REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
Wednesday, September 20, 2017 - 6:15 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 July 19, 2017 Meeting*  (Action; 1 minute)

5. Approval of 2016 Williston Comprehensive Plan and Confirmation Process*  (Action; 10 minutes)

6. ECOS Plan Update  (Discussion/Action; 40 min)
   a. Energy element policy review*
   b. MTP financial plan
   c. CEDS status update

7. Legislative Breakfast topics  (Discussion; 10 minutes)

8. Chair/Executive Director’s Updates  (Information; 15 minutes)
   a. Clean water initiatives update
   b. Executive Director’s Report (to be sent separately)

9. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports *  (Information, 5 minutes)
   a. Executive Committee (draft minutes August 2, 2017)*
      i. Act 250 Sec 248 letters*
   b. Transportation Advisory Committee (draft minutes September 5, 2017)*
   c. CWAC & MS4 Subcommittee (draft minutes, August 1)*
   d. Long Range Planning Committee (draft minutes, August 17)*
   e. LRPC Energy Subcommittee (draft minutes, August 15, 2017)*
   f. Finance Committee (draft minutes, August 23, 2017)*

10. Members’ Items, Other Business  (Information, 5 minutes)

11. Adjourn

The September 20th Chittenden County RPC meeting will air on Burlington Telecom 17 and Comcast 17 on Tuesday, September 26, 2017 at 8 p.m. and will be available on the web at: http://www.cctv.org/watch-tv/programs/chittenden-county-regional-planning-commission-70

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
- Transportation Advisory Committee - Tuesday, October 3, 2017; 9:00 a.m.
- Clean Water Advisory Committee - Tuesday, October 3, 2017; 11:00 a.m.
- CWAC MS4 Subcommittee - Tuesday, October 3, 2017; 12:15 a.m.
- Executive Committee - Wednesday, October 4, 2017; 5:45 p.m.
- Long Range Planning Committee - Thursday, October 12, 2017; 8:30 a.m.
- Energy Sub-Committee meeting - Tuesday, October 17, 2017 at 5:00 p.m.
- CCRPC Board Meeting - Wednesday, October 18, 2017; 6:00 p.m.
- Planning Advisory Committee - Wednesday, November 8, 2017; 2:30 p.m.

### Tentative future Board agenda items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Agenda Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 18, 2017</td>
<td>Final Draft Rule – Municipal Road General Permit Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Draft MTP, CEDS, Energy ECOS Plan Updates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brownfield Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joe Flynn, Vermont Secretary of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 15, 2017</td>
<td>Review and Accept Draft FY17 Audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Draft MTP, CEDS, Energy ECOS Plan Updates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Highway System update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December TBD</td>
<td>Legislative Breakfast</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.
Prior to the board meeting, Charlie Baker held a training session beginning at 5:15 p.m. for any board members and alternates who wanted to get a basic look at what CCRPC is and does.

1. **Call to order; Changes to the Agenda.** The meeting was called to order at 6:20 p.m. by the chair, Chris Roy. There were no changes to the agenda. Chris had everyone introduce themselves since there were several new folks in attendance.

2. **Public Comment Period for Items not on the agenda.** There were none.

3. **Action on Consent Agenda.** There was a minor amendment to the TIP for an I-89 paving project from Colchester to Swanton. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA. SHARON MURRAY SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. **Approve Minutes of June 21, 2017 Annual Meeting.** CATHERINE McMAINS MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CHRIS SHAW, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JUNE 21, 2017 AS PRESENTED. MOTION CARRIED WITH ABSENCIONS FROM JOHN ZICCONI, ANDREA MORGANTE, DAN KERIN, AND BRIAN BIGELOW.
5. FY18-21 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) – MPO Business.
   a. Presentation & Public Hearing. Christine gave a presentation explaining what the TIP is, why we need a TIP, how projects get on the TIP and the sections of the document and how to read it. She noted that the TIP is a fiscally constrained document which means these are projects we really believe will be funded in the year given. This authorizes the obligation of federal funds. When a project begins a phase such as design, ROW or construction the money for that phase is obligated at that point which ensures the funds will be there to complete that phase. Projects in the TIP (which is on the federal fiscal year – Oct 1- Sept 30) must be on the Vermont Capital Program (which is on the state fiscal year – July 1-June 30). The TIP lists federal funds only – not state or local dollars that might be part of the cost. The TIP funds for FY18 - $78.8 million; FY19 - $48.8 million; and FY21 - $47.3 million. The TIP includes funding for Burlington International Airport, but those funds are not in our fiscal constraint. We do not have a set number of projects or dollars each fiscal year, because the amount is based on projects ready to go to that phase. She then broke down the TIP projects by use category. Christine then talked briefly about the Circ Alternative projects that were added a few years ago after the Circ itself was cancelled. Phase 1 and 2 of the Circ Alt projects are in the TIP, but Phase 3 projects will have to compete like other projects, but some are in design. This brought up concerns from Chris Roy since Williston had agreed to go along with this process. Discussion ensued.
   
   b. Action on TIP. JEFF BARTLEY MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE TIP AFTER THE WARNING PERIOD ENDS ON JULY 28TH AND HAVE THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE RATIFY IT AT THEIR MEETING ON AUGUST 2ND. MOTION WAS SECONDED BY DAN KERIN. John Zicconi brought up the category of “illustrative” projects which Christine didn’t talk about. Shelburne has a project on Bay Road that leads to the marina and Shelburne Farms and it has been Shelburne’s #1 project for a couple of years. The town had tried to fix it on their own to no avail. He asked that this be put on the TIP as Illustrative with no funding. After a lengthy discussion, it was agreed not to add this to the TIP at this late date as it could set a precedent which we’d rather not get into. Perhaps if they bring it up earlier in the process next year. Amy indicated that VTrans would have to rethink their action the TIP if we put too many illustrative projects in it. She noted that in 17 years we have not added an illustrative project at this late date. MPO VOTE ON TIP AS PRESENTED:

   |  Bolton:    | Yes | Buel’s Gore: Absent | Burlington: Yes (4) |
   |  Charlotte: | absent | Colchester: Yes (2) | Essex: Yes |
   |  Essex Jct: | Yes | Hinesburg: Yes | Huntington: Yes |
   |  Jericho:   | Yes | Milton: Yes | Richmond: Absent |
   |  St. George | Absent | Shelburne: Yes | So. Burlington: Yes (2) |
   |  Underhill: | Yes | Westford: Absent | Williston: (Yes) |
   |  VTrans:    | Yes | | |

   MOTION CARRIED WITH 19 OF 24 VOTES AND 13 OF 18 MUNICIPALITIES.
   

6. FY18 Schedule of Meetings. As the cover memo indicated, the Vermont Open Meeting Law requires that public bodies clearly designate the time and place of all regular meetings. Staff is asking the Commission to approve the schedule of meetings. CATHERINE McMAMS MADE A MOTION,
SECONDED BY SHARON MURRAY TO APPROVE THEY FY18 MEETING SCHEDULE. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

7. Solicitation and Appointment of Members to serve on Committees. Each year board members asked to serve on one or more standing committees. The bylaws were amended earlier this year to add that members are “expected” to serve on at least one standing committee. Chris review the memo that lists the vacancies. The following volunteered to serve: Dan Kerin on Board Development Committee; Michael Bissonette, Jeff Bartley and Sharon Murray on UPWP Committee; and we hope Bard Hill will serve on Long Range Planning Committee. Chris Roy appointed those members and asked the Commission to vote their consensus of these appointments. DAN KERIN MADE A MOTION THAT WE PROVIDE CONSENSUS OF THESE APPOINTMENTS. JOHN ZICCONI SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

8. Board and Staff Recognition. The meeting packet included several resolutions. The first is to thank Marc Landry for his 12 years on the CCMPD/CCRPC boards serving many of them on the Executive Committee. The next three resolutions are to honor the three staff members who are celebrating 10 years at CCRPC: Eleni Churchill, Bryan Davis and Jason Charest. There was recognition and applause for each of the honorees. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION TO AUTHORIZE THE CHAIR TO SIGN THESE RESOLUTIONS ON OUR BEHALF. BRIAN BIGELOW SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

9. Energy Plan Review. Chris Roy noted that there are a couple pieces to this – the first is state data for generating renewable energy and the second is to put together a regional energy plan to make that possible. This will help facilitate adopting municipal energy plans and allow RPC to weigh in on siting decisions at the Public Utilities Commission (formerly the Public Service Board). He feels most of our decision should be focused on broad policies as to what we as the RPC want our plan to say. Melanie provided some background information to help the Board weigh in on this question: Should the regional plan (ECOS Plan) prohibit development in state and local constraint areas or act in a more advisory role? Melanie then reviewed the renewable energy targets for the state and for Chittenden County and the acreage needed to achieve that target. Lengthy discussion ensued with the bottom line being that Chittenden County has more than enough acreage outside of natural resource constraints (“known constraints” as currently determined by Staff) to meet either high or low target. Melanie noted that we have received feedback from the Department of Public Service: clear standard is best for the Public Utilities Commission; outline specific areas in your map with supporting text to identify what is and what is not appropriate there; need to be equally restrictive with all types of development; general policy guidance is okay. So, if we’re saying NO to renewable generation, then we need to say NO to all development. Staff explained that these constraints are already in place at the municipal level; nothing is being imposed on a municipality. Discussion continued, and Sharon Murray added that in addition to known constraints you have to address suitability. Lengthy discussion continued about how restricted areas could be depicted on maps or with narrative. Several members expressed concern about restricting all development in known constraint areas. Staff spoke to the siting policy options for the Plan. Option C is the baseline; and the question is whether to add either Option A (shall) or Option B (should). Several members asked how this will be implemented in our Act 250/Section 248 review; and municipal plan approvals. Ultimately Chris Roy asked Staff to draft language associated with a combination of Option C and B, so that the Board has something more substantial to react and respond to in September. In doing so, consider the constraints, suitability and preferred sites; and the associated ramifications for CCRPC’s Act 250 and Section 248 reviews, and municipal plan approvals.
10. **CCRPC comments on State Treasurer’s Clean Water Report.** Charlie noted that comments are due to the state by August 2\(^{nd}\). The Clean Water Advisory Committee (CWAC) talked about this and added some comments to the memo the board had approved previously. Don Meals is concerned that not all of the CWAC members have seen this version and asked that this be on their agenda for the August 1\(^{st}\) meeting. That way they entire committee can act on it and then the Executive Committee can take final action at their meeting on August 2\(^{nd}\). It was noted that this is not the only time in the process that we will be asked for comments. After a brief discussion DON MEALS MADE A MOTION TO REFER THIS TO THE CWAC. SHARON MURRAY SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

11. **Chair/Executive Director’s Update.** There were none.

12. **Committee/liaison Activities and Reports.** As always, minutes of various committees were included in the meeting packet.

13. **Member’s Items, Other Business.** There were none.

14. **Adjournment.** CHRIS SHAW MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JOHN ZICCONI TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:35 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
September 20, 2017
Agenda Item 5: Town of Williston Comprehensive Plan, 2016-2024, Approval and Confirmation

Issues: The Town of Williston has requested, per Title 24 V.S.A §4350, that the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (1) approve its 2016-2024 Comprehensive Plan, and (2) confirm its planning process.

Attached is the proposed Resolution of approval and the staff report to the Planning Advisory Committee. The Planning Advisory Committee met on September 13, 2017 and recommended that the Plan, and the municipal planning process, should be forwarded to the CCRPC Board for approval.

The Plan was adopted by the Williston Selectboard on August 22, 2017. The CCRPC Planning Advisory Committee held a duly warned public hearing on the Plan at their meeting on October 12, 2016, during the Planning Commission public hearing process. 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, October 12, 2016 and on Wednesday, September 13, 2017 at the CCRPC Offices and made the following motion on September 13, 2017:

The PAC finds that the Williston 2016-2024 Comprehensive Plan, as submitted, meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC approval, and that the municipality's planning process meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC confirmation.

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 Williston 2016-2024 Comprehensive Plan and confirm the Town of Williston’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
Williston’s Comprehensive Plan & Planning Process

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

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

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

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

WHEREAS, The Town of Williston formally requested CCRPC to approve its Comprehensive 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 Williston’s Comprehensive Plan as meeting the requirements of 24 V.S.A.§ 4350 and the Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans and confirms the community’s planning process as consistent with Title 24, Chapter 117.


WHEREAS, the 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 2016-2024 Williston Comprehensive Plan and the Commission finds that said Comprehensive 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 Williston’s municipal planning process.

Dated at Winooski, this 20th day of September, 2017.

CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

____________________________________________________
Christopher D. Roy, Chair
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC)

Resolution

Williston’s Comprehensive Plan & Planning Process

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

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

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

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

WHEREAS, The Town of Williston formally requested CCRPC to approve its Comprehensive 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 Williston’s Comprehensive Plan as meeting the requirements of 24 V.S.A.§ 4350 and the Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans and confirms the community’s planning process as consistent with Title 24, Chapter 117.


WHEREAS, the 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 2016-2024 Williston Comprehensive Plan and the Commission finds that said Comprehensive 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 Williston’s municipal planning process.

Dated at Winooski, this 20th day of September, 2017.

CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

Christopher D. Roy, Chair
The Town of Williston has requested, per 24 V.S.A §4350, that the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (1) approve its 2016-2024 Williston Comprehensive Plan; and (2) confirm its planning process.

This draft 2016-2024 Williston Comprehensive Plan is an update and re-adoption of the 2011-2016 Williston Comprehensive Plan. In accordance with statute, re-adoption means a fully compliant plan. The 2016-2024 Williston Comprehensive Plan has added several new required elements, including flood resilience and economic development. The addition of these sections ensures that the plan meets statutory guidelines. CCRPC staff reviewed the 2011-2016 plan in 2013 as part of an Enhanced Consultation process. Additionally, staff and the Planning Advisory Committee reviewed the 2016-2024 plan and held a public hearing in October of 2016, while it was in draft format. The Williston Selectboard adopted the plan on August 22, 2017. While CCRPC staff has already completed a formal review of this plan in October 2016, this review looks at changes in the text that happened since the last review.

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 2016-2024 Williston Comprehensive Plan to determine whether it is:

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

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

Please see the CCRPC website for a link to Williston’s Plan, maps and associated documents: http://www.ccrpcvt.org/about-us/committees/planning-advisory-committee/

Staff Review Findings and Comments

1. The 2016-2024 Williston Comprehensive Plan is consistent with all of the general goals of §4302. See the attached Appendix A submittal that describes how the Plan is consistent with these goals.

2. The 2016-2024 Williston Comprehensive Plan is consistent with the specific goals of §4302. See Table 1A on Page 2 of the Plan that describes how the Plan is consistent with these goals.

3. The 2016-2024 Williston Comprehensive Plan contains the required elements of §4382. See Table 1A on Page 2 of the Plan that describes compliance with these required elements.

4. The 2016-2024 Williston Comprehensive Plan is generally compatible with the planning areas, goals and strategies of the 2013 Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan.
5. The 2016-2024 Williston Comprehensive Plan is generally compatible with the municipal plans for South Burlington, Essex Junction, Essex, St. George, Shelburne, Richmond and Jericho.

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

Additional Comments/Questions:
CCRPC completed an initial review of Williston’s 2011-2016 Plan in September 2015, and a formal review of the 2016-2021 Plan in October 2016. The comments from those reviews, and whether they were incorporated or not, can be seen in the attached memos. All required changes were made.

This plan is incredibly comprehensive, easy to read, and it clearly communicates the various planning efforts that Williston is undertaking, both in the text and via references to other documents.

Proposed Motion & Next Steps:
PROPOSED MOTION: The PAC finds that the draft 2016-2024 Williston Comprehensive Plan, as submitted, meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC approval, and that the municipality's planning process meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC confirmation.

Upon notification that the Plan has been adopted by the municipality, CCRPC staff will review the plan, and any information relevant to the confirmation process, for changes. If staff determines that changes are substantive, those changes will be forwarded to the PAC for review. Otherwise the PAC recommends that the Plan, and the municipal planning process, should be forwarded to the CCRPC Board for approval.
Staff will provide an update and seek feedback on recent changes to draft components of the ECOS Plan related to energy: (1) Energy Siting Policies, (2) Energy Siting Maps and (3) Constraint Screening Methodology.

(1) 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. “Suitability Policies” provide a list of desirable characteristics for energy facilities on unconstrained lands, which are considered guidelines rather than regulations.

(2) The known and possible constraints discussed in the text are shown on Map 6 of the current ECOS Plan. Map 6 currently shows “areas with natural, scenic, agricultural and/or recreational value.” The revised version included here has been updated to reflect Act 174 standards and now maps known and possible constraints. Known constraints replace the previously mapped protected areas, and possible constraints replace the previously mapped partially protected areas. Additionally, a map of wind potential is provided, because it is referenced in Policy 3.2.2.4.b.vii.

(3) Staff has developed a methodology for determining which local constraints are “known” versus “possible.” Staff will reach out to municipalities in October to reach agreement on the list of known and possible local constraints that will ultimately be included in the ECOS Plan.

**Staff Recommendation:** No action needed at this time.

**Exec. Comm. Recommendation:** No action needed at this time.

**For more information contact:** Melanie Needle and Regina Mahony 846-4490 x *27 & *28 or mneedle@ccrpcvt.org & rmahony@ccrpcvt.org
3.2.2 STRIVE FOR 80% OF NEW DEVELOPMENT IN AREAS PLANNED FOR GROWTH, WHICH AMOUNTS TO 15% OF OUR LAND AREA AND PROTECT NATURAL, CULTURAL, HISTORIC, OR SCENIC RESOURCES

4. Energy – Transform the Region’s energy system to meet the goals of Vermont’s energy and greenhouse gas reduction goals.

a. Reduce energy consumption and decrease greenhouse gas emissions, to support the State’s goals:
   • Reduce greenhouse gas emissions 50% from 1990 levels by 2028,
   • Reduce greenhouse gas emissions 75% from 1990 levels by 2050,
   • Reduce per capita energy use across all sectors (electricity, transportation and heating) 15% by 2025,
   • Reduce per capital energy use across all sectors (electricity, transportation and heating) by more than 1/3 by 2050, and
   • Weatherize 25% of all homes by 2020.

i. Continue partnerships with Vermont Gas, Burlington Electric Department, Efficiency Vermont and the State Weatherization Assistance Program to facilitate the weatherization and increased energy efficiency of housing stock and other buildings.

ii. Promote alternatives to fossil fuels for heating by working with partners such as Efficiency Vermont to educate developers and homeowners on the benefits of technology such as cold climate heat pumps, wood heating and geothermal systems, and by supporting alternative forms of heating. Examples of alternative forms of heating include district heating (for example, using waste heat from the McNeil Plant to heat buildings in Burlington) and biogas generation (capturing the methane produced by landfills or farms and using it instead of natural gas).

iii. Work with partners to establish a consistent energy code for all jurisdictions and geographic areas to avoid disincentives for infill development in areas planned for growth.

iv. Reduce fossil fuel consumption in the transportation sector, through the Transportation Demand Management and electric vehicle promotion strategies outlined in Part 6c of this section and in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) included in this plan.

v. Collaborate with the State of Vermont and utilities to ensure that state energy policy implementation (i.e. permits for non-renewable fuels) reflect state energy goals.

vi. Work with partners to increase rooftop solar generation wherever possible, especially net metering on publicly owned buildings to reduce public money spent on energy costs, provided infill development is not precluded.

vii. Provide assistance to municipalities to enhance town plans to be consistent with Act 174 standards for the purpose of enabling municipalities the ability to gain substantial deference in the Certificate of Public Good Section 248 process. This assistance will include working
with municipalities to identify natural, cultural, historic, or scenic resources to be protected from all development types and identify preferred locations for renewable energy generation facilities.

viii. Use the Vermont Energy Action Network (VEAN) Energy Dashboard to educate residents and municipalities about opportunities to reduce energy use and switch to renewable energy sources.

b. To meet the Vermont Comprehensive Energy Plan’s goal of using 90% renewable energy by 2050, xx,xxx MWh of new renewable energy generation will need to be sited in Chittenden County. This energy can be produced through a variety of technologies, including solar, wind, biodigesters, biomass generators, expanded hydroelectric capacity at existing dams. The following statements are CCRPC’s energy facility siting policies.

Constraint Policies: Energy generation is constrained in certain areas due to state and local restrictions on development.

i. Site renewable energy generation to avoid state and local known constraints and to minimize impacts to state and local possible constraints, as defined in strategies 3.2.3.1.f, 3.2.4.1.e, 3.2.4.2.e.

ii. Ground-mounted solar development must comply with applicable state regulations, including setback standards as defined in 30 V.S.A. §248(s) and screening requirements as defined in 30 V.S.A. §248(b)(B).

Suitability Policies: Unconstrained areas have different levels of suitability for renewable energy generation. In unconstrained areas, energy generation facilities should meet as many of the following guidelines as possible and relevant.

iii. Site solar generation on previously impacted areas (such as existing structures, parking lot canopies, previously developed sites, brownfields, landfills, or the disturbed portion of gravel pits or quarries).

iv. Locate solar generation (and residential scale wind?) in Chittenden County’s areas planned for growth, provided infill development is not precluded.

v. Locate ground-mounted solar larger than 15 kW and large-scale wind\(^\text{1}\) installations outside of state designated village centers, growth centers, downtowns, new town centers, neighborhood development areas, and historic districts on the State or National Register.

vi. Locate solar and wind generation in areas identified in plan as preferred or suitable sites in a municipal plan or in a joint letter from the municipality and CCPRC, as described in Chapter 4.

---

\(^1\) Large-Scale Wind means any wind turbine with a hub height of 50m or higher, not including the blade. Commercial-scale wind has a capacity between 100kW and 1MW, and utility scale wind has a capacity of 1MW or more.
vii. Locate wind generation in areas with high wind potential, such as the prime and base wind potential areas shown on Map X.

viii. Locate energy generation where distribution and transmission infrastructure has adequate capacity, where it will not interfere with the reliability of the electric grid, and where needed connections or extensions can be made within 1,000’ of existing distribution and transmission lines.
3.2.3 Improve the safety, water quality, and habitat of our rivers, streams, wetlands and lakes in each watershed.

While striving toward all of these ECOS strategies, and particularly Strategy #2 – 80% of growth in 15% of our land area, it is essential to do so in such a way that we do not impair our essential water resources (including potable water) and that we prepare ourselves for the impacts of a changing climate.

1. **River Hazard Protection** – Develop and implement adaptation strategies to reduce flooding and fluvial erosion hazards. While supporting planned growth, ensure that growth is evaluated in terms of preparedness for a changing climate. Chittenden County will continue its efforts, along with the municipalities, to avoid development in particularly vulnerable areas such as floodplains, river corridors, wetlands, lakeshore and steep slopes; protect people, buildings and facilities where development already exists in vulnerable areas to reduce future flooding risk; plan for and encourage new development in areas that are less vulnerable to future flood events (see Section 3.2.2); and implement stormwater management techniques to slow, spread and sink floodwater (see the Non-Point Source Pollution section below).

a. Identify problem locations - Conduct on the ground inventories and map flow and sediment attenuation locations and problematic infrastructure (undersized culverts, eroding roadways, "vulnerable infrastructure" - infrastructure subject to repeat damage and replacement, etc.).

b. Revise bridge/culvert designs - Revise public works and zoning ordinances with culvert and bridge design specifications that allow for wildlife passage and movement of floodwater and debris during high intensity events. Implement culvert and bridge designs that produce stable structure in river channels (i.e. fluvial geomorphology).

c. Protect river corridors – Existing bylaws protect the majority of Fluvial Erosion Hazard (FEH) areas with stream setbacks and floodplain regulations. Work with ANR to get the FEH data incorporated into the River Corridor Protection Area maps. Work with municipalities and ANR to improve bylaws to protect the River Corridor Protection Areas or River Corridors not currently protected and enforce these bylaws. Continue protection of river corridors including non-regulatory protection measures such as stream re-buffering, river corridor easements on agricultural lands, river corridor restoration and culvert and bridge adaptation.

d. Support non-regulatory conservation and/or preservation of vulnerable areas through public and land trust investments, including identification of repetitively damaged structures and provide assistance to elevate, relocate or buy out structures, and identify where flood storage capacity may be restored and conserved.

e. Participate in the development and implementation of the Lamoille, Winooski and Direct to Lake Tactical Basin Plans. CCRPC will work with the State, municipalities and other partners to address river hazard protection, flood resiliency and water quality through these Plans – including prioritizing projects for funding.

f. **To protect water quality**, locate development to avoid field-verified state and local known constraints, and to minimize impacts to field-verified state and local possible constraints.
3.2.4 Increase investment in and decrease subdivision of working lands and significant habitats, and support local food systems.

1. **Habitat Preservation** - Protect forests, and wetlands and agricultural lands from development, and promote vegetative landscaping in urban areas in order to maintain natural habitats, natural storm water management and carbon sequestration. This will keep people and infrastructure out of harm’s way and allow for natural flood attenuation areas.

   a. **Inventory** - Conduct on the ground surveys and inventories of significant habitats (include wetlands), connectivity corridors, scenic resources and locations of invasive species and map this information. Incorporate this data into municipal and regional plan text and maps and establish specific policies that address and protect these resources.

   b. **Municipal Development Review Regulations** - Develop clear definitions of the resources to be protected and establish standards to describe how to protect these resources within zoning and subdivision regulations.

   c. **Education** - Educate engineers, developers, real estate professionals, planners and the public regarding resources and methods for restoration and protection.

   d. **Non-regulatory Protection** - Support non-regulatory conservation and/or preservation through public and land trust investments. Establish invasive plant removal management plans, implement the plans and include long-term monitoring.

   e. **To protect significant habitats**, locate development to avoid field-verified state and local known constraints, and to minimize impacts to field-verified state and local possible constraints

   - **State and Local Known Constraints**, as protected by municipalities and State agencies, are shown on Map 6 and include the following: State -significant natural communities and rare threatened and endangered species, vernal pools (unconfirmed and confirmed), and Class 1 and Class 2 Wetlands, Local Known Constraints: TBD (as of date)

   - **Possible State and Local Constraints**, as protected by municipalities and State agencies, are shown on Map 6 and include the following: Protected Lands (state lands in fee simple ownership and privately conserved land), deer wintering areas, the Agency of Natural Resources Vermont Conservation Design
2. **Working Lands Implementation** – To preserve the soul of Vermont, as well as move forward into the future with resiliency, Vermont needs to protect the farmland and forestland we have and support existing and new operations (including, but not limited to, un-intensive urban and suburban home gardens and mini-homesteads). Support implementation of the Farm to Plate Strategic Plan and the VT Working Landscape Partnership Action Plan.

   a. Municipal Development Review Regulations - Develop clear definitions of working lands to be protected and establish zoning and subdivision standards to describe how to protect these areas from development so that they may be retained and accessible as “working” lands. Maintain access and scale of working lands to ensure viability after subdivision in the rural landscape (including but not limited to protection of log landings of previously logged forested parcels, zoning techniques such as fixed area ratio zoning to separate lot size from density, conservation zoning and homeowners association bylaws that allow for farming on the open space lots, etc.); while promoting urban agriculture in areas planned for growth. While farming is generally exempt from municipal zoning, some structures such as farm houses, processing facilities, the generation of energy for on-farm use, and on-farm retail and related enterprises may be regulated. The economic viability of farm enterprises can often depend on these facilities so municipal regulation should not impede reasonable farm related improvements.

   b. Infrastructure & Systems – support establishment of food processing industries, value-added product markets, workforce training, etc to help support the viability of these industries.

c. Support non-regulatory conservation and/or preservation through public and land trust investments (including but not limited to municipal land conservation funds).

c. d. Work with farmers and the Farm to Plate Initiative to balance this plan’s goals of a strong local food system and increased production of renewable energy.

e. **To protect preserve working lands, locate development to avoid field-verified state and local known constraints, and to minimize impacts to field-verified state and local possible constraints**

   - **Possible State or Local Constraints, as protected by municipalities and State agencies, are shown on Map 6 and include the following:** Agricultural soils and Act 250 agricultural soil mitigation areas. **Local Possible Constraints: TBD**
Note: This map and the corresponding data is intended to be used to inform energy planning efforts by municipalities and regions for the purpose of estimating whether a town or region is able to meet solar generation targets. This map may also be used for conceptual planning as it is a basic state-wide analysis that may not be sensitive to site specific energy potential; therefore renewable energy generation potential may be possible in the white areas. The Chittenden County ECOS Plan Known and Possible Constraint Maps should be consulted to aid in the planning for renewable energy generation.

These maps do not take the place of site-specific investigation for a proposed facility and should not be used as “siting maps”. This map does not take all regulations into account and automatically prohibit or allow renewable energy generation and replace the detailed process a developer must go through to propose a site for a renewable energy facility. This map shall not be used without the accompanying policies contained within the Chittenden County ECOS Plan.

Sources:
- Wind Energy Resource Areas; VCGI, 2017

Disclaimer:
The accuracy of information presented is determined by its sources. Errors and omissions may exist. The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission is not responsible for these. Questions of on-the-ground location can be resolved by site inspections and/or surveys by registered surveyor. This map is not sufficient for delineation of features on-the-ground. This map identifies the presence of features, and may indicate relationships between features, but is not a replacement for surveyed information or engineering studies.

Note: The local known constraints have been removed from the prime wind resource areas. The Williston possible constraint of conservation areas still need to be added.

Prime wind areas which overlap local possible constraints are considered to be base wind potential areas.
Map 6 - Natural System Areas
Areas with natural, scenic, agricultural and/or recreational values.

Note: This map and the corresponding data is intended to be used to inform energy planning efforts by municipalities and regions for the purpose of estimating whether a town or region is able to meet solar generation targets. This map may also be used for conceptual planning as it is a basic state-wide analysis that may not be sensitive to site specific energy potential; therefore renewable energy generation potential may be possible in the white areas. The Chittenden County ECOS Plan Known and Possible Constraint Maps should be consulted to aid in the planning for renewable energy generation.

These maps do not take the place of site-specific investigation for a proposed facility and should not be used as “siting maps”. This map does not take all regulations into account and automatically prohibit or allow renewable energy generation and replace the detailed process a developer must go through to propose a site for a renewable energy facility. This map shall not be
Constraints and Suitability – Draft August 15, 2017

Constraints Methodology

State Constraints

The Department of Public Service has distributed energy planning standards, which establish known and possible constraints at the state level. Regions and municipalities can make constraints more restrictive (i.e. turn a possible constraint into a known constraint) but not less restrictive (i.e. turn a known constraint into a possible constraint). CCRPC has not made any changes to state constraints.

Local and Regional Constraints

Because one of the purposes of Act 174 is to give local land use policies greater weight in the Public Utilities Commission process, CCRPC’s ECOS Plan includes local constraints in the energy siting maps and policies. In late 2016, CCRPC staff discussed the possibility of substantial deference for municipal land use policies with planning commissions and municipal staff, and asked municipalities to provide a list of “constraints” that they would like to see given substantial deference. The CCRPC Long Range Planning Committee Energy Subcommittee (the Subcommittee) asked staff to map the constraints provided by the municipalities. Municipalities requested known constraints (areas in which they wanted no renewable energy development), possible constraints (areas on which they wanted renewable energy development to be limited or impacts to be mitigated or minimized). All requested constraints were mapped in early 2017 and reviewed by the Subcommittee.

Based on feedback from the Department of Public Service, it was determined that for constraints on energy to be consistent with the Act 174 energy planning standards, the constraints had to be restrictive of all development, not just renewable energy development. With this in mind, CCRPC staff screened the constraints originally requested by municipalities and determined that a number of them originally requested as known constraints were not equally restrictive of all development. These constraints were considered possible constraints, based on the description below. If no supporting policies or regulations could be located to support a request for a possible constraint, the constraint was not included at all.

Please note that this is an ongoing process and CCRPC staff will work with municipalities to ensure that constraints are adequately characterized.

These local constraints are included in the ECOS Plan due to their importance at the local level. The ECOS Plan included classified local constraints based on the following methodology. However, the description of constraints below is for classification only, and these descriptions are not the definitions of known and possible constraints as discussed in the policies of the ECOS Plan.

Known Constraints: Zoning districts or resource areas where development is prohibited with no exceptions. Typically, phrases such as “development shall not take place” are used to denote these areas.

Possible Constraints: Zoning districts or resource areas such as those in which:

- Development is not completely prohibited, but impacts of development should be “minimized”, “avoided,” “limited,” “avoided where possible,” mitigated or similar;
- Development is allowed only following conditional use review;
- The goals of the zoning district are such that large scale energy development may not be appropriate, such as scenic overlay districts;
- The regulation or plan describing the development restriction is in draft format.

These constraints are identified in an adopted municipal plan or municipal land use regulations, such as zoning regulations or subdivision regulations, in effect as of December 1, 2017. Over the next few years CCRPC will be working with municipalities to complete energy planning, and will continue to review municipal plans through...
CCRPC’s Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans. CCRPC will check to ensure that any local policies don’t preclude municipalities from meeting their energy generation targets and complying with the state energy goals. CCRPC will determine on a case by case basis if an edit is needed to the ECOS Plan.

CCRPC staff evaluated constraints based on the requests of the municipality. Not every development constraint in Chittenden County is reflected in the regional energy planning process, because some municipalities did not request any known or possible constraints (no requests from Buel’s Gore, Huntington or St. George), or only requested that some of their resource protections a portion of their regulations be considered.

While there was some overlap between the constraints requested by each municipality, no constraints emerged as being universal restrictions to development across the county. Therefore, no region-wide constraints were added.

Constraints are discussed in Strategies 3 and 4 of the ECOS Plan, which addresses the protection of natural resources.

Suitability Methodology

Constraints represent areas in which development, including energy generation, is restricted. However, areas in which development is generally appropriate still have different levels of suitability for different types and scales of renewable energy generation. This may be due to conflicts between energy generation and other types of planned development, or infrastructure capacity issues. Therefore, we have incorporated considerations of scale into our siting policy statements in Chapter 3 to address suitability.
DATE: Wednesday, August 2, 2017

TIME: 5:45 p.m.

PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404

PRESENTER:

Chris Roy, Chair  
Mike O’Brien, Vice-Chair  
Brian Bigelow, Secretary-Treasurer  
Barbara Elliott, At-large  
John Zicconi, At-Large

STAFF:

Regina Mahony, Planning Program Mgr. 
Eleni Churchill, Transportation Program Mgr. 
Forest Cohen, Senior Business Manager 
Bernadette Ferenc, Trans. Business Manager

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 July 5, 2017 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O’BRIEN, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JULY 5, 2017. Barbara noted a change on page 1, line 28 – change “she” to “Regina” since it’s the first time she’s mentioned. Barbara also noted that Charlie had intended to send a link to a video by Urban3. Regina will send that out later tonight. MOTION CARRIED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS AMENDED.

3. Act 250 & Sec. 248 Applications.
   a. Cambrian Rise, Burlington #4C1301. Regina noted that she had given us a heads up about this project. She has had time to review the application and we have no concerns. We do like all of the TDM efforts included. The hearing has not yet been scheduled. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE LETTER OF SUPPORT. BRIAN BIGELOW SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. FY18-21 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Ratification. Eleni Churchill noted that at their July meeting the CCRPC Board approved the FY18-21 TIP, with the provision that the Executive Committee ratify the vote once the comment period ended on July 29th. There were no further comments received on the TIP. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BARBARA ELLIOTT TO RATIFY THE APPROVAL OF THE FY18-21 TIP. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. Clean Water Fund Comments. Regina distributed tracked version showing changes from the CWAC meeting yesterday. This is not much different than what was referred to in the State Treasurer’s Clean Water Report we saw before. We want to be sure municipalities who are MS4 communities that already charge a per-parcel fee for stormwater aren’t double-taxed. We’re suggesting that they really look at what will be the best system. There are a lot of funding sources for construction right now, so we’re trying to let them know there is still a lot of planning/engineering to be done for some projects to be ready for construction. John Zicconi questioned the paragraph on page two under Funding Efforts... beginning with “Municipalities... Regina noted that the legislature appropriated large sums of money for construction in 2018. In April, it became clear that we
weren't given a reasonable time to plan and develop projects. There is a lot of angst from municipalities about the large funding without much direction. John said that at the end of the same paragraph it talks about geographic equity of this funding. Brief discussion ensued and it was agreed to change the second from last sentence to read “While this is a reasonable policy...” to say “While this may be a reasonable policy...” Barbara Elliott gave several grammatical changes to Regina. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE REVISED MEMO WITH CHANGES DISCUSSED TONIGHT. MIKE O’BRIEN SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

6. Chair/ Executive Director’s Report.
   a. Building Homes Together Campaign. Regina noted that our housing numbers for the calendar year 2016 was just under 1,000 which is more than we’ve seen in recent years – 600-700/per year. One-fifth of those are affordable. We're working with VHFA and other partners to do a press release in the fall with those numbers and will thank the legislature for the $35 million housing bond. The vacancy rate was at 4.4% in November and this spring was at 2.3%. Committee members discussed whether this will plateau or if there will be another upward trend with all of the housing projects already in process. When asked if we count campus housing in this, Regina said no although if students move from apartments off campus to campus housing then this will increase available units.
   b. Municipal Roads General Permit (MRGP). Regina and Eleni noted that we were expecting the draft MRGP to be released August 1st, but it may be closer to the end of August. We hope to have a presentation to the TAC and CWAC in September. There will be a 60-day comment period so there should be enough time to present to and get comments from the Board. We are doing a lot of work on this already. We are currently working, and are close to completing, road erosion inventories for all municipalities in the county. We are also assisting with development of conceptual plans for the top five priority erosion sites within each municipality so that they have the necessary information to apply for VTrans/DEC implementation grants. We are involved in the Municipal Roads Grant-in-Aid program from DEC. Funding for this program is allocated on the basis of the number of hydrologically connected road segments within a municipality. It’s a lump sum given to communities to fix erosion issues. There were several awards in Chittenden County.

The CCRPC is also involved in VTrans’ Municipal Highway and Stormwater Mitigation grant program. These grants are for the bigger stormwater projects and they can fund all phases from scoping to construction. The program is around $6 million, and VTrans is advising municipalities to apply for construction projects that are at least of $250,000 since they have to follow federal regulations.

The last program that we are involved in is DEC’s Block Grant program. This program is still being finalized. The goal is for each RPC to help implement projects from DEC’s “Go-list.” Generally, there is a lot of work being done around water quality issues by staff these days.

7. Agenda Review. There is no CCRPC Board meeting in August.
8. Other Business. There was none.
9. Executive Session. None needed.
10. Adjournment. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BRIAN BIGELOW, TO ADJOURN AT 6:08 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
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2  Respectfully submitted,

3  Bernadette Ferenc
CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE - MINUTES

DATE: Tuesday, September 5, 2017
TIME: 9:00 a.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal St. Winooski, VT

Members Present
Dean Bloch, Charlotte
Dean Pierce, Shelburne
Dennis Lutz, Essex
Bob Henneberger, Seniors
Chris Jolly, FHWA
Sandy Thibault, CATMA
Bruce Hoar, Williston
Nicole Losch, Burlington
Dave Armstrong, GMT
Dick Hosking, VTrans
Brian Bigelow, Underhill
Mary Anne Michaels, Rail
Ryan Lambert, Winooski
Jason Van Driesche, Local Motion
Amy Bell, VTrans

Staff Present
Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
Christine Forde, Senior Transportation Planner
Eleni Churchill, Transportation Project Manager
Sai Sarepalli, Transportation Planning Engineer
Bryan Davis, Senior Transportation Planner
Peter Keating, Senior Transportation Planner
Chris Dubin, Transportation Planner
Marshall Distel, Transportation Planner
Jason Charest, Senior Transportation Planning Engineer
Karen Adams, Colchester
Jim Ryan, ANR

1. Consent Agenda
No items this month.

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

3. Public Comments
There were none.

4. GMT’s NextGEN Transit Plan
Dave Armstrong of GMT described this planning work now underway with the help of consultant Nelson Nygaard. The Plan is designed to improve service throughout the system. The plan will help identify ways to:

- better match service with current needs,
- make service simpler, more direct, faster, and more convenient, and
- better integrate urban and rural services.

Dave described this plan as one recommending changes between now and the next five years. He noted that much of the Plan will be based on decisions around trade-offs. For instance, those between levels of coverage, frequency, days of service, transfers, route directness and bus stop spacing. So far, there’s been work on all of the existing routes and some preliminary recommendations. Route profiles document route statistics, note route variants and suggest possible modifications. GMT and consultant staff have also done a market study to determine transit demand that includes:

- Population and employment density
- Socio-economic characteristics
- Major activity centers, and
- Work trip travel flows
That analysis revealed that GMT routes cover the areas of highest demand fairly well. Dave described the public outreach process that included a live blog, Survey Monkey, RPCs, local events, and public hearings. Based on the analysis and input the Plan has recommended a draft service scenario which includes:

- Simplified service(s): Fewer route deviations with more linear service
- Bolstered network of “Major Local Routes:” #7 North Ave, #2 Essex Jct., #1 Williston Rd, #6 Shelburne Rd
- More evening service
- More/better weekend service
- Minimum service frequency-standards: e.g. Major Local route – trip every 20 minutes, Local route (#5 Pine St) trip every 30 minutes
- One-seat connection to Airport

Next steps in Plan development are:

- Continue to hold monthly Advisory Committee meetings
- Continued “public” involvement: RPCs, Towns/Cities, Planners, Passengers, Non-passengers
- Finalize service recommendations for display/discussion
- GMT Board approval
- Implementation
- Fare policy study

The expectation is that the Plan should be complete at the end of the calendar year.

5. MTP Update

Peter referred members to the memo on this in the meeting packet. There were three items to present. First was the MTP development schedule and what the TAC would be scheduled to review at upcoming meetings through March 2018. This was highlighted in a table in the memo. Next Peter addressed the financial plan of the MTP. There are three elements to this:

1. Identify the funding “reasonably expected to be available”
2. Determine the level of funding needed to operate and maintain the existing system
3. Calculate the difference between 1 and 2 and determine how this will be allocated to new projects/strategies

Element #1 was determined by looking at the history of federal funding coming to the entire state and then calculating what a reasonable share of that total would come to Chittenden County. This concluded that the CCRPC regions would get, on average, 19.4% of the state total which comes to $41.05M per year (in 2016 dollars). Peter noted that VTrans has agreed on the reasonableness of this methodology. For element #2, we developed average annual costs based on historic TIP obligations to:

- Paving and Bridge, and
- CCTA Maintenance and Operations

We used these as proxies for the operations and maintenance calculations. When we looked at the overall funding proportions that went into these categories over different time periods we saw very different results. If we take the long view back to FY2000 up to FY16, the maintenance and operations share is 55%. If, however, we look at a shorter period, over the past seven years, that share is over 73%. After consultations with VTrans we’ve decided to go with a higher percentage for our planning purposes. Next steps will be include establishing funding levels to project categories using the calculated balance between elements #1 and 2 above.

The third part of the MTP update had Jason go over some transportation model results. He began with a series of charts showing region-wide results from 2015 and 2050 with and without TIP projects. Measures charted included VMT, VMT per capita, VHT, delay per capita, transit/walking/biking mode split and average trip length. Many of the measures see significant changes due to the projected increases in houses and jobs expected over the 35-year planning period. He also showed maps of 2015 and 2050
featuring two measures of congestion: Volume to capacity ratio and delay per mile. Jason noted that these were just some of many other measures the model will produce and that we intend to analyze in the coming weeks.

6. Municipal General Roads Permit (MGRP) Update
Jim Ryan of ANR attended to provide the latest information on this. He reported that a final draft will be out this week and that there will be a 45-day comment period following the MGRP release. He began his presentation with some background that included the legislative language guiding the permit and the near and long-term timeline for key permit deliverables. He next defined what’s covered by the permit and what a hydrologically connected road is. He then went into some detail on the permit’s major components: Inventories, prioritization and implementation. Jim defined the following as MGRP principles:

- First- disconnect road Stormwater whenever possible, starting at the top of the road watershed
- Second- Infiltrate stormwater
- Third- Stabilize conveyances and turn out ditches

This was followed with a description of baseline standards then the following summary for towns:

- Application coverage and annual fees to begin in July 31, 2018
- Road erosion inventories for hydrologically-connected roads due for all towns by 12/1/2020 and updated every 5 years thereafter.
- Implementation plans and schedules by 12/1/2020
- Road BMP implementation on or before 2021 to achieve all connected roads meeting standards by 2036 (a minimum amount of implementation per year)
- Annual reporting on implementation progress due every February starting 2/1/2019

He finished mentioning assistance to towns from funding (new municipal grant-in-aid), outreach and technical assistance, and shared equipment.

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

8. CCRPC July Board Meeting Report
Peter mentioned that the Board held the public hearing and adopted the FY18 TIP.

9. Chairman’s/Members’ Items
No items this month

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted, Peter Keating
DATE: Tuesday, August 1, 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>Bolton: Joss Besse</th>
<th>Hinesburg: Merrily Lovell</th>
<th>St. George: Underhill: Brian Bigelow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buels Gore:</td>
<td>Huntington: Darlene Palola</td>
<td>Westford:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington: Jenna Calvi</td>
<td>Jericho:</td>
<td>Williston: James Sherrard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte:</td>
<td>Milton:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richmond:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex: Annie Costandi,</td>
<td>Shelburne: Chris Robinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Junction:</td>
<td>South Burlington:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tom DiPietro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington Airport:</td>
<td>University of VT:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lani Ravin, Claire Forbes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCRPC Board: Don Meals,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Attendees: Joel Perrigo, VAOT

CCRPC Staff: Dan Albrecht, Regina Mahony, Eleni Churchill, Chris Dubin

1. Welcome: Don Meals called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

2. Changes to the Agenda
Joel Perrigo had contacted Dan earlier and asked to provide a briefing on VTRAN’s “Municipal Highway and Stormwater Mitigation Program.” The Committee agreed to add this after discussion of the letter to the Clean Water Fund Board.

3. Review and action on draft minutes of July 5, 2017
After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, Costandi made a motion, seconded by Adams to approve the July 5, 2017 minutes. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED

4. Finalize comment letter on DEC Clean Water Fund Budget for action by CCRPC Exec Cmtee
Chairman Meals introduced the topic. He was at the mid-July CCRPC Board meeting where it was briefly discussed and expressed his concern then that there needed to be more review of the letter and hence the discussion here today. Albrecht noted that CCRPC requested and DEC granted an extension of 8 hours to the comment deadline to accommodate formal action and letter submission after the Executive Committee looks at the letter. Meals then walked through various minor edits he is suggesting. The Committee discussed the letter and accepted some of the edits and made additional ones as well. James Sherrard made a motion, seconded by Palola to forward the revised comment letter to the Executive Committee for action. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED with Harris, Callahan and Witters abstaining. [Note: The Executive Committee made a minor tweak to the letter which was submitted on August 2nd to DEC. See copy at link above.]

5. Presentation, VAOT “Municipal Highway and Stormwater Mitigation Program”
Joel Perrigo briefed the Committee on this new program funded via a targeted programming by the Agency of various capital funds (see link above for copy of powerpoint). Like other agency funding, the timeline for completion is generous with scoping projects to be completed within two years and construction projects within four years. The first set of applications are due August 15th. There will also be a second round funded via the reallocation of the Transportation Alternatives block of monies due on November 20th. TA funds will also be available for FY19 with 100% of the funds going towards stormwater.
6. Items for September 5th meeting agenda
   a. Draft MRGP permit
   b. Second round of comments to Clean Water Fund Board
   c. DEC new stormwater rule

7. Updates
   Eleni indicated that the CCRPC will soon issue a request solicitation to our municipalities to seek consultant technical assistance to scope/develop conceptual plans and cost estimates for any environmental mitigation activity to address highway runoff. The application will be very simple. If the project is selected we would then assign the work to one of our five pre-qualified firms.

8. Adjournment
   The meeting adjourned at 12:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Dan Albrecht
1. Welcome: Chelsea Mandigo called the meeting to order at 12:15 p.m.

2. Review and action on draft minutes of July 5, 2017
   After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, DiPietro made a motion, seconded by Sherrard to approve the July 5, 2017 minutes. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED with abstentions by Harris, Ravin

3. Reports and Updates
   a. Stream Team Activities: Kreiner provided a brief update on recent activities and showed photos of recent storm drain stenciling and storm drain mural painting efforts. They will also look to publicize the Stream Team during the upcoming Vermont Clean Water Week. Albrecht showed the example of the Rethink Runoff stickers produced by Tally Ho. The Committee directed him to circulate the examples and solicit desired quantities so a bulk order can be finalized.
   b. Advertising update: Albrecht provided a recap of the costs of the spring advertising and planned Cynobacteria ad buy based upon information provided by Tally Ho.

4. Items for September 5th meeting agenda
   a. Draft MS4 permit
   b. Review draft Fall 2017 Stormwater Opinions and Behavior Survey

5. Updates
   Albrecht read a portion of an email from Jim Pease of DEC as follows: “I am holding off on the municipal employee training workshop to see if we get the Clean Streets grant, if we do then there will be plenty of things for road crews to learn about in relation to that project this fall.”

8. Adjournment
   The meeting adjourned at 12:46 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Dan Albrecht
DATE: Thursday, August 17, 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
- Alex Weinhagen, Hinesburg – PAC Rep

Staff
- Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
- Emily Nosse-Leirer, Planner
- Eleni Churchill, Transportation Program Manager
- Peter Keating, Senior Transportation Planner
- Christine Forde, Senior Transportation Planner
- Jason Charest, Senior Transportation Engineer

1. Welcome and Introductions
Regina Mahony called the meeting to order at 8:34 a.m.

2. Approve Minutes
Justin Rabidoux made a motion, seconded by Andrea Morgante, to approve the minutes of July 13, 2017. MOTION PASSED. Jim Donovan abstained.

3. Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy
Emily Nosse-Leirer provided an overview of the draft that was sent out in the packet. Andrea Morgante asked whether programmatic work should be added back into the CEDS project list, to try to bring relevance and importance to health and social related work that is important to our economy, especially since they also create jobs. Heather Danis stated that she felt that the action lists in Chapter 3 adequately captured the work of the Health Department and other social service agencies, and that there was not a need for these projects to be in the CEDS list.

There was extensive discussion about the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) section, which was brand new. Emily Nosse-Leirer explained that she recategorized issues identified in the 2012 analysis reports to fit into these categories, and also added issues identified by the LRPC, other committees and other CCRPC work. SWOT analysis compares Chittenden County to both the rest of Vermont and the rest of the county. Several changes were suggested:

- Discussing a “livable wage” instead of a “minimum wage,” and adding it into the strength and weaknesses section. There is still a lot of debate about the benefits and consequences.
- Adding the lack of affordable workforce housing as a weakness. Fifteen highest cost for rental housing in the country – which is a real issue.
- Clarifying that although the quality of public schools is high compared to the rest of the country, the quality is uneven throughout the county, and STEM skills are not as good as employers need.
- Making sure that the opportunities section lists things that are actual opportunities, not just needs.
- Clarifying that VTC is Vermont Technical Council, and adding in other similar organizations to general that strength
- Adding Creative Economy, UVM and aesthetics to the strengths section.
- Differentiating between low unemployment (strength) and labor shortage (bad) need to be differentiated
- Adding equity issues to weaknesses – there is income inequality across economic classes and New Americans are especially affected. However, it is important to clarify that income inequality is a weakness, while the county’s relatively high incomes compared to Vermont and the country are strengths.
• Adding aging infrastructure and limited funds for replacing this infrastructure (water, sewer, stormwater, etc) to the threats section.
• Uncertainty about health insurance was removed from the weaknesses list, as it is a federal issue and not unique to Chittenden County
• Adding chronic disease as a threat. Heather can help with language. Chittenden County is very healthy compared to the rest of the state and country, but our trends are in the wrong direction. Heather argues that being the best of the worst is still a problem, and it should be discussed. We also have higher teenage drinking rates.
• Adding lack of diversity to the weakness section. We are more diverse in our County that the state, but we are not at all diverse in comparison to the rest of the country.
• Adding refugee resettlement area is strength / opportunity. We are socially tolerant, which is a strength.
• Adding the declining workforce age population as a threat.
• Adding expansion of high speed internet to the opportunities section.

Our strengths are often our weaknesses. One reason why housing market is so tight is b/c it is a good place to be; and attractive to retirees (at least for half the year). There was discussion on the degree to which Vermont’s ambitious energy goals and the Clean Water Act are weaknesses or strengths. Do they grow jobs, or are they just costs?

Emily explained that she didn’t add much new information to the Economic Base Analysis, and just updated the data. The committee made a number of suggestions:
• Strengthen references to affordable housing
• Again, explain the distinction between unemployment and labor supply. Low Unemployment is not necessarily a bad thing.
• Examine whether it’s good, bad or neutral that UVM and the Medical Center is the largest employer and non-profits.
• Link food insecurity with high risk of obesity and chronic conditions
• Instead of discussing the federal poverty level as an indicator, examine the Basic Needs Budget.
• The committees asked to include renewable energy in the working lands section, since it can co-exist with agriculture and help farms stay profitable.

The Economic Resilience section is brand new, and must be included to meet CEDS requirements. The committee agreed that equity issues should be discussed here. Also, specific examples for Chittenden County and the ECOS Plan are needed. Perhaps AHMP content can be added here.

The committee agreed to add outdoor recreation and food systems to the strategic industry sectors discussion, but not to the target sectors list.

Actions need to be added to discuss funding for adequate public infrastructure and housing affordability. The discussion of permit streamlining must be more nuanced.

New indicators to show economic resilience were discussed. Emily will investigate data on economic diversity (percentage of population in various income brackets and NAICS sector diversity); housing available at various price points, and wages (minimum wage over time, married with average starting wage within the County by sector, and historical trends of starting wages in low wage jobs to see if that has changed over time).

4. Transportation Plan Update

Peter explained the financial plan, which is a required component of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan. Three elements: (1) How much money will we reasonably have? (2) How much is needed for preservation and maintenance? (3) The difference can be used for new projects. Alex asked whether CCRPC has to show we
have money to maintain the new projects we proposed. We don’t, but we do show and look at the history of
our maintenance costs. Peter explained how we’ve determined how much money we can reasonably expect to
have - $211 million for the State, and we’ve gone with 19.5%, which VTrans has signed off on. Discussion
ensued, because the percentage of state funds to Chittenden County has been lower since 2007. However, staff
feels that 20% is appropriate for Chittenden County considering our percentage of the population and economy
in Chittenden County.

The committee talked about the maintenance percentage and which percentage (54% vs. 70%) is appropriate.
Jim feels the 70% makes the most sense. Andrea asked why stormwater maintenance looks like it is staying
steady. Staff explained that the category allocation is based on a trend, but perhaps we want to increase that
category. Justin stated that the gray area is a good idea, because we haven’t had any macro projects that will
fix the global problem. Alex stated that a conservative approach makes sense, with the flexibility to go below
the line. It’s important to understand the long-term maintenance costs down the line, and we should think
about this as we decide what projects get above the line.

Jason showed two maps of congestion issues in 2015 and 2025. These are congestion issues regarding lane
capacity, not operational capacity; and these are based on a no build scenario. These maps show volume to
capacity ratio: Yellow: 70 to 79% at capacity; Orange: 80 to 89% at capacity; Red 90 to 100% capacity; and
Purple is over capacity. Jason explained the difference between operational capacity v. lane capacity, and said
that we also need to see the congestion points, married with these in order to be able to see the real problem
and help us figure out where to identify priority projects. He clarified that this maps shows that even if we
make operational changes to the intersections, such as different signaling, we’d need new lanes in these areas.
There was extensive discussion regarding the local congestion issues verse what the model shows (such as the
North Williston Road bridge), because the map appears different than what most people experience on the
ground. It may be that the experience is similar near Rte. 116, and 189, but the number of cars is so much
greater at 189 and potentially more of a regional priority.

The committee suggested using the term intersection control rather than signalization so that round-abouts are
included.

5. Next Meeting
The next meeting will be on September 14, 2017 from 8:30am to 10:00am.

10. Adjourn
The meeting adjourned at 10:25 a.m. Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony and Emily Nosse-Leirer.
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) 861-0129 or bdavis@ccrpcvt.org, no later than 3 business days prior to the meeting for which services are requested.

CCRPC Long Range Planning Energy Sub-Committee

Minutes

DATE: Tuesday, August 15, 2017
TIME: 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 pm

Attendees:
- Catherine McMains, Jericho (Chair)
- Karen Adams, Colchester
- Matt Burke, Charlotte alternate
- Jim Donovan, Charlotte
- Keith Epstein, South Burlington
- Jeff Forward, Richmond
- Sharon Murray, Bolton
- Irene Renner, Essex

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

1. Review July 18, 2017 Minutes
   Staff will attach the language options A, B and C to the minutes, since the three letter options are referenced a few times in the minutes. Keith Epstein made a motion to accept the minute and Karen Adams seconded. Sharon Murray, Jim Donovan and Irene Renner abstained. The minutes were adopted.

2. Discuss Revised Generation Targets for Municipalities
   At the last meeting, the committee reviewed high and low county-wide electric generation targets. The high target is 25% of the state’s generation goal, and the low target is 15% of the state’s generation goal. Staff allocated the targets to the municipal level by averaging the municipal of county population and the municipal share of electricity consumption, and applying that proportion to the county-wide goals. Existing generation in each municipality is subtracted from this share, so municipalities “get credit” for generation already sited in their community. Each municipality then has a net new generation target. This allocation is included in the packet. It was confirmed that generation only “counts” for a municipality if it is physically located in that municipality. (There’s no consideration of RECs, who owns the facility, etc.) While Burlington Electric Department has argued that they should “get credit” for Georgia Mountain Wind, the solar installation at the Burlington Airport and the Winooski One dam, because they own all the facilities, this argument is contradictory to DPS guidance on the issue. The generation for the turbines at Georgia Mountain that are located in Chittenden County is counted towards Milton’s goal, and the airport solar array is counted towards South Burlington’s. The dam is located directly on the border of Winooski and Burlington, so this generation is split in half.
Staff let the committee know that there is a discrepancy between the county’s total current renewable generation as reported by the Vermont Energy Action Network Energy Dashboard and the Department of Public Service. The current generation as reported by DPS is 556,623 MWh, but the Energy Dashboard reports only 383,053 MWh. The targets reported here are based on the Energy Dashboard statistics. Depending on which number is correct, targets could be lower.

There was substantial discussion on how to report targets for municipalities that already produce more than their annual targets. The consensus was that these targets should be reported as being over 100% met, and the net target will be reported as zero instead of as a negative number.

These targets will likely be updated every 5 years along with the ECOS Plan, which will allow the targets to take into account new generation facilities.

The committee agreed that CCRPC should make a recommendation to the utilities to help update the Energy Dashboard with actual energy generation rather than the permitted or nameplate generation.

3. **Screening of Local Constraints**

Staff explained the methodology used to categorize requested municipal constraints as “known” and “possible” constraints. This methodology is included in the packet. Staff will work with municipalities individually if there are concerns about the categorization. Sharon Murray suggested looking at both regulations and the Plans because some of the Plans are more restrictive than the bylaws, especially if the plan is newer than the bylaws.

Originally, constraints in draft documents were included as “possible” constraints to give municipalities time to finish their plans and bylaws, but it was determined that we should have a deadline for when they can make local changes that can be incorporated into the Regional Plan. After that, anything still in draft form will not be included at all.

Additionally, a “time stamp” should be added to the discussion of local constraints to make it clear what version of the regulations or town plan was evaluated.

It should be noted that there is a footnote missing from the table included in the packet. A single asterisk means that a municipality requested something to be a known constraint, but staff moved it to a possible constraint.

4. **Discussion of Siting Policy Statements**

The committee suggested looking at the Bennington Regional Energy Plan’s definition of “suitable sites” for energy, which asks developers to use a checklist to determine whether or not a site is suitable.

The committee reviewed the draft siting policies provided by staff in advance of the meeting. It was determined that saying that renewable energy generation should locate on preferred sites was too broad a statement, because preferred sites don’t make sense for wind, just for solar. In addition, preferred sites may not be appropriate for solar development that’s not net metered, so the policy should not direct solar development exclusively there—it’s basically a first choice, not the only choice.

Saying that energy development is preferred in areas planned for growth if possible also only really applies to solar.

It needs to be added that the criteria are policy guidance, and developers should meet as many as possible, but not necessarily all of them.

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) 861-0129 or bdavis@ccrpcvt.org, no later than 3 business days prior to the meeting for which services are requested.
Sharon Murray suggested, and the committee agreed, that the statements should be reworded to eliminate problem words like “shall” or “should.” Instead of “renewable energy generation should be located on…” we will reword as “locate renewal energy generation on…” This language is still aspirational plan language instead of bylaws but it will be given more weight by the PUC because it is clear, consistent and unambiguous. This will also make Policy III more positive by having it describe where we should locate things, not where we shouldn’t.

There was extensive discussion about whether we should use the prime and base wind potential map as a siting guideline by saying “Locate large scale wind installation in areas of prime and base wind potential.” It was determined that even though some questions remain about the data analysis, wind potential is a useful map and the policy may be useful since it is a guideline, not a requirement.

There was extensive discussion about the policy “Locate renewable energy generation where existing or planned (or will have adequate capacity) transmission or distribution infrastructure exists.” Some members felt that every project needs at least a small extension of 3 phase power. However, other members felt that expanding 3 phase power can allow for other kinds of commercial development and therefore may have unanticipated consequences, and therefore projects should only be near existing or planned transmission and distribution facilities. Staff will map a series of buffers around 3-phase power for the committee to consider. Within 1,000 feet of a planned or existing 3-phase power line may be the correct policy.

It was discussed that the plan should mention that local policies that are constraints or preferred sites for energy development may change as local plans change over time.

The committee discussed the fact that other renewable energy generation facilities like biomass plants should also not impact constraints, in keeping with the other policies of the plan.

5. **Next Steps**

The committee will meet again on September 19.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town Name</th>
<th>Average of Population and Electricity Use</th>
<th>Total Low Target (MWh)</th>
<th>Total High Target (MWh)</th>
<th>Existing Renewables (MWh)</th>
<th>Low Range Net Remaining</th>
<th>High Range Net Remaining</th>
<th>Low Target Per Capita (MWh per resident)</th>
<th>High Target Per Capita (MWh per resident)</th>
<th>Low Target Status</th>
<th>High Target Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4,218</td>
<td>7,057</td>
<td>327.984</td>
<td>3,890</td>
<td>6,729</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>7.78%</td>
<td>4.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buels Gore</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>6.50%</td>
<td>3.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>168,431</td>
<td>281,769</td>
<td>167,905</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>113,864</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>99.69%</td>
<td>59.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12,607</td>
<td>21,090</td>
<td>5,059</td>
<td>7,548</td>
<td>16,031</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>40.13%</td>
<td>23.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>67,204</td>
<td>112,427</td>
<td>2,086</td>
<td>65,119</td>
<td>110,341</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
<td>1.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Junction</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>104,508</td>
<td>174,832</td>
<td>40,212.12</td>
<td>64,296</td>
<td>134,620</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>13.87</td>
<td>38.48%</td>
<td>23.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Town</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>106,878</td>
<td>178,797</td>
<td>2,293.35</td>
<td>104,585</td>
<td>176,503</td>
<td>9.77</td>
<td>16.48</td>
<td>2.15%</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinesburg</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14,975</td>
<td>25,051</td>
<td>1,457</td>
<td>13,517</td>
<td>23,594</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>9.73%</td>
<td>5.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5,644</td>
<td>9,442</td>
<td>628.76</td>
<td>5,016</td>
<td>8,814</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>11.14%</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jericho</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>15,869</td>
<td>26,547</td>
<td>1,347</td>
<td>14,523</td>
<td>25,201</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>8.49%</td>
<td>5.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>39,817</td>
<td>66,610</td>
<td>102,752.32 (62,935)</td>
<td>(36,142) (5.93)</td>
<td>(3.41)</td>
<td>258.06%</td>
<td>154.26%</td>
<td>19.94%</td>
<td>11.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13,445</td>
<td>22,491</td>
<td>4,485</td>
<td>8,960</td>
<td>18,006</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>33.36%</td>
<td>19.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelburne</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>28,443</td>
<td>47,582</td>
<td>4,648</td>
<td>23,795</td>
<td>42,934</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>16.34%</td>
<td>9.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Burlington</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>85,841</td>
<td>143,604</td>
<td>14,626.77</td>
<td>71,214</td>
<td>128,977</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>17.04%</td>
<td>10.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2,368</td>
<td>3,961</td>
<td>311.68</td>
<td>2,056</td>
<td>3,649</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>13.16%</td>
<td>7.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underhill</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9,420</td>
<td>15,759</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>8,656</td>
<td>14,995</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>8.12%</td>
<td>4.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westford</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6,209</td>
<td>10,387</td>
<td>411.30</td>
<td>5,798</td>
<td>9,976</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>6.62%</td>
<td>3.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williston</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>44,647</td>
<td>74,691</td>
<td>3,434.84</td>
<td>41,213</td>
<td>71,256</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
<td>4.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winooski</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>25,633</td>
<td>42,882</td>
<td>30,297.46 (4,664)</td>
<td>12,584 (0.65)</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>118.20%</td>
<td>70.65%</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
<td>4.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>756,250</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,265,134</strong></td>
<td><strong>383,053.42</strong></td>
<td><strong>373,197</strong></td>
<td><strong>882,081</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.34</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.52</strong></td>
<td><strong>50.65%</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.28%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The meeting was called to order at 5:45 p.m. by Brian Bigelow, Finance Committee Chair.

1. Approve May 24, 2017 Finance Committee Minutes. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MAY 24, 2017 WITH CHANGES IF ANY. MIKE O’BRIEN SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

   a. Balance Sheet – June 30, 2017. Cash in checking (operating) - $188,933; Cash in Savings (Match) - $173,753; Cash in Money Market/CDs (Reserve) - $580,235. Deferred income communities current year (available for match): $7,936. Income statement. As expected ACCD funds were fully expended after April. Local dues match covered April, May and June. Transportation staff billing was very close to budget in FY17. Rows 41 (Regional Energy), 42 (Act 174) and 48 (Jericho Stormwater) represent deliverables based grants as opposed to reimbursable grants. They are accounted for differently and are becoming more common in our revenue mix. Row 54 (All Hazards Mitigation Plan) is an example of how costs and revenue shifts can happen. This particular grant always had to be subsidized by another revenue source – ACCD and local dues. Non-direct Expense Notes. The Salaries expense (Row 80) was budgeted pretty well in FY17. There were some additional staff costs related to CCOA that account for the slight overage. The budget amounts for Conference and Training and Conference Travel were rightsized for FY18. We exceeded the Equipment Purchase budget intentionally this year. We tried to purchase as much equipment as we know we will need in FY17 when we have a surplus vs. FY18 which will likely be a deficit year. Discussion ensued about the effect on the indirect rate because of the surplus this year. When asked how we’re doing to stabilize the indirect rate, Charlie noted we are in discussion with the Chief Auditor about perhaps adjusting indirect rate mid-year when we see that we are headed for a surplus. Members agreed that we don’t want to collect too much or too little, so mid-year is a good time to re-evaluate to avoid having such a great difference in indirect rates from year to year.
   b. Cash Position/Targets. Cash flows were quite strong at end of FY17. We gained about $78,000 in cash over the course of the fiscal year. We will likely need some of this to cover income losses in FY18. The question is whether we should move any cash into Reserve or keep it in the Operating pool for now. The balance in the Savings account at the end of July is the result of most of the local dues checks already coming in. We will align the amount of Local Dues available for match to the Savings account balance - $244,700 (FY18 dues) plus $7,936 (balance of FY17) for a total of $252,636.
3. **Approve Quarterly Journal Entries – April-June, 2017.** JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O’BRIEN, TO APPROVE THE JOURNAL ENTRIES FOR APRIL-JUNE 2017. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. **Discuss Investing in the Vermont Community Loan Fund.** Members reviewed Forest’s memo regarding the Vermont Community Loan Fund and whether we might move our reserve funds from money market/CDs into this fund. After a brief discussion it was decided to keep an eye on it, but that right now the difference in interest is not worth the admin time to change it all over.

5. **Other Business.** Jeff Carr feels we are in good shape which is excellent and they appreciate the information and good staff work. It was noted that the health area has increased over the years, as well as water quality where we don’t have a lot of expertise, especially if we are going to manage construction projects. Charlie noted that there is capital bond money out there that the state is asking the RPCs for help with. Members were not concerned about increasing staff if there is enough work for them to do and we do not ask towns for more money. Discussion continued. Jeff asked about capital budget items for FY18. Charlie said we have addressed that in the budget.

6. **JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O’BRIEN TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 5:26 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc