REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
Wednesday, October 18, 2017 - 6:00 p.m.
CCRPC Offices; 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202
Winooski, VT 05404

CONSENT AGENDA –
C.1 none

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 minute)
4. Approve Minutes of September 20, 2017 Meeting* (Action; 1 minute)
5. Approval of 2017 Hinesburg Town Plan and Confirmation Process* (Action; 5 minutes)
6. Secretary Joe Flynn, Vermont Agency of Transportation (Discussion; 30 minutes)
7. ECOS Plan Update (Discussion/Action; 40 min)
   a. MTP scenarios*
   b. CEDS status update*
8. Final Draft Rule – Municipal Road General Permit Comments * (Action; 10 minutes)
9. FY19 Municipal Dues* (Action; 5 minutes)
10. Brownfield Program update presentation (Discussion; 10 minutes)
11. Legislative Breakfast topics (Discussion; 10 minutes)
12. Chair/Executive Director’s Updates (Information; 5 minutes)
   a. Clean water initiatives update
   b. Regional Dispatch update
   c. Executive Director’s Report (to be sent separately)
13. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports * (Information, 5 minutes)
   a. Executive Committee (draft minutes September 6, 2017 & October 4, 2017)*
      i. Act 250 Sec 248 letters*
   b. Transportation Advisory Committee (draft minutes, October 3, 2017)*
   c. CWAC & MS4 Subcommittee (draft minutes, September 5, 2017 & October 3, 2017)*
   d. Long Range Planning Committee (draft minutes, September 14, 2017)*
   e. LRPC Energy Subcommittee (draft minutes, September 19, 2017)*
2. Members’ Items, Other Business (Information, 5 minutes)
3. Adjourn

The October 18th Chittenden County RPC meeting will air on Burlington Telecom 17 and Comcast 17 on Sunday, October 22, 2017 at 1 p.m. and will be available on the web at: http://www.cctv.org/watch-tv/programs/chittenden-county-regional-planning-commission-71

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 Bryan Davis, CCRPC Title VI Coordinator, at 802-846-4490 ext *17 or bdavis@ccrpcvt.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:

- Executive Committee - Wednesday, November 1, 2017; 5:45 p.m.
- Transportation Advisory Committee - Tuesday, November 7, 2017; 9:00 a.m.
- Clean Water Advisory Committee - Tuesday, November 7, 2017; 11:00 a.m.
- CWAC MS4 Subcommittee - Tuesday, November 7; 12:15 p.m.
- Planning Advisory Committee - Wednesday, November 8, 2017; 2:30 p.m.
- Long Range Planning Committee - Thursday, November 9, 2017; 8:30 a.m.
- CCRPC Board Meeting - Wednesday, November 15, 2017; 6:00 p.m.
- Energy Sub-Committee meeting - Tuesday, November 28, 2017 at 5:00 p.m.

Tentative future Board agenda items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 15, 2017</td>
<td>Review and Accept Draft FY17 Audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECOS Plan Draft Updates: MTP, CEDS, Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 12, 2017</td>
<td>Legislative Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@ Double Tree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 17, 2018</td>
<td>National Highway System update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warn ECOS Plan Update Public Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY18 Mid-Year Adjustment Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 21, 2018</td>
<td>ECOS Plan Update Public Hearing #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St George Town Plan (tentative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richmond Town Plan (tentative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 21, 2018</td>
<td>Warn ECOS Plan Update Public Hearing #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 18, 2018</td>
<td>Warn the FY19 UPWP &amp; Budget Public Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 16, 2018</td>
<td>ECOS Plan Update Public Hearing #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY19 UPWP &amp; Budget Public Hearing &amp; Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 20, 2018 –</td>
<td>Election of Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Annual</td>
<td>ECOS Plan Update adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with GBIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Bryan Davis, CCRPC Title VI Coordinator, at 802-846-4490 ext *17 or bdavis@ccrpcvt.org, no later than 3 business days prior to the meeting for which services are requested.
1. **Call to order; Changes to the Agenda.** The meeting was called to order at 6:05 p.m. by the Chair, Chris Roy. There were no changes to the agenda.

2. **Public comment period on items not on the agenda.** There were no members of the public present.

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

4. **Approve Minutes of July 19, 2017 Board Meeting.** JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O’BRIEN, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JULY 19, 2017 WITH CORRECTIONS, IF ANY. Mike noted that Winooski was left off of the vote on the TIP. He also had some grammatical changes which he gave to Bernie. MOTION CARRIED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS CORRECTED. TONY MICKLUS ABSTAINED. Chris Roy introduced Tony who is the new representative from Milton.

5. **Approval of 2016 Williston Comprehensive Plan and Confirmation of Planning Process.** Emily Nosse-Leirer noted that the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) reviewed the Williston Plan on October 12, 2016 and held a duly warned public hearing during the Planning Commission public comment period. The Williston Selectboard adopted the Plan at a public hearing on August 22, 2017. The PAC discussed the Plan and staff’s review memo on September 13 and recommended the Board approve the plan and certify the planning process. Jeff Carr questioned whether there had been discussions between Williston and neighboring communities regarding elements of the plan that might affect those communities as we had done in the past. Regina noted that was prior to the formation of the
PAC and the guidelines developed for reviewing town plans. Jeff expressed concern that the old process allowed for discussion between parties outside of a public hearing setting. Regina said one thing we can do is two years before a municipal plan expires when we provide a letter to the community we could notify commissioners in neighboring communities that the process is about to begin. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CATHERINE McMAINS, THAT CCRPC APPROVES THE WILLISTON 2016-2024 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND CONFIRMS THE TOWN OF WILLISTON’S MUNICIPAL PLANNING PROCESS. ONLY MUNICIPAL REPRESENTATIVES VOTED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Since Dan Kerin had not yet arrived and Jeff Carr is Essex Junction Alternate, Jeff voted in favor of the motion for Essex Junction.

6. ECOS Plan Update
   a. Energy Element Policy Review. Chris Roy noted that there was a lengthy discussion at the July board meeting and since then staff has worked with several committees and came up with a new approach to Constraint and Strategy Policies for siting renewable energy generation facilities. Melanie Needle distributed a new version that includes input from the Energy Subcommittee last night. She reviewed what happened since July. We’ve restructured the policy statement and broke them up into two distinct constraint policies we’ve noted as Strategy 3 (water quality) and 4 (working lands and significant habitats). By moving the policy to that section we’re giving this more weight based on Article 174 standards. Strategy 2 is where we discuss growth. So, the suitability policy is to talk about where and at what scale we want renewable energy generation in areas that don’t have a constraint. Staff has been working with PAC, LRPC, Executive Committee, and Energy Sub-committee to review these ideas.

Melanie then reviewed the policy statement as of today. These are by no means a final product and we will continue to refine them. Page 1 – these policy statements have not changed and says what we can do with our partnerships. The meat of the changes begin on page 2 under b. where we talk about Constraint policies. “Energy generation is constrained in certain areas due to state and local restrictions on development.” Site renewable energy generation to avoid state and local known constraints and to minimize impacts to state and local possible constraints. This is an education piece for any applicant. Suitability Policies: Unconstrained areas have different levels of suitability for renewable energy generation. In unconstrained areas, locate energy generation facilities to meet as many of the following guidelines as possible and relevant. It lists seven, which Melanie reviewed. Discussion ensued. When asked if these were weighted, Melanie said no but we want applicants to do as many of these as possible.

Lengthy discussion continued. Jeff expressed concerns that we don’t want ground mounted solar in the designated growth centers. Policy needs to be clearer and the relationship between all the policies needs to be clearer, but they’re on the right track. Chris Roy reiterated that he likes this format and the suitability policies generally since they are just guidance, not mandates or restrictions. There was quite a bit of discussion about how these policies relate to one another. For example, does Policy vii accidentally trump all of the other ones because it’s much more specific than the others? Also, there appear to be locations or scales that aren’t currently covered. For example, turbines between 30m and 50m; and ground mounted small scale residential? Jeff suggested that we need to be more explicit that we’re pro-renewable energy where it’s effective in meeting our energy demands and affordable. Regina stated that this may have been more obvious in previous versions and we’ll take a look to see how we can address this. There was a discussion regarding the wind energy map, and its relevancy. It is useful to show where the resource areas are, especially in light of the constraints. Jeff asked if there are
any subsidy cliffs that may limit the applicability of some of this work. Chris Roy suggested not getting into it in the plan as the programs change frequently.

b. **MTP Financial Plan.** Peter Keating reviewed the financial plan for the next 35 years, starting with some background. The Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) is required to be updated every five years because of federal law. The RPC is required to update the regional plan every 8 years. One of the things we have to do in the transportation element (MTP) of the plan, is the financial plan which includes: Here is what we want to do, this is what it’ll cost to do, and how much we estimate we’ll have available to do whatever we want to do. MPO’s have to do this, but state DOTs do not. Three elements of the MTP Financial Plan are: 1) funding “reasonably expected to be available.” 2) Level of funding needed to operate and maintain the existing system. 3) The difference between 1 and 2 and how this will be allocated to improvement projects/strategies. In determining available funds, we reviewed the trend in statewide obligation history; the region’s historic share of state funding; we assume that both continue into the future and forecast funding in constant and year of expenditure dollars. We have had discussions with VTrans and they agree with this approach. Peter then reviewed the FHWA & FTA funds to Vermont between FY2010 and FY2016, which we converted to constant 2016 dollars. The average is $211,609,103, which we are assuming Vermont will receive annually over the next 35 years. To determine what percentage of the pie will come to Chittenden County, we were able to go back to 1999 to show how much has come to Chittenden County vs. rest of the state. The high was 40% in 2005 and the low was 7.5% in 2014, but the average has been 19.4%. In our last plan we estimated we’d get 17%. We then had to estimate what we’ll have available, so the next table shows the estimated total federal funds which we expect to be even funded over the next 35 years assuming a 3% annual inflation rate per the Engineering News Record The total cumulative dollars is estimated to be $2.55 billion. At constant 2016 dollars it is estimated to be $2.43 billion. We then had to estimate what it’ll take to maintain the current system. We looked at the TIP (Transportation Improvement Plan) to develop average annual costs for paving and bridges; and CCTA maintenance and operations. Peter then reviewed the comparison of Chittenden County obligation history by project use category. Over the 16 years we’ve spent about 55% on maintenance. Between 2005-2016 it averaged 65.4%; and 2010-2016, 73.6%. All charts have shown only federal funds which is 80%. This chart shows total funds available (federal, state and local). One column shows 70% or $1.257 billion allocated for preservation and $418 million for new transportation needs; and the other 55% or $987.82 million for preservation with $687.7 million for new transportation needs. Charlie noted that we will have some large projects in the next couple of years – Champlain Parkway, Circ Alternative projects so in the next plan horizon we may be getting higher share of new projects because of these larger projects. Discussion ensued. Andrea asked if stormwater facility maintenance should be included in preservation. Charlie said in the near term we are anticipating these to be improvements because they don’t exist yet. We don’t have those projects as preservation, but we have to build it into our future. Christine said when we do the next five-year update we’ll have more information on that. Next steps for the financial plan includes developing the MTP project list that takes into account the fiscal constraint limit; and consider funding targets by project sue category (e.g. roadway, bridges, etc.) Charlie noted we will be meeting with municipal staff (public works, managers/administrators) to help get to the prioritized project list. We’ll start this discussion here in October with a more complete list in November.

c. **CEDS (Community Economic Development Strategy) Status Update.** Regina said the process is moving. Emily is drafting it with input from GBIC. CEDS has to be updated every five years as
well. After GBIC’s review, we’ll send it to the municipalities. So, for October and November board meetings, expect to spend more time reviewing these parts of the plan.

7. Legislative Breakfast Topics. Charlie said every year in early December we have a breakfast for the Chittenden County legislators. We’re refining how to do this each year. This is a heads up to get topics we should be discussing with the legislators this year. Suggestions included:
   a. Transportation needs, because once we get the MTP financial plan we have to stress the amount of funding Chittenden County should get as the economic engine of the state.
   b. Act 250 Commission and what they’re being tasked to do.
   c. Stormwater funding will be potential discussion item and are there other ways of funding the stormwater. Fees vs. taxes so you can charge those not on tax rolls.
   d. Airport governance.
   e. Let legislators know that RPC is a resource for our communities as well as the legislators.

8. Chair/Executive Director Update.
   a. Charlie has been asked to serve on the Airport Technical Advisory Committee regarding noise study. They’ll meet October 16th. Andrea read with interest what South Burlington is proposing to do and wondered why this wasn’t a regional issue. It is important to Chittenden County and the state. It’s good that Charlie is being asked to serve on this. Chris Roy said some of us met with representatives of the airport and they were looking to expand communication with us. He noticed that there seems to be more exchange of information between BIA and CCRPC. Lengthy discussion continued.
   b. Clean Water initiatives update. Charlie noted that the state is working on pushing water quality funds through various agencies. 1. There is Grants-in-Aid program from DEC through the RPCs – 10 of our municipalities have applied for this funding. There was $2 million in road maintenance funds and statewide 187 out of 250 towns are participating; 2. There are construction funds available through Clean Water Block grant. The RPCs have a contract with DEC and right now we’ve started discussion with municipalities about projects they have that are almost ready for construction; 3. Better Roads inventories and work with municipalities on priorities on road projects. The state is moving the cycle to October/November to line up with the municipal budgeting cycle; 4. Transportation Alternatives Program – Eleni noted there is $5-7 million available for this program that we had seen traditionally used for bike/ped and other transportation enhancements, but the state has decided to use these funds for the next two years on stormwater improvements. Charlie asked to hear any feedback members hear on this. We also have UPWP funds available for developing projects.
   c. Executive Directors’ report. Will be sent later.

9. Committee/Liaison Activities and Reports. Minutes of various committee meetings are included in the meeting packet. Questions can be directed to staff.

10. Members’ Items; Other Business. There was no other business.

11. Adjournment: CHRIS SHAW MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY TIME BAECHLE, TO ADJOURNE THE MEETING AT 7:50 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,
Bernadette Ferenc
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
October 18, 2017
Agenda Item 5: 2017 Hinesburg Town Plan, Approval and Confirmation

Issues: The Town of Hinesburg has requested, per Title 24 V.S.A §4350, that the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (1) approve its 2017 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 March 8, 2017 and recommended that the Plan, and the municipal planning process, should be forwarded to the CCRPC Board for approval. This meeting served as a public hearing on the Plan and was warned as such.

The Plan was adopted by the Hinesburg Selectboard on September 25, 2017. 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, March 8, 2017 at the CCRPC Offices and made the following motion:

The PAC finds that the draft 2017 Hinesburg 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: NA

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the CCRPC Board approve the 2017 Hinesburg Town Plan and confirm the Town of Hinesburg’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
Hinesburg’s 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 Hinesburg, Vermont is a member municipality of this Commission; and

WHEREAS, The Town of Hinesburg formally requested CCRPC to approve its 2017 Town Plan and confirm its planning process; and

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

WHEREAS, the Planning Advisory Committee reviewed the records and recommended that the Commission approve Hinesburg’s 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 Town of Hinesburg Selectboard adopted the 2017 Hinesburg Town Plan at a warned public hearing on September 25, 2017;

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 2017 Hinesburg 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 Hinesburg’s municipal planning process.

Dated at Winooski, this 18th day of October 2017.

CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

__________________________
Christopher D. Roy, Chair
Staff Review of the 2017 Hinesburg Town Plan  
Emily Nosse-Leirer, CCRPC Planner  
March 8, 2017

The Town of Hinesburg has requested, per 24 V.S.A §4350, that the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (1) approve its 2017 Hinesburg Town Plan; and (2) confirm its planning process.

This draft 2017 Hinesburg Town Plan is a comprehensive update and re-adoption of the 2013 Hinesburg Town 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 in 2013 as part of an Enhanced Consultation process. The 2017 Hinesburg Town Plan addresses several new required elements, and also describes some significant changes to the community’s vision for the future.

CCRPC staff completed an informal review of the 2017 Hinesburg Town Plan in November 2016, prior to the first Planning Commission public hearing (discussed below). Staff have completed this formal review of the plan in advance of the Selectboard public hearings on the plan, which have 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 2017 Hinesburg 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 2017 Hinesburg Town 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 2017 Hinesburg 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 2017 Hinesburg Town 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 2017 Hinesburg 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 2017 Hinesburg Town Plan is compatible with the municipal plans for Shelburne, St. George, Williston, Richmond, Huntington, Monkton and Charlotte. The plan acknowledges that there are potentially incompatible land uses planned for Hinesburg’s border with Starksboro. Along Route 116, Hinesburg plans...
for future industrial use, while Starksboro plans to preserve farmland. Staff finds that while an industrial planning area and a large scale agricultural planning area may be incompatible, they are not inherently so if managed properly.

  a. Staff suggests that as Hinesburg moves forward in developing this industrial area that they consult with Starksboro and mitigate any concerns from development pressures that may arise in Starksboro.

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

Additional Comments/Questions:
In November 2016, CCRPC staff completed an informal review of the draft 2017 Hinesburg Town Plan before the first Hinesburg Planning Commission hearing on the plan. The informal review included a discussion of one required section that needed to be added to the plan (a reference to basin planning), as well as a number of suggestions for changes intended to improve the next draft of the plan. All suggested and required additions were incorporated. The details of the suggestions and the way in which they were addressed can be found in the annotated 2016 memorandum, attached.

While Staff does not find that any amendments are necessary for approval and confirmation of the process by the CCRPC, the following recommendations are for the next full Plan update:

1. CCRPC staff discussed several small typos and formatting issues with Town staff.
2. The Housing chapter (Chapter 3) says that the provision of municipal water and sewer is allowing more housing development in the village center area, and says that this new pattern represents a change in the town’s historic pattern of development (page 23). However, in several other places in the plan, the village center is described as an area that has historically been the town’s center of development. Therefore, the statement in the housing chapter could use some clarification.

CCRPC Staff have no other recommendations, however we would like to commend the Town on this Plan for the following reasons:

1. This plan left me with a very clear picture of the town as a whole: its character, the key issues and challenges facing the people and government, the specific strategies that have been identified, what’s already been done and the areas where the town is letting things “shake out” before making decisions.
2. There are numerous helpful cross-references in the plan, such as emphasizing the very important connection between economic development in the town and the ongoing water and wastewater challenges.
3. The implementation section is particularly strong. I especially appreciated the top 10 strategies for plan implementation, along with the acknowledgement in the implementation section that not all the good ideas identified in the plan are possible to accomplish.

Proposed Motion & Next Steps:
PROPOSED MOTION: The PAC finds that the draft 2017 Hinesburg 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.

Source: Historical data, U.S. Dept. of Commerce; Forecast, Approved 2050 Forecast, CCRPC

Chittenden County Historic Employment (1970-2015) & Approved 2050 Total Employment Forecast

Source: Historical data, U.S. Dept. of Commerce; Forecast, Approved 2050 Forecast, CCRPC
Chittenden County Historic Household (1970-2015) & Approved 2050 Household Forecast

Source: Historical data, U.S. Dept. of Commerce; Forecast, Approved 2050 Forecast, CCRPC

Chittenden County Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled (2000-2016)

Source: VTRANS Highway Performance Monitoring System
## Adjacent County Population Forecast and Estimation of Future Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Name</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2046</th>
<th>Total Change (Persons)</th>
<th>Total Change in Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addison County</td>
<td>37,100</td>
<td>39,280</td>
<td>2,180</td>
<td>995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin County</td>
<td>48,873</td>
<td>51,447</td>
<td>2,574</td>
<td>1,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Isle County</td>
<td>6,870</td>
<td>7,215</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamoille County</td>
<td>25,267</td>
<td>26,516</td>
<td>1,249</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>58,687</td>
<td>61,580</td>
<td>2,893</td>
<td>1,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>176,797</td>
<td>186,038</td>
<td>9,241</td>
<td>4,220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: VTrans Demographic and Economic Trends & Forecast Report, CCRPC 2050 Household Approved Forecast, 2045 Household Size
ECOS Plan Update/Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Scenarios

Background:
Staff has developed and run, in close collaboration with RSG, the various MTP transportation scenarios using the recently updated regional travel demand model. At the October Board meeting we will present and discuss future year 2050 model results for Scenarios A through D. Please note that 2025 and 2050 Base Scenarios include TIP projects that are also “front-of-the-book” projects in the VTrans Capital Program. All scenarios are briefly described below:

- **Scenario A:** Vehicle capacity scenario that evaluates the effect of building all TIP Projects (Front-of-the-Book, Development & Evaluation, Candidate list) and all MTP roadway projects as listed in the 2013 ECOS/MTP Plan (http://www.ecosproject.com/plan/).
- **Scenario B:** Technology Intensive scenario that includes Connected and Autonomous Vehicles (CAVs) by 2050. Specifically, Scenario B includes:
  - 80% of vehicle fleet is comprised of CAVs
  - 50% of CAVs are privately owned
  - 50% of CAVs are operating with a shared service (automated car sharing services)
  - 100% increase in freeway capacity and 5% increase in signalized intersection capacity.
  - Induced demand associated with increased mobility for the youth, the elderly and people with disabilities.
  - Zero Occupancy Vehicle (ZOV) trips circling the block while people run errands for areas that parking is at a premium.
  - ZOV trips traveling to and returning from remote parking areas to drop off and pickup workers.
  - “Mobility as a Service” concept with ZOV trips between fares for the shared CAVs. Note that vehicle occupancy does not increase under this concept – people are sharing a vehicle not a trip.
- **Scenario C:** TDM scenario that includes a robust increase in transit service and bike & pedestrian facilities. Specifically, Scenario C includes:
  - 20-minute headways for all existing transit routes.
  - New VT-127 to Colchester transit loop service.
  - Bus Rapid Transit (10-minute headways) on a dedicated lane/ROW for the following corridors:
    - US 2 (University Place in Burlington to Taft Corners)
    - VT 15 (Exit 15 to Five-Corners)
- US 7 (Shelburne Street Roundabout in Burlington to Webster Road in Shelburne)
- Colchester Avenue (University Place in Burlington to Winooski River Bridge)
  - Robust increase in bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure in Villages and City/Town Centers.
- **Scenario D:** The two land use scenarios included in this packet are: **D1** – 90% of the approved 2050 household (HH) growth is allocated to TAZs that correspond to the center and village planning areas for all towns; and **D3** – 10% increase in overall HHs in Chittenden County. Additional HH growth is allocated as with D1 to TAZs that correspond to the center and village planning areas.
- **MTP Scenario:** Hybrid scenario which combines multimodal projects and strategies from Scenarios A through D. A draft MTP Scenario will be presented at the November Board Meeting for discussion and feedback.

County-wide metrics charts for Scenarios A through D are attached for your review as well as demographic data used in the model/scenarios. Please note that each of these scenarios is narrowly focused on a specific issue/mode/strategy/future and that the draft MTP scenario will be a hybrid of these scenarios.

**Staff Request:** Please provide us your feedback on the different elements of each scenario and specifically let us know which elements within these scenarios you would like to see carried forward in the hybrid MTP Scenario.

**Staff contacts:** Jason Charest, jcharest@ccrpcvt.org & Peter Keating, pkeating@ccrpcvt.org
Countywide Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per Capita

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025 Base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050 Base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit 12B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Exit 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Exit 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All MTP Projects (A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connected Autonomous Vehicles (B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Demand Management (C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of HH growth in Village/Center (D1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% increase in County HH Total (D3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Countywide Daily Transit, Walking & Biking Mode Split

- 2015
- 2025 Base
- 250 Base
- Exit 12B
- Full Exit 13
- Full Exit 1S
- All MTP Projects (A)
- Connected Autonomous Vehicles (B)
- Transportation Demand Management (C)
- 90% of HH Growth in Village/Center (D1)
- 10% Increase in County HH Total (D3)
Countywide Daily Delay per Capita

- 2015
- 2025 Base
- 2050 Base
- Exit 12B
- Full Exit 13
- Full Exit 15
- All MTP Projects (A)
- Connected Autonomous Vehicles (B)
- Transportation Demand Management (C)
- 90% of HH Growth in Village/Center (D1)
- 10% Increase in County HH Total (D3)

Minutes

2015: 6.0
2025 Base: 6.0
2050 Base: 10.0
Exit 12B: 10.0
Full Exit 13: 10.0
Full Exit 15: 10.0
All MTP Projects (A): 9.0
Connected Autonomous Vehicles (B): 20.0
Transportation Demand Management (C): 9.0
90% of HH Growth in Village/Center (D1): 9.0
10% Increase in County HH Total (D3): 9.0
Countywide Daily Average Length of Trip (time)

- 2015
- 2025 Base
- 2050 Base
- Exit 128
- Full Exit 13
- Full Exit 15
- All MTP Projects (A)
- Connected Autonomous Vehicles (B)
- Transportation Demand Management (C)
- 90% of HH growth in Village/Center (D1)
- 10% increase in County HH Total (D3)

Minutes
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
October 18, 2017
Agenda Item 7B: Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) Update

Issues: Staff will provide an update and seek feedback on recent changes to the ECOS Plan’s CEDS.

(1) Edits and Reorganization: Staff have worked with the Long Range Planning Committee, GBIC and the Executive Committee to edit and reorganize the CEDS to comply with the latest requirements from the US Economic Development Administration. A SWOT analysis and a discussion of economic resilience are new requirements. The current draft incorporates the most current feedback from all groups. Some components in this draft appear in different parts of the ECOS Plan besides the CEDS, and their location is noted.

(2) The SWOT analysis included in the draft is a new component. Items were drawn from the 2012 analysis completed for the ECOS Plan and from recent work.

(3) The Economic Resilience section is also a new component, which was adapted from the State of Vermont CEDS section on economic resilience.

(4) The strategies and actions have been edited to reflect new projects and initiatives and to show work that has been completed since 2013.

(5) The introductory text to the CEDS chapter and all data and indicators have been updated. The indicators included at the end of the document will be shown on the ECOS Scorecard in the final plan.

(6) While a project list is now longer required, one will still be included. A draft project list is included in your materials, but it will be updated further.

(7) Next steps:
   a. Project list updates: Charlie will meet with all municipalities to determine which of their planned infrastructure projects should be included. Staff will meet with Champlain Water District, Chittenden Solid Waste District, the airport, and UVM Medical Center to determine which projects should be included on the CEDS project list.
   b. Municipal Feedback: Staff will distribute the draft CEDS components to municipalities for feedback.

Staff Recommendation: No action needed at this time.

For more information contact: Emily Nosse-Leirer and Regina Mahony
846-4490 x *15 & *28 or enosse-leirer@ccrpcvt.org & rmahony@ccrpcvt.org
4.2 Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) – DRAFT 10/12/2017

SUMMARY BACKGROUND

Over the past several decades, Chittenden County has enjoyed a competitive advantage relative to the balance of the state. The County’s share of population, Gross Domestic Product, jobs and income, among other economic indicators, has increased since 2010. Data points in this CEDS, drawn from the Vermont Department of Labor, the US Census, the Vermont Department of Health and other sources, are used to update the findings of the 2012 Economic Base and Competitive Assessment reports.

Despite the advantages the region has enjoyed in many areas, however, there are some disquieting trends that need to be acknowledged. Although job growth has largely recovered from the 2008 recession, recent trends show a continuation of higher job growth in lower-wage industries and less job growth in higher-wage industries. While the Chittenden County region has a highly desirable quality of life by many measures, population is projected to grow only 0.4% per year. However, our challenge remains how to promote, manage and shape growth to improve our job opportunities and incomes while also improving our quality of life.

Understanding Economic Development

- Economic development is about building a community’s capacity for shared and sustainable improvements in the economic well-being of residents.
- Economic development is about access to good jobs that can support an adequate standard of living for all residents of a region or community.
- Economic development is also about continuous and sustainable improvements in the internal functioning of the economy, where its structural underpinnings are made stronger without sacrificing long-term quality of life.
- Economic development provides the means and the continuous process to strengthen the foundation of our communities, and to make them more resilient and able to withstand shocks.

We need economic development:

- To constantly renew and strengthen the “living economy.”
- To address on-going infrastructure needs of key dollar-importing regional businesses.
- To supply the financial resources in order to create and sustain healthy communities.
The Circle of Prosperity

When a state has and maintains a talented workforce it attracts a diverse industrial base of dollar importing businesses that create high wage jobs. From the economic drivers dollars flow into the private sector to provide taxes, public revenues, capital, resources, and employment opportunities. These private sector actions fund the public sector's operations through taxes and governmental fees of which both the public and private sectors invest in creating and maintaining a clean environment, good schools, access to higher education and housing, and enhances the state's quality of life, thereby creating healthy communities. The "Circle of Prosperity" illustrates this interrelationship. First articulated in Vermont back in 1997 by the Vermont Business Roundtable, the "Circle of Prosperity" emphasizes the fact that economic development and healthy communities are a system, involving the collective and sometimes coordinated actions of many individuals, businesses, and institutions.¹

Key Issues/Trends/Insights

NOTE: This section is a combination of updated information originally included in Chapter 2 and 3 of the 2013 ECOS Plan and information from the CEDS chapter of the 2013 ECOS Plan.

SWOT ANALYSIS

This section analyzes the Region's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT). The issues below have been identified by regional work between 2012 and 2017, including initiatives such as the Building Homes Together campaign, work on the Vermont Clean Water Act, research for other plans and the analysis reports completed for the 2013 CEDS. Findings from these background documents were updated with the most recent data and findings. Supporting data on each issue and related actions are included elsewhere in this chapter. It should be noted that one issue can have positive and negative implications for the region, and therefore may be listed multiple times in the SWOT analysis. For example, Vermont’s Clean Water Act creates new regulations that will increase costs for municipalities and developers, but the increased funding dedicated to these issues will also create jobs and clean up the lake – an invaluable economic resource.
**Strengths:** A region’s relative competitive advantages (e.g. industry supply chains and clusters, extensive port, rail and broadband assets, specialized workforce skills, higher education levels, collaboration among stakeholders) often internal in nature.

- High concentration of a young and educated population
- Diversified base economic sectors in comparison to the rest of Vermont
- High labor quality
- High concentration of well-regarded institutions such as the University of Vermont, Champlain College and St. Michael’s College.
- More diverse population than the rest of Vermont
- High quality airport
- University of Vermont Medical Center
- High quality of public K-12 education
- Vermont and Burlington “brand”
- Strong creative economy
- Access to high quality infrastructure - natural gas (though non-renewable), interstate, high speed broadband
- Concentration of high net worth individuals
- Access to recreational, entertainment, and cultural opportunities
- Highly networked non-profit and service provider sector

**Weaknesses:** A region’s relative competitive disadvantages (e.g. a risk-averse or change-resistance regional culture), often internal in nature.

- Rising income inequality
- Labor constraints and skill shortages
- Uneven quality of public K-12 schools throughout the county
- Lack of connection between educational outcomes and employer needs
- Lack of career fairs and career planning
- Lack of affordable child care
- Housing affordability
- Limited developable site inventory
- Lack of racial and ethnic diversity compared to the rest of the US
- Land transportation and commuter mass transit infrastructure
- Wages not keeping pace with high cost of living
- Slow population growth
### Opportunities: Chances or occasions for regional improvement or progress (e.g. expansion of a biosciences research lab in the region), often external in nature.

- Increasing involvement of University of Vermont, Champlain College, and St. Michaels in economic development
- Nurturing entrepreneurial environment and support systems
- Improving structured employer engagement in K-16 education curricula and State training programs
- Improving the quality of vocational and technical education programs available in Chittenden County and Vermont, and increasing consistency between governance and funding structures of various programs
- Coordinating and increasing efficacy and efficiency of state and local permitting processes
- Creating more dynamic economic development programs and services
- Increasing policy focus and investment in renewable energy and clean water
- Improving parking management in downtown Burlington
- Promoting telecommuting and remote workforce based upon our regional assets
- Expanding access to career, vocational and technical education in K-12 and to adult Vermonter
- Engaging a highly skilled and trainable retirement age population
- Engaging and supporting a growing New American population

### Threats: Chances or occasions for negative impacts on the region or regional decline (e.g. several companies in the region considering moving out of state), often external in nature.

- Permitting costs, redundancies, delays, and appeals in the construction process
- Cost of complying with the Lake Champlain Total Maximum Daily Load for phosphorus
- Declining workforce participation
- Increasing rate of population aging and increase in needed services
- Declining K-12 population
- Labor/skills needs negatively impacting employers’ growth, investment, and location decisions
- Aging transportation, water and wastewater infrastructure and limited maintenance funds
- Rising rates of chronic disease and dangerous behaviors, such as addiction, substance abuse, mental health, and obesity,
- Increasing population of economically disconnected young adults in Vermont who do not seek post-secondary education and/or job training and therefore have limited opportunities
- Lack of rental and owner-occupied housing that is affordable
Economic Base Analysis

This sub-section provides an analysis of the current economic base of Chittenden County and the trends that have been shaping the County’s economy up to this point in time. It considers those aspects of a regional economy most typically included in the preparation of a Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) or similar economic development strategic plans.

Some disquieting trends need to be acknowledged in Chittenden County. Goods-producing sectors are dropping in economic output and employment. The rate of population growth has declined and that is likely to continue into the future. The population continues to age, and the workforce will shrink because of that. Though unemployment is currently very low, workforce participation is also decreasing. This may mean that businesses will struggle to grow due to a lack of skilled workers. These and other problems are exceedingly difficult to address on a local level, but local efforts, coupled with action by state and federal elected and appointed officials, can mitigate some of these disadvantages.

However, Chittenden County maintains strong advantages as well. Chittenden County remains the largest player in Vermont’s economy. Over the past several decades, the County’s share of population, GDP, jobs and income, among other factors, has increased. The county includes the largest urban area in the state and the largest for-profit employer in the state, but also significant agricultural, recreational and open space areas. This mix of uses results in a character cherished by its residents and appealing to prospective residents.

The data below illustrate recent positive and negative conditions and trends in Chittenden County.

Chittenden County’s Place in the Vermont Economy

- Chittenden County contains 26% of the State’s population
- Median household income is $67,997 versus $56,990 for the State
- Between 2010 and 2015, the State’s population grew .01%, while Chittenden County’s population grew 3%.
- Chittenden County is home to 27% of the State’s private businesses. Between 2010-2016, the number of private businesses increased by 3.7% in Vermont, and by 13.8% in Chittenden County.
- Chittenden County accounted for 36% of total Vermont manufacturers’ shipments in 2012, down from 45% in 2007*
- Thirty percent of the State’s retail sales occurred in the County (2012)* and in 2016, the Department of Taxes reports show that five of the six highest retail sales tax collections occurred in Chittenden County (Williston – #1; Colchester – #2, South Burlington – #3; Burlington – #4; and Essex - #6).
- GDP per capita in 2015 was $53,759 in the Burlington-South Burlington Metropolitan Statistical Area, vs. $43,495 for the State

* Data from the 2012 Economic Census. The 2017 Economic Census is underway, and data will become available in 2019.
• Chittenden County provides 28.6% of sales tax revenue in Vermont in 2015 (a drop from 32% in 2012)
• Chittenden County provides 36% of state income tax revenues in 2015 (an increase from 35% in 2012)
• The annual rate of population growth in both Chittenden County as well as the State has slowed over the past several years. While regional population growth (3% increase from 2010-2015) is still stronger than statewide growth (.01% increase from 2010-2015), it is lower than the national growth rate (4%). Though the region still has a population growth advantage compared to the state, it does not when compared to the rest of the country.
• Chittenden County has the highest percentage of New Americans in the state, and the percentage is growing—1/3 of all new county residents between 2006-2016 were born outside of the US. This group makes up 6.1% of the county’s spending power and is strongly represented in key sectors like manufacturing and health care.

**Employment, Wages and Key Sectors**

• After declining from 2000-2010, employment in the private sector increased by 9.5% between 2010 and 2016. Public sector employment grew more slowly during the same time period (6.2%).
• The growth in the MSA’s gross domestic product from 2010 to 2015 has come entirely from the services sectors. Over that time period, the MSA’s GDP increased 5.4%, the GDP of private goods producing industries dropped 18.6%, and the GDP of private services-providing industries increased by 10.9%.
• Growth in total nominal wages has risen off its sharp decline in 2009, and average wages were 11.4% higher in 2016 than they were in 2010. However, manufacturing, one of the sectors with the highest average wages in Chittenden County, has seen wages decrease by 2% since 2009.
• After decreasing from 2008-2010, the number of private businesses in Chittenden increased by 820 establishments from 2010-2016.
• The largest employers in Chittenden County are the University of Vermont Medical Center and the University of Vermont. While there has been concern in the past that having these institutions as such large employers rather than private sector businesses is a problem, these institutions are an advantage to Chittenden County, and the economy is not overly reliant on them. Both are net dollar importers and are highly stable.
• Services-providing industries have become a larger portion of the economy since 2010. In 2010, private goods-producing industries were 19.7% of the economy, and private services-providing industries were 65.9% of the economy. In 2015, the industries made up 15.2% and 69.3% of the economy respectively.
• GDP per capita in the retail sector increased 3.8% between 2010 and 2016. However, over that same time period, employment in retail sectors decreased by 0.9%.
The number of Chittenden County jobs in high-wage industries has declined by more than 5,000 since the year 2000; much of this has been from cutbacks at Global Foundries (formerly IBM). Employment in mid-wage and low-wage industries has increased slightly. The loss of jobs in high wage industries is not unique to this region—it is part of a larger trend that has been seen nationwide.

The construction industry has recovered since the 2008 recession, and the numbers of newly permitted projects, both housing and commercial/industrial, have reached pre-recession levels.

Global Foundries (formerly IBM) remains a strong part of the economy. The information technology and analytical instruments cluster remains the most important element of traded sector employment (those industries that sell their products and services outside the region and bring new money back in, thus supporting the local, or non-traded, industries). Durable goods manufacturing, which includes electronics manufacturing, remains 7% of the region’s GDP. However, following the loss of more than 4,000 jobs at Global Foundries (formerly IBM) over the past decade, the long-term security of these jobs may be in question.

Working lands and resource extraction industries are critical components of a self-reliant and diverse economy, making a region less vulnerable to market crises. Working lands and resource extraction industries are economically viable within the constraints of our natural landscape. For more information on working lands in Chittenden County, see Section 2.4.3 and Strategy 3.2.4.

Renewable energy generation, especially solar panels and biodigesters, provide opportunities for farmers to bring in extra income by producing electricity. Both net metering (using the energy produced on-site) and leasing the land to a developer may be valuable economic opportunities. For more information on CCRPC’s goals for renewable energy generation and facility siting policies, see Strategy 3.2.2.

Household Financial Security

Although this plan celebrates Chittenden County’s high income and education levels, household financial security is still a concern.

Income inequality increased in Chittenden County between 2010-2015. This follows a national trend that has been occurring since the 1980’s. While Vermont and Chittenden County have significantly lower levels of income inequality than the country as a whole, this trend is still concerning.

Vermont’s Basic Needs Budget determines the hourly rate a worker would need to make to pay for their "basic needs," ranging from food and housing to childcare and insurance. This rate is known as the “livable wage,” and it is calculated differently depending on household size/makeup and rural or urban location. For full time workers, the Vermont minimum wage is only 74% of the average living wage. However, this varies significantly by household composition and location. For example, the Vermont minimum wage is only 43% of the living wage for two working parents with two children in an urban area, and only 25% of the living wage for a single parent with two children in an urban area.
• In 2016, lower income Vermonters reported higher rates of depressive disorders, poor mental health and chronic conditions, such as obesity, asthma, heart disease, stroke and diabetes. While data on addiction were not available broken down by income, some substance uses, such as using marijuana or tobacco, were higher among adults with lower incomes. Data from 2013 showed similar trends in Chittenden County.

• Lack of financial resources can also cause food insecurity. For example, in Chittenden County, 29% of students are eligible for free or reduced priced school meals. Food insecurity is also linked to obesity, as “unhealthy,” high calorie foods tend to be cheaper in terms of “calories per dollar” compared to “healthy” food like fresh produce.

• The County’s ability to grow its economy in the future will be closely tied to its ability to provide available labor. A broad-based strategy of skills upgrading, new methods of recruiting and alternative working arrangements will be necessary.

• More focus is needed on education and workforce development to train employees for the opportunities in the technologies needed for manufacturing, professional services and health care.

• For a more detailed discussion of housing costs in Chittenden County, please see Section 2.5.2.

Competitive Assessment
This sub-section provides an assessment whether Chittenden County, Vermont is competitive as an economic development product. In the economic development marketplace, the product being sold is usually a place, and the characteristics of that place determine its competitiveness. In this instance, the place being assessed is Chittenden County, Vermont and its constituent communities, in particular, the central City of Burlington. Chittenden County is comprised of many communities that have varying degrees of interest in differing forms of economic development. Taken as a whole, this provides the basis for a diverse and sustainable economy and quality place in the future.

In reviewing the findings presented in the Competitive Assessment report (http://ecosproject.com/analysis), the following highlights were noted. Statistics and conclusions are from the Competitive Assessment report unless otherwise noted.

• Chittenden County is a mix of urban, suburban and rural areas, with an essential rural character that polling has consistently shown is important to many residents. Protection of this character must be reflected in economic development efforts if public sector economic development efforts are to be broadly supported.

• The County has a high quality of life, making it attractive to businesses and workers. The notable exception is the affordability of housing, which was rated the lowest quality of life factor in the 2012 Employers Survey. Recent focus groups conducted during the Building Homes Together Campaign show that this issue persists as the most commonly observed weakness of the area in interviews of employers. While there are many reasons an employee in Chittenden County may choose to live outside the region, it is important to increase quality housing stock available to all income levels, to increase quality of life for current residents and to attract those who wish to live near their jobs.
• Based upon the results of the Employers Survey, recreational opportunities, safety from crime, and cultural opportunities all scored Very Good or higher, while the quality of the K – 12 educational system scored just below Very Good.
• Educational levels among residents 25 years old and older exceed state and national norms. However, 30% of employers report that they have training needs that are not met by local resources, and significant racial and income-based achievement gaps remain (See Section 2.5 Education for more detail.)
• Vermont Agency of Education data show that, roughly 40% of graduating high school seniors do not go on to further education (industry recognized credentials, certificates, or two and four-year degrees) once they leave school. This often means they have limited ability to engage in the workforce, and disproportionately suffer from negative social, economic, and health outcomes. These issues will be characterized in greater detail by the State Workforce Development Working Group’s efforts, which are currently ongoing.
• The County represents 26% of the state’s population, and is relatively young, with household incomes and educational attainment exceeding state and national norms.
• Between 2012 and 2016, Chittenden County’s employment base has remained concentrated within five private industry sectors: healthcare and social assistance; retail trade; manufacturing; accommodation and food service; and professional, scientific and technical services. However, the proportion of jobs in these sectors has dropped from 71% of total employment in the County in 2012 to 54% in 2016.
• The number of subsectors with high location quotients (goods production, construction, manufacturing, education and health services and other services) shows a diversified employment base that offers opportunities for continued economic diversification and a broad base on which the County’s economy can flourish.
• The County’s ability to grow its economy in the future will be closely tied to its ability to provide available skilled labor, particularly once the currently unemployed are absorbed back into the ranks of the employed as much as their skills will allow. A broad-based strategy of skills upgrading, training, new methods of recruiting and alternative working arrangements will be necessary. An integrated workforce delivery system plan will need to be considered and implemented.
• Unemployment in Chittenden County is low. In January 2016, unemployment in Chittenden County was 2.9%, compared to the US average of 4.9%. However, Vermont’s percentage of “underutilized” workers is 8.2%, much higher than the unemployment rate. Workers who are unemployed, involuntarily part time, or marginally attached fall into this category. Although Vermont’s rate of underutilized workers is lower than the national average (10% in 2015), many Vermonters are still searching for a job that fits their skills and economic needs.
• The best recruiting experiences reported by county employers are typically from workers in the Northeast, the upper Midwest and areas with similar climate and outdoor recreational opportunities, such as the Northwest and Colorado. Recruiting people from large technology centers such as Boston, Austin and California is difficult.
• Employers report very good to excellent workforce quality, with good work ethic and productivity, and low turnover and absenteeism.
• The County’s higher education infrastructure is excellent, although almost 30% of employers participating in the Employer Survey indicated that they have training needs that are not being met by local resources. While some of these needs are for skills that
are unique to specific companies, several employers surveyed for this assessment reported similar training needs for skilled manufacturing occupations particularly in the machine trades. Interviewed manufacturers emphasized the strong need for local training programs in machining and other skilled occupations to support their growth and sustainability.

- With the notable exception of affordability of housing, most every kind of quality of life factor sought by most people is readily available in the County.
- The County’s perceived regulatory environment rates as less than Good (where Good = 3 on the five point scale used in the Employer Survey conducted as part of the competitive assessment), with local property taxes and the local construction permitting process (regulations and procedures) both topics of complaint.
- As of 2016, most permitted industrial parks are approaching full build out, and consequently the supply of industrial land remains low. This will continue to inhibit industrial growth in the County. [Staff will work with GBIC to get more information on this, including specific past examples of companies that have not located or expanded within Chittenden County due to industrial land supply.]
- As of 2016, commercial land sales have increased since the 2008 recession and high sales activity is projected to continue. However, the market for office space is currently somewhat oversupplied, and construction will likely slow.
- Chittenden County features a well-developed transportation network that facilitates multi-modal travel. While the physical infrastructure is adequate for future demand, strategic investments will be needed in: 1) technology, such as coordinated signals, to improve the function of existing infrastructure, and 2) Single Occupant Vehicle (SOV) alternatives such as walking, biking and transit. Over the next 35 years, the majority of transportation spending will be on maintaining the system we’ve invested in over the past several decades. See the Metropolitan Transportation Plan for more details on the Region’s transportation infrastructure.
- The County is generally well-served with utilities and telecommunications services necessary to support economic development. The weakest part of the County’s utilities and telecommunications system is the quality and costs of telecommunications, in particular cell phone service in our rural areas. Though almost all Chittenden County households are served by broadband internet, faster internet is an important utility for many of the region’s key sectors, including those who work at home.
- Continued and increased attention must be paid to providing services to existing businesses and entrepreneurs in Chittenden County. Organizations such as the Vermont Center for Emerging Technologies, BTV Ignite and the South End Arts and Business Association are key to the region. Encouraging the creation and growth of small, “home-grown” businesses is key to diversifying the economy instead of relying solely on large employers like Global Foundries (formerly IBM) for all technology jobs.
- Three of the County’s public high schools have low performance indicators, and employer interviews indicate that the limited proficiency of students remains a concern as they move into the workforce. Equal education that meets or exceeds state standards, especially for financially disadvantaged students and those for whom English is not their primary language, is key to the economy.
- Funding the water quality projects necessitated by the Lake Champlain TMDL will present a challenge for Chittenden County municipalities by straining municipal budgets.
Additionally, complying with increased stormwater management requirements will increase the cost of development.

**Strategic Industry Sector Analysis**

This sub-section provides a summary of the identification of target clusters and industry sectors that will likely be significant economic drivers for Chittenden County. The full Strategic Industry Sector Analysis report can be found at [http://ecosproject.com/analysis](http://ecosproject.com/analysis). Based on the Economic Base Analysis and Competitive Assessment, the following 14 initial target clusters and industries for attraction and development efforts were identified and submitted to GBIC for consideration:

- Information Technology
- Value Added/Sustainable Agriculture
- Digital Media
- E-Commerce
- Clean Tech/Green Technology
- Tourism
- Retail
- Non-profit Organizations
- Health Care
- Business and Administrative Services
- Value-Added Manufacturing
- Higher Education
- Outdoor Recreation
- Food systems

From this initial selection, five primary targets, one of which is a combination of three of the initial recommendations, were selected as value-adding industries with high location quotients and are profiled in the Strategic Industry Sector Analysis report referenced above:

1. Information Technology, Communications, and Media
   - Information Technology
   - E-Commerce
   - Digital Media
2. High Value-Added Manufacturing
3. Higher Education
4. Clean Tech/Green Tech
5. Health Care and Wellness
ECONOMIC RESILIENCE

Economic resilience is an area’s ability to withstand, prevent, or quickly recover from major disruptions (i.e., ‘shocks’) to its underlying economic base, identify vulnerabilities and withstand or recover from disruptions. Depending on the character of the hazard, employees in certain industries, residents of certain areas or people with lower incomes or a more limited social safety net will be impacted more than others. Increasing economic resilience means that all Chittenden County residents, institutions and businesses will be better equipped to handle economic shocks.

As identified in the Weaknesses and Threats section of the SWOT analysis, Chittenden County faces a number of economic challenges. In addition, the Chittenden County Multi-Jurisdictional All Hazards Mitigation Plan\(^2\) identifies two hazards facing the county’s economy:

1. Economic Recession: While employment and property values have recovered strongly since the 2008 recession, Chittenden County could be affected by another national recession.
2. Major Employer Loss: The loss of a major employer, either through severe job cutbacks or outright closure, has the potential to dramatically increase unemployment and reduce property values due to out-migration of terminated employees or facilities closure.

To work towards greater resilience, and preparedness for the above hazards, the County CEDS is incorporated into the ECOS Plan as it requires more than traditional economic development activities alone. The State of Vermont CEDS states that any economic development activity that meets one or more of the following criteria increases economic resilience.

1. Embraces complexity
2. Plans for change
3. Expands opportunities
4. Develops diverse relationships
5. Designs for learning
6. Builds local and regional self-reliance

The table below, organized by the above criteria, shows the different strategies and actions throughout the ECOS Plan that increase the region’s economic resilience. Continued implementation of these strategies and actions will help the County be resilient to the hazards identified above.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A RESILIENT ECONOMY:</th>
<th>THE ECOS PLAN’S STRATEGIES INCLUDE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Embraces complexity (Does it encourage flexibility, economic diversity, and awareness of uncertainty?)</td>
<td>Improving and strengthening the economic systems of our region to increase opportunities for Vermont employers and employees (3.2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans for change (Does it reflect systems thinking and foresight? Does it consider multiple scales? Does it build adaptive capacities?)</td>
<td>Directing growth in a way that benefits all sectors of the economy and enables economic diversity—trying to make development for homes, retail and industrial uses easier in the areas planned for their growth, and simultaneously decreasing the destruction of working lands (Strategies 3.2.1, 3.2.2 and 3.2.4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expands opportunities (Does it enrich human, social, cultural, economic, and ecological wellbeing? Does it build diverse and accessible forms of livelihood and local wealth?)</td>
<td>Implementing strategies about education and equity, and seeking to improve the water quality of the region’s lakes, rivers and streams, and to increase investment in and reduce fragmentation of the working landscaping (3.2.3 and 3.2.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develops diverse relationships (Does it forge trusted partnerships and rich feedback loops amongst a flexible network of people and resources?)</td>
<td>Partnering with health and social welfare groups to increase the health and safety of every community member (Strategy 3.2.5).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ECOS PLAN ACTIONS TO IMPLEMENT THESE STRATEGIES INCLUDE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1.2: Identify and plan for new industrial site locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1.4: Innovation and Entrepreneurial Development - Create an economic system of resources that is easily navigable at all stages of the innovation and entrepreneurial continuum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.5.1: Basic Needs - Provide the basic needs of all people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Designs for learning  
(Does it facilitate continuous learning, adaptation, knowledge sharing, and innovation?) | Supporting educational efforts for all ages to ensure that children have equal opportunity for good educations, that teenagers are prepared for future careers, and that adults have the skills they need to thrive at work (Strategy 3.2.6). |
| Builds local and regional self-reliance  
(Does it empower communities?) | Making equity a focus of planning through government partnerships data analysis, project prioritization and public participation (Strategies 3.2.7 and 3.2.8). |

3.2.6.2: Elementary Readiness and Comprehensive Student Needs

3.2.6.3: Student-centered, proficiency based, flexible pathways to graduate

3.2.6.5: Career Awareness and Skill Alignment

3.2.7.1: Community Development Finance Tools - Expand and improve implementation of financial tools available to municipalities

3.2.7.7: County coordination and alignment

3.2.7.8: Multi-jurisdictional services

3.2.8.3: Increase opportunities and remove barriers for civic engagement for all, including underrepresented populations
4.2.3 STRATEGIC DIRECTION/ACTION PLAN

(Note: A Project List is no longer required, but one will be included. It will hopefully include identifying funding sources besides EDA grants. See the attached draft project list.)

Goals

Broad Goal: Build the region’s capacity for shared and sustainable improvements in the economic wellbeing of the community through support of both local and globally competitive initiatives.

Economy Goal: Retain and support existing employers and job growth, grow target sector employers and entrepreneurs, and work to attract a greater diversity of employers and employees.

Household Financial Security Goal: Improve the financial security of households.

Working Lands Goal: Support the growth and vitality of working farms and managed forests; and sustainably manage sand and gravel extraction operations.

Strategies

(Note: These strategies are currently found in Chapter 3 of the ECOS Plan, most in Strategy 1. However, other issues are addressed in detail elsewhere in the ECOS Plan. If no edits are proposed, those actions are not included here. For example, actions related to housing affordability can be found in Section 3.2.2.3.)

1 IMPROVE AND STRENGTHEN THE ECONOMIC SYSTEMS OF OUR REGION TO INCREASE OPPORTUNITIES FOR VERMONT EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYEES.

Economic development is about building a community’s capacity for shared and sustainable improvements in the economic well-being of residents. Providing access to good jobs that can support an adequate standard of living for all residents of a region or community; continuous and sustainable improvements in the internal functioning of the economy, where its structural underpinnings are made stronger without sacrificing long-term quality of life; and providing the means and the continuous processes to strengthen the foundation of our communities.

Actions

1. High wage employers – The primary goal of any economic development strategy is retaining and growing the already existing high wage jobs within the economy. The region should maintain economic diversity by deepening existing sectors, and increase diversity by identifying and supporting businesses in sectors with high location quotients (a higher concentration in the region compared to the country as a whole). Providing support and connecting available resources is critical to ensuring that this economic base remains vital and is able to grow. The high wage sectors in which Chittenden County expects to drive our economy are: Information Technology, Communications, and Media (including Information Technology, E-Commerce, and Digital Media); High
Value-Added Manufacturing; Higher Education; Clean Tech/Green Tech; and, Health Care and Wellness (see the Target Sector Analysis – will be located here www.ecosproject.com/analysis shortly.).

a. Build relationships with these employers. For example, the Region’s Tech Jam highlights some of the region's many successful tech companies. Success here connects to the action on innovation and entrepreneurial development and includes: developing and attracting a tech workforce, access to financing, marketing VT and the region as a home for tech jobs and tech companies, supportive infrastructure such as broadband access, incubator space, and networking.

b. Facilitate access to employment and infrastructure development resources made available by the State. Currently these include programs such as the Vermont Employment Growth Incentive and the Vermont Training Program.

c. Market the quality of life and the Vermont and Burlington “brand”— Chamber action

2. **Industrial Site Locations** – With only a few years supply of existing buildings or permitted sites left for high wage industrial or manufacturing businesses in the region, additional sites need to be identified and carefully planned to ensure a smooth permitting process to be ready for employers’ needs for expansion or relocation in Chittenden County. The most likely employment sectors with this need are high wage, technology-based and other types of manufacturing. The best opportunities for these sites are on vacant portions of land owned by current major employers, within close proximity to - or already connected to - existing infrastructure services for long term efficiency.

   a. CCRPC and GBIC will work with ACCD to have business/industrial parks recognized as benefit locations in state designation programs. (Funded by GBIC and CCRPC. No direct additional employment is expected, but this would help to create future opportunities.)

   b. Efforts should be made by CCRPC to educate businesses and developers about “Smart Growth”—development practices that achieve a higher level of density, greater compatibility within traditional development patterns, use less land, and provide for all modes of transportation.

   c. Prepare a “longevity analysis” to project when additional fully-serviced land should be added to the regional inventory (GBIC action).

3. **Workforce Education and Skills Development** – Promote public/private partnerships for education that connect the skills development infrastructure of our institutions of higher education, vocational programs, and technical schools with the direct needs of the Vermont workforce. If education takes place with connections to our economic needs, students and retrained workers will have their skill sets match with the employment market.

   a. See Strategy 3.2.6 for more actions related to education.
b. Maintain, improve and market the assets that attract and retain young professionals, such as the “Vermont brand,” social and professional opportunities, and affordable and attractive housing.

c. Implement actions identified by the S.135 working group to assess current workforce education and training needs. (The working group’s report is due by November 15, 2017).

4. **Innovation and Entrepreneurial Development** – Coordinate and promote the providers, programs, and services already available in the State to create an economic system of resources that is easily navigable at all stages of the innovation and entrepreneurial continuum. This must aggregate and address services such as finding capital, mentorship, prototyping, commercialization, etc.

   a. Encourage home-based small businesses throughout the Region as allowed by municipal zoning, and ensure that sufficient telecommunications infrastructure, especially high-speed internet, is available to make these businesses possible.

   b. Research successful efforts to capitalize on the entrepreneurial spirit of recent immigrants and ensure that they are a cornerstone of economic development policy and actions, and incorporate strategies as appropriate.

5. **Creative Economy and the Arts** – Arts and the creative economy are what drives a large and diverse amount of economic activity in our region (e.g. local foods, design, technology, media, craftsmanship/fabrication, arts, emergent media, music, dance, festivals, education, and recreation). This portion of the economy is fundamentally unique in that it is a significant contributor to the culture in our region. Support creative economy and arts programs and efforts. Create collaborations between arts, culture and recreation groups and the Chamber of Commerce and local businesses to promote the use of local artists in regular business needs (i.e. advertising, branding, communications, etc.) and to share vacant or underutilized commercial spaces with artists for gallery and/or studio space.

6. **Working Lands** - Support value-added foods, farms and forest products through the work of Farm to Plate by Vermont Sustainable Jobs Fund and Working Lands Enterprise Board. See Strategy 4 for more details.

7. **Tourism** – Continue good efforts in tourism including VT Convention Bureau, Lake Champlain Regional Chamber of Commerce, and Lake Champlain Byway. Support the work of the Vermont Outdoor Recreation Economic Collaborative, a task force created by Governor Phil Scott in 2017, to strengthen and expand Vermont’s outdoor recreation economy.

8. **Economic Development Coordination** – Work with the State of Vermont to implement the 2014 Vermont Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (Vermont 2020); and coordinate with Northwest Regional Planning Commission on their economic development efforts.
9. **Public Infrastructure** – Adequate funding for public infrastructure is necessary to maintain and expand existing systems. See the Metropolitan Transportation Plan for more details.

10. **Housing Affordability** – Rental and owner-occupied housing that is affordable is a key component of economic development. See Strategy 3.2.2.3 for more details.

11. **State/Local Permitting Coordination & Improvement (Currently in the ECOS Plan as Action 3.2.2.5)**

   a. Support changes to the local and state permitting process to make the two more coordinated and effective. Participate in the Commission on Act 250.

   b. Collaborate with stakeholders to ensure local and state regulations, bylaws and plans encourage transparency, predictability and timely review of sustainable and environmentally sound development applications.

   c. Develop a transportation assessment process that supports existing and planned land use densities and patterns in Center, Metro, Suburban, Village, and Enterprise Planning Areas to allow for more congestion and greater mode choice than allowed by current standards. The CCRPC will collaborate with the Vermont Agency of Transportation (VTrans), the Natural Resources Board, and other state and local stakeholders to develop a process that evaluates the transportation impact from a multi-modal perspective rather than just a traffic flow standpoint.

   d. Policies and planning studies that are adopted as part of this ECOS Plan and subsequent amendments will guide CCRPC’s position in permit proceedings
EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

The Key Indicators below are reported on the ECOS Scorecard: https://app.resultsscorecard.com/Scorecard/Embed/8502

Proposed New Indicators:

- Percent of employment and location quotient of target industry sectors in Chittenden County – Will add
- Economic Diversity – Will add
Current Indicators (From ECOS Scorecard Unless Otherwise Noted - https://app.resultsscorecard.com/Scorecard/Embed/8502)

Change in Age Cohorts, 2006-2016
Source: American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates

ECOS Total (Covered) Employment - Chittenden County
Data Source: Vermont Department of Labor, Economic & Labor Market Information

ECOS Number of Businesses
Data Source: Vermont Department of Labor

CEDS for ECOS Plan 2018 Update, Page 21 of 24
1. **Median Household Income, Chittenden County**

   Data Source: American Community Survey, 1-year estimate

   - 2009: $61,179
   - 2010: $67,997
   - 2011: $68,843
   - 2012: $66,958
   - 2013: $64,904
   - 2014: $62,004
   - 2015: $67,997
   - 2016: $68,843

2. **Median Household Income by Race, (Black/African American Householder)**

   Data Source: American Community Survey, 1-Year Estimates, Table B19013B

3. **Percentage of families whose income in the last 12 months is below poverty level, Chittenden County**

   Data Source: Percentage of families whose income in the last 12 months is below poverty level. U.S. Bureau of the Census, ACS 1-year estimates

   - 2009: 7.30%
   - 2010: 7.30%
   - 2011: 7.30%
   - 2012: 7.30%
   - 2013: 7.30%
   - 2014: 7.30%
   - 2015: 7.30%
   - 2016: 7.30%

4. **Housing + Transportation Costs for Median Income Family**

   Data Source: http://www.locationaffordability.info/ai.aspx

   - 2006: 49%
   - 2007: 49%
   - 2008: 49%
   - 2009: 49%
   - 2010: 49%
## Draft CEDS List - for 2018 ECOS Plan Update

### Municipality and Infrastructure Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Infrastructure Type</th>
<th>Project Summary</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burlington/South Burlington</td>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>Airport Improvements - South End Development Engineering Design - General Aviation/Corporate Taxiway &amp; Apron.</td>
<td>$9,780,000</td>
<td>2013-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington/South Burlington</td>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>Airport Improvements - South End Development PHASE 6 - Taxiway G Extension, Taxiway B rehabilitation.</td>
<td>$80,000,000</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>Vermont Aviation Center (CEDO) - Working with VTC, Heritage Aviation and the Airport to establish a facility housing the Burlington Aviation Tech Program, Vermont Flight Academy and allowing room for VTC to expand their future aviation program offerings.</td>
<td>$5,250,000</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington, South Burlington</td>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>Airport Improvements - South End Development PHASE 5 - Construction of New Cargo Area.</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>2018-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington, South Burlington</td>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>Airport Improvements - South End Development PHASE 7 - General Aviation/Corporate Taxiway &amp; Apron.</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>General utility upgrades in waterfront district - Water, sewer, lighting, electrical, conduit, telecommunications upgrades to prepare sites for development and enhanced public space.</td>
<td>$6,500,000</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Broadband</td>
<td>Burlington High School Renovations - to meet 21st century learning needs, such as electrical outlets and capacity, wireless infrastructure, smart boards and projectors.</td>
<td>$6,500,000</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>Broadband</td>
<td>Community Broadband Wireless Technology Access</td>
<td>$25,000,000</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Brownfield</td>
<td>Redevelopment of 453 Pine (CEDO) - Redevelop Brownfield at 453 Pine St to allow growth in the South End. Possible inclusion of solar array.</td>
<td>$6-12,000,000</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Burlington</td>
<td>City Hall</td>
<td>New City Hall - Expanded facility to meet community needs for municipal services and municipal meeting space.</td>
<td>$60-65,000,000</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVE, Essex Junction</td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Champlain Valley Exposition (CVE) music pavilion/grandstand - Renovation &amp; expansion</td>
<td>$65,000,000</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinesburg</td>
<td>Electric</td>
<td>Extension of 3-phase power - to South Hinesburg along VT116 by Green Mountain Power. Job creation possibly substantial, service extension to existing industrial district with ample build out potential.</td>
<td>$1,140,000</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chittenden County</td>
<td>Emergency Services</td>
<td>New regional dispatch facility and technology capital costs.</td>
<td>$1,140,000</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Ferry - Waterfront</td>
<td>Redevelopment of King Street Dock Site / Ferry Yard Relocation (CEDO) - Relocation of maintenance yard, and redevelopment of King Street dock site and ferry terminal - mixed use development.</td>
<td>$60-65,000,000</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Food Systems</td>
<td>Intervale Heated Greenhouse (CEDO) - Build greenhouses on Intervale land heated by excess heat from the McNeil Plant.</td>
<td>$65,000,000</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Color Key:
- **Strikethrough:** Projects proposed for removal (as well as programs that are already removed) so we can instead focus on major infrastructure/utilities.
- **Projects proposed for removal because they are on the MTP project list**
- **Questionable infrastructure projects - keep these or remove?**
- **Cost estimate or date from old CEDS list that needs to be updated**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Infrastructure Type</th>
<th>Project Summary</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Food Systems</td>
<td>Burlington Food Enterprise Center (CEDO) - Finalize Environmental remediation of the site (CAP) and possibly sell property to Intervale Center for future redevelopment.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVE, Essex Junction</td>
<td>Food Systems</td>
<td>Champlain Valley Exhibition Agricultural Center - create an agricultural center</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Heating</td>
<td>District Heating Plan (CEDO) - Plan to recapture &quot;waste heat&quot; from the McNeil power plant and distribute it to the Old North End of Burlington, a densely populated area within the City.</td>
<td>$21,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinesburg</td>
<td>Heating</td>
<td>Extension of Natural Gas service in Hinesburg up Richmond Road.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George</td>
<td>Heating</td>
<td>Vermont Gas service to enable concentrated growth center.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>Highway, Garage</td>
<td>Highway Garage planning, design and construction - Expand existing space to accommodate all vehicles and repair activities.</td>
<td>$103,000</td>
<td>After 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinesburg</td>
<td>Highway, Garage</td>
<td>planning, design and construction</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Historic Structure repairs, construction - Fort Ethan Allen Water Tower requires funds for preservation of structure.</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>2016 and beyond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Burnham Memorial Library Expansion - The current public community library has outgrown its space and is limited to what it can and should potentially offer to the public. Serving 60,000+ patrons.</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Library Expansion and Renovation, Planning, design and construction - expand existing space to meet current needs.</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Burlington</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Library and recreation facility serving community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Vermont Medical Center</td>
<td>Medical Facility</td>
<td>UVM Medical Center Inpatient Facility - Development of a new inpatient facility to serve the population of Northwest Vermont. Design completed, in permit process.</td>
<td>$187,000,000</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Downtown parking garage on the campus of Edmunds School for the use of School, Champlain College and the community (BSD). Underground facility with turf surface above to extend green area for School. Consider parking revenue as one source of funding.</td>
<td>$5-10,000,000</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Burlington</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>City Center Parking Decks - Construct 500 spaces to provide necessary infrastructure to facilitate business and residential development.</td>
<td>6300000</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westford</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Formalize on-street parking in front of brick meeting house - upgrade, pave and stripe parking.</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Leddy Arena Parking Lot Renovation (Parks) - Existing parking lot deteriorating and in need of major reconstruction.</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Boathouse Public Restroom Renovation (Parks) - Significant leaking has deteriorated existing facilities. Need for renovation.</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>In-progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Waterfront Electrical Distribution Design (Parks) - Improvements needed to better support waterfront events.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Miller Community Recreation Center Roof Renovation (Parks) - Facility currently experiences serious, extensive leaking throughout building. Repair/replace existing roof, remove chimney.</td>
<td>$7-10,000,000</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Infrastructure Type</td>
<td>Project Summary</td>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>City Hall Park (BCA/Parks) — Imagine City Hall Park master planning process completed, park slated for major reconstruction. Stimulate downtown business growth.</td>
<td>$575,000</td>
<td>In-progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Parks — Waterfront</td>
<td>Marina Expansion and Long-term Improvements (Parks) — In conjunction with Plan BTV, the Parks Master Plan, and an assessment of the existing Boathouse, opportunities to improve/renovate/replace the Boathouse, increase transient boater slips, and improve land side amenities should be considered.</td>
<td>$2,300,000</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Parks — Waterfront</td>
<td>Continue reconstruction of and enhancement of 7.5 mile bike path</td>
<td>$17,000,000</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Multi-Generational Community Recreation Center — Land secured, funding needed to build.</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>In-Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Redevelopment</td>
<td>Town Center Mall redevelopment — associated public infrastructure and parking</td>
<td>$200,000,000</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Redevelopment</td>
<td>Gateway Block Redevelopment (CEDO) — Redevelopment of the Gateway Block at Main and North Winooski. Properties include Memorial Auditorium, Municipal surface lot, motel and firehouse.</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Redevelopment</td>
<td>Moran Plant/Waterfront Redevelopment (CEDO) — To redevelop one of the last parcels/vacant buildings on the shores of Lake Champlain in downtown Burlington. The Moran plant has been vacant for decades and the city is now working to develop a private/public partnership to renovate the facility.</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Redevelopment</td>
<td>YMCA — Redevelopment of current site.</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Burlington</td>
<td>Redevelopment</td>
<td>City Center Development — Assure there is an adequate inventory of &quot;developable&quot; sites with the necessary infrastructure to promote retention and expansion of existing firms and the recruitment of new startup operations in strategic business clusters in the region and workforce housing.</td>
<td>$7,200,000</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Burlington</td>
<td>Redevelopment</td>
<td>Market Street — Assure there is an adequate inventory of &quot;developable&quot; sites with the necessary infrastructure to promote retention and expansion of existing firms and the recruitment of new startup operations in strategic business clusters in the region and workforce housing.</td>
<td>$12,000,000</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Road</td>
<td>North Beach Emergency Access Road Improvement (Parks) — Renovation of roadway to better accommodate emergency vehicle access to North Beach Campground.</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Railyard Enterprise District (CEDO) — Develop and build out new street grid including bike/ped, mixed use, greenspace and connections to the lake and bike path.</td>
<td>$10-30,000,000</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Realignment of Birchcliff Pkwy and Sears Lane — Realigning the roads to facilitate better, safer traffic connections.</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williston</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Taft Corner Grid Streets - construct local streets in Taft Corner area to improve circulation</td>
<td>$3,900,000</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Milton Hourglass Intersection — this project invests in an area planned for growth and would address a high-accident intersection at US7, Middle and Railroad Street by creating an hourglass-shape intersection scoped by the RPC.</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>2017?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Infrastructure Type</td>
<td>Project Summary</td>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Roadway - Complete Streets</td>
<td>Pine Street Corridor Redevelopment (CEDO) - Ongoing work with businesses along Pine St. (Sondik, Noyes, Champ. Choc., Dealer and others). Individual Projects may be funded by private businesses. Complete street improvements would be publicly funded.</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westford</td>
<td>Salt Shed</td>
<td>Town Salt &amp; Salted Sand Shed – protect water resources from salt contamination.</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winooski</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Winooski School District Renovations and Upgrades</td>
<td>$591,000</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westford</td>
<td>Sidewalk/Path</td>
<td>Create a path from the common to the school along the Browns River.</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>In Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westford</td>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
<td>Pedestrian infrastructure - construct sidewalks connecting public facilities (common, library, town office, post office, school, meeting house, etc.)</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Town</td>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>Stormwater projects – planning, design and construction to meet MS4 permit and Flow Restoration Plans</td>
<td>$50,000,000</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Burlington</td>
<td>Stormwater Improvements</td>
<td>Continue to comply with State Standards. Prepare for the implementation of the MS-4 Permits.</td>
<td>$2,835,000</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Streetscape</td>
<td>Cherry Street Streetscape - Phase 1 - Creating walkable environment and links between the waterfront and Church Street Marketplace.</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Streetscape</td>
<td>Cherry Street Streetscape - Phase 2 - Creating links from Battery Street at foot of Cherry Street down to Lake Street.</td>
<td>$23,000,000</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Streetscape</td>
<td>Side Streets Project (CEDO) - Expand amenities of Church Street Market Place to more of the downtown district. Add connectivity to waterfront from CSMP. Stimulate downtown business growth.</td>
<td>$28,000,000</td>
<td>2013-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>Streetscape</td>
<td>Milton 4D Streetscape Improvements: Defining Downtown from the Diner to the Dam - this project invests in lighting, street trees, sidewalk improvements, and wayfinding/placemaking signage along US Route 7 in the Town Core.</td>
<td>$2,300,000</td>
<td>2016 &amp; ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>Gilbane Smart Growth Center, Phase III (CEDO) - South End Transit Center - This is an ongoing discussion on how best to utilize the site.</td>
<td>$13,000,000</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Vermont</td>
<td>University-Facility</td>
<td>UVM STEM Building – Development of a University building designed to meet the specific needs of classes to teach Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics related courses. Under construction.</td>
<td>$106,000,000</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSWD, Burlington, Hinesburg</td>
<td>Waste Disposal</td>
<td>Relocate Burlington, Colchester and Hinesburg Drop-Off Centers - Build New Drop-Off Centers.</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td>2016 &amp; ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSWD, Burlington, Hinesburg</td>
<td>Waste Disposal</td>
<td>Construct new relocated Burlington and Hinesburg Drop-Off Centers - Construct new Drop-Off Centers.</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>2016 &amp; ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSWD</td>
<td>Waste Disposal</td>
<td>Design &amp; Construction for HHW Facility Upgrades</td>
<td>$185,000</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSWD</td>
<td>Waste Disposal</td>
<td>Design, Permitting &amp; Construction of Regional Landfill - New Regional Landfill in Williston, design presently on hold indefinitely</td>
<td>$50,400,000</td>
<td>On hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSWD</td>
<td>Waste Disposal</td>
<td>Construction of Special Waste Management System - Special Waste &amp; C&amp;D Facility.</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Infrastructure Type</td>
<td>Project Summary</td>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>Burlington North Wastewater Treatment Plant - increased capacity needed to meet TMDL phosphorous reduction requirements (currently at 59% of of the proposed TMDL phosphorous load). North Plant began optimizing in August 2015, thus 2015 load for those plants is reduced from previous years.</td>
<td>$4,300,000</td>
<td>near-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>Burlington Riverside Wastewater Treatment Plant - increased capacity needed to meet TMDL phosphorous reduction requirements (currently at 90% of the proposed TMDL phosphorous load).</td>
<td>$4,300,000</td>
<td>near-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>Burlington Main Wastewater Treatment Plant - increased capacity needed to meet TMDL phosphorous reduction requirements (currently at 110% of proposed TMDL phosphorous load). Main Plant began implementing additional chemically based phosphorus removal in June 2015.</td>
<td>$29,400,000</td>
<td>near-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>Data are not available for Burlington Electric’s wastewater treatment plant.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>Recent studies concluded that Goodsell Point and East Lakeshore Drive, realistically, could only be served by a centralized sewer system. With the most logical treatment option being the North Plant in the City of Burlington, the sewer line would extend from Goodsell Point, East Lakeshore Drive, West Lakeshore Drive, Prim Road, Heineberg Drive, and then into Burlington. Capacity will be needed from the North Plant. This project may be affected by any work needed to meet TMDL for the Burlington North Wastewater Treatment Plant. This project was listed on the 2017 Pollution Control Priority and Planning List distributed by the Clean Water State Revolving Fund.</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>Sewer infrastructure may be needed around Exit 17. The project would utilize the Milton Wastewater Treatment Plant. This project may be affected by any work needed to meet TMDL for the Milton Wastewater Treatment Plant.</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>long-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex &amp; Essex Junction</td>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>Additional capacity needed over the long term to meet TMDL phosphorous reduction requirements. Essex Junction Wastewater Treatment Plant is currently at 25% of its phosphorous load after a $15 million refurbishment. Over the long term, $1,200,000 may need to be invested to maintain the TMDL.</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>Construction of new municipal sewers is needed on Pinecrest Drive, Blair and portions of Pioneer and Ira Allen. Essex may be affected by any work needed to meet TMDL for the Essex Junction Wastewater Treatment Plant.</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>After 6/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelburne</td>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>Additional capacity needed in the future to meet the new 2016 TMDL phosphorous reduction goals. Shelburne Wastewater Treatment Plant #1 is currently at 60% of its phosphorous load and Shelburne #2 is at 50%. Improving these plants was listed on the 2017 Pollution Control Priority and Planning List distributed by the Clean Water State Revolving Fund.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Burlington</td>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>Additional wastewater treatment capacity needed in the future to meet the TMDL phosphorous reduction. The Bartlett Bay Wastewater Treatment Plant upgrade is currently at 80% of its phosphorous load.</td>
<td>$88,000,000</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Infrastructure Type</td>
<td>Project Summary</td>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winooski</td>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>Additional capacity needed in the future to meet the TMDL phosphorous reduction. The Winooski Wastewater Treatment Plant is currently at 130% of its phosphorous load. Winooski WWTF headworks and phosphorous removal was listed on the 2017 Pollution Control Priority and Planning List distributed by the Clean Water State Revolving Fund.</td>
<td>$7,052,897; $525,000 for Headworks and P removal</td>
<td>near-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinesburg</td>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>The Hinesburg Wastewater Treatment Plant is currently at 71% of its phosphorous load, but future upgrades may be needed. This project was listed on the 2017 Pollution Control Priority and Planning List distributed by the Clean Water State Revolving Fund.</td>
<td>$3,250,000 - $7,800,000</td>
<td>long-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>Possible upgrades may be needed to meet the TMDL in the long term.</td>
<td>$1,620,150</td>
<td>long-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williston</td>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>Addition to an existing gravity sewer line on Route 2A.</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>Done?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td>Wastewater - New</td>
<td>Stone Environmental completed a village wastewater system feasibility study in 2012. There are no current plans to implement this plan.</td>
<td>$10,461,000</td>
<td>long-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George</td>
<td>Wastewater - New</td>
<td>The town completed a feasibility study on expanding the town center’s community septic system, but have no immediate plans to implement it. A developer is currently working with the DRB to complete a development in the town center, which will be served by the community septic system. All costs for septic hookup will be borne by the developer. In 2015, funding for a treatment building and pumping facility improvements was bypassed by the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund Capitalization Grant.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>long-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westford</td>
<td>Wastewater - New</td>
<td>The town is currently investigating a large scale community wastewater system. Study and planning are funded by a Municipal Planning Grant. Cost includes engineering and construction. Land acquisition is expected in 2017. This project was listed on the 2017 Pollution Control Priority and Planning List distributed by the Clean Water State Revolving Fund.</td>
<td>$2,090,000</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Colchester Fire District #3 also requires additional water storage capacity and an expanded distribution system to provide necessary fire storage capacity for the growth center.</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Additional water system capacity is needed. New waterlines with increased pipe sizes have been studied for Susie Wilson Road to provide adequate fire flows and pressures.</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Sandhill Road Waterline Improvements planning, design and construction. Increase waterline with 8 inch pipe to replace section of 3 inch piping and add pressure reducing valves.</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>After 6/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williston</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>In the process of replacing the water storage tank on Tower Lane.</td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champlain Water District</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Twin Filtered Water Tank &amp; Wet Well - New redundant 1.0 MG filtered water tank and wet well expansion</td>
<td>$3,800,000</td>
<td>2017 to 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champlain Water District</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Close-in Transmission Main Cross-tie - 1,300’ of new 24” transmission main along Farrell Street to tie HS1 and HS2 together close to the plant</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>2017 to 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champlain Water District</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Williston High Service Storage Tank - New 0.6 MG tank in Williston High Service area</td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
<td>2017 to 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champlain Water District</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Interior piping upgrades for existing Well #7 meter vault</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>2017 to 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Infrastructure Type</td>
<td>Project Summary</td>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champlain Water</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Replacement of the existing Milton meter vault</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>2017 to 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champlain Water</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>New communications tower at Williston South Tank to replace antenna at Williston East Tank</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>2017 to 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champlain Water</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Exit 16 Double Diamond Transmission Main - Replacement of 1,300’ of 16” main as part of VTrans interchange project</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>2018 to 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champlain Water</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Filter Effluent Pump System Upgrade - Upgrade of existing filter effluent pumps, piping, and controls</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>2018 to 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champlain Water</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Allen Road Meter Vault Improvements - Replacement of the existing Allen Road meter vault</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>2018 to 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champlain Water</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Spear Street PRV Replacement - Replacement of the existing Spear Street PRV vault</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>2018 to 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champlain Water</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Essex West PS and Transmission Main - New pump station and transmission main at Essex West tank for interconnection with the Town of Essex</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>2018 to 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champlain Water</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Treatment Plant Emergency Generators - Three new emergency generators for backup power at the plant and raw water pump station</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>2018 to 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champlain Water</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Second Emergency Backup PRV Feed from HS to MS - New PRV vault to feed water from High Service to Main Service</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>2018 to 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champlain Water</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Old Filtered Water Tank Rehabilitation - Rehabilitation of the existing filtered water tank</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>2018 to 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champlain Water</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Permnaganate Process Upgrade - Upgrade of the permanganate feed system at the plant</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>2018 to 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champlain Water</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>North Intake Sample / Chemical Feed Upgrade - Upgrade of the North Intake sample and chemical feed lines</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>2018 to 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champlain Water</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Main Service Pump #3 and Discharge Header - Upgrade of Main Service Pump #3 and the Main Service discharge header</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>2018 to 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champlain Water</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Parallel Lake Water Transmission Main - Plant End - Completion of a parallel transmission main from the Lake Water Pump Station to the plant</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>2018 to 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champlain Water</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Treatment Plant HVAC Improvements - Upgrade of the plant HVAC system</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>2018 to 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champlain Water</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Essex South Tank Flow Control Valve &amp; Passive Mixing System - Installation of a flow control valve and passive mixing system at the Essex South tank</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>2018 to 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinesburg</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Another water source is still needed for projected demand in the village center. The town hopes to build two new wells and a nanofiltration system.</td>
<td>$1,175,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Infrastructure Type</td>
<td>Project Summary</td>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champlain Water District</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>A project is being planned to install a new 1 million gallon Filtered Water Tank and wet well expansion project at the CWD treatment facility in South Burlington. The project will provide redundancy of two critical elements at the plant: filtered water storage and filtered water effluent wet well volume. The total project cost includes both the new tank and the wet well expansion. CWD is planning to begin design this summer, conduct a bond vote on November 1, 2016, and construction in 2017. $2,000,000 of the project will be funded by a Drinking Water State Revolving Fund Capitalization Grant.</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jericho-Underhill Water District</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>The system needs a new Maple Ridge pump station and distribution system, as well as other minor improvements, beginning in 2018. This project was determined to be Non Fundable on the 2015 Drinking Water State Revolving Fund Capitalization Grant Revised Comprehensive Project Priority List.</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td>Water - New</td>
<td>Publicly regulated water systems serve Huntington Woods/Roberts Park and the BPMS elementary school. Additional capacity may be needed.</td>
<td>$8,164,000</td>
<td>long-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>Water and Wastewater</td>
<td>System improvement needed. Water and sewer lines on Pleasant Street and Bridge Street need to be improved. $957,550 loan obtained in 2015 from the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund Capitalization Grant.</td>
<td>$2,100,000 for system improvement; $10,170,000 for extension</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>Water and Wastewater</td>
<td>Scoping study completed in 2015 re: extending water and sewer into the West Main Street area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>Water and Wastewater - New</td>
<td>The town is investigating sites for potential community sewage disposal and drinking water supply in the Village and Commercial districts.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>long-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Infrastructure Type</td>
<td>Project Summary</td>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Water, wastewater or both?</td>
<td>This is an asset management project. City-wide gravity pipe assessment and rehabilitation is needed.</td>
<td>$5,020,000</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Waterfront</td>
<td>Breakwater planning and construction – Breakwater to protect harbor from north and south winds</td>
<td>$4,300,000</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Fire station consolidation (CEDO) – This is an ongoing conversation related to Gateway Block Redevelopment.</td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Incorporate the Metropolitan Transportation Plan project list by reference</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>Redevelopment</td>
<td>Creamery Site</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Redevelopment</td>
<td>Burlington Town Center</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Stormwater/Water Quality</td>
<td>Incorporate the State of Vermont Watershed Project Database by reference</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Color Key:**
- **strikethrough** Projects proposed for removal (as well as programs that are already removed) so we can instead focus on major infrastructure/utilities.
- Projects proposed for removal because they are on the MTP project list
- Questionable infrastructure projects - keep these or remove?
- Cost estimate or date from old CEDS list that needs to be updated
- New projects
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
October 18, 2017 Meeting

Agenda Item 8
CCRPC comments on draft Municipal Roads General Permit  (Action Item)

Background: On Monday, September 11th, Vermont DEC formally issued its draft MRGP. See info at: http://dec.vermont.gov/watershed/stormwater/permit-information-applications-fees/municipal-roads-program. The public is invited to provide written comment on the draft MRGP through the close of business (4:30pm) on October 27, 2017.

Written comments on the draft MRGP should be emailed to Jim Ryan at jim.ryan@vermont.gov or mailed to:
Jim Ryan DEC Stormwater Program  1 National Life Drive, Main 2 Montpelier, VT 05620-3522

The draft comments have been reviewed by the CWAC, TAC and the Executive Committee at their early October meetings.

For documents referenced in the letter, including the CCRPC-Fitzgerald Environmental “Prioritization Methodology” see the attachments for our October 3rd CWAC meeting located here: http://www.ccrpcvt.org/about-us/committees/clean-water-advisory-committee/

Action: The Board should review the draft letter and then if desired vote to formally submit the letter to DEC.

Staff contacts: Dan Albrecht, dalbrecht@ccrpcvt.org, 861-0133
Chris Dubin, cdubin@ccrpcvt.org 861-0121
Proposed Final

TO: Jim Ryan, Municipal Roads General Permit Manager
FROM: Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
DATE: October 19, 2017
RE: Comments on Draft Municipal Roads General Permit

First off, we’d like to thank you for all the hours you have put in meeting with the CCRPC and countless municipalities as you have developed this permit. Your dedication to such engagement is truly appreciated.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Municipal Roads General Permit. Please consider these comments of our Board of Directors approved at their monthly meeting on October 18th.

General comment – The MRGP references numerous documents/forms which are to be used by municipalities to work towards and/or demonstrate compliance with this permit including, for example:
- DEC Road Erosion Inventory Template
- MRGP Implementation Table
- RSWMP Implementation Table
- Implementation Table
- MRGP Planning Report
- Culvert sizing based on in-field and mapping techniques
- Catch Basin Inventory and Outlet Erosion Evaluation
The draft permit directs the reader to obtain these various documents by accessing them on the recommended web links. However, in some cases, the referenced documents are embedded within larger PDFs or within additional links whose names are not intuitive to the casual user.

Recommendation 1  CCRPC recommends that DEC create a separate webpage or Permit Appendix which clearly lists and numbers each of the various documents (e.g. MRGP, Attachment A-DEC Road Erosion Inventory Template; Attachment B-Example RSWMP Implementation Table, etc) that are to be used to comply with this MRGP as well as provide examples where appropriate.

Specific comments:

2.1 Duty to Apply

Recommendation 2  There is a reference to MS4 and “Part 7” in the 3rd sentence. It appears that this should refer to “Part 6.”
3.1. Submittal of Initial Notice of Intent and Application Fee

Recommendation 3: A $2,000 flat annual fee is too heavy of a burden for smaller towns. The total amount of fees should be tied to the cost to administer the permit and not generate excess revenue. Fees could be a lower flat fee, be tiered, or be variable depending on the number of connected road segments or road-related impervious cover. There should be some incentive, such as a reduced fee, for towns to complete their road erosion projects in less than the 20-year timeframe.

4.1 Comprehensive Plan for All Stormwater Discharges

A municipality shall complete and submit for Agency approval a Road Stormwater Management Plan (RSWMP) for all municipal roads, which include municipally-owned and controlled town highways, rights-of-ways, and municipal stormwater infrastructure associated with town highways.

Recommendation 4: The applicability of this permit to “rights-of-ways” needs further clarification. This permit should not be applicable to such ROWs that are vacant and/or lack road infrastructure regulated by this permit.

A.1 Road Erosion Inventory for all municipal hydrologically-connected road segments

Slope Data – Because required BMPs vary for different slope ranges, 0<5, 5<8, 8+, 10+ the use of accurate slope data is critical. As Chittenden County has recent 2014, 1ft. contour LiDAR data, the CCRPC with DEC concurrence, has used this data (rather than that in the ANR Atlas) to derive slope values in order to perform road erosion inventories in 2016 and 2017.

Recommendation 5: CCRPC recommends that the permit should clearly allow the use of alternative data sources when more accurate data exists.

a. “For paved roads with catch basins: the catch basin outfall pipe is within 500 feet of a water of the state or wetland.”

Within 500 feet seems overly expansive and inconsistent with use of 100 ft. as a cutoff point as noted in 4.1.A.1.b.1 and with use of “uphill” as noted in 4.1.A.1.b.3.

Recommendation 6: CCRPC recommends modifying to reduce distance to “within 100 feet and uphill of a water of the state or wetland.”

Similarly, this subsection, needs refinement...

b. 3. The municipal road segment is uphill from, and drains to, a municipal road that bisects a water of the state or wetland, and should be included in the REI to accurately capture the extent of the stormwater watershed.

Recommendation 7: The definition of uphill should be refined to set a specified distance......e.g. “is uphill from, and within x00 feet, and drains to....”
The REI will include a road erosion “score” for each hydrologically-connected road segment. All road segments will be scored as “Fully Meets,” “Partially Meets,” or “Does Not Meet” the standards listed in Part 6 of this permit. A detailed procedure for scoring road segments is provided in the Inventory. Road segments that score “Partially Meets” or “Does Not Meet” shall be upgraded to meet standards according to the municipality’s implementation schedule. Road segments that score “Fully Meets” do not require upgrades, but shall be maintained to ensure that they continue to meet standards. The Inventory scores and explanation of those scores shall be entered into the RSWMP Implementation Table.

We appreciate the inclusive process by which DEC developed the Road Erosion Inventory methodology especially the involvement of CCRPC and other Regional Planning Commissions. Overall, the Inventory Template is useful to assessing the various attributes of a given road segment with regards to its ability to handle stormwater. However, we have the following recommendations which, if followed, would more appropriately target remedial actions/upgrades to improve water quality.

The inventory assesses the degree to which various standards ----Crown, Berm/Windrow, Drainage, Conveyances/Turnouts, Driveway Culverts, Drainage Culvert and Rill/Gully Erosion--- are being implemented on a given segment. Depending upon how many of these standards are considered to have scored as Partially Meets or Does Not Meet determines the Overall Segment Score. We are concerned however that all these Standards are weighted equally regardless of their relative impacts to water quality.

In July 2017, the firm of Fitzgerald Environmental completed development of a refined and field-calibrated Road Erosion Prioritization Methodology (see attached memo dated July 14, 2017) based upon 2016 inventory data collected by CCRPC. Most critically, the methodology weights the relative importance of these standards vis-à-vis sediment and pollutant source and transport mechanisms. The methodology concludes that the most critical variables and those that should be weighted the highest when predicting impacts to water quality are:

- Slope
- Adequacy of Road Drainage
- Total Number of Poor Conveyances
- Gully Erosion Locations
- Stream and Road Conflicts
- Total Conveyances
- Stream Culverts

Conversely, the performance of the following variables was less critical:

- Roadway Crown
- Berm
- Total Road Drainage Culverts less than 18” in Diameter
- Total Road Drainage Culverts lacking Header(s)
- Total Driveway Culverts less than 15” in Diameter

Therefore, we recommended that the REI Scoring Methodology be refined to incorporate this
analysis so that the RSWMP Implementation is focused on improving water quality rather than focusing on meeting road maintenance and construction standards. Therefore, we recommend:

**Recommendation 8** Adjust any or all of the following standards from the Segment Scoring process [Roadway Crown, Berm, Road Drainage Culverts less than 18” in Diameter; Road Drainage Culverts lacking Header(s) and Driveway Culverts less than 15” in Diameter] so that they are not weighted equally with more “water-quality-determinant” standards. For example, scores of Partially Meets for these standards should not count as much towards the cumulative total [“One or two Partially Meets individual scores = Partially Meets segments score.”] that labels a segment as Partially Meets.

**Recommendation 9** Create one set of Partially Meets / Does Not Meet criteria for segments with slopes less than 5% and one for segments of 5% or more as Slope is probably the single most important variable.

**Recommendation 10** Require segments that Do Not Meet criteria for Adequacy of Road Drainage; a high number of Poor Conveyances; Gully Erosion Locations and Stream and Road Conflicts to be addressed in the first five years of the Permit to meet all standards.

**Recommendation 11** Similarly, as Stream Crossings provide the most likely avenue by which sediment and flow can be conveyed into waters, require any segments with such crossings to be addressed in the first five years of the Permit to meet all standards.

**Recommendation 12** While assessing Road Crowns and Berms could remain as part of the Inventory process, it is inappropriate to make them part of the MRGP Standards. They are transient features of roads and their status and condition fluctuate depending upon the timing and frequency of maintenance activities.

**3. Very High Priority Road Segments.** Hydrologically connected road segments scoring “Does Not Meet” on the REI, on slopes greater than 10 %, are considered Very High Priority Road Segments. Very high priority segments shall be upgraded to meet the MRGP standards listed in Part 6 of this General Permit by December 31, 2025.

**Recommendation 13** The requirement to upgrade these segments by 2025 will be too onerous for certain municipalities. The 2025 deadline should be extended.

**C. Schedule of Compliance.** The municipality shall bring all hydrologically-connected road segments up to the MRGP standards as soon as possible but no later than January 1, 2037. The municipality shall include in its RSWMP Implementation Table the number of non-compliant road segments the municipality will bring up to standards each year, in order to achieve compliance by January 1, 2037. The minimum number of road segments that must be brought up to MRGP standards annually until compliance is achieved shall be determined by dividing the total number of non-compliant segments by the years remaining in the MRGP implementation schedule.

The requirement to upgrade a minimum road segments each year severely interferes with the ability of municipalities to carry out their public works functions. There are simply too many
variables which could prevent meeting an artificial annual target. These include: weather, permitting constraints, the lack of available qualified contractors, mandates required by other permits, etc.

**Recommendation 14** Strike the following from 4.1.C: The minimum number of road segments that must be brought up to MRGP standards annually until compliance is achieved shall be determined by dividing the total number of non-compliant segments by the years remaining in the MRGP implementation schedule.

**Part 6. Road Stormwater Management Standards**

This section is the heart of the permit. We appreciate the work that DEC has put into it. We have a few suggestions for improvement.

**6.2 Required Standards for Gravel and Paved Roads with Ditches**

**Recommendation 15** With regards to “new construction” and “significant road upgrades,” please clarify that the MRGP standards only apply to such work if the segment is a hydrologically-connected gravel and/or paved municipal road segment with drainage ditches.”

**6.2 B. Road Drainage Standards**

Roadway runoff shall flow in a distributed manner to grass or a forested area by lowering road shoulders. Road shoulders shall be lower than travel lane elevation. If distributed flow is not possible, roadway runoff may enter a drainage ditch, stabilized as follows:

**Recommendation 16** For “shoulders lower than travel lane” allow for exceptions consistent with 2nd paragraph of start of Part 6 especially if “excessive ledge” is present that precludes lowering of road shoulders.

2. For roads with slopes 5% or greater but less than 8%:
   a. Stone-lined ditch: minimum 6”-8” minus stone or the equivalent for new construction,
   b. Grass-lined ditch with stone check dams, or
   c. Grass-lined ditch if installed with disconnection practices such as cross culverts and/or turnouts to reduce road stormwater runoff volume. There shall be at least two cross culverts or turnouts per segment disconnecting road stormwater out of the road drainage network into vegetated areas, or spaced every 164’.

**Recommendation 17** The flexibility to implement options a, b or c. is appreciated. Additional guidance should be provided on when options b or c could be implemented such as soil type and/or performance-based requirements.

**Recommendation 18** Please clarify item “c” above. Topography and field conditions may preclude spacing these cross-culverts/turnouts apart. Suggest revising to state “It is recommended that these be spaced at least 163’ apart.”
4. If appropriate, bioretention areas, level spreaders, armored shoulders, and sub-surface drainage practices may be substituted for the Above Road Drainage Standards.

In more sparsely populated areas or areas of high elevation, existing municipal roads often lack ditches. Municipalities have had to prioritize the use of limited funds and grants and therefore focus most effort on more heavily traveled roads. To address the lack of ditches, road foremen often make several “grader cuts” along the edge of a road so as to act as a “conveyance” to direct water into adjacent vegetated areas or woods.

Recommendation 19 Please clarify under what conditions existing or new “grader cut” conveyances may be used.

6.2.C Stable Conveyances – Drainage Outlets to Waters & Turnouts

Recommendation 20 CCRPC recommends that the permit make clear that in addressing outfalls, the Road Erosion Inventory is only required to address what is visible within the ROW, within any applicable easements or within the area allowed to be inventoried by the applicable property owner. The permit should make it clear that municipalities are not required to bring up to standards any outfall that is outside of the municipal ROW, outside of any applicable easement and not allowed by any applicable landowner.

6.3 Standards if Rill or Gully Erosion is Present on Gravel and Paved Roads with Ditches

This section is highly detailed. We appreciate the clear direction given. We have a few comments as follows.

Recommendation 21 The permit should make clear that these standards do not apply to new construction on non-hydrologically-connected segments?

Both rill erosion and gully erosion are defined with regards to depth as 1”-12” and 12” or more respectively. However, no difference is made in recommended standards depending upon the length or severity regardless of the fact that gully erosion of 5 ft. in length is a much more significant issue than rill erosion of 5 ft.

Recommendation 22 CCRPC recommends that the DEC establish a length measurement within the definition for both rill erosion and gully erosion, and establish standards appropriate for the length and severity of each issue.

Rill or gully erosion is mostly caused by inadequate road crowns, the presence of berms, slope and other factors. However, adherence to these standards mostly trigger improvements that are totally unrelated to said problem of rill or gully erosion. Furthermore, those discrete areas of improvement may not have any erosion issues at all.

Recommendation 23 CCRPC recommends improvements to road crowns, grading and/or berm removal in this section rather than improvements to culverts; or please explain the rationale for this section as written.
6.4 Standards for Connected Class 4 Roads

Currently municipalities are not required to maintain Class 4 roads in accordance with 19 V.S.A. § 310 and case law. We are, however, supportive of doing road erosion inventories of Class 4 roads. Additionally, we are also concerned that requiring maintenance on Class 4 roads, even if it is confined to major erosion problems, could lead to causing more erosion just to get to the site with the right equipment.

Recommendation 24. No permit requirements on municipalities should be established on Class 4 roads unless and until statute is clarified to specifically require this responsibility.

Putting legal issues aside, language in the draft permit and Inventory Template is problematic in that the presence of any gully erosion automatically classifies that Class IV segment as “Does Not Meet Standard.”

Recommendation 25. CCRPC recommends that this standard be changed to say, for example, “any gully erosion equals Partially Meets, gully erosion exceeding 10 ft. in length equals Does Not Meet.”

Recommendation 26. CCRPC recommends it be made clear that improvements to Class IV roads to meet the MRGP standards shall be considered the last priority.

Part 10: Definitions

Recommendation 27. Please define “new road construction” and “significant road upgrades.” Clear metrics such as total linear feet, depth of reconstruction, etc. should be used and examples given. Additionally, it may be helpful to define what does NOT constitute either of these two key terms as they are used as triggers throughout the permit.

Recommendation 28. Please define “redevelopment” as used in Section 6.2, A.1.b.

Recommendation 29. Please clearly define and/or reduce the number of terms for “ditch,” “swale” and “gully.”

Recommendation 30. Please define “stream crossing” culverts in relation to whether it applies only to perennial streams and/or intermittent streams.

8.6 Right of Entry

The permittee shall allow the Secretary or his/her authorized representatives, at reasonable times and upon presentation of credentials, to:

--------

D. Sample or monitor at reasonable times, for the purposes of ensuring permit compliance or as otherwise authorized by the CWA or state law, any substances or parameters, including BMP performance, at any location.

Recommendation 30. Please provide an additional detail on the type and frequency of anticipated sampling and any anticipated obligations incumbent upon the affected municipality.
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission

October 18, 2017

Agenda Item 9: FY19 Municipal Dues

FY2019 Municipal Dues

Background:

Each year the CCRPC assesses municipal dues that are primarily used to match federal transportation dollars for municipal and regional projects in Chittenden County.

The municipal dues assessment amounts are distributed among the member municipalities based on the Equalized Education Grand List (EEGL). Even with no increase in total dues, the dues for each municipality are adjusted each year consistent with their proportion of the EEGL. The most recent EEGL issued by the State of Vermont for Chittenden County is used in the FY19 tables. A copy of the January 1, 2017 Chittenden County EEGL is included in your packet.

The CCRPC kept municipal dues level for fiscal years 2012 through 2014 following the merger. The dues were increased by 1.8% in FY15 based on the change in the Employment Cost Index (ECI) for State and Local Government Employee Compensation, which is published by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). The Commission decided to level fund the dues again for FY16, FY17, and FY18.

**Table 1** shows a proposed 0% increase over FY18 dues for FY19. The Executive Committee recommends that the Full Board approve level funding the municipal dues for FY19.

Recommendations:

The Executive Committee recommends keeping the municipal dues level for FY19. The Executive Committee recommends the Full Commission approve the FY19 dues as shown on **Table 1**.

For more information contact:

Forest Cohen
fcohen@ccrpcvt.org, 846-449 ext. 19
## Equalized Education Grand List

**Effective January 1, 2017**

**Chittenden**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town Name</th>
<th>Total Taxable Parcel Count</th>
<th>Education Grand List</th>
<th>Education CLA</th>
<th>COD</th>
<th>Total Equalized Education Grand List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>1,245,335</td>
<td>99.07</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1,256,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buels Gore</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29,226</td>
<td>94.13</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>31,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Burlington</td>
<td>10,410</td>
<td>36,564,045</td>
<td>82.42</td>
<td>10.97</td>
<td>44,365,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>1,743</td>
<td>9,172,036</td>
<td>99.00</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>9,265,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>6,776</td>
<td>20,777,414</td>
<td>94.33</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>22,026,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Jct.</td>
<td>3,403</td>
<td>10,859,353</td>
<td>97.50</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>11,138,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Town</td>
<td>4,333</td>
<td>14,417,686</td>
<td>97.45</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>14,795,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinesburg</td>
<td>1,966</td>
<td>5,300,201</td>
<td>90.02</td>
<td>11.07</td>
<td>5,887,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>2,144,580</td>
<td>99.84</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>2,148,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jericho</td>
<td>2,058</td>
<td>6,622,983</td>
<td>104.19</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>6,356,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Milton</td>
<td>4,381</td>
<td>11,395,039</td>
<td>99.36</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>11,468,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>1,678</td>
<td>4,537,391</td>
<td>96.95</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td>4,680,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelburne</td>
<td>2,896</td>
<td>15,027,674</td>
<td>95.67</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>15,707,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* South Burlington</td>
<td>7,501</td>
<td>29,101,126</td>
<td>95.98</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>30,318,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>710,257</td>
<td>95.83</td>
<td>17.87</td>
<td>741,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underhill</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td>3,878,517</td>
<td>100.40</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>3,863,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westford</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>2,391,997</td>
<td>100.52</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>2,379,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williston</td>
<td>4,089</td>
<td>18,952,964</td>
<td>99.24</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>19,098,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Winooski</td>
<td>1,776</td>
<td>5,577,706</td>
<td>92.20</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>6,049,870</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**County Totals**

|               | 57,269 | 198,705,530 | 211,576,580 |

* Municipality has active TIF district. For more information, refer to introduction preceding this report.
Each town is assessed dues using their percentage of the Equalized Education Grand List. Their amount is determined by taking the total dues and multiplying it by the municipality's percentage of the total Grand List.

Equalized Education Grand List can be accessed at the Vermont Department of Taxes
http://www.state.vt.us/tax/publications.shtml

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>EEG List January 2016</th>
<th>% of County</th>
<th>EEG List January 2017</th>
<th>% of County</th>
<th>1/16 - 1/17 $ Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>CCRPC FY18 Assessment</th>
<th>0% Increase FY18 - FY19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td>1,289,810</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>1,256,970</td>
<td>0.59%</td>
<td>$32,840</td>
<td>-5.51%</td>
<td>$1,534</td>
<td>$1,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buels Gore</td>
<td>29,390</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>31,050</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>$1,660</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>42,433,560</td>
<td>20.62%</td>
<td>44,365,230</td>
<td>20.97%</td>
<td>$1,931,670</td>
<td>1.66%</td>
<td>$50,475</td>
<td>$51,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>9,356,940</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
<td>9,265,070</td>
<td>4.38%</td>
<td>$(91,870)</td>
<td>-3.84%</td>
<td>$11,130</td>
<td>$10,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>21,093,970</td>
<td>10.25%</td>
<td>22,026,060</td>
<td>10.41%</td>
<td>$932,090</td>
<td>1.53%</td>
<td>$25,092</td>
<td>$25,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Jct.</td>
<td>10,965,840</td>
<td>5.33%</td>
<td>11,138,290</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>$172,450</td>
<td>-1.23%</td>
<td>$6,306</td>
<td>$6,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Town</td>
<td>14,242,250</td>
<td>6.92%</td>
<td>14,795,180</td>
<td>6.99%</td>
<td>$552,930</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
<td>$23,679</td>
<td>$23,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinesburg</td>
<td>5,784,720</td>
<td>2.81%</td>
<td>5,887,620</td>
<td>2.78%</td>
<td>$102,900</td>
<td>-1.02%</td>
<td>$6,881</td>
<td>$6,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td>2,134,910</td>
<td>1.04%</td>
<td>2,148,000</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
<td>$13,090</td>
<td>-2.19%</td>
<td>$2,540</td>
<td>$2,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jericho</td>
<td>5,964,470</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
<td>6,356,590</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>$392,120</td>
<td>3.52%</td>
<td>$7,095</td>
<td>$7,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>10,882,780</td>
<td>5.29%</td>
<td>11,468,680</td>
<td>5.42%</td>
<td>$585,900</td>
<td>2.43%</td>
<td>$12,945</td>
<td>$13,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>4,576,610</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
<td>4,680,120</td>
<td>2.21%</td>
<td>$103,510</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
<td>$5,444</td>
<td>$5,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelburne</td>
<td>15,767,760</td>
<td>7.66%</td>
<td>15,707,070</td>
<td>7.42%</td>
<td>$(60,690)</td>
<td>-3.22%</td>
<td>$18,756</td>
<td>$18,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Burlington</td>
<td>30,129,570</td>
<td>14.64%</td>
<td>30,318,410</td>
<td>14.33%</td>
<td>$188,840</td>
<td>-2.18%</td>
<td>$35,840</td>
<td>$35,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George</td>
<td>731,650</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
<td>741,200</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
<td>$9,550</td>
<td>-1.50%</td>
<td>$870</td>
<td>$857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underhill</td>
<td>3,792,210</td>
<td>1.84%</td>
<td>3,863,200</td>
<td>1.83%</td>
<td>$70,990</td>
<td>0.93%</td>
<td>$4,511</td>
<td>$4,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westford</td>
<td>2,341,910</td>
<td>1.14%</td>
<td>2,379,700</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
<td>$37,790</td>
<td>-1.19%</td>
<td>$2,786</td>
<td>$2,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williston</td>
<td>18,215,130</td>
<td>8.85%</td>
<td>19,098,270</td>
<td>9.03%</td>
<td>$883,140</td>
<td>1.93%</td>
<td>$21,667</td>
<td>$22,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winooski</td>
<td>6,039,500</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>6,049,870</td>
<td>2.86%</td>
<td>$(10,370)</td>
<td>-2.64%</td>
<td>$7,184</td>
<td>$6,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$205,772,980</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>$211,576,580</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>$5,803,600</td>
<td>2.74%</td>
<td>$244,770</td>
<td>$244,770</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each town is assessed dues using their percentage of the Equalized Education Grand List. Their amount is determined by taking the total dues and multiplying it by the municipality's percentage of the total Grand List.
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
October 18, 2017 Meeting

Agenda Item 10 Brownfields Program Update (Information Item)

Background: In the spring of 2016, the CCRPC was awarded a $400,000 EPA Brownfields Assessment grant. Since that time, the CCRPC have pre-qualified and retained six Qualified Environmental Professional firms and two Historic Preservation / Archeology firms to provide assistance to current or prospective owners looking to redevelop sites. Funds can be used by CCRPC contract with these consultants to conduct Environmental Sites Assessments (ESA) and/or Archeological Site Assessments. Once a redevelopment plan is developed, funds can then be used to develop Corrective Action Plans (CAP) or an Analysis of Brownfields Cleanup Alternatives (ABCA). To date, the CCRPC has supported projects as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waterfront Park, Supplemental Phase II ESA [Burlington]</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Market, 207 Flynn Ave., Soil Management [Burlington]</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winooski Hotel: Phase II ESA [Winooski]</td>
<td>$25,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316 Flynn Avenue: Phase II ESA and CAP [Burlington]</td>
<td>$10,550 $6,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strand Theater, 70 Main St. CAP [Winooski]</td>
<td>$10,550 $6,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453 Pine Street Monitoring [Burlington]</td>
<td>$4,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 Pine Street, “The Vaults” Phase I ESA [Burlington]</td>
<td>$3,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339 Pine, Railyard Enterprise Phase II ESA [Burlington]</td>
<td>$27,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Holbrook Community Center Phase I ESA [Burlington]</td>
<td>$1,237  $1,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobs Parcel, Open Space Phase I ESA [Williston]</td>
<td>$1,560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Action: Information only. A PDF of the Powerpoint presentation is linked at: http://www.ccrpcvt.org/about-us/commission/agendas-minutes/

Staff contacts: Dan Albrecht, dalbrecht@ccrpcvt.org, 861-0133
Emily Nosse-Leirer enosse-leirer@ccrpcvt.org 861-0135
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 August 2, 2017 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BRIAN BIGELOW, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF AUGUST 2, 2017 WITH CORRECTIONS IF ANY. MOTION CARRIED WITH ANDY MONTROLL ABSTAINING.

3. Act 250 & Sec. 248 Applications.
   a. Potential Solar Array project for Colchester – “Preferred Site.” Regina explained that net metering projects in Vermont are capped at 150kW, unless they are located on a preferred site. Vermont’s net metering rules allow for net metering projects to be up to 500kW if they are located on certain sites (described in her memo) or a specific location identified in a joint letter of support from the municipal legislative body and the municipal and regional planning commission. The main applicant is the Town of Colchester and some of the material has been reviewed by the Selectboard. This is on an open space parcel, part of a PUD, which is owned by the town. Colchester selectboard and planning commission drafted a letter to the Public Utilities Commission (PUC) saying that the current Colchester Town Plan does not provide guidance on solar siting and therefore the Planning Commission does not have the basis to evaluate compliance or non-compliance; however the Colchester Selectboard has endorsed the project and will solicit community input on the siting of this proposed solar facility in a comprehensive manner more so than envisioned by a preferred site process. The Town is asking CCRPC if we would consider writing a similar letter in support of this project. Staff has reviewed the project in light of our draft Energy Plan; and under our current practice of development review and didn’t find any issues. This is in the rural planning area and we have in the past found solar projects to be okay in rural areas. We do not need action tonight. Colchester’s solar consultant prepared a draft letter for CCRPC consideration, acknowledging that we also don’t have a plan or process or procedure in place to identify something as a preferred site yet, but that we find the site to be appropriate. Regina said staff is fine with this as an approach, but wanted to check with Executive Committee. Chris Roy questioned the 150kW system which is okay on a preferred site. However, the letter is not consistent with powerpoint printout that says the project is 208kW. Regina will check on this. This is a municipal net metering project and he feels it’ll have public input on it. John Zicconi questioned whether this is indeed a good site or just site that would provide a project that lowers their energy rate. Regina feels that...
Colchester really wants to go with this type of project and has spent a lot of time researching appropriate sites. Discussion continued about whether “preferred site,” since it doesn’t have criteria or procedure yet, is as simple as when someone looks at it they can say “yes that’s it.” Andy Montroll asked if we have any criteria to judge these on yet. We don’t yet. We have our general development review policy, but nothing in place to identify something as a preferred site for solar. Regina said she understands there will be a public process and the town is okay with it, and in the normal Act 250 review we put a good deal of weight into what the municipality supports. John Zicconi said when we have dual sign-off with town and RPC he assumes that’s there for checks and balances. Lengthy discussion continued. Do we feel we have something that we’re comfortable with before we sign it? John Zicconi questioned whether they should do the local public process before they go to the Public Utilities Commission, or should that go first. Regina said she understands there will be a couple of meetings in Colchester in September, so we won’t have final discussion until October for our action. After a brief discussion, Barbara Elliott suggested changing the second from the last paragraph in the letter to PUC to read that CCRPC is not against it, rather than is in support of it. Members agreed. Regina will check with Colchester to see if that type of language would get them what they need to move this project forward.

b. Cobble Hill Trailer Sales, Milton (4C1144-5). Regina noted that Lot #1 is Cobble Hill Trailer sales and the boundary line will be expanded and become Mountain Transit. The Executive Committee is being asked to ratify the letter sent to the DEC #4. JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BRIAN BIGELOW, TO RATIFY THE LETTER SENT TO DEC #4. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. ECOS Plan Update.
   a. Energy Element – draft policy statements. Members reviewed the second page of 3.2.2. The Energy Subcommittee came up with a way to eliminate “should” and “shall”. We need to say that there are places that we don’t want to see this, but there are places that we would like to see renewable energy projects. There are still some questions about how this will play out in the long term. Staff is checking in with the Executive Committee to get their opinion on the tone of this. Chris Roy said he really likes it because there is an area of clear restrictions where we can say “no” and then everything else has a continuum of suggested things that we’re looking for. He feels it was a good approach. John Zicconi agreed and gives high praise for getting out of the “should” and “shall”. Staff will still refine this. The very clear constraint vs. suitability was Emily’s idea. Chris Roy is looking forward to the final draft to review at the board meeting.

b. MTP – draft financial plan. Eleni presented revised material from what was in the packet. We have three elements we have to address: 1) funding reasonably expected to be available; 2) level of funding needed to operate and maintain the existing system; and 3) the difference between 1 and 2 and how this will be allocated to projects/strategies. First we determined the amount of federal funds Vermont received from 2010-2016 ($211,609,103). Then we reviewed the portion of all federal funds (except earmarks) that came to Chittenden County. Between FY1999 and FY2016 the average was 19.4%. VTrans has agreed to use that number although they reminded us that there are several big projects in the pipeline. Now that we know how much money we have, we need to decide how we divide that among the various categories, which we redefined. For planning purposes we’ll define 70% to go to maintenance and 30% for new/expansion projects with the possibility that we’ll go as high as 45% for new projects.

Discussion ensued. It was noted that the percentages are over the period to 2050 and individual
years will fluctuate. Eleni said if the Executive Committee is comfortable with that ratio, staff will work out the details and bring more information next month.

c. **CEDS Update.** Regina noted that we’re updating Community Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) because it’s on the same five-year cycle as the ECOS plan. We’re meeting with GBIC and others and will bring something in October and then go to municipalities to either the economic development committees or planning commissions.

5. **Credit Card Account Officer’s Certificate.** Forest Cohen presented a form that we need to fill out for the credit cards we have. We’re looking for a motion to authorize Chris to sign it. (This was just brought to our attention recently although we’ve had the cards for several years since the merger.)

**BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION TO AUTHORIZE THE CHAIR, CHRIS ROY, TO SIGN THE FORM.**

**BRIAN BIGELOW SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

6. **Draft FY17 Financials.** Forest reviewed his memo in the packet, along with the financial statements. The bottom line is that we have $166,000 of income, unaudited. We did a good job of billing out our projects but fell short and only spent 95% of our expenses. We know when we earn this much it will affect our indirect rate two years down the road. Next year (FY18) will be a penalty year so we will have a lesser amount and have predicted a deficit. Our balance sheet is very strong with plenty of cash in the bank and no debt. Charlie said we made money in FY16 so that’s why we’re recovering less income in FY18. We also made money in FY17 so FY 19 will be another deficit year. We have been trying to be conservative. Charlie noted we talked to the Finance Committee and discussed that we could potentially review the rate at mid-year and perhaps adjust it then to reduce the income. Discussion ensued about having a three-year adjustment. Charlie said the RPCs have differing processes. After the merger we started with a high indirect rate and have been dealing with it ever since. Lengthy discussion continued. Charlie said VTrans is working with us. After further discussion, it was noted that there are pros and cons and perhaps we shouldn’t adjust the indirect rate at the mid-year. Talked about how it might work better if phased over two years.

7. **Executive Director’s Report.**

a. **Building Homes Together Campaign- revised numbers.** Regina noted that we have revised numbers for FY16 and presented a revised chart showing the number and type of housing units built or demolished in 2016. There were 834 new homes (rather than the near 1,000 we reported earlier). The plan is to have a press conference on September 27th to report these numbers and the Governor will also talk about the housing bond passed by the Legislature earlier this year. Regina noted that two years ago 400, 2015-600 and 2016–834. Regina said this chart is based on certificates of occupancy, so they are actually built; and it is based on the calendar year.

b. **Clean Water Program Update.** Charlie noted we’ve started work on these and we have four applications totaling $70,000 which we are reviewing. We are also working on basin planning that we’ve been subcontracted to do. Our application is due next Friday. The state Clean Water Fund Board met yesterday and have not responded to our comments. Capital bond money – they received more revenue than what had been anticipated, so there might be more capital money going in there. The Grants-in-Aid Program has shown that most towns are getting things done. Sec. Moore was tasked with looking at long-term funding. One question is are we going to do a statewide parcel fee and it seems it’s years away because of what has to be done to put this in place and how to bill each property owner and not just those who pay taxes. There may be more information for the October Board meeting.

8. **Agenda Review – September 20th meeting.** Members reviewed the proposed agenda.
9. Other Business.
   a. Charlie noted there is a Union Municipal District Agreement and a draft funding MOU for the regional dispatch project. These were reviewed by municipal managers and attorneys. It then will go to the Attorney General in September and then to selectboards to ask to get it on town meeting ballots. Brief discussion.
   b. John Zicconi asked if South Burlington has come to us with the airport ownership issue. Charlie said no. Brief discussion.

10. Executive Session. None needed.

11. Adjournment. JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN AT 7 P.M. ANDY MONTROLL SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc
October 5, 2017

Warren Foster
Act 250 Acting District Coordinator
111 West Street
Essex Junction, VT 05452

RE: Creekside Village Development; Essex; Application #4C1305

Dear Mr. Foster:

The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission’s Staff and Executive Committee have reviewed this Act 250 application for a project described as construction of Creekside Village Development consisting of 17 single family homes, 14 carriage homes, and 1 existing single family home to remain. The Project is located at 15 Upper Main Street in Essex, VT. The project was approved by the Town of Essex Planning Commission on May 25, 2017. We offer the following comments:

The project is located within the Metro 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 Metro 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), as it is located within an existing center that includes the characteristics defined in 10 VSA §6001(16), it is purely residential, and it makes efficient use of land, roads, energy, utilities and other infrastructure.

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. We have no comments on transportation at this time.

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
DATE: Wednesday October 3, 2017
TIME: 9:00 a.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal St. Winooski, VT

Bryan Osborne called the meeting to order at 9:00 AM.

1. Consent Agenda
N/A this month.

2. Approval of Minutes
The September 5th minutes were approved without changes.

3. Public Comments
There were none.

4. Comments on the Municipal Roads General Permit (MRGP) (Action Item)
Dan Albrecht walked TAC members through comments from CCRPC staff (included in the agenda packet) on the draft MRGP. There was discussion about addressing transitory issues like crowns and berms versus other issues requiring a more permanent solution. The distinction is important when determining priorities and maintenance schedules. CCRPC staff can help municipalities with that part of the process, and Dan will add language to the comments clarifying the transitory nature of some issues, and reaffirming that the permit should be focused on water quality rather than road maintenance. Dick Hosking expressed concerns for allowing grass-lined ditches for slopes more than 5% and the possible failure of seeding techniques for steep slopes. In cases of steep slopes, stone-lined ditches would be better. Dan will ask that slope language be clarified in the comments. There is concern from the Bolton Selectboard about roads greater than 10% slope meeting permit requirements within the required time period. Some flexibility would be appreciated. Bryan Osborne initiated the discussion about how the MRGP permit will affect the MS4 communities. A number MS4 communities expressed concern that when the MRGP requirements are included in the MS4 permits that will also include the MRGP timeline requirements which could be problematic for a number of reasons including varying costs of projects, limiting the ability of a municipality to do capital planning and determine which projects are constructed each year. There was agreement that towns should be able to determine their own maintenance and construction schedules so that they can meet the MRGP compliance date, rather than being required by
the permit to complete a specific number of projects each year. The sentiment was expressed that towns
can better determine which of their projects will have the greatest impact to improve water quality and
how those project schedules will help MS4 towns meet their Phosphorus reduction plans and MS4 permit
requirements. Dan suggested that DEC is proposing this type of scheduling to encourage towns to do
work sooner rather than waiting until MRGP deadlines approach. Charlie noted that this issue is specific
to MS4 towns because of their additional requirements. The concern from Colchester is that the
requirement to complete a certain number of projects per year that may not necessarily meet the goals of
the MS4 permit. Justin Rabidoux suggested that there needs to be one plan, and that MS4 towns have
other permit requirements and will need to balance and manage (i.e., costs and deadlines). Bryan will
share less substantive comments with Dan outside of this meeting.

Please submit additional comments to Dan Albrecht, dalbrecht@ccrpcvt.org, 802-846-4490 ext. *29.
Deadline for edits is next Wednesday, October 10.

5. MTP Update

Jason Charest provided hard copies of the handouts (updated charts and Scenario A map), which included
results from Scenario A (2050 with all MTP Projects). His presentation pointed out the four main
scenarios, and sub-scenarios, which build off the 2050 Base scenario (2050 Forecasts with TIP Projects),
but the presentation focused on the model results of Scenarios A and D. Scenario A is a traditional
capacity expansion and doesn’t include any other improvements besides roadway. Scenario D, the land
use scenario, is included in the charts provided but not in the maps. Results of running Scenario B
(connected and autonomous vehicles) and Scenario C (transit, bike & ped, TDM) in the model will be
presented at the November TAC meeting.

Jason reviewed the various bar charts that included countywide results (VMT, VHT, Total Trips, Mode
Share, Trip Lengths) for the various model scenarios run to date. Charlie pointed out the 25% increase in
VMT for most of the 2050 scenarios compared to the 2025 scenarios and reminded the TAC that these
results don’t include any TDM projects to reduce vehicle travel (i.e., TDM). In these charts, most of
scenario model results are comparable except for Scenario D (10% increase in HH in the county). The
TAC was reminded that these model results are countywide averages, meaning conditions would improve
in some areas and decline in others. There was discussion about impacts of autonomous vehicles, which
RSG is working on (Scenario B) as well as in other, larger communities. Jason Van Driesche suggested
and there was discussion about including Scenario D3 as part of all other scenarios given its striking
impact on model results. There was also discussion about the historical split of percent of Chittenden
County employees living inside or outside of the county, whether Scenario D3 is attainable given the
various issues with housing/development density, and how autonomous vehicles may change where
people live and their commutes (e.g., people can work in self-driving car).

The presentation then examined the maps, which focused on lane capacity issues and not operational
issues (congestion due to intersection delays/signal timings) which is why for example Williston Road
doesn’t show up on the maps as having issues. Dennis Lutz asked if we removed some TIP projects, and
added other projects, would it have a bigger impact on the results? Dick Hosking pointed out that the
maps represent a time-based issue; Jason Charest responded that the maps combine the AM and PM peak
congestion rather than demonstrate a continuous deficiency. Jason Van Driesche noted previous
conversations about new grid streets having the biggest impact in Williston, and whether the CCRPC has
considered including more of these as part of the model to determine impacts?

Jason Charest then toggled through different map layers showing the impacts of including all MTP
projects for the 2050 Interchange and Scenario A. Joss Besse questioned whether the model takes into
account how increasing capacity on some roads (Interstate) impacts congestion on arterials (US7 & US2)
and local streets. That is, does congestion get pushed to other parts of network? Jason noted that the
model accounts for that impact. There was discussion about whether VTrans concurs with how projects
get implemented and the projections being presented, and it was pointed out that they are involved in this
process.

Jason reminded the TAC that the maps show volume-to-capacity ratio rather than delay, which is why
Shelburne Road isn’t showing up (similar to the previous Williston Road example). Bryan Osborne
questioned how we can make the case for additional funds when improvements in some areas results in
deficiencies in other areas. Jason pointed out that the map shows that we can’t build our way out of
congestion.

Dennis asked whether we could have looked at the TIP and MTP for specific solutions with less
detrimental effects than a full build out? He suggested that addressing other issues such as housing and
wastewater could have a bigger effect on the transportation network compare to some of the MTP
transportation projects.

The next step is to show the results of Scenarios B and C at the November TAC meeting and hopefully
have the hybrid MTP Scenario in December. The full draft MTP will be available in January.

6. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports
Bryan referred members to the project list on the back of the agenda and encouraged members to inquire
on project status if interested.

7. CCRPC September Board Meeting Report
Eleni mentioned that the MTP financial plan was presented to the Board and staff received their
comments.

8. Chairman’s/Members’ Items
Bryan Osborne requested that the Transportation Funding Sources spreadsheet be updated and sent to
TAC members. CCRPC staff noted it was updated this summer and can be found at
http://www.ccrpcvt.org/resources/transportation-funding-sources/. Water quality funding opportunities
can be found at http://www.ccrpcvt.org/our-work/environment-natural-resources/water-quality/#funding.

The meeting adjourned at 10:45 a.m.

Respectfully submitted, Bryan Davis
DATE: Tuesday, October 3, 2017
TIME: 11:00 a.m. to 12 Noon
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: Merrily Lovell  St. George:
Buels Gore: Huntington: Darlene Palola  Underhill:
Burlington: Jericho:  Westford:
Charlotte: Marty Illick  Milton:  Williston: James Sherrard
Colchester: Karen Adams  Richmond: Geoff Urbanik  Winooski: Tim Grover
Essex: Annie Costandi, Co-Chair  Shelburne: Chris Robinson  VAOT: Jennifer Callahan
Essex Junction: Chelsea Mandigo  South Burlington: Tom DiPietro  VNR: Christy Witters
Burlington Airport: Polly Harris (Stantec)  University of VT: Claire Forbes  CCRPC Board:
Other Attendees: DEC: Karen Bates
CCRPC Staff: Dan Albrecht, Regina Mahony, Eleni Churchill, Chris Dubin

1. Welcome: Annie Costandi called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

2. Changes to the Agenda – none

3. Review and action on draft minutes of September 5, 2017
After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, Sherrard made a motion, seconded by Palola to approve the September 5, 2017 minutes. Annie Costandi stated that the link to the watershed projects database is missing on page 2. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED. Polly Harris abstained.

4. Disposition of UPWP $100k for water quality assistance
UPWP funds – Chris Dubin stated that we will be sending out formal approval letters for this today and we’ll get started on those once consultants are picked.
Grants in Aid – Chris Dubin stated that these projects are moving along, thanks to those Towns that are participating.
Transportation Enhancement money – transportation related, deadline in early November.
Better Roads - deadline changed to late fall.

5. CCRPC Comment Letter on Draft MRGP Permit
Dan Albrecht provided an overview of the process of this so far. Draft permit is now out and comments are due on October 27th. Dan walked through the draft letter and explained the edits received from the TAC this morning. Staff will bring these to the CCRPC Board for consideration on 10/18. Dan explained that the bulk of our comments are on the standards themselves, and we are concerned that the current standards in the permit are more road maintenance standards than actually water quality. In connection with this, the TAC asked that we remove the roadway crown and berm from the permit altogether. The TAC also suggested edits associated with all segments over 10% need to be corrected by 2025 (may be too difficult and costly to get this done by 2025). Also the TAC felt that the minimum number of road segments per year is too rigid. Christy stated that the MS4s will not be held to this same schedule and no minimum segments. Christy added that the only thing that will be pulled from the MRGP and added to the MS4 permit will be the standards themselves, not any of the deadlines (including the February 1st reporting deadline, because the MS4s do their annual report by April 1st). We’ve maintained our previous comments on the permit fees and Class 4 roads.

Discussion/Questions:
Some grass lined ditches work very well, and so rock-lined ditches shouldn’t be required within 5 to 8% grade. There should be a range of what you can do to stabilize the ditch. Make the permit results oriented so you can check in and make sure it works over time.

In general agreement, but there is a lot of technical detail so can’t make a comment on it now. Darlene was able to read it and seems good.

Should we suggest an alternative compliance schedule (i.e. set their own compliance schedule). Essentially the draft permit says that already, so long as we remove the rigidity of the minimum segments and specific schedule.

There were no other comments. Dan will clean up the language and get it out via email. We’ll need to get this settled by next Wednesday, October 11th so we can send it to the full Board.

Dan showed the CWAC where the draft permit is with all of the attachments that you need to see. Dan reiterated the emphasis on water quality standards rather than road maintenance. Marty added that in clay soils, even very low slope can be an issue.
5. Direct to Lake Basin Plan: Karen Bates, DEC

In the TMDL we have certain requirements and allotments per tactical basin (in the Phase I TMDL Implementation Plan). The Phase II plan includes more information and the tools that we have. But it doesn’t actually say how we are going to do it. The Tactical Basin Plans (TBP) will include the detail of how and what we are going to do.

The current Direct to Lake TBP will be updated to set the phosphorus targets. This TBP will still be updated more in full on its regular update schedule. Discussion around the actual project/implementation prioritization. We aren’t going to get into project prioritization in this update to the Direct to Lake TBP. Charlie Baker stated he hopes that we will be able to get there in the Winooski TBP. There was some discussion on what we mean by “prioritization” and how we provide meaningful input to help prioritize the watershed projects database. Marty added that the TBPs are our implementation plans for the TMDL so it does make sense to have everything in there.

Karen Bates explained that the Phase II implementation plan calls for certain things in the TBPs: where do phosphorus loads originate, how much of the phosphorus load can be reduced; how much phosphors reduction could be required for each land use. The Phase II implementation plan does not include a target for the Direct to Lake basin because it is broken out into the other basins. DEC is currently modeling how to break this out and it has been quite complicated.

Karen showed the phosphorus load data maps for the Direct to Lake basin; and the specific developed lands map.

This will be an update to meet a deadline, not the full update. Essentialy Karen will only be adding this phosphorus load data chapter to the TBP. She plans to have this out by the end of October, and will come to the November CWAC to answer questions (or December). It needs to be adopted by December 31, 2017.

There was a discussion regarding if we put all of our regulations on the ground, what is then left to do? Will the regulations get us to success, or will there be more to do? Tom DiPietro stated that he sent all of his Flow Restoration Projects to get modeled for phosphorus reductions and with those they are almost there on phosphorus reduction for developed lands, 3 acre permit and roads.

6. Brief Updates as Needed

- Act 73 and other State funding issues. Tasked with looking at long-term financing. Karen Adams explained the process so far. The MS4s have been asking to participate in the advisory group. Charlie added that the advisory group was ad-hoc, not a formal group under the Governor. There is currently only one municipal representative so far. Julie Moore is working on a draft plan for October. There needs to be more funding for project development – getting closer in line with VTrans funding. The MS4s are staying involved to keep aware of and try to ensure that if a state-wide parcel fee is suggested and implemented it works from their perspective.

- At what point will the 3 acres be identified? DEC doesn’t have a timeframe yet.

7. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:24 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony and Dan Albrecht
DATE: Tuesday, September 5, 2017
TIME: 11:00 a.m. to 12 Noon
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>Town</th>
<th>Advisor</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td>Hinesburg: Merrily Lovell</td>
<td>St. George</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buels Gore</td>
<td>Huntington: Darlene Palola</td>
<td>Underhill: Brian Bigelow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Jenna Olson</td>
<td>Jericho:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Milton: Victor Sinadinoski</td>
<td>Williston: James Sherrard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11:10 a.m.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>Karen Adams</td>
<td>Vermont:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>Geoff Urbanik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11:11 a.m.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>Annie Costandi, Co-Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shilburne: Chris Robinson</td>
<td>VAOT:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jennifer Callahan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Junction</td>
<td>Tom DiPietro;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dave Wheeler (11:22 a.m.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Polly Harris (Stantec)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; Chris Gendron (Stantec)</td>
<td>University of VT: Lani Ravin, Claire Forbes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CCRPC Board:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>Karen Adams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>Geoff Urbanik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>Geoff Urbanik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>Geoff Urbanik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>Annie Costandi, Co-Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shilburne: Chris Robinson</td>
<td>VAOT:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jennifer Callahan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Junction</td>
<td>Tom DiPietro;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dave Wheeler (11:22 a.m.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Polly Harris (Stantec)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; Chris Gendron (Stantec)</td>
<td>University of VT: Lani Ravin, Claire Forbes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CCRPC Board:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Attendees: DEC: Jim Pease, Jim Ryan, Padraic Monks, VAOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCRPC Staff:</td>
<td>Dan Albrecht, Regina Mahony, Eleni Churchill, Chris Dubin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Welcome: Annie Costandi called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

2. Changes to the Agenda – none

3. Review and action on draft minutes of August 1, 2017

After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, Adams made a motion, seconded by Sherrard to approve the August 1, 2017 minutes. Jenna Olson (formerly Calvi) indicated that she was not in attendance. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED. Jenna Olson abstained.

4. Draft MRGP Permit: Jim Ryan, DEC

Jim Ryan provided an overview of the Municipal Roads General Permit, including the process, timeline and standards. [see copy of presentation at Committee web-paged linked above.]

Discussion/Questions:
- Dan asked if the work between the inventories conducted by CCRPC in ’16 and ’17 and the beginning of the permit can be credited? Yes.
- MS4s deadline the same? Yes, the MS4 deadline will be the same due to the TMDL. Different annual schedule, but same end date. Other dates won’t be far off from this schedule.
- How does this impact non-traditional MS4s? VTrans has the TS4 permit. The Airport and UVM – public roads likely covered by municipal permit. Private roads are not required to meet standards.
- If wetlands or stream alteration permits would be needed, then the municipality would not have to install that BMP. Stream bank erosion is not required in the MRGP and this language will be transferred to the MS4 permit.
- Will the inventories capture outfalls that are on private property? We don’t have this information from the inventories because the interns don’t know where the ROW officially ends. Ownership is an issue, and will be an issue.
- Hydrologically connected definition – this is a different definition than the one used in other DEC regulatory environments. Don’t want to get the definitions mixed up. It is intended to apply strictly to the MRGP.
5. Draft State Stormwater Rule: Padraic Monks, DEC

Padraic Monks provided an overview of the following specific sections of the proposed stormwater rule: 3-acre general permit and the impact fee system (only in stormwater impaired waters in the lake champlain watershed). You have to do the work if you can; if you can’t fully then you have to pay the fee. Also eligible to receive money if you go beyond the requirements (i.e. treat 4 acres instead of 3 acres). Padraic also covered the distinctions between pre-TMDL and post-TMDL. Rule is due January, 2018; hope to have a draft rule to ICAR in October (but likely to miss this date and hope to get on the November agenda). They are accepting public comment now. Shouldn’t call this an impact fee; it’s more of a mitigation fee.

Questions/comments:
- Non-MS4 municipalities don’t need to do anything under the 3-acre parcel permit unless they own a 3-acre parcel. Please send the full list of 3-acre parcels to the municipalities (not just municipally owned).
- Deferral language in the new rule for expired permits? This language is in the legislation, so not likely to change in the rule. The language does expire in June or July of 2018; they intend to propose a one-year extension on this to wait for the 3-acre permit to get in place.
- Payments – Essentially you will get paid back for doing more. Maximum reimbursement will no longer be tied to the total cost of the project.
- Clarification that the 1 acre threshold is for new development projects; the 3 acre threshold is for existing development.

6. Brief demo on Watershed Projects Database: Dan Albrecht, CCRPC

Dan provided a quick overview of the projects database available at

7. Appoint ad hoc subcommittee to work with CCRPC staff to review Clean Water Fund Board draft FY19 budget allocations and determine if additional comments warranted by full CCRPC Board at its 9/20 meeting.

The Board is now open to the second round of comments (Sept. 8-28). We should receive the document today, but comments are due on September 28. We don’t have time for another CWAC meeting, but if there is a sub-committee that would like to work on this, we could draft something in time for September. James, Karen and Marty volunteered to work on this; and that draft will then be sent to the CWAC. Individual comments can be brought to the full CCRPC Board. Dan will send the Clean Water Fund Board’s draft to the full CWAC as soon as he receives it.

8. Updates
- ERP grants received: Street sweeping study grant received by CCRPC in partnership with DEC and USGS; Jericho and Williston also received grants.
- Lewis Creek Association received two ERP grants: Hinesburg garage; and lower McCabe’s in Shelburne. Marty Illick would like to be involved in CCRPC’s consultant selection process next time.

9. Items for October 3rd meeting agenda
   a. Draft MRGP permit – still haven’t seen the official draft permit yet.

10. Other Business
Discussion regarding the MRGP comment period, and setting up a sub-committee to begin to draft comments once the draft permit comes out.

11. Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 12:34 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony and Dan Albrecht
CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
MS4 SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE CWAC– DRAFT MINUTES

DATE: Tuesday, September 5, 2017
TIME: 12:30 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

Municipal MS4 Members
Burlington: Jenna Olson
Essex Junction: Chelsea Mandigo, Co-Chair
South Burlington: Tom DiPietro

Colchester: Karen Adams
Milton: Victor Sinadinoski
Williston: James Sherrard

Essex: Annie Costandi, Co-Chair
Shelburne: Chris Robinson
Winooski: Tim Grover

Non-Municipal MS4 Members
Burlington Airport: Polly Harris (Stantec) & Chris Gendron (Stantec)
University of VT: Lani Ravin, Claire Forbes
VAOT: Jennifer Callahan

Ex-Officio (DEC): Christy Witters
Other Attendees: DEC: Jim Pease

CCRPC Staff: Dan Albrecht

1. Welcome: Chelsea Mandigo called the meeting to order at 12:45 p.m.

2. Changes to the Agenda – none

3. Review and action on draft minutes of August 1, 2017
   After a brief recap by Albrecht, Sherrard made a motion, seconded by Adams to approve the August 1, 2017 minutes with minor corrections as follows: page 1, line 8, Jenna Olson not present; line 23: correct spelling of “cyanobacteria”; line 24: “Due to that...” No further discussion. MOTION PASSED. Jenna Olson and Polly Harris abstained.

4. Draft MS4 Permit
   Witters indicated she hoped to have a draft ready in the next several weeks. She has been engrossed in the related issued of Phosphorus Tracking for MS4s and indicated she hoped members could attended the related planned 9/19 meeting in Montpelier.

5. Fall 2017 Stormwater Practices Survey
   Albrecht recapped the survey which has gone through several revisions over the last few weeks as well as the draft RFP. Subcommittee members suggested several slight tweaks. The subcommittee authorized CCRPC to finalize the document and send out a final draft for final review by email by subcommittee members before distribution.

6. Brief demo on Watershed Projects Database: Dan Albrecht, CCRPC
   Dan provided a quick overview of the projects database available at

7. Updates
   - Street sweeping study grant: Pease indicated that in lieu of the regular Municipal Employee Training there will be a training in late September for how to sample street sweeping piles.

8. Items for October 3rd meeting agenda
   a. T.b.d.

9. Adjournment
   The meeting adjourned at 12:34 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony and Dan Albrecht
**CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION**

**MS4 SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE CWAC—DRAFT MINUTES**

**DATE:** Tuesday, October 3, 2017  
**TIME:** 12:30 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/](http://www.ccrpcvt.org/meetings/clean-water-advisory-committee/)

### Committee Members in Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipal MS4 Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Burlington: Essex Junction: Chelsea Mandigo, Co-Chair | South Burlington: Tom DiPietro  
| Colchester: Karen Adams | Milton: Victor Sinadinoski  
| Essex: Annie Costandi, Co-Chair | Williston: James Sherrard  
| | Williston: James Sherrard  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Municipal MS4 Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Burlington Airport: Polly Harris (Stantec) | University of VT: Claire Forbes  
| | VAOT: Jennifer Callahan  

| Ex-Officio (DEC): Christy Witters |  

| Other Attendees: DEC: Jim Pease; UVM-CDAE: Patrick Bitterman |  

| CCRPC Staff: Dan Albrecht |  

---

1. **Welcome:** Chelsea Mandigo called the meeting to order at 12:45 p.m.

2. **Changes to the Agenda**—none

3. **Review and action on draft minutes of September 5, 2017**

   After a brief recap by Albrecht, DiPietro made a motion, seconded by Adams to approve the September 5, 2017 minutes with the correction to delete reference to the Watershed Projects Database. No further discussion. **MOTION PASSED.** Polly Harris abstained.

4. **Final Review and Approval of RFP for 2017 Stormwater Practices Survey**

   After a brief recap by Albrecht and a recommendation by DiPietro to strengthen the language regarding preferred maximum percent responses by town, Adams made a motion, seconded by Sherrard to authorize CCRPC to issue the RFP as drafted. No further discussion. **MOTION PASSED.**

5. **Operations Updates**

   a. **Stream Team Quarterly Report**

      Kreiner recapped the report posted on the CWAC/MS4 CCRPC webpage. The Committee suggested providing more detail on [www.rethinkrunoff.org](http://www.rethinkrunoff.org) about the “adopted” rain gardens so that potential volunteers can learn more about them and be more likely to want to help maintain them.

   b. **Advertising & Web**

      Albrecht recapped the [www.rethinkrunoff.org](http://www.rethinkrunoff.org) Google Analytics data provided by Tally Ho Design and posted on the CWAC/MS4 CCRPC webpage.

6. **Updates**

   Members discussed with Witters how Phosphorus Control Plans might be implemented and the potential for one town to pay for a project in another town (e.g. if the $/P-removed cost warranted) and receive credit for compliance. Sherrard expressed a concern about some projects being removed from the “Implementation Ready” list without adequate involvement of the sponsoring/implementing party. DiPietro expressed a desire to review the Stream Flow data at a future meeting.

7. **Items for November 7th meeting agenda**

   a. Recommendation to CCRPC of firm to implement Stormwater Survey

8. **Adjournment**

   The meeting adjourned at 1:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Dan Albrecht
DATE: Thursday, September 14, 2017
TIME: 8:30 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT

Members Present
Ken Belliveau, Williston – PAC Rep
Heather Danis – ECOS Steering Committee Rep
Andrea Morgante, Hinesburg - Board Rep
Justin Rabidoux, South Burlington – TAC Rep
Lisa Falcone – Alt. Socio Economic Board Rep
Jim Donovan, Charlotte – Board Rep
Edmund Booth, Charlotte - ECOS Steering Committee Rep

Staff
Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
Melanie Needle, Senior Planner
Emily Nosse-Leirer, Planner
Eleni Churchill, Transportation Program Manager

1. Welcome and Introductions
Jim Donovan called the meeting to order at 8:36 a.m.

2. Approve Minutes
Jim Donovan made a motion, seconded by Ken Belliveau, to approve the minutes of July 13, 2017. MOTION PASSED. Edmund Booth abstained.

3. Outreach Strategy
Regina Mahony provided a quick overview of the outreach strategy for the next few months. Regina Mahony explained that we’ll be trying to get feedback on the three big topics (energy, transportation and economy) of the ECOS update over the next few months. Including meeting with the staff to discuss the MTP project list and CEDS project list. We’ll be meeting with the Managers, Planners and Public Works staff to review these lists and then will meet with Selectboards as well. We know you’ll be starting budget conversations soon and we are doing our best to get these started as soon as possible. The LRPC suggested that Staff provide them and the Board with front porch forum outreach posts so they can post directly. Also do a press release for the community newspaper.
Heather Danis found a helpful approach in the Essex Health Impact Assessment work was to present one page of recommendations with community representatives (like focus groups - students, teachers, etc). Worked well because didn’t have to read the whole thing. There was a suggestion to present the information in this format: “Here is the impact this would be if this plan were to go into effect.”

4. Energy Policies
Melanie Needle provided an overview of the energy policy draft language. Questions/comments included:

- Members indicated that they like the basic concept, including that the constraint policies are for all development, not just energy.
- Comment regarding repeat text in Strategy 3 & 4 and adding too much text when the original intent of this plan was to keep it brief and to the point.
- Discussion around the 1,000’ limit to existing infrastructure, and whether it is needed or not. There was a suggestion to map all existing solar projects to show where these are happening. Three phase power isn’t necessarily a sprawl vehicle because you can have subdivisions without it. If we limit to existing 3 phase power we are eliminating a lot of area. And would it feel like there are too many within the 1,000”? Jim still thinks it’s important to include because its advisory, and not a requirement. We will definitely still need to look at the targets with this in mind. While there was no consensus, ultimately the distance stayed in because of the framework of this entire section. The suitability statements are advisory, and the more you can meet the better, but you don’t have to meet any of them. If you can limit the expansion of infrastructure, why not?
We will circle back with the municipalities on the constraints in early October. Emily Nosse-Leirer went over the methodology for the known and possible constraints. Comments included:

- Avoid “all” or “any” unless absolutely true and needed. Just say “development” or “very limited development” because footpaths can probably still happen.
- Reference to “capital” should be “capita”.

5. **Transportation Plan Update**

Eleni Churchill explained the difference between the previous maps and the maps in this packet. These maps should better reflect the amount of congestion that a driver actually experiences. We know the interstate has issues now. The LRPC also looked at the 2050 delay map with TIP projects. It has no improvements beyond the 2025 TIP projects. This is essentially the “no build” beyond TIP for scenario A. Our next steps is to add the crash history to this map, and choose MTP projects from the list that will address these issues that appear. Scenario A won’t shift any modes. Other scenarios include: bike/ped/transit mode shifts; a technology scenario; and land use scenarios.

Comments/questions:

- Need to clean up the purple blip at the hospital. The red makes sense, but not the purple.
- We are doing the information a dis-service by showing different maps with slightly different terms that no one understands. We need to show one map, that explains it all: capacity, delay and safety all on one “transportation issues” map for the public to see. Also consider putting the technical maps in an appendix. But it is important to explain to the public that adding lanes isn’t going to solve the issue.
- Do we have artificial capacity in road segments only because of the intersections? In other words if we were to “open the dams” at the intersections what would that do to the segments? Do we show linear congestion only, but the intersections are causing the problems?
- Have we done any work to try to quantify the shifting of goods to package delivery v. bricks and mortar retail. Much more growth in freight, capacity trucks. We will consider some of this in the technology scenario because we are likely to see more of the freight capacity go to autonomous vehicles first. We are also going to look at the impact of the Quebec Autoroute 15. They are predicting that they are going to have that done in 10 years (all the way to the border) and we are likely going to see many more trucks on our highways.
- Would be interesting to see the 2025 maps to see what the TIP improvements do. We have these maps and can make them available.
- What is driving the VMT per Capita going up so significantly? Doesn’t make any sense between 2025 and 2050? Staff will look into that.
- The transit, walking & biking mode split – it isn’t a very big difference and it is only likely a result of population growth. Also the title is confusing as folks expect to see these broken out individually. If we keep them grouped together, it should be titled “non-SUV” or something like that.
- Suggestion to add the basic population numbers for 2015, 2025 and 2050 so we can see what those are in comparison to the transportation metrics.
- The Silver Street congestion issue in Hinesburg in the mornings seems to be improved since the extra lane was added at Exit 14.
- Titles on the maps – for reports titles are better at the bottom. But for a presentation the title is better at the top. We should be consistent for all the maps in the plan – they should be at the bottom, with a more minor title at the top.

6. **Next Meeting**

The next meeting will be on October 12, 2017 from 8:30am to 10:00am.

10. **Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 10:01 a.m. Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony
CCRPC Long Range Planning Energy Sub-Committee
Minutes

DATE: Tuesday, September 19, 2017
TIME: 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 pm
PLACE: CCRPC Office, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT

Attendees:
- Catherine McMains, Jericho (Chair)
- Karen Adams, Colchester
- Matt Burke, Charlotte alternate
- Keith Epstein, South Burlington
- Jeff Forward, Richmond
- Will Dodge, Essex

Staff:
- Melanie Needle, Senior Planner
- Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
- Emily Nosse-Leirer, Planner

1. **Review August 15, 2017 Minutes**

Karen Adams made a motion to approve the minutes as drafted. Keith Epstein seconded the motion. The committee voted unanimously.

2. **Discussion of Siting Policy Statements**

Melanie explained that staff has edited and reorganized the energy siting policies based on discussion with the Board, the Executive Committee, the PAC, the LRPC and the Energy Subcommittee. The constraints on energy development are now described in Strategies 3.2.3 and 3.2.4, which currently discuss natural resources preservation. Strategy 3.2.2.4 still includes energy plan actions and policies. Siting policies are now split into two sections: “Constraint Policies” and “Suitability Policies”.

“**Constraint Policies**” place limits on renewable energy generation development.

Keith asked why the constraint policies include state regulations. Staff explained that it is intended to be education for readers. The committee discussed whether more explanation would be useful, and whether policy ii belongs at all. Melanie suggested making it an action to work with municipalities on screening. Karen suggested just adding explanatory language about the fact that the policies here apply to municipal standards that must be adopted in accordance with state statute.
Melanie explained that “Suitability Policies” provide a list of desirable characteristics for energy facilities on unconstrained lands, which are considered guidelines rather than regulations. The committee expressed their desire for a different numbering system that doesn’t include Roman numerals.

Jeff asked that “disturbed portion” be removed in relation to gravel pits. The committee discussed the fact that permitted gravel pits often have reclamation plans that can impact solar development. These projects will probably always have to go through Act 250 because of these plans. Fontaine Solar in Williston is an example of a project that faced this issue.

Matt asked whether we needed to include a definition of infill development for Policy iv to make it clear that infill development does not include solar development. Jeff expressed concern with this policy, siting several places in areas planned for growth that have solar developments proposed or would be good sites for solar, so saying “provided infill development is not precluded” is unclear. Karen thinks that ground mounted solar always precludes infill development and also expressed her concerns about who determines when infill development is precluded. Jeff suggested striking the “precluded” clause. Catherine McMains suggested replacing it with “where possible.” Melanie wondered if this policy should be that we support colocation with load in areas planned for growth outside of designated centers. Will suggested that all the policies on ground mounted facilities could be replaced by saying that sites should be identified in joint letters. The committee decided against this approach. Staff will continue this discussion at the board meeting tomorrow. The committee said that it is necessary to have language that explicitly states the intention of this policy, which is that load and generation should be located close to each other wherever possible to minimize distribution and transmission lines, minimize working landscape fragmentation and balance growth with energy development in areas planned for growth. Co-locate is likely not the correct term. Whatever language we come up with must be consistent with the policies in Section A of this chapter as well.

Keith asked why these policies only address wind and solar. Regina explained that staff have only been able to facilitate discussions on a limited number of technologies so far; some of these may be relevant to all technologies. We will look into this further.

Keith suggested that we change policy iii to say “on or near” existing structures, rather than just on structures.

The committee discussed the issue of 3-phase power. The committee decided to change “within 1000 feet” to something like “proximate to” since we’re not able to reasonably decide a distance.

Keith mentioned that he doesn’t like the word “alternative” forms of heating, since we’re hoping to make these methods the mainstream. Maybe “sustainable” is the right choice.

Jeff expressed his support for the fact that the constraints are not just decisions that CCRPC made unilaterally, but instead represent restrictions that are already in place at the state and local level.

Jeff asked about the difference between what municipalities can plan for and what the regional plan says regarding energy beyond siting. Melanie clarified that the regional plan does discuss issues like conservation and efficiency, but that municipalities have more information in their plans on these issues because they have different authority and influence than the RPCs. Committee members expressed enthusiasm for the greater ability of municipalities to enact specific policies.
Karen stated that she appreciated that the policy focus is not on mandating things for municipalities, but gives the option for each municipality to do what works for them in most cases.

3. **Update**
   a. **Generation Targets**

   At a prior meeting, the committee discussed the fact that the amount of energy generation reported by the Vermont Energy Atlas plus Burlington Electric Department and the Department of Public Service is different, with the former being a smaller amount. Melanie explained that these two numbers are closer now, but the number from the energy atlas and BED is still about 50,000 mWh lower than the DPS number. She also explained that DPS confirmed that we can use the lower number if we are more comfortable with the data, as long as we explain that there is a difference.

   b. **DPS Comments**

   Melanie explained that staff have received comments from the Department of Public Service, which were generally positive. The committee agreed that wherever possible, the more specific actions are, the better. Specifically, the committee asked that we get more specific in response to this DPS comment “The plan states support for an EV charging network and natural gas and biodiesel HDVs, but does not include any implementation actions.” Melanie provided what we do on this front, and we can make the actions more specific.

4. **Next Steps (5 minutes)**

   The next meeting will take place on October 17, 2017.