principal or Minor Arterial roadway                                                                                                                                 |
|                          | □ New median barriers, guardrails or shoulders                                          | □ Intersection/roadway safety improvement in a location with a documented safety problem       | □ Rail grade crossing improvement or warning signs                                          | □ Dedicated pedestrian/bike facility with a documented safety problem on a Principal or Minor Arterial roadway                                                                                                                                 |
|                          | □ Rail grade crossing improvement or warning signs                                       | □ Dedicated pedestrian/bike facility with a documented safety problem on a Principal or Minor Arterial roadway | □ Dedicated pedestrian/bike facility on a Principal or Minor Arterial roadway              | □ Safety related transportation project identified in a study/report                                                                                                                                 |
|                          | □ Dedicated pedestrian/bike facility making intermodal linkages or regional connections in a location with a documented existing safety problem | □ Dedicated pedestrian/bike facility on a Principal or Minor Arterial roadway                | □ Dedicated pedestrian/bike facility making intermodal linkages or regional connections in a location with a documented existing safety problem | □ Safety related transportation project identified in a study/report                                                                                                                                 |

### No Impact (0 Points)

|                         | □ No discernible benefit                                                              | □ No discernible benefit                                                                        |

* Improved access is defined as increase in capacity or reduced delay
## Project Characteristics

### High Impact (10 points)
- Bicycle/pedestrian facility making intermodal linkages or regional connections to or within a Vermont designated Growth Center, Downtown, New Town Center or Village Center
- Project that facilitates movement of goods or improves intermodal connectivity to or within a Vermont designated Growth Center, Downtown, New Town Center or Village Center
- Project that benefits areas where 10% or more of the households are below the poverty level
- Bridge or other project that maintains connectivity or reduces flood vulnerability in a location with no alternative route for residents or businesses or a detour of 25 miles or more

### Medium-High Impact (7 points)
- Bicycle/pedestrian facility making intermodal linkages or regional connections to or within a CCRPC designated Center, Metro, Enterprise or Village Planning area or municipal designated growth area
- Project that facilitates movement of goods or intermodal connectivity to or within a CCRPC designated Center, Metro, Enterprise or Village Planning area or municipal designated growth area
- Project maintains or improve connectivity on interstate or principal arterial
- Bridge or other project that maintains connectivity or reduces flood vulnerability in a location with limited alternative routes for residents or businesses (detour 10 – 24.9 miles)

### Medium Impact (5 points)
- Bicycle/pedestrian facility making intermodal linkages or regional connections to or within a locally important activity center
- Project that facilitates freight movement or intermodal connectivity to or within a locally important activity center
- Project maintains or improves connectivity on minor arterial or major collector
- Project that maintains connectivity and mobility for a rural community including town highway bridges with a detour of 5 – 9.9 miles

### Low Impact (3 points)
- Project that maintain or improve connectivity on minor arterials or major collectors
- Bridge project with a detour less than 5 miles

### No Impact (0 Points)
- No discernible benefits

## Planning Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessibility, Mobility and Connectivity</th>
<th>Environment, Energy and Quality of Life</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight</td>
<td>Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, improve the quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and State and local planned growth and economic development patterns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### High Impact (10 points)
- Pedestrian/bike facility making intermodal linkages or regional connections resulting in the potential for reducing VMT
- Clean fuel buses/vehicles and alternative fuel infrastructure
- VMT reduction program including transportation demand management and park and ride lots
- Transportation project that encourages compact land use or transit oriented development
- Transportation project that reduces stormwater runoff or improves water quality or other stream ecological conditions for impaired waterways

### Medium-High Impact (7 points)
- Transportation project that reduces delay at an existing high volume intersection or group of intersections within a Vermont designated Growth Center, Downtown, New Town Center, Village Center, CCRPC designated Center, Metro, Enterprise or Village Planning area or municipal designated growth area
- Traffic calming/streetscape project within a Vermont designated Growth Center, Downtown, New Town Center, Village Center, CCRPC designated Center, Metro, Enterprise or Village Planning area or municipal designated growth area
- Projects that remove traffic from a neighborhood within a Vermont designated Growth Center, Downtown, New Town Center, Village Center, CCRPC designated Center, Metro, Enterprise or Village Planning area or municipal designated growth area
- Pedestrian/bike facility making local connections resulting in the potential for reduced VMT
- Transportation project that reduces stormwater runoff or improves water quality or other stream ecological conditions for non-impaired waterways

### Medium Impact (5 points)
- Transportation project that reduces delay at an existing high volume intersection or group of intersections
- Necessary bridge or roadway improvements within a Vermont designated Growth Center, Downtown, New Town Center, Village Center, CCRPC designated Center, Metro, Enterprise or Village Planning area or municipal designated growth area
- Necessary bridge or roadway improvements on interstate or principal arterial

### Low Impact (3 points)
- Necessary bridge or roadway improvements on minor arterial or major collector
- Other project that has a positive effect on the environment, energy use or quality of life in the region
- Other bridge improvements

### No Impact (0 Points)
- No discernible benefits
### Planning Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Characteristics</th>
<th>Preservation of Existing System</th>
<th>Efficient System Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system</td>
<td>To encourage and promote the safe and efficient management and operation of integrated, intermodal transportation systems to serve the mobility needs of people and freight and foster economic growth and development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Impact (10 points)</td>
<td>□ Reconstruction, resurfacing or intersection improvement for a project with a documented critical need □ Bridge structural improvement for a bridge documented to be in danger of being closed or weight restricted (sufficiency rating of less than 25) □ Reconstruction or resurfacing of an existing pedestrian/bike facility making intermodal linkages or regional connections with a documented signification need</td>
<td>□ TDM strategies, programs and incentives including new or expanded park and ride lot that would reduce VMT □ Traffic signal interconnect or other ITS improvement to reduce congestion □ Improvement that reduces congestion to roadway, corridors or intersection with significant congestion (V/C over 1.5) □ Pedestrian/bike facility making intermodal linkages or regional connections resulting in the potential to reduce congestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-High Impact (7 points)</td>
<td>□ Reconstruction, resurfacing or intersection improvement for a project with a documented significant need □ Bridge structural improvement for a bridge with documented significant structural deficiencies (sufficiency rating of 25 – 50) □ Reconstruction or resurfacing of an existing pedestrian/bike facility with a documented significant need □ Necessary improvement to an existing park and ride lot</td>
<td>□ Improvements that reduces congestion to roadway, corridor or intersection (V/C over 1) □ New interchange on limited access highway, in a location with significant congestion, to relieve congestion □ New signals or roundabout where warranted □ New connections between existing streets to facilitate the use of alternative routes and reduce congestion □ Necessary improvements to operate existing bridges and roadways on interstate or principal arterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Impact (5 points)</td>
<td>□ Reconstruction, resurfacing or intersection improvement for a project with a documented moderate need □ Bridge structural improvement for a bridge with documented moderate structural deficiencies (sufficiency rating of 50.1-70) □ Reconstruction or resurfacing of an existing pedestrian/bike facility</td>
<td>□ Improvement that reduces congestion to roadway, corridor or intersection (V/C less than 1) □ Median treatment or access management □ Bicycle/pedestrian facility making locally important connections resulting in the potential for reducing congestion □ Improvements that reduce travel time □ Necessary improvements to operate existing bridges and roadways on minor arterial or major collector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Impact (3 points)</td>
<td>□ Other improvement to the existing transportation system □ Transportation improvement that has an indirect benefit to the existing transportation system</td>
<td>□ Necessary improvements to operate town highway bridges on minor collectors and local roads □ Other improvements that benefit the transportation system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Impact (0 Points)</td>
<td>□ No discernible benefits</td>
<td>□ No discernible benefits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Vermont Climate Pledge Coalition

Background: Chris Shaw, South Burlington Representative, in reviewing the Draft ECOS Plan asked the CCRPC to consider joining the Vermont Climate Pledge Coalition. The Executive Committee discussed this at the March 7th meeting and decided to put this on the Board agenda and recommended the Board ask the Energy Sub-Committee to make a recommendation on whether CCRPC should join the Climate Pledge. The Energy Sub-Committee is a sub-committee of the Long Range Planning Committee and is charged with guiding the update of the ECOS Plan energy sections. At this time, the Energy Sub-Committee does not have a meeting scheduled.

The Vermont Climate Pledge Coalition, coordinated by the City of Burlington and the Energy Action Network, is a group totaling 45 organizations consisting of Vermont municipalities, non-profits, colleges and universities, businesses, farms, and other community organizations committed to reducing carbon emissions and help Vermont meet the U.S. pledge to reduce greenhouse gas emissions levels from 2005 by 26-28% by 2025. One central purpose of the Coalition is to demonstrate a commitment to the Paris Agreement despite the Federal government’s withdrawal. Additionally, coalition members are encouraged to make pledges via the Climate Pledge Tracker. If CCRPC becomes a member, CCRPC can record actions already taken and pledge to take new actions which may include ongoing activities and accomplishments such as encouraging transportation alternatives, developing enhanced energy plans, and installing EV charging equipment.

Current coalition members include but are not limited to City of Burlington, City of South Burlington, Burton, Dealer.com, Efficiency Vermont, Local Motion, Lake Champlain Regional Chamber of Commerce, University of Vermont Health Network, Vermont Businesses for Social Responsibility, Vermont Gas Systems, Vermont League of Cities and Towns, and Vermont Natural Resources Council. There may be a concern about CCRPC joining when only two of our municipalities have joined.

There may be benefits to joining the Vermont Climate Pledge Coalition. The Climate Pledge Tracker is a useful tool for sharing resources and educating others on planning for an energy future that is clean and affordable. By joining the coalition, CCRPC will elevate the work already being done on climate mitigation and lead by example in becoming a member. Additionally, the draft ECOS Plan includes an action encouraging entities to join the coalition. Strategy 2.4.a.vi. reads: “Use the Energy Action Network (EAN) Community Energy Dashboard to educate residents and municipalities about opportunities to reduce energy use and switch to renewable energy sources. Additionally, institutions (including municipalities, institutions of higher education, businesses and non-profits) can use the Vermont Climate Pledge Coalition Tracker to upload actions that will help the State achieve its 90% renewable energy 2050 goal.”

Executive Committee Recommendation: The Executive Committee voted to put this on the board agenda and recommended the Board send it to the Energy Subcommittee for further review and recommendation.

Staff Contact: Melanie Needle, Senior Planner, mneedle@ccrpcvt.org
Comment letter on draft MS4 permit

Background: In February the Vermont Agency of Natural Resources (ANR) provided public notice of the draft General Permit 3-9014 (2018) for Stormwater Discharges from Regulated Small Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems and Certain Developed Lands (MS4 General Permit). The purpose of the permit is as follows:

This general permit (referred to as the “MS4 GP”) is for stormwater discharges from regulated small MS4s in Vermont, to the extent of the traditional municipalities’ boundaries, roads requiring permit coverage under 10 V.S.A. § 1264(c)(6), municipally owned or controlled impervious surfaces of three acres or greater requiring permit coverage under 10 V.S.A. § 1264(c)(7), and developed lands for which those municipalities have assumed full legal responsibility. This general permit incorporates the requirements from the previously issued MS4 GP and includes requirements to meet the EPA-approved Lake Champlain total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) for phosphorus. This general permit also includes new road stormwater management standards, identical to those included in the Municipal Roads General Permit (MRGP), to provide traditional municipalities subject to this general permit the ability to develop Phosphorus Control Plans (PCPs) that simultaneously meet the statutory requirements for municipal road stormwater management in addition to the requirements for other developed lands within the municipality.

Nine municipalities [Milton, Colchester, Essex, Essex Junction, Winooski, Burlington, Williston, South Burlington and Shelburne] and two entities [Burlington Int’l Airport and UVM] are subject to this draft permit.

Public comments will be accepted through 4:30 p.m. on Friday, March 23, 2018. The draft permit as well as several other useful documents can be viewed here.

http://dec.vermont.gov/watershed/stormwater/permit-information-applications-fees/ms4-permit#New

Staff Recommendation: Members of the MS4 Subcommittee developed the talking points in the attached draft letter and the Subcommittee voted at its 3/7 meeting to ask the CCRPC Board to review and consider approval of the comment letter and subsequent submission to DEC.

Staff Contact: Dan Albrecht, Senior Planner, dalbrecht@ccrpcvt.org
Direct Line: 861-0133
To: Christy Witters
DEC Stormwater Program

From: Dan Albrecht, Senior Planner on behalf of
CCRPC Board of Directors

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft MS4 General Permit 3-9014. Please consider these comments developed by our MS4 Subcommittee of our Clean Water Advisory Committee at its March 7th, 2018 meeting and subsequently adopted by our full Board at its March 21, 2018 meeting.

1.1 Purpose

1. Please clarify if the MS4 boundaries are expanding. Also, provide clarity on the fees associated with the MS4 boundary and expanding to the traditional boundary.

2.3 Limitations on Coverage

2. Please spell out the acronym CERCLA.

3.1 Submittal of NOI, Necessary Attachments, and Application Fee

3. When an MS4 submits an amendment or application to the Agency for technical review, what are the fees associated with the review?

3.8 Amendments

4. Please spell out the acronym WQRP.

5.1 Comprehensive Plan for Covered Stormwater Discharges

5. In the second sentence, it states that the SWMP must be signed in accordance with Subpart 9.8 of this permit. It appears that this should refer to Subpart 10.8 Signatory Requirements.

5.2 Reviewing and Updating Stormwater Management Programs (SWMP)

6. The Flow Restoration Plans (FRPs) and Phosphorus Control Plans (PCPs) are living documents and will be updated regularly as the MS4s implement the Plans. Does the Agency require a full submittal of the FRPs and PCPs every time they are updated?
Please provide clarity on the extent that MS4s can update their FRPs and PCPs without having to go through the formal review process. What kind of change requires the FRP and PCP to go through the amendment process as outlined under 3.8 Amendments? The MS4s would prefer to notify the Agency of changes to the FRPs and PCPs with the submittal of their annual reports or have them understood to be living documents that change frequently.

6.2 Minimum Control Measures

7. Please identify what specific changes have been made to the Minimum Control Measures that differ from the 2012 MS4 General Permit 3-9014.

7. Assumption of Responsibility for Previously Permitted Stormwater Systems

8. Please elaborate on the definition of “full legal responsibility.” If an MS4 is going to have “full legal responsibility” of a stormwater system, the MS4 must also have proper infrastructure in place to adequately access the stormwater system in order to maintain it. It is recommended that the language in the permit reflects this point.

8.2 Lake Champlain Phosphorus Control Plan (PCP) Requirements

9. Under 8.2.A.2.d, the permit states that stormwater BMPs installed after 2010 and permitted offset projects installed after 2002 shall be included in the phosphorus reduction calculation. Please clarify the reasoning behind using 2010 as the baseline date for the implementation of BMPs.
10. “After 2010” and “after 2002” is ambiguous and open to interpretation. It is recommended that the specific dates of 1/1/2002 and 1/1/2010 be listed in the permit.
11. The MS4s are responsible for phosphorus reductions on municipally owned or controlled impervious surfaces of three acres or greater and developed lands for which they have assumed full legal responsibility. DEC is releasing a developed lands permit that will target impervious surfaces of three acres or greater. Please clarify whether MS4s will receive credit towards their percent reduction for these properties that fall under DEC’s jurisdiction and lie within the MS4’s boundary.
12. It is recommended that DEC encourages the MS4 communities to work together to develop and implement PCPs similar to the development and implementation of the FRPs and SWMPs.
13. MS4s worked together to create FRPs. Please provide clarity on how DEC will decide how MS4s will receive phosphorus credit on BMPs that are implemented under a joint FRP.

8.3 Municipal Road Requirements
Note: The following comments do not apply to the three non-traditional MS4s.
14. The definition of an outfall under the Municipal Roads requirement is inconsistent with MS4s have used under their SWMP. It is recommended that the word “outfall” is replaced with “discharge point” under 8.3.A.1.a.
15. Currently, municipalities are not required to maintain Class 4 roads. MS4s believe that maintenance on Class 4 roads is tied to drainage and erosion. It is recommended that no permit requirements should be established on Class 4 roads unless and until statute is clarified to specifically require this responsibility.

9.1 Monitoring
16. It is requested that DEC provide a link to the specific Discharge Monitoring Report they’d like MS4s to use.

Appendices
17. Please provide any additional appendices that are associated with this permit.
The meeting was called to order at 4:35 p.m. by Brian Bigelow, Chair of the Finance Committee.

1. **Approve October 25, 2017 Finance Committee Minutes.** MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BRIAN BIGELOW TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 25, 2017 AS WRITTEN. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

2. **Review of Financial Reports – FY18 first half (July-December 2017).**
   a. **Balance sheet.** Cash in checking (Operating): $282,173. Cash in savings (match): $201,027. Cash in money market & CDs (Reserve): $406,771. Current assets over current liabilities: $499,381. Total available for match $153,704. **Income statement:** Rows 4&5, ACCD funds are expending slightly above budget which is expected. The transportation staff billing is slightly under budget to date, but we expect that will increase in the second half of the fiscal year. December is often one of our lowest billing months due to the holidays, as well as July. Salaries and benefits expenses are both under budget to date. Net income through December 2017 is ($57,566), which is not good, but totally expected because of our lower indirect rate. We do expect billing to rise in the second half and hopefully have the deficit at under $100,000. The January report will include new budget numbers from the mid-year adjustment. Forest noted that expenses for Car Share will be higher because we hadn’t received any billing for a few months. We also have reduced our EV fleet to one vehicle. We will look into obtaining another EV or two this spring as the lease on the current EV runs out this fall. We hope to find EVs that have a greater mileage range so staff can use them for trips to Montpelier. We typically use the EVs more in the summer when our interns are in the field.
   b. **Cash Flow Targets.** Cash flows were strong at the end of 2017. This is partly the result of generating positive income and partly the result of having other “agency” funds in our cash pool. The current Cash Flow projects show us exceeding projections. However, after January, nearly $300,000 of CCOA funds will have transferred out of our cash balances. After a brief discussion about the projections, members asked if these number included the reduction of the CCOA funds. Forest will research this. (NOTE: Forest did confirm that these numbers do reflect that reduction.)

3. **Approve Journal Entries – 2nd quarter – Oct-Dec 2017.** MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE JOURNAL ENTRIES FOR 2ND QUARTER FY18. BRIAN BIGELOW SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. (Jeff Carr arrived.) He did not have any questions on the journal entries.
4. **Discuss Finance Committee Schedule through May.** Forest noted that since we are in the process of preparing the FY19 UPWP, we should probably meet in March and April. After a brief discussion it was agreed to have a stand alone meeting on March 28\(^{th}\) and to meet jointly with the Executive Committee on May 2\(^{nd}\) to finalize the budget.

5. **Other Business.** There was no other business.

6. **Adjournment.** JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O’BRIEN TO ADJOURN AT 4:59 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc
CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

DATE: Wednesday, February 21, 2018
TIME: 5:00 p.m.
PLACE: CCRPC offices, 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404
PRESENT: Chris Roy, Chair  Michael O'Brien, Vice-Chair
Brian Bigelow, Secretary-Treasurer  Barbara Elliott, At-Large<5,000
John Zicconi, At-Large >5,000  Andy Montroll, Immediate Past Chair
Staff: Charlie Baker, Executive Director  Reginal Mahony, Planning Program Manager
Eleni Churchill, Trans. Program Mgr.  Forest Cohen, Senior Business Manager

Th meeting was called to order at 5:04 p.m. by the Chair, Chris Roy.

1. Changes to the Agenda, Members’ Items. There were no changes other than Charlie had a couple more items under his report.

2. Approval of January 3, 2018 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BARBARA ELLIOTT, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 3, 2018 WITH CORRECTIONS. Bernie noted that Barbara had given her two grammatical corrections to the minutes, which she will add. MOTION CARRIED WITH BARBARA ABSTAINING.

3. Act 250 & Sec. 248 Applications. Regina noted that the first two letters just need ratification as members approved them via email earlier this month.
   a. East Allen Street Mixed Use Development, Winooski, #4C1309. BRIAN BIGELOW MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BARBARA ELLIOTT, TO RATIFY THE LETTER TO THE D.E.C. REGARDING THIS PROJECT. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
   b. Snyder Hotel, Williston #4C0887-1R-1. John Zicconi disclosed that Bob Snyder is a friend and neighbor of his. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION TO RATIFY THE LETTER FOR SNYDER HOTEL IN WILLISTON. ANDY MONTROLL SECONDED, AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
   c. Hilton Garden Inn, Burlington #4C1253-2. Regina noted that this is an after-the-fact approval of signage at the Hilton Garden Inn. The building had been permitted by the district commission and Burlington and is constructed. The new issue is the signage which was constructed and had been permitted by the City of Burlington. After a brief discussion, JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO APPROVE THE LETTER TO THE D.E.C. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
   d. Regina noted that we had talked about the sign on top of Water Tower Hill in Colchester. That Act 250 permit was denied under aesthetics via Colchester zoning regulations which state that in accordance with state law if a sign can be seen from a limited access highway it is prohibited.

4. ECOS Plan Update – Top 10 Actions. Regina said the Top Actions for the next Five Years are in the plan. We have some time to discuss these at the board meeting as well. John likes the list. When asked if there has been any reaction to this list, Regina said not yet. It was noted that these are not in any order of priority. Members deferred to discussion at the board meeting. There were no recommendations from the TAC.
5. **Transportation Performance Measures Report.** Eleni reviewed the memo from the meeting packet. After a lengthy discussion, Mike O’Brien made a motion that the Executive Committee recommend the CCRPC Board accept the VTrans statewide safety targets as reported in the 2018 HSIP report and not set regional (MPO) targets this year (2018). John Zicconi seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

6. **Chair/Executive Director’s Report.**
   a. **UPWP Update.** Charlie noted the 2nd UPWP committee meeting will be held tomorrow. Mike O’Brien, Barbara Elliott and John Zicconi are on the committee. We received requests for projects requiring less money than we have available. There are a couple of questions on some of the projects, which should be answered at tomorrow’s meeting.
   b. **Economics of Housing.** Regina reported that we held a workshop on January 29th with great participation (about 50 people) from selectboards, housing committees, planning commissions, UVM, VHFA. There were four panelists from Champlain Housing Trust, Housing Vermont, Redstone and Brad Dousevicz, Inc. The general idea was to discuss what goes into the cost of housing. One of the South Burlington Housing Committee members asked if CCRPC could hold regional workshops for housing committees. So we have selected a potential date of April 30th and Charlie said we may want to offer a bigger event for the kick-off and have more managers and elected officials there.
   c. **ECOS Annual Report.** The report is out for review by our partners and should be available soon.
   d. **Airport Noise Compatibility TAC.** Charlie noted that this is airport trying to have us help them decide what to put in their plan for noise compatibility. In the past, they have purchased and demolished homes in the area. This time there are a couple of options: the airport can purchase the homes and insulate them and resell them; or, the airport will insulate the homes for the residents and they can remain. On another issue, Charlie said we may be asked to testify at the legislature regarding a proposal for charter changes for South Burlington, Burlington and Winooski regarding the airport. The second piece of proposed legislation is to ask VTrans and ACCD to look at regional governance of the airport. Burlington is opposed to this bill going forward, but Charlie wanted members to be aware of it. After a brief discussion, members recommend that the Executive Committee inform Charlie that if he is asked about regional governance of the airport that we would prefer not to have anything to do with it. It was made clear that this request is not in response to the F-35 issue. Mike noted that regional governance has been discussed in the past, and there are many things to consider. It was agreed that until the Burlington City Council asks for a change, we want to leave it alone.
   e. **Regional Dispatch Update.** Charlie informed members that he did an Op Ed piece for the Burlington Free Press to explain what the Regional Dispatch vote is about as there seem to be many misconceptions out there. He noted that the vote does not commit the towns to any costs, it just sets up the entity for governance and then all of the cost details can be worked out. (Charlie will forward this to members.) There will be a press event on Monday with police, fire and rescue, Aaron Frank and Charlie to talk to the press. There will be more public relations efforts before Town Meeting, as well as towns using their social media contacts.
   f. **Legislative Update.** Water quality has taken some turns and we’re not as engaged as we thought we’d be. There is a bill that has been in Senate Natural Resources for a long time and there is some expectation that the Senate will vote on it. They are trying to get money out to regions or basins and there is no direct way, so they’re talking about Regional Basin Coordinating Councils and the money will go through there. When asked if we’d had any response to our position paper on long-term funding for water quality, Charlie said no. Charlie did testify on a public safety bill where they’re talking about requiring a public safety section in
municipal plans. It also says the state police will no longer be allowed to serve local
communities after July 1, 2020. He’s not sure where that will go.
g. **Annual Meeting.** There has been discussion about getting the Governor to come.
h. **Meeting Minutes.** Charlie noted we’re having an issue with getting meeting minutes posted
within five days. He has asked staff to do minimalist minutes (citing attendees, agenda and any
action taken) to get them posted quickly; and then fill them in later to send to the committees
for their next meetings.
i. **Monthly Reports.** Charlie asked for feedback because it’s been awhile since he’s done a
monthly report. Should we try to get more information into the newsletter? It was noted there
may be a way to get varying reports from SharePoint. Charlie will think about that.

7. **Agenda Review** – Feb 21st. No need to review board agenda.

8. **Other Business.** There was no other business.

9. **Executive Session.** Chris Roy noted that the Executive Director annual review will take place at the
March Executive Committee meeting. Charlie will prepare his self-review and Chris will compile a
composite of material he received from staff.

10. **Adjournment.** MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BRIAN BIGELOW, TO ADJOURN AT
5:57 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc
The meeting was called to order at 5:45 p.m. by the chair, Chris Roy.

1. Changes to the agenda, Members’ Items. There were none.

2. Approval of February 21, 2018 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes. (Because of inclement weather the February 7th Executive Committee meeting was postponed to February 21st.) MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 21, 2018 WITH CORRECTIONS, IF ANY. Barbara Elliott asked to clarify line 39 on page 1 to say “That Act 250 permit was denied…” Chris Roy asked what the blank on page 2, line 28 should be. Charlie noted it was ACCD. THE MOTION WAS CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS CORRECTED.

3. Act 250 & Section 248 Applications.
   a. Intervale Center, Burlington; Application#4C1206-4. Regina noted that the packet included a site plan and a spreadsheet showing the uses that they’d like to change. We don’t have any issues with any of these and there are no transportation comments. BRIAN BIGELOW MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO APPROVE THE LETTER TO THE D.E.C. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Mike O’Brien pointed out that “goads” on first page should probably be “roads.”
   b. Philbrik Family Revocable Trust; Jericho – Application #4C0041-1. This is a small two-lot subdivision where lot #1 will be 1.16 acres where an existing 5-bedroom residence will remain; and Lot #2 will be 1.00 acres with a proposed 4-bedroom residence to be constructed. There will be a hearing because a neighbor is questioning it, as it is a part of an existing permit. We do not have an issue with it. ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O’BRIEN, TO APPROVE THE LETTER TO THE D.E.C. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. Review Changes to the draft ECOS Plan. Regina distributed new copies of the comments received on the 1st Draft ECOS Plan. The blue highlighted cells are reminders for staff to determine action. Yellow highlights indicate areas staff would like input from the Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC). Peach highlights are the new comments received since the packet was emailed. Regina reviewed all highlighted comments:
   • Line 6 questions information in Health intro in the main document.
   • Line 19 asks for necessary compliance language re. Act 171 – forestry/habitat blocks and connectivity planning. This was mentioned by Marty Illick, ANR and Andrea Morgante. Staff met yesterday with ANR staff to determine what we need to include in our plan.
• Lines 20-36 are comments from Vermont Gas Systems (VGS). Many of them talk about “renewable natural gas” (RNG) and the Energy Committee discussed this at great length and does not feel we should include it in our plan. In VGS definition RNG includes methane captured from landfills, cow power and other types of gas that happen and can be captured. Members discussed possible alternative language such as biogas, sustainable renewable natural gas, which are broader terms.

• Line 20, VGS asks to include the following in the introduction in the main document. “it is not intended to be a prescriptive planning tool supporting or opposing any specific projects and it is important for the Commission and its municipalities to maintain flexibility in their future planning initiatives.” Members feel this is too broad a statement and should not be included.

• Line 30, VGS asks to include a similar statement in Supplement 3, ECOS Plan Policies and Maps. Staff will suggest we not include it but the LRPC will review tomorrow. When she talked to VGS staff before she received their comments, they were worried that someone could use this against any type of new development, or adding customers to existing lines, etc. Regina feels our language will not prohibit any of these developments.

• Line 41, ANR suggests adding more language about source and management of woody biomass and provide a description of the Woody Biomass Resource Areas map.

Eleni Churchill noted that we received a lot of comments from VTrans with suggestions for clarification in the MTP. One specific area was in the list of projects which are shown as short-term (through 2025), medium-term (through 2035) and long-term (through 2050). The TAC had a very good discussion this morning revising some of the projects from short-term to short/medium term because some of the elements of the project could be done sooner, but some later. VTrans also asked us to describe what the list is and what it is not. Eleni was able to update the list this afternoon and members will see it in the second public hearing draft next week. Charlie noted that this is the opportunity for our region to have some input as to our priorities to go into the state Capital Program. VTrans is revising its project prioritization process and also developing a guide as to how a project can get into the Capital Program. Eleni noted that these projects are the needs of our communities. The last major thing is to make sure we include our Active Transportation Plan and the ITS Plan by reference in the MTP. Eleni noted other comments received since the public hearing:

• Lines 54 and 55 summarize comments received at the public hearing from Deb Sachs and David Blittersdorf.

• Line 57 summarizes comments from Bard Hill on the top 10 actions list regarding health care and autonomous vehicles.

• Line 65 was a comment from staff after reviewing a new solar application on an existing parking lot and we wanted to review the plan to be sure it was allowed.

• Line 67 – the future land use map is amended to include Underhill zoning changes approved at town meeting.

• Lines 68-84 are additional written comments received from Deb Sachs. Staff feels that these are things that might be able to be included in future iterations of the plan.

• Lines 85-102 are comments from Hans Ohanian of Charlotte. His biggest issue is that he disagrees with the methodology we used or the information we received from the state. We did incorporate some of these in the plan, but others we just can’t do.

When asked what action the Executive Committee needs to take, Regina suggested they recommend the board warn the 2nd public hearing for May. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION,
SECONDED BY BRIAN BIGELOW, TO RECOMMEND THESE CHANGES TO THE BOARD AND THAT THE BOARD WARN A SECOND PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE MAY 16, 2018 MEETING. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. Vermont Climate Pledge Coalition. Charlie noted we’re trying to follow through on Chris Shaw’s request on behalf of South Burlington to have the CCRPC board consider joining the Vermont Climate Pledge Coalition. Chris wanted to include joining the coalition in the ECOS plan, in response to the U.S. pulling back from the Paris Agreement. Members reviewed the memo from Melanie Needle. It was noted that only Burlington and South Burlington are currently members of the coalition along with several business and organizations. Staff did not feel we could join without input from the Executive Committee. Charlie asked members how they felt and whether this should go to the board. After a brief discussion, ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BARBARA ELLIOTT, TO ADD THIS TO THE FULL BOARD AGENDA AND RECOMMEND THAT THIS BE REFERRED TO THE ENERGY SUBCOMMITTEE TO TAKE A HARDER LOOK AT IT. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

6. Chair/Executive Director’s Report.
   a. UPWP Update. We are about 2/3 of way through the process. Right now staff are putting in hours for each task to get the funding needs. The next UPWP committee meeting will be held on March 22nd and at the April Executive Committee meeting we should have a good draft to warn a public hearing in May. There will probably be adjustments to the elderly and disabled transit service as there have been unforeseen cost increases this fiscal year. We have about 11% user rate in Chittenden County, which is low compared to other regions.
   b. ECOS Annual Report. Charlie noted a copy was included in the meeting packet. He reviewed the data contained in the report.
   c. Regional Dispatch Update. Charlie noted that six out of seven towns voted in favor of forming a Union Municipal District, with only Shelburne voting it down. The next steps include signing on to the UMD, and start to work out the details of potential costs and budgets. It may start out with just dispatchers and chiefs. CCRPC has been acting as the fiscal agent, but it is unclear if we will continue or if a municipality will want to take on payroll, etc. This will take 12-24 months.
   d. Legislative Update.
      i. Charlie noted that S.260 is a clean water bill that has gone through several changes and he’s not sure what happened with it. He thinks at best they will recommend a group come up with long-term funding stream.
      ii. We did okay with Senator Pearson to work out Water Basin Planning Block Grants. There was a funding gap between basin planning and identifying projects.
      iii. The electronic notification bill sailed through the House.
      iv. The Transportation Bill needs to be amended to include Exit 14 traffic signals using Earmark funds as VTrans didn’t realize these were ready for construction.
      v. The House Transportation Committee may be putting something in a bill that would ask CCRPC to look at regional airport governance. He’s not sure that will go anywhere.

7. Agenda Review for March 21, 2018 Board Meeting. Members reviewed the proposed agenda and added Vermont Climate Pledge Coalition and Charlotte Town Plan approval and certification of planning process.

8. Other Business. There was no other business.
9. **Executive Session.** MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO GO INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION AT 6:42 P.M. FOR THE PURPOSE OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ANNUAL EVALUATION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Chris noted that the Executive Committee would meet first without Charlie and then ask him to join them.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY MIKE O’BRIEN, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO COME OUT OF EXECUTIVE SESSION AT 7:22 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

10. **Adjournment.** MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO ADJOURN AT 7:23 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc
April 6, 2018

Rachel Lomonaco
Act 250 Coordinator
111 West Street
Essex Junction, VT 05452

RE: Intervale Center; Burlington; Application #4C1206-4

Dear Ms. Lomonaco:

The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission’s Staff and Executive Committee have reviewed this Act 250 application for a project described as updating the existing Land Use Permit to cover future contemplated activities and modifications to non-agriculture structures. The project is located at 180 Intervale Road in Burlington, VT. This project has not yet submitted any application materials to the City of Burlington. We offer the following comments:

The project is located within the Enterprise Planning Area as defined in the Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan. We find this project to be consistent with the Planning Areas for the following reasons:

1. The Enterprise Planning Area is identified in the Plan as an area planned for growth, and therefore this project helps implement Strategy #2 of the Plan which calls for 80% of new development in the areas planned for growth.
2. The project will be served by municipal water and sewer service, and is accessible via GMT transit routes.
3. The density and uses are consistent with the local regulations.

Therefore, we find this project to be in conformance with the Planning Areas of the 2013 Chittenden County Regional Plan.

We also find that this project meets the requirements of Criterion 9(L). The Intervale is a unique area of Burlington with large agricultural parcels and a low density of development, and we do not find it to be located in an existing settlement as defined by 10 VSA §6001(16). However, the project makes efficient use of land, energy, roads, utilities, and other supporting infrastructure, because it proposes to improve existing facilities at the Intervale Center, an established use, and will not require any additional infrastructure. The project does not propose any additional buildings that will contribute to a pattern of strip development, and it contributes to Vermont’s working lands economy. Therefore, the project complies with Criterion 9(L).

We reviewed the Traffic Impact Study conducted by VHB dated September 11, 2017 and concur with its overall conclusions. We have no further comments on traffic at this time.

Due to the detailed level of development review in most Chittenden County municipalities and the environmental permit reviews at the Department of Environmental Conservation, CCRPC will give
specific attention in its Act 250 reviews to the type of use and the Planning Areas section of the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan. While there are many other topics covered in the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan, there has been significant analysis at the Regional level regarding transportation impacts. The CCRPC will also focus its attention on transportation, where appropriate, in accordance with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, which is within the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan.

These comments are based on information currently available; we may have additional comments as the process continues. Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Charlie Baker
Executive Director

Cc: CCRPC Board
Certificate of Service
March 29, 2018

Rachel Lomonaco
Act 250 Coordinator
111 West Street
Essex Junction, VT 05452

RE: Philbrick Family Revocable Trust; Jericho; Application #4C0041-1

Dear Ms. Lomonaco:

The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission’s Staff and Executive Committee have reviewed this Act 250 application for a project described as a two-lot subdivision where Lot #1 will be 1.16 acres and Lot #2 will be 1.00 acres, and where an existing 5-bedroom residence will remain on Lot #1 and a proposed 4-bedroom residence will be constructed on Lot #2. The project is located at 13 Ross Lane in Jericho, VT. This project is currently undergoing review by the Town of Jericho Development Review Board. We offer the following comments:

The project is located within the Village Planning Area as defined in the Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan. We find this project to be consistent with the Planning Areas for the following reasons:

1. The Village Planning Area is identified in the Plan as an area planned for growth, and therefore this project helps implement Strategy #2 of the Plan which calls for 80% of new development in the areas planned for growth.
2. The project will be served by municipal water service, and
3. The density and uses are consistent with the local regulations.

Therefore, we find this project to be in conformance with the Planning Areas of the 2013 Chittenden County Regional Plan.

We also find that this project meets the requirements of Criterion 9(L). The project is proposed within an existing center that meets the definition in 10 VSA §6001(16)—the area is compact in form and size; it contains a mixture of uses with a substantial residential component and within walking distance of each other; it has significantly higher densities than the area outside the center; and the project is served by existing municipal infrastructure. Therefore, the project complies with 9(L).

The project is estimated to generate one additional AM and PM peak hour trip. We have no concerns about traffic at this time.

Due to the detailed level of development review in most Chittenden County municipalities and the environmental permit reviews at the Department of Environmental Conservation, CCRPC will give specific attention in its Act 250 reviews to the type of use and the Planning Areas section of the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan. While there are many other topics covered in the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan, there has been significant analysis at the Regional level regarding transportation...
impacts. The CCRPC will also focus its attention on transportation, where appropriate, in accordance with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, which is within the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan.

These comments are based on information currently available; we may have additional comments as the process continues. Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Charlie Baker
Executive Director

Cc: CCRPC Board
Certificate of Service
UPWP Committee Meeting 2
February 22, 2018

Attendees:
Mike O’Brien, Committee Chair
Amy Bell, VTrans
Barbara Elliot, TAC
Ken Belliveau, PAC
John Zicconi, Board
Mike Bissonnette, Board
Bard Hill, Board
Chris Jolly, FHWA
Justin Rabidoux, TAC

Staff:
Charlie Baker
Regina Mahony
Eleni Churchill
Forest Cohen
Marshall Distel
Bernie Ferenc
Bryan Davis

1. Committee Chair Mike O’Brien opened the meeting at 5:30 p.m.
2. Introductions were made.
3. The minutes from meeting one were reviewed and approved with no changes. Barbara made the motion and Justin seconded.
5. Regina provided the Committee with updates related to the land use projects. Justin asked about how the land use projects are judged. Charlie replied by describing how land use projects are not PL funded so we’re not “judging” them against transportation projects but rather assessing them against the available budget/staff time. By the next meeting, we will be able to better determine how staff hours will be allocated to the new land use requests and which tasks staff recommends be part of the UPWP.
6. Ken stated that Williston would need to know about the implications of municipal project #10 (Land Value Analysis) earlier in the fiscal year in order to contribute financially towards the $100,000 project cost. Perhaps this could be discussed this year and municipalities could be asked to contribute for FY20.
7. Eleni noted that CCRPC staff met with VTrans/FHWA to determine PL funding eligibility.
8. Staff recommended that regional project #4 (Exit 14 Intercept) be deferred until the I-89 Needs Analysis is conducted.
9. For regional project #6 (Hinesburg Bus) the budget was reduced to eliminate the need for a consultant and to use a student intern. Charlie recommended keeping this project with a budget of $5,000. Richard Watts would serve as resident rather than a UVM staff member. John asked whether there was an indication that this route might be eliminated by GMT? The was no indication that the route would be eliminated, but an outreach-related initiative would help boost ridership. The revised proposal expanded the scope beyond UVM and into Burlington. John is more comfortable with this proposal with the recent revisions.
10. For regional project #10 (East Allen Scoping) there was a brief discussion about its
regional significance. With its current scope, the Committee feels that this is better suited as a local project. Charlie talked with the Winooski City Manager and understands that the City would prefer to defer this project to either see if it could be done as a regional project with Colchester or locally at either mid-year or in FY20.

- $50,000 is the minimum needed for the MRGP work within regional project #11 (Water Quality Transportation). Eleni described how this figure likely needs to increase if funding is available (up to $100,000). Eleni noted that $100,000 was allocated in FY18.

- Eleni described the new VEIC project (regional #12). John Z asked for more details on how this benefits our municipalities (specifically with the county forum) since the state will already be getting a VW settlement. Eleni will provide the Committee with more details and a draft scope of work prior to the next meeting. Chris suggested the tasks be broken out into two separate activities.

- Bryan described the regional project #13 (Regional Bike Share) and will prepare a draft scope for the Committee to review.

- For municipal project #4 (Asset Management), the project is eligible, but there is a concern that this project would set an expensive precedent. John stated that if a high-dollar request is made in a year with funding available, then great; however, what happens when more high requests come in the future with limited budgets? Justin asked about where the line is drawn for maintenance requests? Chris Jolly described how this project will help the town make informed decisions with data gathering. States are required to develop an asset management plan, and data gathering for that purpose has been determined to be an eligible planning activity. The Committee would like to make it clear that an approval for FY19 would not indicate a commitment to future phases. Justin asked for more detail related to the budget. Is this gathering data on every pipe or taking a representative sample? Staff will reach out to Colchester for updates.

- Justin explained municipal project #11 (SB Lane Assignments) and how it has already been looked at multiple times, but yielded conflicting results. This could be handled through other South Burlington work as an operational initiative. It could also be considered as an in-house Burlington work as an operational initiative.

- Staff moved on to partner requests. There was a discussion about how best to evaluate Local Motion’s deliverables. Staff received some information from VTrans that wasn’t entirely helpful. John said that there is little info for the Bikes Mean Business effort and it seems to be covered in other tasks. We asked them to cut back before because it seemed to be an overreach. $105,000 seems like a large ask when compared to the other partner requests. The Committee will review the annual report from Local Motion prior to the next meeting. Charlie suggested to keep this request as is for now, if budget allows, and come back to it if needed.

- Neighbor Rides requested a similar $47,000 ask as in previous years. Via Email, John asked the Committee if we should increase their funding. They submitted a proposal with how they would use additional funds. Charlie explained how SST A has raised rates for E&D service. Charlie wants to have some conversations with VTrans, GMT and funding partners to learn more and get a better sense of appropriate partners (is NR the
right service provider?), etc. Chittenden County is an anomaly in how this service is provided in comparison to other areas of the state. Amy added that TPI guidance for other RPCs is to serve as E&D coordinators, we could be a co-coordinator/convener in this effort. Barbara noted that Age Well is providing services to rural areas.

- John suggested that CATMA has no concrete projects in their request. Are UPWP funds used to hire staff members rather than complete projects? Charlie explained that the funds are used for deliverables and staff time. Our funds helped them extend beyond the campus areas as a countywide TDM partner. Staff will reach out to CATMA for details related to their overall budget and deliverables.

- Marshall gave an overview of Jon Moore’s GMT memo that details how GMT’s decline in ridership is similar to decline felt by other similar-sized transit agencies around the country. The Committee felt that it would be beneficial to have GMT present at a future Board meeting.

- Committee Chair Mike O’Brien adjourned the meeting at 7:15.

Respectfully submitted,
Marshall Distel
Bryan Osborne called the meeting to order at 9:00AM and asked for a round of introductions.

1. Consent Agenda
A list of TIP amendments was approved.

2. Approval of Minutes
The February 6th minutes were approved without changes.

3. Public Comments
There were none.

4. Transportation Survey Consultant Selection
The following motion passed unanimously: To approve the selection of WBA Research to undertake the 2018 regional transportation survey.

5. MTP Comments/Revisions and Recommendation to Board
The following motions were approved: 1) To revise the MTP project list to change former short-term projects that had been recommended by VTrans to become medium term projects, to short/medium projects. This motion passed with VTrans abstaining. 2) To recommend this latest draft MTP, as revised, to the Board for second public hearing and to incorporate by reference the Active Transportation Plan in the MTP. This motion passed unanimously.

6. 2020 Project Prioritization
The following motion was approved: Recommend approval of the 2020 Regional Project Scores and forward to CCRPC Commission. This motion passed unanimously.

7. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports
This information item was presented and discussed.
8. CCRPC February Board Meeting Report
   This information item was presented and discussed.

9. Chairman’s/Members’ Items
   General updates and discussion.

10. Municipal Roads General Permit (MGRP) Update
    This information item was presented and discussed.

The meeting adjourned at 11:40 a.m.

Respectfully submitted, Peter Keating
CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
CLEAN WATER ADVISORY COMMITTEE – DRAFT MINUTES

DATE: Wednesday, March 7, 2018
SCHEDULED TIME: 10:30 a.m. to 12:10 p.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT
DOCUMENTS: Minutes, documents, and presentations discussed accessible at: http://www.ccrpcvt.org/meetings/clean-water-advisory-committee/

Committee Members in Attendance
Bolton: Joss Besse
Hinesburg:
St. George:
Buels Gore:
Huntington: Darlene Palola, Barbara Elliot (departed after TAC)
Underhill: Brian Bigelow
Burlington: Jenna Olson
Jericho:
Westford:
Charlotte:
Milton:
Williston: James Sherrard
Colchester: Karen Adams
Richmond: Geoff Urbanik (11:07 a.m.)
Winooski: Tim Grover, John Choate, Jon Rauscher (departed after TAC)
Essex: Annie Costandi,[Co-Chair], Dennis Lutz (departed after TAC)
Shelburne: Chris Robinson
VAOT:
Essex Junction: Chelsea Mandigo
South Burlington: Tom DiPietro
VANR: Christy Witters
Burlington Airport: Larry Lackey
University of VT: Claire Forbes (11:35 a.m.)
CCRPC Board:

Transportation Advisory Committee members: Bryan Osborne (departed after TAC), Dean Bloch (departed after TAC)
Other Attendees: VTDRC: Jim Ryan (departed after TAC), Terisa Thomas (departed after TAC), Jim Pease
CCRPC Staff: Dan Albrecht, Charles Baker
Eleni Churchill, Chris Dubin, Jason Charest, Marshall Distel (these 4 staff departed after TAC)

1. Welcome: The CWAC meeting started at 10:30 a.m. joining the Transportation Advisory Committee.

2. Presentation on MRGP Permit (Jim Ryan, DEC)
   Mr. Ryan gave an extensive presentation. Committee members and Mr. Ryan engaged in discussion. No action by the Committee.

The TAC meeting adjourned at 11:40 and the CWAC meeting recessed from 11:40 – 11:45

The meeting resumed at 11:45 a.m. Members and staff present and remaining for the rest of the meeting above.

3. Review and action on draft minutes of January 9, 2018
   After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, Jenna Olson made a motion, seconded by James Sherrard to approve the minutes with corrections as follows: Annie called the meeting to order not Chelsea. MOTION PASSED.

4. Clean Water Revolving Loan Fund; potential expansion of eligibility to include natural resources projects (Terisa Thomas, DEC)
   Ms. Thomas gave an extensive presentation. Committee members and Ms. Thomas engaged in discussion. No action by the Committee.

5. Update on Winooski TBP process
   Albrecht indicated that Karen Bates of DEC would have the first rough draft done by mid-April. As members have seen, Dan has been gathering information on “municipal protectiveness”, i.e. what water quality protections are already in place due to zoning, etc.

6. Items for Tuesday, April 3rd meeting
No items identified at this time. The chairs will work with staff to develop the agenda.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Dan Albrecht
DATE: [Wednesday, March 7, 2018]
SCHEDULED TIME: [12:15 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.]
PLACE: [CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT]
DOCUMENTS: [Minutes, documents, and presentations discussed accessible at:
http://www.ccrpcvt.org/meetings/clean-water-advisory-committee/]

Committee Members in Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Jenna Olson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington Airport</td>
<td>Larry Lackey, Polly Harris (Stantec)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williston</td>
<td>James Sherrard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>Karen Adams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winooski</td>
<td>Tim Grover; John Choate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Junction</td>
<td>Annie Costandi, Co-Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelburne</td>
<td>Chris Robinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandigo, Co-Chair</td>
<td>Chelsea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Burlington</td>
<td>Tom DiPietro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of VT</td>
<td>Claire Forbes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christy Witters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Attendees: Holly Kreiner, WNRC

CCRPC Staff: Dan Albrecht, Charles Baker

1. **Welcome:** Chelsea Mandigo called the meeting to order at 12:31 p.m.

2. **Changes to the Agenda** – The Chair suggested and the Subcommittee agreed to move the consideration of vendor selection for Stream Team services later in the meeting so Ms. Kreiner would be able to leave during the discussion.

3. **Review and action on draft minutes of February 6, 2018**

   After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, Karen Adams made a motion, seconded by Chris Robinson to approve the minutes with no corrections. Polly Harris abstained. MOTION PASSED.

4. **Consider approval of Lead Agency services line-item for FY19 of more than 10% of overall budget ($8,250 of $68,911 or 11.9%) pursuant to stipulation in Program Agreement**

   After a brief discussion describing the need for this approval, Tom DiPietro made a motion, seconded by Karen Adams to approve the $8,250 allocation. Polly Harris abstained. MOTION PASSED.

5. **Review and Finalize 2017 Annual Reports**


   Committee members had no recommended edits to the Stream Team report. With regards to the water quality monitoring, Ms. Forbes asked and members concurred to have some sentences removed that theorized on what land uses might be causing high Phosphorus or high Chloride counts. Based upon a recommendation from Jim Pease, it was also recommended that a local “attainment” stream be added to the monitoring effort. It was also recommended that sampling be discontinued for turbidity as it is not a pollutant and it was also suggested that sampling locations be located closer to DEC’s Biological Monitoring sites. Finally, Tom DiPietro raised the larger question of the purpose of collecting this data. Members agreed that it was done primarily as a citizen engagement mechanism but that this question should be revisited at the next meeting.

   Chris Robinson made a motion, seconded by Jenna Olson, to approve the MCM#2 report with the recommended edits to the water quality monitoring report. Polly Harris abstained. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.

   b. Minimum Control Measure #1 (RSEP / Rethink Runoff report)

   Dan recapped the highlights of the report noting in particular the improved web traffic. Karen Adams made a motion, seconded by Claire Forbes, to approve the MCM#21. Polly Harris abstained. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED
6. **Review and consider adoption of CCRPC comment letter on draft MS4 permit**

   Annie Costandi walked through the comments which had been developed earlier at a meeting of various MS4 representatives. One small suggested edit was suggested to “Section 8.3 Municipal Road Requirements” to note that the comments do not apply to the three non-traditional MS4s. Karen Adams made a motion, seconded by Tim Grover, to approve and forward the draft comment letter for consideration by the full CCRPC Board for transmittal to DEC. Polly Harris abstained. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED. Note: Ms. Olson was not present during the vote due to having to step out for a phone call.

[ Note: Ms. Kreiner of WNRCD left the meeting at this time. ]

7. **Review recommendation of CCRPC on Vendor selection for Stream Team services**

   Dan Albrecht walked through the scores of the review committee consisting of Costandi, Mandigo, Allerton and Olson plus himself. He had mistakenly left off Ms. Olson’s rankings in the paper memo he distributed. Ms. Olson indicated that she considered WNRCD’s proposal to be ranked first with the Clark Group second. Overall, all five reviewers had WNRCD’s proposal ranked first. James Sherrard made a motion, seconded by Jenna Olson, to recommend that CCRPC hire WNRCD for the needed Stream Team services Polly Harris abstained. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.

8. **Items for Tuesday, April 3rd meeting**

   Report on results of Survey.

10. **Adjournment**

    The meeting adjourned at 1:06 p.m.

    Respectfully submitted, Dan Albrecht
DATE: Thursday, March 8, 2018
TIME: 3:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. NOTE: Due to snow this meeting was held later than originally scheduled.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT

1. Welcome and Introductions
Regina Mahony called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

2. Approve Minutes
Andrea Morgante made a motion, seconded by Jim Donovan to approve the minutes of January 11, 2018. Jim Donovan stated that he should be noted as in attendance at the top; and that there are a number of questions and things that need clarification. Regina Mahony noticed that they are just notes without any refinement. Regina Mahony will work to improve these minutes.

Jim Donovan made a motion, seconded by Andrea Morgante to table the minutes of January 11, 2018. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.

3. Review of the Second Public Hearing Draft of the 2018 ECOS Plan
Staff has prepared a spreadsheet of all of the comments received on the first public hearing draft, and Staff’s recommendation on how to address the comment. Staff handed out an updated spreadsheet with Deb Sachs and Hans Ohanian’s comments added. In addition, Staff has already made edits to the document to address the majority of the comments (as indicated in the second to last column of the spreadsheet). In addition, the Energy sub-committee’s recommendations are included here where relevant. Staff can also provide input from the TAC and the Executive Committee as they have now seen these comments as well. The yellow highlighted rows are the comments that Staff would specifically like to discuss with the LRPC, to gauge direction on how to address these comments.

Row 6 – this comment is socioeconomic level and its connection to physical activity and tobacco use. Heather has provided references to this evidence, and Staff has added that into the document. Staff wanted to point this comment out to the LRPC because this comment is on the introduction to Health (Strategy 5), which the LRPC did not see before the first public hearing draft went out. But it was included in that draft that the Board saw.

Row 19 – this comment is on forest integrity. We received comments at the Board and from ANR on forest integrity. We’ve addressed many of these comments (including adding a map), but will also make some additional edits based on a conversation with Jens Hilke (ANR) on Tuesday. Andrea Morgante asked that we not only help the municipalities refine the local data for themselves, but that we then aggregate that information into one County map so that we can show the true regional priorities and how they relate from one municipality to the next rather than the data the State is suggesting as a starting point. Staff will add this as an action.

Row 20 – This is one of two broad statements from VT Gas that attempts to indicate that the Plan is not intended to support or oppose any specific project. Staff didn’t talk with the Energy Sub-Committee about because we felt it was more appropriate for the LRPC to discuss as it deals with the entire plan. Regina Mahony added that we also discussed this with the Executive Committee last night and they felt that it was too broad of a statement. Staff also feels that the Plan already states that it specifically doesn’t use the term “shall” on purpose, however, that doesn’t...
mean that we might not find something that isn’t in conformance with our Plan. Regina Mahony added that when Charlie, Melanie, Emily and I met with VT Gas they were concerned about extensions to existing neighborhoods and new industrial buildings. Staff thought about those types of projects and don’t feel the Plan would prevent that from happening and isn’t the intent. The LRPC agreed to not add this statement.

Row 21 – This is a simple addition of energy systems to a variety of infrastructure that we want to support in the areas planned for growth. This concept wasn’t added to the location where VT Gas originally asked for it, but it was added to an action.

Row 23 – this is the first of many comments (and highlighted rows) where VT Gas has asked for “renewable natural gas” to be added to the Plan. The Energy Sub-committee felt very strongly that this is not an appropriate phrase to add to the Plan as there is no industry standard around this yet (as did Board members at our last meeting), and they do not feel that the Plan as currently written, precludes VT Gas from shifting to renewable natural gas. The LRPC agrees with not including “renewable natural gas” here and in all other comments (except for Row 28 – see below), particularly because biogas is included and is all encompassing.

Row 28 – this is another request for adding renewable natural gas from VT Gas. Staff looked into what Northwest RPC said about this in their Plan (after the Energy Sub-committee meeting); and Staff suggests that adding this same statement into Supplement 2 Regional Analysis could be useful to keep track of it next time around: “Vermont Gas Systems is currently working to deploy renewable natural gas in their service territory. The economic viability of renewable natural gas, its impacts on climate change, and its classification as a “renewable” resource should be analyzed in future updates to this plan.” The LRPC had an extensive discussion about this statement including concern about adding it into the Plan at all, and whether CCRPC really is going to analyze it or not (more than likely the state would), however most felt it was an accurate statement that opens the door to working with VT Gas into the future and recognizes the uncertainty of this fuel source. The LRPC agreed to add the sentence.

Row 30 – This is the second broad statement suggested by VT Gas that the LRPC agreed to not add for similar reasons as stated for the comment in Row 20 (see above).

Row 39 – This is a summation of comments from VTrans on the MTP. These comments have been addressed in the Plan. Of particular note is the comment from VTrans that many of the projects on the list in the short-term category are not on VTrans’ radar, making them difficult to implement within the stated timeframe. This is a particular issue for Burlington who has many projects in the short-term category. There was a healthy discussion about this at the TAC meeting as this project list is an opportunity to influence what is on VTrans’ radar, but also that some of the projects are unrealistic and have been re-categorized to medium or long-term. Staff also added the Active Transportation Plan and the ITS Plans as “incorporated by reference”.

Row 41 – No need to discuss this comment, but we just wanted to make the LRPC aware that ANR asked us, and we added more information on biomass resources.

Row 46 – Jim Donovan asked if we are updating the analysis reports as suggested in this comment from ANR. Regina Mahony stated that we are not updating the Analysis Reports. Those were done in 2011-12 with the help of consultants and we don’t have the capacity to update them with this 2018 Plan. Staff will add this to the response for this comment.

Row 53 – Jim Donovan asked if we are going to provide this exact response to Julie Macuga or something more, since she put a great deal of effort into her comments. Staff indicated that this is just the response for this spreadsheet that will ultimately become a part of the Plan itself (as attached to Supplement 1).

Row 54 & 55 – These are a summation of the comments received at the first public hearing on the MTP. The comment spreadsheet also includes 17 specific comments from Deb Sachs. Many of these comments are worthwhile, however they are more likely things that we would do outside of the plan as we implement it, or out of our purview altogether.

Row 57 – These are comments on CCRPC’s Top Ten Action list from the Board at the first public hearing. Staff showed the LRPC edits made to Action 7 to address the social health comment; and edits to Action 8 to address the question about autonomous vehicles. The LRPC edited the statements to read: “7. Support local and regional efforts to improve population health, such as…” And list the organizations we do work with (which are the ones already included). Also, “8. …to ensure the ECOS goals are met (or achieved).” And stop after that.

Row 65 – Staff had an opportunity to review a solar project on an existing parking lot, in an area that also includes natural resource constraints. Staff have made a small edit to ensure that existing parking lots and rooftops are ‘okay’ places for these projects regardless of natural resource constraints considering they are already built. The LRPC agreed with the edit, without the word “any”.

Row 67 – Underhill voters approved zoning changes at Town Meeting Day, so Staff will make an edit to the Underhill’s Village Center district on the Future Land Use Map to match their new zoning.
Row 75 – We’ve had multiple requests for a glossary; however, Staff is not intending to add a glossary to this Plan because we have one on the website. The LRPC suggested that we add a link to the glossary in the Plan.

Row 85 – 107 – These are comments received from Hans Ohanian from Charlotte on the Energy piece. He does not agree with the State’s and CCRPC’s methodology, however, there isn’t anything we can do about that at this stage. However, there are some comments that Staff have been able to address as stated in the response column. Jim Donovan suggested a clarifying statement to the response in Row 107: clarify that CCRPC has worked extensively with Town staff to make this determination.

Additional LRPC recommendations include:
- CEDS and water quality – acknowledge how good our water quality is and it’s a strength to our economy. Also, don’t put blame on the regulators (re. TMDL).
- There was a discussion about local v. regional economy. We should play on the strengths of each individual municipality rather than compete. Add as an opportunity: regional services and economic growth.

4. Recommendation to the Board
Andrea Morgante made a motion, seconded by Jim Donovan to recommend that the Board accept the March 19th or 21st draft as the second public hearing draft and warn it for the second public hearing on May 16, 2018. The March 19th or 21st draft will include all edits as discussed today by the Committee, including edits staff still needs to make to address the comments as described in the response column of the spreadsheet. Staff will send the draft to the Board and the LRPC on March 14th, the LRPC will provide Staff with any final comments by March 16th. Staff will incorporate any final edits if necessary by March 19th or 21st. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED. Justin Rabidoux and Edmund Booth left prior to the vote.

5. Next Meeting
The next meeting will be on Thursday, April 12, 2018 or May 10, 2018 from 8:30am to 10:00am if needed.

11. Adjourn
The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony