

1 CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
2 PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE - MINUTES
3

4 DATE: Wednesday, November 8, 2017
5 TIME: 2:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.
6 PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT
7

Members Present:
Joss Besse, Bolton
Victor Sinadinowski, Milton
Everett Marshall, Huntington
Darren Schibler, Essex
Andrew Strniste, Underhill
Ken Belliveau, Williston
Luke Valentine, St. George
Sarah Hadd, Colchester
Cathyann LaRose, South Burlington

Daryl Benoit, Charlotte
David White, Burlington

Staff:
Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
Emily Nosse-Leirer, Planner
Lee Krohn, Senior Planner
Jason Charest, Senior Transportation Planner

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

11 Joss Besse called the meeting to order at 2:36 p.m.

12
13 **2. Approval of September 9, 2017 Minutes**

14
15 Ken Belliveau made a motion, seconded by Everett Marshall to approve the September 9, 2017 minutes. No further
16 discussion. MOTION PASSED. David White and Darren Schibler abstained.
17

18 **3. ECOS Plan Update**

19 Regina Mahony provided a brief presentation on where we are with the ECOS Plan amendments. Regina Mahony
20 added that the minor updates include: Re-organization to bring the implementation section up front, addition of an
21 Implementation Table, addition of content to satisfy Act 171 – Forest Integrity, edits to the Future Land Use Map
22 including Village modifications in Hinesburg, Westford & Colchester. Regina asked the PAC to please let us know
23 if there are any other Land Use Map edits we should know about. The major updates include the enhanced energy
24 element, Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan.
25

26 The **enhanced energy element** is out for public comment and has been posted to Front Porch Forum. We have a
27 two-page infographic summary and the full draft in a software system where you can comment right on the pdf.
28 Comments are due 11/22. Regina Mahony indicated that there are three things she'd like to make the PAC aware
29 of:

- 30 • After all the analysis has been done we have 3 to 8x the amount of area needed for solar, under a scenario
31 of 75% of our energy goals coming from solar. Meaning:
32 – Total Land Area of Chittenden County = 342,307 acres
33 – Amount of land area considered “good” for solar (no constraints & prime generation) = 9,600 acres
34 – Amount of land area needed to meet the low target = 1,251 acres (8x the amount of “good” for
35 solar)
36 – Amount of land area needed to meet the high target = 3,740 acres (3x the amount of “good” for
37 solar)
38 • The renewable energy siting policies include:
39 – Should avoid the constraints.
40 – Guidelines for places where we'd like to see renewable energy generation facilities.
41

42 The **CEDS** draft is in your inboxes (sent on 10/27). We'd like comments by 12/1 if possible. The content has not
43 changed that much in terms of policy from the existing plan, however there is updated data and analysis,
44 and we've strengthened emphasis on workforce development and education; and the housing shortage as an

1 economic development issue. Let us know if you'd like us to meet with your PCs or Economic Development
 2 Committees. We are also visiting with staff to update CEDS project list (emphasis on facilities and utilities).

3
 4 The draft **MTP** scenario was in your packet. Regina Mahony explained that there is a lot of detail on the results of
 5 the MTP in your packet. Regina Mahony explained that after looking at many pure scenarios and analyzing the
 6 results, we pulled a variety of aspects together into this hybrid scenario. Jason Charest is here also to answer any
 7 questions. The draft MTP Scenario includes:

- 8 • All TIP Projects
- 9 • Third Lane on I-89 between Exits 14 and 15 as the model shows that this gets over capacity by 2050.
- 10 • Exit 12B placeholder. We will conduct a future I-89 Interchange Scoping Study to figure out which
 11 interstate exchange would be the best one to do.
- 12 • ITS Investments
- 13 • Transit enhancements
 - 14 – 20 minute headways on all routes, every day
 - 15 – New Colchester loop
- 16 • Increases in walking/biking
- 17 • Land-use concentration: 90% of HH growth in areas planned for growth. 80% of the growth is distributed
 18 to all of the areas planned for growth; 10% of the growth is concentrated in the urban centers and villages;
 19 and 10% in the rural planning areas.

20
 21 Staff also provided information on the funding splits for this scenario:

Proposed 2050 Program Allocations for New MTP Improvements			FY00-16 TIP Obligation Percentages
Program Category	Allocations	Percent	
Roadway Corridor Improvements			73.6%
New Facility/ Major Roadway Upgrades	\$289,000,000	68.7%	
Safety/ Traffic Operations/ ITS			
Bike/Pedestrian/ Enhancement	\$70,000,000	16.6%	14.1%
Transit Expansion	\$40,000,000	9.5%	4.9%
Park & Ride/ Intermodal	\$5,700,000	1.4%	3.5%
Rail	Outside our Fiscal Constraint		3.8%
Stormwater/ Environmental	\$16,000,000	3.8%	0.1%
New Improvements (30% of Total Funding):	\$420,700,000	100.0%	100.0%
Total Funding (2050): \$1,744.72 million			
TIP Projects: \$ 102.72 million			
Preservation Projects (Operate/Maintain Pavement, Bridges, and Transit ops): \$1,221.30 million			

22 Regina Mahony explained that it helps to look at this table from the bottom up to see the total funding in 2050
 23 \$1,744.72 million – 70% of this will go to preservation and committed projects in the TIP. That leaves 30% of new
 24 projects, and that has been allocated to the program categories in the top 2/3 of the chart.

25
 26
 27 Staff and Joss Besse explained that the TAC had quite a bit of good discussion about the amount of money going to
 28 the Interstate projects versus other road projects. At the TAC we thought the interstate projects were about \$100

1 million out of the \$289 million – it is probably closer to \$80 million – about a 1/3 of the new highway projects.
2 Discussion at the PAC included:

- 3 • Why not put all of this money toward county wide bus service?
- 4 • Discussion of other potential interstate exchange improvements like 14N.
- 5 • The land use options that showed more concentrated growth had real transportation benefits, and that is the
6 purpose of the concentrated land use element. The PAC discussed that improvements in the downtowns can
7 also help reinforce the smart growth goals.

8 9 **4. Housing Conversation**

10 Regina Mahony provided the PAC with a draft concept of a housing workshop for either the Planners, and our Planning
11 Commissioners and Selectboard members. The PAC provided some great feedback and emphasized that it would be
12 great to focus on the economics of housing. It would really help to understand why it costs so much to build housing,
13 permitting included. The PAC suggested that the Planning Commissioners and the Selectboards would really benefit
14 from this information as well. The PAC suggested an evening may be the best (rather than a Saturday or during the day).

15 16 **5. Milton Comprehensive Plan - Final Review**

17 This review was not warned as a public hearing because Staff didn't have enough time; so we'll need to host the
18 hearing at the Board meeting. Emily Nosse-Leirer provided an overview of the Plan update and her findings as
19 described in the Staff Report. This is a relatively minor update which addresses the new required elements. The
20 intent was to get these edits done prior expiration of the current plan. The draft plan meets statute as is, but we do
21 have some recommendations that could be made now (moved away from housing targets). Milton is planning to
22 rewrite the Plan in the near term (by 2019).

23
24 Victor Sinadinovski explained that Milton spent 2.5 years on the unified development bylaw, and have recently had
25 staff turnover that prevented them from doing more of a complete update at this time. He further explained that the
26 staff comments were discussed with the Planning Commission and they've already addressed items 3 (goal that
27 refers to CCRPCs old housing targets) & 4 (clarified that all elements have been met in the Plan) in the staff report.
28 They intend to address the other items in the 2019 Town Plan (a more complete data update and transportation
29 study update).

30
31 The PAC had a discussion regarding whether municipalities could readopt older plans as we've done in the past to
32 buy more time. With the change in legislation to 8-year plans, CCRPC's read of statute is that we can't approve a
33 Plan with a new timeframe, unless the Plan is up to speed on all required statutory requirements. If you want to
34 amend the Plan but keep the timeframe the same (i.e. do an amendment in 2016, but the Plan will still expire in
35 2019) you don't have to bring the Plan up to speed with all new statutory requirements. The PAC suggested that
36 Staff make this clear to the municipalities. Staff will do that.

37
38 Ken Belliveau made a motion, seconded by Daryl Benoit, that the PAC finds that the draft 2018 Milton
39 Comprehensive Plan, as submitted, meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC approval, and that the
40 municipality's planning process meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC confirmation.

41
42 Upon notification that the Plan has been adopted by the municipality, CCRPC staff will review the plan, and any
43 information relevant to the confirmation process, for changes. If staff determines that changes are substantive, those
44 changes will be forwarded to the PAC for review. Otherwise the PAC recommends that the Plan, and the municipal
45 planning process, should be forwarded to the CCRPC Board for approval. No discussion. MOTION CARRIES.

46 47 **6. Charlotte Town Plan Public Hearing & Final Review**

48 Joss Besse opened the public hearing and closed. No one from the public was in attendance. Darren Schribler stated
49 that Dana Hanley (who couldn't be in attendance today) had previous concerns about the Town Plan, but those
50 concerns have now been addressed.

51
52 Emily Nosse-Leirer provided an overview of the changes in the Plan since the last time the PAC looked at this. One
53 outstanding item is the content in the implementation spreadsheet as it still includes the content from the last plan,
54 rather than the content in the new Plan. Daryl Benoit stated that this will be a conditional of approval for the PC

1 moving the plan to the Selectboard, therefore he will make that change before the Plan gets to the Selectboard.
2 There was quite a bit of discussion on this to clarify that the content that will go in the implementation table is
3 indeed in the Plan now, just not in the table. Emily Nosse-Leirer provided an overview of the previous comments
4 and how they've been addressed in this draft. The Staff review includes a recommendation on the organization/style
5 of the plan for better readability; however, this is not a content issue and not a problem for formal approval. Daryl
6 Benoit agrees with the recommendation and would like to address it. The PC will receive this staff review, so
7 they'll see the comment. on style is not something the PAC is going to push. It is a recommendation, it isn't
8 content.

9
10 Darren Schribler reiterated that Dana Hanley's previous comments have been addressed.

11
12 David White made a motion, seconded by Victor Sinadinowski, that the PAC finds the Charlotte Town Plan, as
13 submitted, meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC approval, and that the municipality's planning process
14 meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC confirmation, and forwards the Plan to the CCRPC Board for approval.
15 Discussion about the implementation and merging the present and future chapters. Decided to not make this part of
16 the motion but we add to the memo. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.

17 18 **7. St. George Town Plan – Final Review**

19 This review was not warned as a public hearing because Staff didn't have enough time; so we'll need to host the
20 hearing at the Board meeting. Lee Krohn described the staff review for this Plan. St. George's current plan is
21 expired; and this update primarily includes the new statutory requirements have been put in place since the last Plan
22 was written. Some of the data is fairly dated, we recommend adding a reference to more updated data. There are
23 other minor technical corrections recommended as well: the maps could use some titles because they don't always
24 follow the text. The plan includes a number of policies for the Town to pursue; ultimately it may be helpful to
25 prioritize those in some way. State designation intent should be clearer if they want to pursue a designation since it
26 isn't mapped right now. May also be helpful to understand what the Town may intend to do with the data.
27 However, Staff finds that as drafted the Plan meets all the requirements.

28
29 Scott Baker (participated via phone for this part of the agenda) responded that the comments make sense and he is
30 generally on board with them. They rely on Brandy Saxton to do most of their work. He didn't realize some of the
31 data tables were still old. He agrees with the comments on the map titles and numbers. They've thought about the
32 designation aspect a number of years ago, and got sidetracked with their land use regulations. These new
33 regulations are working quite well. He will see what they can do regarding these edits before the November 28th PC
34 public hearing. Discussion regarding the possible Village Center Designation as they don't know exactly what the
35 boundary would be. Regina added that we have seen the planning budget which was not included in the meeting
36 packet.

37
38 Cathynn LaRose agreed that the data is old; and specifically pointed out the education section. Is there a reason to
39 not get the Plan up to date, since the Plan is expired already? Scott Baker thinks they do have the time; just a lot of
40 busy work. Want to do it, but isn't sure about the 11/28 deadline, but they may be able to make some larger changes
41 at the Selectboard review stage. Cathynn also suggested that the Plan should include who wrote the Plan – give
42 credit to Brandy and the Planning Commission, Selectboard, etc.

43
44 Victor Sinadinowski made a motion, seconded by Ken Belliveau, that the PAC finds the Charlotte Town Plan, as
45 submitted, meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC approval, and that the municipality's planning process
46 meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC confirmation, and forwards the Plan to the CCRPC Board for approval.
47 Discussion about the implementation and merging the present and future chapters. Decided to not make this part of
48 the motion but we add to the memo. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED. Sarah Hadd and Cathynn LaRose
49 voted no due to the lack of updated and analyzed data.

50
51 Joss Besse left at this time (4:18pm)

52 53 **8. Regional Act 250/Section 248 Projects on the Horizon**

- 54 • Underhill – nothing

- 1 • Huntington – nothing
- 2 • Burlington – nothing
- 3 • Essex – 500kW solar array on 281 River Road – former sand pit. Approached the Town for a net metering
- 4 agreement. The Town thinks it is a good location.
- 5 • St. George – three lot subdivision on Rte 2A; and two storage places.
- 6 • Colchester – Lomartire PUD at Act 250 now. There is a sign application going to hearing at Water Tower
- 7 Hill. There is a 33 unit residential and perimeter drive project that is making its way to final in the Growth
- 8 Center. Another 113 to over 500 units but are looking at priority workforce housing in the Growth Center
- 9 so may not have to go to Act 250.
- 10 • South Burlington – nothing new since Paul Conner’s last update.
- 11 • Milton – No Act 250 stuff. Addition to cell tower and 40 acre solar farm. Planning Commission no
- 12 concerns. The property is currently in agriculture.
- 13 • Charlotte – Vtec & 8-lot subdivision at sketch now.
- 14 • Williston – Finney Crossing still coming for more phases and 100-unit hotel. Williston Road/Blair Park
- 15 hotel at sketch. 17,000 animal veterinary hospital on Marshall Ave. – Burlington Emergency Vet – also in
- 16 sketch. Town Act 250 application for a trail; the trail is already there and wanted to make some changes but
- 17 there are some archeology issues.
- 18

19 **9. Other Business**

- 20 a. December meeting for Richmond Town Plan – December 6th or 13th. The PAC didn’t have any concerns
- 21 about this. Staff will follow-up with the date.
- 22 b. FY19 UPWP Solicitation will go out before Thanksgiving.
- 23 c. From Rebecca Pfeiffer: “From January 8-11, we will be hosting FEMA’s 4-day introductory class to the
- 24 National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP), called Managing Floodplain Development Through the NFIP.
- 25 There will be no cost for the course, although there will be an optional cost for lunch and break snacks.
- 26 We’re excited that we will be able to bring this class to Vermont and hope you’ll be able to join us~
- 27 ASFPM’s CFM exam will be held on Friday, January 12th, open to anyone who would like to sit for the
- 28 exam. We’ll be following up with more details and registration shortly. For now, we wanted people who
- 29 may be interested to save the date for this 4-day course, January 8-11, at the Essex Junction Regional
- 30 Office, with the CFM exam being offered on January 12th, open to anyone.
- 31 d. There will be resources coming out to assist with the new Forest Integrity requirements associated with Act
- 32 171 from ANR and VNRC. There are also a few webinars coming up. Staff will send out more information.
- 33 e. DHCD updated their [Mobile Home Park Guidance for Municipalities](#) (pdf) which is a resource for your
- 34 town’s planners when dealing with pre-existing mobile home parks or proposed new developments, and
- 35 explains why free-standing “trailer park ordinances” are no longer allowed under State law. They also have
- 36 additional resources here: [Planning for Housing Resources](#).
- 37 f. Some State Agencies put their recommendations together for the Commission on Act 250. Staff will send
- 38 that out for your information.
- 39 g. There was mention that the Secretary of State’s Office is reviewing licensing for contractors and
- 40 handymen. In process now, they intend to open up the process to talk to municipalities.
- 41

42 **9. Adjourn**

43 The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

44
45 Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony