Agenda
Executive Committee
Wednesday, July 5, 2017 – 5:45 p.m.
Small Conference Room, CCRPC Offices
110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT

1. Changes to the Agenda, Members’ Items

2. Approval of June 7, 2017 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes* (Action)

3. Act 250 & Sec 248 Applications*
   a. Cambrian Rise, Burlington, #4C1301 (Action)
   b. O’Brien Farm Road, LLC; South Burlington; Application #4C1106-3 (Action)
   c. Allen Brook Development, Essex; Application #4C0329-21 (Action)

4. Energy Planning* (Discussion)

5. Resolutions to Recognize Employee Service & Board Recognition (Action)

6. Recommend FY18 Meeting Schedule to Board* (Action)

7. Review Commission Committees/members* (Action)

8. Chair/Executive Director Report (Discussion)
   a. Priorities for the Next Year
   b. Building Homes Together Campaign*
   c. Shared Dispatch Services Update

9. Agenda Review – July 19th Meeting* (Discussion)

10. Other Business (Discussion)

11. Executive Session – if needed (Action)

12. Adjournment (Action)

*Attachments

NEXT MEETING – Executive Committee – Wed. August 2, 2017; 5:45 p.m.

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 x *17 or bdavis@ccrpcvt.org, no later than 3 business days prior to the meeting for which services are requested.
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 no changes to the agenda.

2. Approval of May 3, 2017 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MAY 3, 2017 WITH CORRECTIONS IF ANY. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. Act 250 & Section 248 applications. There were none.

   a. Procurement Policy. Forest noted that we aligned our procedures to address the federal regulations and State rules. We reviewed this with the Executive Committee previously. (Barbara Elliott arrived.) When asked if we had any concerns about the changes, Charlie noted that we tried to follow through and include what we already do. ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O’BRIEN, TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENTS TO THE PROCUREMENT POLICY. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
   b. Other amendments. Forest noted that we added a new position of Senior Business Manager and revised the Transportation Business Manager and Finance Assistant positions slightly to include reporting to Senior Business Manager. We updated the salary table; we updated language in our backup procedures and added language regarding computer replacement policy. There was a brief discussion about computer backup. We will ask Pam to revise the language regarding backups. When asked about QuickBooks backup, Forest said it’s backed up in two different places, and there are 5-6 backups to the company file. Charlie noted that this language is a recommendation on the IT side, not the accounting side. When asked if these amendments need to be approved by the board, Charlie said the bylaws give the Executive Committee authority to approve administrative policies. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THESE CHANGES TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATING PROCEDURES AND POLICIES. BRIAN BIGELOW SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. Auditor Selection. Forest noted that we put out annual audit services out to bid, as recommended by this committee. We received three proposals and the Finance Committee, Charlie, Bernie and
Forest reviewed them. The Finance Committee recommended we hire the incumbent, Sullivan Powers and Company, with the request that we asked SPC to align the cost more closely with the other responders since they weren’t the low bidder. They subsequently reduced the cost by $2,500. We also asked that they have a different audit reviewer oversee our audit this year. Mike noted based on professional interactions with the other two responders, and feedback from the other RPCs, Charlie and Forest had indicated that it would be difficult to work with either of those firms. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O’BRIEN, THAT THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AWARD SULLIVAN POWERS AND CO. THE CONTRACT TO PROVIDE ANNUAL AUDITING SERVICES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017, AND SUBSEQUENT YEARS AS DEEMED APPROPRIATE; AND, THAT A REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS BE ISSUED AGAIN IN NO MORE THAN FIVE YEARS. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

6. CCRPC & ECOS Plan role regarding energy planning. Charlie referred to the memo in the packet and explained that he’d like to propose a different recommendation, which is to hold off on additional outreach to the municipalities until we have feedback from the Department of Public Service and to allow staff to dig into the local constraints a bit further. With this information, we can provide the Selectboards with a much clearer ask. At this stage, an ask about what level of authority we should establish in the regional plan would be a bit too theoretical.

Chris believes there are three fundamental questions the RPC needs to decide about where we want to be and how to get there:

1. Simply provide a framework and defer to the Towns for the specifics?
2. Take more of an advocacy role in the Plan; and if so, in which direction as there are opinions on both sides?
3. Who are we going to take municipal input from? The legislative bodies, our Board members? Our Board members need to represent the opinion of their municipality, unless the legislative body defers to their representative.

Charlie added that another important factor to consider is the specific terminology the legislature used to devise this system. “The Public Service Board shall give substantial deference to the land conservation measures and specific policies contained in a duly adopted regional and municipal plan...” Therefore, to gain substantial deference we likely need to more broadly define land conservation measures that are relevant to all development rather than just wind and solar generation facilities. This would broaden the approach that we’ve taken thus far.

Chris indicated that while identification of “no build” areas may meet a larger public good, discerning the impact on landowners at the municipal level is a challenge and at the regional level we are even farther removed from landowner ramifications. We should be wary of mapping development restrictions across the county unless and until all relevant players are on board with such a designation after adequate public notice and input.

Andy stated that we’ve traditionally supported our municipalities in development review. For us to set up a system where we may oppose one of our municipalities on a proposed development would be a real morass. We ought to avoid that situation. There was some discussion about the challenges in this realm where there may be opposing municipal viewpoints, particularly regarding wind turbines given potentially different financial and aesthetic impacts on host towns and nearby
communities. Mike agreed that we should stick with our current practice of supporting our municipalities on development applications.

There was discussion about supporting municipal interests, but not advocating. These was a suggestion to build upon the concept behind the planning area map and associated policy. In that example, the planning areas are established based on local zoning, with a regional policy to build 80% within the areas planned for growth. Perhaps a similar method could be used for the 90% renewable goal – build a regional framework from municipal input. There was general agreement that CCRPC would work regionally to understand how we reach the energy goals and that we would be supportive of town’s approach and that the regional plan would provide the general framework for supporting municipalities in their approach to getting to 90% renewable.

7. Chair/Executive Director Report.
   a. Water Quality Implementation Role. Charlie will keep members updated as things are finalized. We’ve been managing the basin planning contract for all of the RPCs. We’ve received Municipal Roads Grants and there is more capital money in the state budget and they’re trying to decide how to get the money out there. There will be $2.5 million available through the RPCs to towns (about $10-20,000 per project) with Northwest RPC taking the lead on administering the funds. There is a third grant program that they constructed that the RPCs applied for and Southern Windsor RPC will be the administrator on this one to deal with the “go lists” of project ready to be constructed. There are also ecosystem restoration grant fund available now. We will have another compliment of transportation-stormwater grant programs after July 1st. We’re trying to tell them that this is not the time to have municipalities complete applications for funding, as they are busy with construction projects already in the pipeline.

8. Agenda Review for June 21, 2017 Annual Board Meeting. Bernie noted that this is indeed for 2017 and not 2016 as the draft agenda indicates. Barbara Elliott noted that the invitation that went out to folks indicated that the social hour would begin at 5:30, with the business meeting at 7 p.m. and guest speaker at 7:15 p.m. Members agreed we should be consistent with what invitees have already seen. We will also make sure Julie Moore knows the correct time. So far there has not been a great response to attend. Bernie will follow up with our board members.

9. Other Business.
   a. Barbara suggested we make sure the list of upcoming meetings shows the 5:15 start time for training in July. We will add this as another item.
   b. Regina asked members if they were all available for the next Executive Committee meeting since it’s scheduled for July 5th. Members present indicated they could attend.

10. Executive Session. Not needed.

11. Adjournment. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO AJOURN AT 6:50 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc
July 10, 2017

Stephanie Monaghan  
District #4 Coordinator  
111 West Street  
Essex Junction, VT 05452

RE: Cambrian Rise; Burlington; Application #4C1301 – DRAFT

Dear Ms. Monaghan:

The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission’s Staff and Executive Committee have reviewed this Act 250 application for a Project described as the creation of a 10-lot subdivision, along with construction of 12 new buildings with 739 residential units, 18,000 square feet of non-residential support/amenity space, 49,000 square feet of neighborhood oriented commercial space, 42-room hotel, 1,084 off-street parking spaces, and 2,250 linear feet of public roadway with supporting landscaping and utility infrastructure. The Project is located at 311-375 North Avenue in Burlington, VT. The City of Burlington’s Development Review Board has approved the project. We offer the following comments:

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

1. The Center Planning Area is identified in the Plan as an area planned for growth, and therefore this project helps implement Strategy #2 of the Plan, which calls for 80% of new development in the areas planned for growth.
2. The project is proposed in a state-designated Neighborhood Development Area and is served by municipal water and sewer, is served by a CCTA transit route and is within walking distance to many services.
3. The density and uses are consistent with the local regulations.

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

Additionally, we find that this project complies with Criterion 9(L), as it is located in a state-designated Neighborhood Development Area.

TRAFFIC COMMENTS HERE

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

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

Charlie Baker  
Executive Director  
Cc: CCRPC Board  
    Certificate of Service
August 2, 2017

Peter E. Keibel
Act 250 Coordinator
111 West Street
Essex Junction, VT 05452

RE: O’Brien Farm Road, LLC; South Burlington; Application #4C1106-3 – DRAFT

Dear Mr. Keibel:

The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission’s Staff and Executive Committee have reviewed this Act 250 application for a project described as development of 39.16 acres of land adjacent to Old Farm Road, Kennedy Drive, Eldredge Street, and Kimball Avenue, into a PUD with 118 residential units on footprint lots, along with six large residential/mixed use development lots, park space and open space. The Project seeks complete review of the 118 residential units and associated infrastructure, and only partial findings for the six large residential/mixed use lots. The Project is located at 255 Kennedy Drive in South Burlington, VT. The project has received master plan approval from the City of South Burlington Development Review Board, but each individual phase will be subject to site plan approval.

We offer the following comments:

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

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

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

We also find that this project meets the requirements of Criterion 9(L), as its location is within an existing center that includes the characteristics defined in 10 VSA §6001(16). The project is in an area planned for growth that is compact in form and size; that contains a mixture of uses that include a substantial residential component and that are within walking distance of each other; that has significantly higher densities than densities that occur outside the settlement; and that is typically served by municipal infrastructure such as water, wastewater, sidewalks, paths, transit and public parks.

We reviewed the Traffic Impact Assessment conducted by Lamoureux & Dickinson Consulting Engineers (L&D) dated August 8, 2016 and found the PM peak value to be significantly different from a study done by Green International Affiliates (Green). Green analyzed the VT 116/Kennedy Drive intersection as part...
of its work for VTrans on the culvert reconstruction, currently underway, just north of the intersection on VT 116. In a memorandum dated August 21, 2015 the 2015 PM peak level of service (LOS) at the intersection was calculated to be an E with an average delay of 73.3 seconds. This is inconsistent with the findings of the L&D analysis that resulted in a future 2025 PM peak No-Build LOS of D or 37 seconds of average delay. The discrepancy between the two PM peak values is significantly more than what would normally be possible through differences in engineering judgement or traffic counts used. We are calling attention to this because should Green’s analysis be the more accurate of the two, the development’s impacts could cause the intersection to cross into failing (LOS F) conditions.

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

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

Sincerely,

Charlie Baker
Executive Director

Cc: CCRPC Board
Certificate of Service
June 7, 2017

Peter Keibel
District #4 Coordinator
111 West Street
Essex Junction, VT 05452

RE: Allen Brook Development, Essex; Application #4C0329-21 – DRAFT

Dear Mr. Keibel:

The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission’s Staff and Executive Committee have reviewed this Act 250 application for a nine-lot subdivision, the extension of Thompson Drive by 1,220 square feet, the construction of an office and laboratory building on Lot #1, the construction of a spec warehouse with associated office on Lot #5, the construction of a 16-space temporary parking lot on Lot #9 and associated infrastructure. The Project is located at 31 Allen Martin Drive in Essex, VT. The project has received approval from the Essex Planning Commission and Selectboard. We offer the following comments:

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

1. The Enterprise Planning Area is identified in the Plan as an area planned for growth, and therefore this project helps implement Strategy #2 of the Plan, which calls for 80% of new development in the areas planned for growth.

2. The project will have water and sewer service, as it is within the Town of Essex sewer core area.

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

We also find that this project meets the requirements of Criterion 9(L). We find that this area does not meet the exact definition of “existing settlement”. Therefore, under Criterion 9(L), the applicant must show that any project outside an existing settlement:

i. Makes efficient use of land, energy, roads, utilities and other infrastructure, and either:
   (I) Will not contribute to strip development, or
   (II) If the project is “confined to” existing strip development, it incorporates infill and minimizes the characteristics of strip development.

We find that this project makes efficient use of land, energy, roads, utilities and other infrastructure: it is located within an established industrial area; it will expand upon existing roads and curb cuts; and it has water or sewer service.

We also find that this project will not contribute to strip development. The Natural Resources Board Act 250 Criterion 9(L) Guidance indicates that a project does not contribute to a pattern of strip development if the properties surrounding the project tract are conserved lands that are unable to be developed and the underlying zoning limits commercial development of these properties. Previous development applications on this parcel have included provisions that 230+ acres will be conveyed to the Town of Essex for recreation and conservation purposes. Further, the parcel is located within the Resources Preservation-Industrial District as defined by the
Town of Essex Zoning Regulations. This District allows development on only 40% of a parcel at any given time. This prevents additional commercial development of this property.

We concur with the general findings of the Traffic Impact Study (TIS) conducted by Trudell Consulting Engineers dated June 7, 2016. The study acknowledged the project will impact delay and queuing at the VT 15/Allen Martin Drive intersection and is contributing towards a planned improvement of a westbound left turn lane on VT 15. The TIS indicated a scoping study of the VT 15/Allen Martin Drive intersection was under way at the time of the study. The scoping study has since been completed in April 2017 and resulted in a municipally preferred alternative of a traffic signal. Going forward, the fee structure for additional development in this area should be reexamined in light of this.

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

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

Sincerely,

Charlie Baker
Executive Director

Cc: CCRPC Board
Certificate of Service
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
July 5, 2017
Agenda Item 4: Energy Planning

Issues: We will provide an update on feedback from the Department of Public Service (DPS); and in the attached spreadsheet you’ll find the level of municipal protection of the local constraints and feedback we’ve received from the municipalities regarding their preference on the role of the Regional Plan. For the latter, this is in response to the April 30th communication, and the feedback is largely from the Planning Commission/Energy Committee level and NOT the Legislative Bodies.

We will be discussing this information to determine next steps for our Board and communication to the Legislative Bodies.

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
Resource Areas with Development Prohibition
(aka known constraints)

- Conservation District
- Very Steep Slopes (25% or more)
- Wetland Buffers
- Surface Water Buffers
- Town-Owned Land
- Flood Hazard Overlay II

Supporting Regulation

- BLUDR Table 2.1A: The Conservation District includes all land above 2,000 feet in elevation, the town's permanently conserved lands, including town and state-owned parks, forests and conservation land, and existing private in-holdings on Honey Hollow Road. Conditional Uses: Alpine Ski Facility, Primitive Campground, Nordic Ski Facility, Public Facility, Recreation/Ocular, Telecommunications Tower.
- BLUDR Section 3.16(B): All development is specifically prohibited on very steep slopes in excess of 25% except for the following which may be allowed by the Development Review Board subject to conditional use review and the requirements of Subsection (A). (i) Schools and all trails associated with an approved Alpine or Nordic ski facility, hiking and rock climbing trails, development on pre-existing lots legally in existence as of the effective date of these regulations for which the Board determines that there is no portion of the lot on which the slope does not exceed 25% and, as such, that the total prohibition of development on slopes in excess of 25% would unduly preclude reasonable use of the lot.
- BLUDR Section 3.17(A)(1): All structures and other impervious surfaces shall be set back at least 50 feet from... wetlands identified on Vermont Significant Wetland Inventory (VSII) maps or through field investigation, as measured from a delineated boundary.
- BLUDR Section 3.17(B)(2): All structures and impervious surfaces, except for allowed encroachments under Subsection (C) below, shall be set back at least...200 feet from Goose Pond, Preston Pond and Upper Preston Pond, as measured from the annual mean high water mark. In addition, all structures and other impervious surfaces shall be set back at least 50 feet from... the shorelines of all naturally occurring lakes and ponds with a surface area greater than one (1) acre, as measured from the mean water line.
- Selectboard Authority
- BLUDR Table 2.8 states that the only new construction allowed in the FHO II district is an accessory structure to an existing one.

Supporting Regulation

- Forest District
- Steep Slopes (15-25%)

- BLUDR Table 2.1A: The purpose of this district is to protect Bolton's more remote and inaccessible forested upland areas from fragmentation, development, and undue environmental disturbance, while allowing for the continuance of traditional uses such as forestry, outdoor recreation and compatible low density residential development.
- BLUDR Section 3.16(A): Development on steep slopes equal to or in excess of 15%, or which results in such slopes, shall be subject to conditional use review under Section 5.4 and [provisions including stormwater management, erosion control and design intended to minimize visual impacts from public vantage points].

- Stormwater Setback and Buffer Area Surface Waters, Wetlands, and Buffer areas 2. Flood Hazard Areas 3. Special Natural Areas 4. Wildlife habitat

Supporting Regulation

- Storm Regulation page 65 states Land development in Charlotte is evaluated and sized so as to avoid and/or minimize impacts to the following AHPV as identified in Charlotte’s Town Plan and Land Use Regulations: flood hazard areas, Surface waters, wetlands and associated setback and buffer areas, special natural areas, Wildlife habitat (as identified in Charlotte Town Plan or as field delineated)

Supporting Regulation

- and Burlington’s Standards for Historic Buildings. and Sites state that new additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the historic materials, features, use, scale, and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment. (5.4.8)
- Development Ordinance Section 4.4.2 and 4.5.2: Development in the Downtown Mixed Use Districts and Institutional Core Campus Overlay is intended to be intense with high lot coverage and large tall buildings placed close together. Development in the Enterprise District is intended to ensure that sufficient land area is appropriately designated within the city to provide a unique and diversified economic base that will facilitate high-density job creation and retention (4.4.3).
- Designated Downtown and Neighborhood Development Area are intended to be the center of Burlington’s economic and commercial development.
- Development Ord. section 4.4.1 states that building heights and forms shall respect the principal view corridors, defined as the rights-of-way of Pearl, Cherry, College, and Main Streets, and preserve or enhance views to the lake and mountains.

- Enterprise Zoning District
- Designated Downtown and Neighborhood Development Area is intended to be the center of Burlington’s economic and commercial development.
- Recreation/Outdoor, Telecommunications Tower.

- 1 and 3. Burlington’s Standards for Historic Buildings and Sites state that new additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the historic materials, features, use, scale, and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment. (5.4.8)
- Development Ordinance Section 4.4.2 and 4.5.2: Development in the Downtown Mixed Use Districts and Institutional Core Campus Overlay is intended to be intense with high lot coverage and large tall buildings placed close together. Development in the Enterprise District is intended to ensure that sufficient land area is appropriately designated within the city to provide a unique and diversified economic base that will facilitate high-density job creation and retention (4.4.3).
- Designated Downtown and Neighborhood Development Area are intended to be the center of Burlington’s economic and commercial development.
- Development Ord. section 4.4.1 states that building heights and forms shall respect the principal view corridors, defined as the rights-of-way of Pearl, Cherry, College, and Main Streets, and preserve or enhance views to the lake and mountains.

- 1. Historic Districts
- 2. Mixed-use, Institutional Core Campus and Enterprise Zoning Districts
- 3. Historic Neighborhoods (Eligible for Listing)
- 4. Designated Downtown and Neighborhood Development Area
- 5. Official Map Features
- 6. View Corridors

- 1. Conservation District
- 2. Very Steep Slopes (25% or more)
- 3. Wetland Buffers
- 4. Surface Water Buffers
- 5. Town-Owned Land
- 6. Flood Hazard Overlay II

- 1. Conservation District
- 2. Historic Districts
- 3. Wetland Buffers
- 4. Surface Water Buffers
- 5. Town-Owned Land
- 6. Flood Hazard Overlay II

- 1. Conservation District
- 2. Very Steep Slopes (25% or more)
- 3. Wetland Buffers
- 4. Surface Water Buffers
- 5. Town-Owned Land
- 6. Flood Hazard Overlay II
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Answer to Question 4</th>
<th>Responding Entity</th>
<th>Request for TA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>The Planning Commission does not feel comfortable providing comment on this issue until the CCRPC receives feedback from the state.</td>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td>Bolton's Conservation District does allow very limited development of ski facilities and telecom towers. CCRPC staff are unsure whether this means it should be a possible constraint instead of a known constraint or not. Yes (see above)—otherwise how do these differ from “potential” constraints? Per 480B(a)(3) the regional energy element/plan and enhanced local energy elements/plans are required to identify both “potential areas for the development and siting of renewable energy resources and areas that are unsuitable for siting those resources…” That was the intent behind A.174 w/re integrating energy and land use planning, in association with giving more weight to regional and municipal plans in Section 248. This also suggests however, that known constraints should be given pretty careful consideration at the regional as well as local level.</td>
<td>Sharon Murray, Selectboard Member</td>
<td>At some point RPC assistance in this area would be welcome, but likely not in FY18. As you know, our Planning Commission will be focusing on an update of our development regulations over the next year or so—which potentially could include some assistance with solar facility screening standards?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>According to Act 274, “the ECOS Plan will carry greater weight—substantial deference—in the Section 248 siting process for energy generation. The EC recommends that, if we want our regional plan (ECOS Plan) to prohibit energy generation in areas that have “known” constraints.” If this were not the case, then making the distinction between “known” and “possible” constraints would be rendered meaningless and not have any weight or credibility. It’s crucial for public buy-in on the “possible” constraints to demonstrate a willingness to protect the “known” constraints.</td>
<td>Planning Commission, Energy Committee</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Resource Areas with Development Prohibition

(aka known constraints)

- **Municipality**: Hinesburg, Essex Junction, Essex, Colchester

### Supporting Regulation

- **Zoning Regulations** To preserve the natural growth and cover of the shorelines, to preserve water quality, to prevent pollution, to regulate development and appearance of the shorelines, to prevent erosion, to prevent nuisance, and to preserve the property rights of the shoreline property owners. Permitted uses are those uses which are permitted in the underlying zoning district.

- **Zoning Regulation: Setback from Slopes. The minimum setback from a slope exceeding 45 degrees (See Appendix B) shall be 50 (50) feet** (ARTICLE 2).

- It is the purpose of this Section to provide for the protection and improvement of the surface waters and wetland within the Town of Colchester. These regulations and standards are intended to lead to the establishment and protection of natural areas along the Town’s surface waters and wetlands to provide improved protection for water quality and the provision of open space areas and wildlife habitat.

- It is the further purpose of this Section to provide for the retention of existing residential neighborhoods located along surface waters and streams in a manner consistent with the resource protection goals of this Section and the Municipal Plan. For the FRH portion of this district, permitted uses are those uses which are permitted in the underlying zoning district. For wetlands and surface waters, encroachment is allowed for very specific uses, recreation, assess, stormwater management, or agriculture.

### Possible Constraints

- **Shoreland Setback and buffer area**

- **Shoreland setback and buffer areas, Shoreland setback and buffer areas, special natural areas**

---

### Resource Areas with Development Prohibition

- **Scenic Resources Protection Overlay District**
- **Resource Protection District Industrial**
- **Steep Slopes 15-20%**

### Supporting Regulation

- **Zoning Regulations** 5.8.B.2: Development shall be prohibited on slopes of 15 percent or steeper due to the likelihood of erosion and stormwater runoff problems.

- **Zoning Regulations** 5.8.B.2: Development shall be prohibited on slopes of 15 percent or steeper due to the likelihood of erosion and stormwater runoff problems.

---

### Resource Areas with Development Prohibition

- **Steep Slopes 20 Percent or Higher**

### Supporting Regulation

- **Zoning Regulations** 5.8.B.2: Development shall be prohibited on slopes of 15 percent or steeper due to the likelihood of erosion and stormwater runoff problems.

- **Zoning Regulations** 5.8.B.2: Development shall be prohibited on slopes of 15 percent or steeper due to the likelihood of erosion and stormwater runoff problems.

---

### Resource Areas with Development Prohibition

- **Steep Slopes 20%**

### Supporting Regulation

- **Zoning Regulations** 5.8.B.2: Development shall be prohibited on slopes of 15 percent or steeper due to the likelihood of erosion and stormwater runoff problems.

- **Zoning Regulations** 5.8.B.2: Development shall be prohibited on slopes of 15 percent or steeper due to the likelihood of erosion and stormwater runoff problems.

---

### Resource Areas with Development Prohibition

- **Steep Slopes (25 or greater)**

### Supporting Regulation

- **Zoning Regulations** Building sites and related development areas shall avoid primary resource areas...including steep slopes of 25% or greater.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Answer to Question 4</th>
<th>Responding Entity</th>
<th>Request for TA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>Dwelling units are a permitted use in GD4 Overlay District, so it was changed from Known to Possible.</td>
<td>The Commission was supportive of including language in the regional plan regarding renewable energy prohibitions in areas of known, previously called Level 1, constraints. The Commission did agree that projects located on existing structures or impervious areas were acceptable (i.e. an existing home located within the floodplain), and that any prohibition should be based on a site investigation to ensure the presence of the constraint. There was not support for prohibiting renewable energy generation in areas of possible constraints, previously called Level 2.</td>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td>Planning Commission are currently working with Colchester in FY 2017 and work will likely continue in FY18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Junction</td>
<td>Village requested that the Scenic Resources Overlay be a Known Constraint; CCRPC staff did not find it prohibited all development</td>
<td>Did not provide comments to 4/30 memo</td>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinesburg</td>
<td>Village requested that Conserved Lands be elevated to a Known Constraint. CCRPC staff finds that the development of conserved lands are governed on a case-by-case basis per their individual development restrictions</td>
<td>Did not provide comments to 4/30 memo</td>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Village requested that Conserved Lands be elevated to a Known Constraint. CCRPC staff finds that the development of conserved lands are governed on a case-by-case basis per their individual development restrictions.</td>
<td>We do want the regional plan to prohibit energy generation in areas with known constraints; however, we recognize that gaining access to unconstrained areas may require passing through a constrained area. We allow for this in traditional development projects as follows (section 6.12.1 #2, Subdivision Regulations): “Building sites and related development areas (e.g., roads, driveway, lawn, etc.) shall avoid primary resource areas and minimize impact on secondary resource areas. Limited impacts to primary resource areas for access (e.g., road or driveway) may be allowed, at the discretion of the Development Review Board, if there are no alternate development plans and no other means of access. In such cases, the access shall be designed to impact as little of the primary resource area as possible.” We encourage the regional plan to take a similar approach.</td>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Resource Areas with Development Prohibition (also known as constraints)</td>
<td>Possible Constraints</td>
<td>Supporting Regulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jericho</td>
<td>2. Well Protection Area Overlay District 2. Natural Areas and Natural Communities 3. Primary Conservation Areas</td>
<td>1. Secondary Conservation Area Areas with Management Plans 2. Village Centers</td>
<td>1. Tiered Conservation Priorities, as shown on Map 9 of the Town Plan, depicts all the conservation priorities identified in Jericho in three tiers of priority. Secondary Conservation Areas are also very sensitive but some activities can occur within them without compromising their integrity. These include wildlife road crossings, a larger area surrounding vernal pools, significant (but not rare) natural communities, and ledge and cliff habitat that may be important for wildlife. In general, these places should be evaluated carefully when development is proposed within them for potential conflicts with the natural resource values. (Town Plan Pg. 36) 2. The purpose of the Village Center District is to encourage the concentration of people and community-focused activities in traditional centers (Land Use Regulations 3.2.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. 28) [May be added to zoning in next update]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Section 804.6: OPEN SPACE Requirements for developments with ten (10) or more multi-family residential units. The proposal shall provide for the preservation and maintenance of OPEN SPACE which is designed to be an integral part of the whole development. The size, shape and locations of OPEN SPACE shall be approved by the Development Review Board. The OPEN SPACE shall be protected by appropriate legal devices to ensure the continued use of such lands for the purpose of AGRICULTURE, FORESTRY, recreation or conservation. Such mechanisms include dedication of development rights, conservation easements, homeowners associations, restrictive covenants, conveyance to land trusts, or other appropriate grants or restrictions approved by the Development Review Board. Permitted future USES and maintenance of the OPEN SPACE shall be specifically identified as part of the approval of development with ten (10) or more multifamily units. HOWEVER, the town plan recognizes the need to improve these regulations: Goal 8.5 is to “Establish standards for more appropriate, useful, and usable open space that is set-aside as a result of cluster subdivisions, such as Planned Unit Developments.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Significant View Areas 2. Archeologically Sensitive Areas 3. Lakeshore Buffer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Direct developments in a manner to minimize visual adverse impacts on the Town’s scenic beauty, open lands, shorelines, and riparian areas with particular attention paid to roadways or views or views from Lake Champlain. Identification of such resources can be aided by the maps listed in Objective 1 (Town Plan pgs. 36) 2. could not map these 3. The purpose of this district is to preserve vegetation and natural cover of the shoreline adjacent to Lake Champlain in order to preserve views both from and of the lake, the preservation of water quality and prevention of soil erosion and other nuisances, and the assistance of problems resulting from over intensive exploitation of the lakeshore. Uses are permitted according to underlying district (Zoning)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Answer to Question 4</td>
<td>Responding Entity</td>
<td>Request for TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jericho</td>
<td>(The Planning Commission members) are generally OK with that (the statement) but are concerned about potential future technology for renewable structures that could be developed that would not be intrusive or harmful to these areas. If that could be considered in the language, that is OK. Also, just for clarity, they would like it to add the following underlined word “… unless located on an existing structure or existing imperious surface.”</td>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>Milton originally requested all constraints as known constraints, but CCRPC staff were unable to find supporting regulation in either zoning or the town plan. Hydric soils were requested, but not included because no documentation could be found. Additionally, the Town requested that Conserved Lands be elevated to a Known Constraint. CCRPC staff finds that the development of conserved lands are governed on a case-by-case basis per their individual development restrictions.</td>
<td>did not provide comments to 4/30 memo</td>
<td>no-response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>Richmond has requested the following constraints, but there is not supporting language for them in the zoning or in the town plan, as the plan is expired and a drafting process is ongoing. The following will be considered by CCRPC staff after the adoption of the Town Plan: 1. Ridges 2. Slopes &gt; 30% 3. Trails 4. Conserved Land 5. ANR Primary Conservation Areas 6. Highest Priority Habitat derived from STA Report.</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>Richmond Conservation and Planning Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelburne</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Municipality**

- Jericho
- Milton
- Richmond
- Shelburne

**Answer to Question 4**

- Planning Commission: Yes

**Responding Entity**

- Milton Conservation Commission
- Richmond Conservation and Planning Commission
- No response
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Resource Areas with Development Prohibition (also known constraints)</th>
<th>Supporting Regulation</th>
<th>Possible Constraints</th>
<th>Supporting Regulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Burlington</td>
<td>2. Source Protection Area Zone 1</td>
<td>Need to identify supporting regulation</td>
<td>2. wetlands and buffers; 3. Habitat Blocks and Riparian Connectivity; 4. Slopes 20% or greater; 5. NRE Natural Resource Protection Area</td>
<td>2. Zoning is the purpose of this Section to provide appropriate protection of the City’s wetland resources in order to protect wetland functions and values related to surface and ground water protection, wildlife habitat, and flood control. Encroachment is conditional with State CUD and/or DBR approval (Article 12). This plan shall serve to provide guidance as to where the siting of renewable energy facilities should be avoided in favor of certain conservation areas: All Primary Conservation Areas identified per the map included in the 2014 South Burlington Open Space Report. Uncommon Species, Habitat Blocks identified by the Secondary Conservation Maps included in the 2014 South Burlington Open Space Report (Town Plan, 3-42). 4. The presence of important ecological resources, as well as steep slopes, shallow soils, and extensive bedrock outcappings should be incorporated into all types of planning for development and conservation (Town Plan, 2-105). 5. 777 Dwellings are permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Regulations: All structures, with the exception of telecommunications and wind towers and ancillary 25% facilities, tent platforms and lean-tos, shall be prohibited above 1,500 ft. above mean sea level. 1. Source Protection Area Zone 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>36 minimize site disturbance and construction on steep slopes (&gt;25%), and to avoid site disturbance on very steep slopes (&gt;25%).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning It is the purpose of this Section to provide appropriate protection of the City’s wetland resources in order to protect wetland functions and values related to surface and ground water protection, wildlife habitat, and flood control. Encroachment is conditional with State CUD and/or DBR approval (Article 12). This plan shall serve to provide guidance as to where the siting of renewable energy facilities should be avoided in favor of certain conservation areas: All Primary Conservation Areas identified per the map included in the 2014 South Burlington Open Space Report. Uncommon Species, Habitat Blocks identified by the Secondary Conservation Maps included in the 2014 South Burlington Open Space Report (Town Plan, 3-42). 4. The presence of important ecological resources, as well as steep slopes, shallow soils, and extensive bedrock outcappings should be incorporated into all types of planning for development and conservation (Town Plan, 2-105). 5. 777 Dwellings are permitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Regulation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All structures, with the exception of telecommunications and wind towers and ancillary 25% facilities, tent platforms and lean-tos, are prohibited in this district over 1,500 feet in elevation above mean sea level. (pgs. 14,17,20,23)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Development must not disturb areas with significant natural resources (SNR),prime or statewide ag soils are included in the definition of SNR (pg. 3-52)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Regulation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Prime and (State-wide significant) Agricultural Soils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All structures, with the exception of telecommunications and wind towers and ancillary 25% facilities, tent platforms and lean-tos, are prohibited in this district over 1,500 feet in elevation above mean sea level. (pgs. 14,17,20,23)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Development must not disturb areas with significant natural resources (SNR),prime or statewide ag soils are included in the definition of SNR (pg. 3-52)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Regulation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Answer to Question 4</td>
<td>Responding Entity</td>
<td>Request for TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Burlington</td>
<td>The City as requested that their Source Protection Area Zone 2 be a Known Constraint, but the source of this regulation is currently unclear.</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underhill</td>
<td>1. Dwelling units are a permitted use in the Mt. Mansfield Scenic Preservation District. The towns desire to restrict renewable energy development does not match their zoning regulations. The language in the plan expresses that the Town has a desire to protect its ridgelines for all types of development.</td>
<td>Both the Planning Commission and the Energy Committee answered in the affirmative to this question, as both generally believed that the regional plan should regulate energy generation in areas with State and local known constraints.</td>
<td>Planning Commission and Energy Committee</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williston</td>
<td>Check to ensure the Water Resource Overlay District covers streams draining less than 2 miles. Town requested ag soils as a possible constraint but regulation is more restrictive—should possibly be a Known Constraint?</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westford</td>
<td>The Town requested that Conservation Areas be a Known Constraint, but the regulations indicate that it is more appropriately a Possible Constraint. The town also requested that there be different constraints for wind (viewsheds, watersheds, conservation areas) and solar (watershed, conservation). The town requested that Significant Wildlife Habitat Areas be listed as a possible constraint, but 27.5.6.4 specifically exempts alternative and renewable energy installations from SWHA regulations.</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>Conservation Commission</td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHITTENDEN COUNTY
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

RECOGNITION & APPRECIATION

OF

MARC LANDRY

for 12 YEARS OF SERVICE

REPRESENTING THE TOWN OF COLCHESTER
ON THE CCMPO BOARD JUNE 2005-June 2011
ON THE CCRPC BOARD JULY 2011-JUNE 2017
AND
ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AS
CCMPO VICE-CHAIR FROM JULY 2007 – JUNE 2010
CCMPO CHAIR FROM JULY 2010-JUNE 2011
CCRPC CHAIR FROM JULY 2011-JUNE 2012
IMMEDIATE PAST CHAIR FROM JULY 2012-JUNE 2014

Dated this 19th day of July, 2017 in Winooski, Vermont

______________________________
CHRISTOPHER D. ROY, CHAIR
CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

- RESOLUTION HONORING BRYAN DAVIS -

WHEREAS, THE CHITTENDEN COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (CCMPO), WHICH WAS DESIGNATED BY THE GOVERNOR OF VERMONT TO MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION LAWS, IS RESPONSIBLE FOR MANAGING THE CONTINUOUS, COOPERATIVE AND COMPREHENSIVE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING PROCESS IN CHITTENDEN COUNTY HIRED BRYAN IN MAY 2007; AND THE CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION MERGED WITH CCMPO IN 2012;

WHEREAS, BRYAN DAVIS HAS FAITHFULLY SERVED THE CCMPO/CCRPC FOR TEN YEARS AS AN EMPLOYEE; AND

WHEREAS, BRYAN DAVIS, HAS PROVIDED OUTSTANDING EFFORTS IN PROVIDING TRANSPORTATION PLANNING SUPPORT FOR THE CCMPO/CCRPC BOARD, STAFF, MUNICIPALITIES, AND PARTNER AGENCIES; AND

WHEREAS, BRYAN DAVIS HAS CREATED, LED AND CHAMPIONED MANY INITIATIVES AT THE CCMPO/CCRPC INCLUDING: TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES WAY TO GO COMMUTER CHALLENGE REGIONAL AND LOCAL BICYCLE & PEDESTRIAN INITIATIVES TITLE VI AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ACTIVITIES LOCAL PROJECT MANAGEMENT SERVICES; AND

WHEREAS, THROUGHOUT HIS CAREER AT CCMPO/CCMPO, BRYAN DAVIS HAS ALWAYS BEEN PROFESSIONAL AND HAS HAD HIGH ETHICAL STANDARDS IN HIS WORK, THEREBY EARNING THE RESPECT AND GRATITUDE OF HIS PEERS, THE PUBLIC AND PUBLIC OFFICIALS;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION THAT:

IT THANKS BRYAN DAVIS FOR HIS OUTSTANDING WORK, DEDICATION, PROFESSIONALISM AND HIGH ETHICAL STANDARDS, AND SUPPORT OF THE LEADERSHIP OF THE CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

DATED THIS 19th DAY OF JULY 2017 IN WILLISTON, VERMONT

CHRISTOPHER D. ROY, CHAIR
CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
- RESOLUTION HONORING ELENI CHURCHILL -

WHEREAS, THE CHITTENDEN COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (CCMPO), WHICH WAS DESIGNATED TO MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION LAWS, AND BE RESPONSIBLE FOR MANAGING THE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING PROCESS IN CHITTENDEN COUNTY HIRED ELENI IN FEBRUARY 2007; AND CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION MERGED WITH CCMPO IN 2012; AND

WHEREAS, ELENI CHURCHILL HAS FAITHFULLY SERVED THE CCMPO/CCRPC FOR TEN YEARS AS AN EMPLOYEE; AND

WHEREAS, ELENI CHURCHILL, HAS PROVIDED OUTSTANDING EFFORTS IN PROVIDING TRANSPORTATION PLANNING SUPPORT FOR THE CCMPO/CCRPC BOARD, STAFF, MUNICIPALITIES, AND PARTNER AGENCIES; AND

WHEREAS, ELENI CHURCHILL HAS CREATED, LED AND CHAMPIONED MANY INITIATIVES AT THE CCMPO/CCRPC INCLUDING:
SERVING AS SENIOR TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ENGINEER OVERSEEING NUMEROUS TRANSPORTATION CORRIDOR, NETWORK AND SCOPING STUDIES; AND,
BECOMING TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM MANAGER IN 2015

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION THAT:

IT THANKS ELENI CHURCHILL FOR HER OUTSTANDING WORK, DEDICATION, PROFESSIONALISM AND HIGH ETHICAL STANDARDS, AND SUPPORT OF THE LEADERSHIP OF THE CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION THEREBY EARNING THE RESPECT AND GRATITUDE OF HER PEERS, THE PUBLIC AND PUBLIC OFFICIALS;

DATED THIS 19th DAY OF JULY 2017 IN WINOOSKI, VERMONT

CHRISTOPHER D. ROY, CHAIR
CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

- RESOLUTION HONORING JASON CHAREST-

WHEREAS, THE CHITTENDEN COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (CCMPO), WHICH WAS DESIGNATED BY THE GOVERNOR OF VERMONT TO MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION LAWS, IS RESPONSIBLE FOR MANAGING THE CONTINUOUS, COOPERATIVE AND COMPREHENSIVE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING PROCESS IN CHITTENDEN COUNTY HIRED JASON CHAREST IN JUNE 2007; AND THE CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION MERGED WITH CCMPO IN 2012; AND

WHEREAS, JASON CHAREST HAS FAITHFULLY SERVED THE CCMPO/CCRPC FOR TEN YEARS AS AN EMPLOYEE; AND

WHEREAS, JASON CHAREST, HAS PROVIDED OUTSTANDING EFFORTS IN PROVIDING TRANSPORTATION PLANNING SUPPORT FOR THE CCMPO/CCRPC BOARD, STAFF, MUNICIPALITIES, AND PARTNER AGENCIES; AND

WHEREAS, JASON CHAREST HAS CREATED, LED AND CHAMPIONED MANY INITIATIVES AT THE CCMPO/CCRPC INCLUDING:
- RUNNING THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION MODEL
- OVERSEEING SCOPING EFFORTS AND PROJECT DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES
- PROVIDING TRAFFIC ENGINEERING ASSISTANCE TO MUNICIPALITIES AND PARTNERS INVOLVED WITH THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN;
- MENTORING NEW CCRPC STAFF; AND

WHEREAS, THROUGHOUT HIS CAREER AT CCRPC/CCMPO, JASON CHAREST HAS ALWAYS BEEN PROFESSIONAL AND HAS HAD HIGH ETHICAL STANDARDS IN HIS WORK, THEREBY EARNING THE RESPECT AND GRATITUDE OF HIS PEERS, THE PUBLIC AND PUBLIC OFFICIALS;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION THAT:

IT THANKS JASON CHAREST FOR HIS OUTSTANDING WORK, DEDICATION, PROFESSIONALISM AND HIGH ETHICAL STANDARDS, AND SUPPORT OF THE LEADERSHIP OF THE CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION.

DATED THIS 19th DAY OF JULY 2017 IN WILLISTON, VERMONT

CHRISTOPHER D. ROY, CHAIR
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
July 5, 2017
Agenda Item 6: Action Item

FY2018 Schedule of Meetings

Issues: Vermont’s Open Meeting Law requires that public bodies clearly designate the time and place of all regular meetings. Below is the proposed meeting schedule for both the Executive Committee and the CCRPC Commission for the 2018 fiscal year beginning July, 2017. Please mark your calendars.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE</th>
<th>COMMISSION MEETINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Wednesday of the Month</td>
<td>Third Wednesday of the Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:45 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

July 5, 2017 | July 19, 2017 (Training 5:15 p.m.)
August 2, 2017 | NO AUGUST MEETING
September 6, 2017 | September 20, 2017
October 4, 2017 | October 18, 2017
November 1, 2017 | November 15, 2017
(Joint with Finance Comm. for audit) | Legislative breakfast date TBD
December 6, 2017 | January 3, 2018
January 3, 2018 | January 17, 2018
February 7, 2018 | February 21, 2018
March 7, 2018 | March 21, 2018
April 4, 2018 | April 18, 2018
May 2, 2018 | May 16, 2018
June 6, 2018 | June 20, 2018 (ANNUAL MEETING)

The Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) meets the first Tuesday of each month at 9:00 a.m. (except on Town Meeting Day, when they meet on the 1st Wednesday.)

The Clean Water Advisory Committee (CWAC) meets the first Tuesday of each month at 11:00 a.m. (except on Town Meeting Day, when they meet on the 1st Wednesday.)

The Finance Committee meets the 4th Wednesday of each month at 5:45 p.m. as needed.

The Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) generally meets bi-monthly on the 2nd Wednesday of the month from 2:30-4:30 p.m.

Staff Recommendation: That the Executive Committee recommend approval of the FY2018 Meeting Schedule to the Commission.


For more information contact: Bernie Ferenc 846-4490 ext. *10 or bferenc@ccrpcvt.org
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission

July 5, 2017

Agenda Item 7: Chair Action Item

FY2017 Committee Appointments

From the Bylaws: Article VII.B. “The Chair shall ... with concurrence of the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission, establish and appoint committees and their members.” Article XI: “All Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission Board members are encouraged to participate in at least one standing committee. The Chair may appoint ad hoc committees for a specific purpose with the approval of the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission. Committees should include subject matter experts as needed to provide advice to the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission Board.”

Finance Committee (Secretary/Treasurer, Vice Chair and 1 other board member): Brian Bigelow, Underhill (Chair); Mike O’Brien, Winooski, Jeff Carr, Essex

Board Development Committee (past Chair and up to 4 other board members): Andy Montroll, Burlington (Chair); Sandy Dooley, South Burlington; Catherine McMains, Jericho; Jeff Carr, Essex;

Unified Planning Work Program Committee (3-5 board members): Michael O’Brien, Winooski (Chair); John Zicconi, Shelburne; Andrea Morgante, Hinesburg; _______________; ________________

Transportation Advisory Committee (1 board member): Barbara Elliott, Huntington

Planning Advisory Committee (1 board member): Joss Besse, Bolton

Long Range Planning Committee (3-6 board members, one of them to be Chair of the LRPC): Justin Dextradeur, Socio-Econ (Chair); Andrea Morgante, Hinesburg; Marc Landry, Colchester; Jim Donovan, Charlotte; Lisa Falcone, Socio-Econ

Clean Water Advisory Committee: (1 board member) Don Meals, Conservation/Environment

ad hoc Brownfields Advisory Committee: Curt Carter, GBIC (Chair); Jacquba Boure, AALV; Eric Howe, LCBP; Marcel Beaudin; Dr. Pablo Bose, UVM; Justin Dextradeur, Socio/Econ/Housing

ad hoc All Hazards Mitigation Plan Update Committee: Chris Shaw, So. Burlington.

ad hoc Clean Water Funding/Financing Committee: Don Meals, Conservation/Environment; Brian Bigelow, Underhill; Megan Moir, Burlington; Jim Jutras, Essex Junction; James Sherrard, Williston

VAPDA representative: Andy Montroll, Burlington; __________________________ (Alt.)

For questions, contact Charlie Baker, 846-4490 ext. *23 or cbaker@ccrpcvt.org
### Number and Type of Housing Units Built/Demolished in 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Accessory Unit</th>
<th>Camp</th>
<th>Group Quarters</th>
<th>Multi-Family</th>
<th>Mobile Home</th>
<th>Single Family</th>
<th>Demolitions</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Junction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>288</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinesburg</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jericho</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelburne</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Burlington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St George</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winooski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>-46</td>
<td>962</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CCRPC and member municipalities, 2016
REGULAR MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING AGENDA
Wednesday, July 19, 2017 - 6:15 p.m.
CCRPC Offices: 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202
Winooski, VT 05404

DRAFT

CCRPC TRAINING SESSION – 5:15 P.M. – 6:15 P.M.

CONSENT AGENDA –
C.l Minor TIP Amendments

DELIBERATIVE AGENDA

1. Call to Order; Changes to the Agenda
2. Public Comment Period on Items NOT on the Agenda
3. Action on Consent Agenda (MPO Business) (Action; 5 minutes)
4. Approve Minutes of June 21, 2017 Meeting* (Action; 5 minutes)
5. FY18-21 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) (MPO Business)
   a. Presentation & Public Hearing (Information: 30 minutes)
   b. Approval of the TIP* (Action: 5 minutes)
   c. Certification of the Planning Process* (Action: 5 minutes)
6. FY18 Schedule of Meetings* (Action: 5 minutes)
7. Solicitation and Appointment of Members to serve on Committees * (Action/Information: 15 minutes)
8. Energy Plan Review Presentation/Discussion; 20 minutes
9. Chair/Executive Director’s Updates (Information; 15 minutes)
   a. Priorities for the year
   b. Executive Director’s Report (to be sent separately)
   c. 
10. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports * (Information, 5 minutes)
    a. Executive Committee (draft minutes July 5, 2017*)
    i. Act 250 Sec 248 letters*
    b. Transportation Advisory Committee (draft minutes July 5, 2017*)
    c. CWAC & MS4 Subcommittee (draft minutes, July 5, 2017*)
    d. 
11. Members’ Items, Other Business (Information, 5 minutes)
12. Adjourn

The July 19th Chittenden County RPC meeting will air on ___________________ at 8 p.m. and repeat on ___________________ at 1am and 7am and available on the web at: http://www.cctv.org/watch-tv/programs/chittenden-county-regional-planning-commission

NO AUGUST MEETING FOR CCRPC BOARD

In accordance with provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, the CCRPC will ensure public meeting sites are accessible to all people. Requests for free interpretive or translation services, assistive devices, or other requested accommodations, should be made to Bryan Davis, CCRPC Title VI Coordinator, at 802-846-4490 ext *17 or bdavis@ccrpcvt.org, no later than 3 business days prior to the meeting for which services are requested.
Upcoming Meetings - Unless otherwise noted, all meetings are held at our offices:

- Transportation Advisory Committee, Tuesday, August 1, 2017; 9:00 a.m. (TENTATIVE)
- Clean Water Advisory Committee, Tuesday, August 1, 2017; 11:00 a.m.
- Executive Committee, Wednesday, August 2, 2017; 5:45 p.m.
- **NOTE – No CCRPC Board Meeting in August**
- Transportation Advisory Committee – Tuesday, September 5, 2017; 9:00 a.m.
- Clean Water Advisory Committee; Tuesday, September 5, 2017; 11:00 a.m.
- Executive Committee, Wednesday, September 6, 2017; 5:45 p.m.
- CCRPC Meeting - Wednesday, September 20, 2017; 6:00 p.m.

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