REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
Wednesday, April 18, 2018, 6:00 pm
CCRPC Offices at 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202
Winooski, VT 05404

CONSENT AGENDA: Minor TIP Amendments*

DELIBERATIVE AGENDA

1. Call to Order; Changes to the Agenda
2. Public Comment Period on Items NOT on the Agenda
3. Action on Consent Agenda (MPO Business) (Action: 1 min)
4. Approve Minutes of March 21, 2018 Meeting * (Action; 2 min)
5. South Burlington City Center Presentation, Kevin Dorn, City Manager (Information; 25 min)
6. Review FY19 Draft UPWP & Budget & Warn for Public Hearing* (Action: 15 min)
7. Housing Data Update* (Information; 15 min)
8. Chair/Executive Director’s Updates (Information; 15 min)
   a. Chair - Board Development Committee to develop officer nominations for May meeting
   b. Clean Water
   c. Legislative Updates
9. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports (Information; 2 min)
   a. UPWP Committee (draft minutes March 22, 2018)*
   b. Finance Committee (draft minutes March 28, 2018)*
   c. Transportation Advisory Committee (draft minutes April 3, 2018)*
   d. Clean Water Advisory Committee (draft minutes April 3, 2018)*
   e. MS4 Subcommittee of CWAC (draft minutes April 3, 2018) *
   f. Executive Committee (draft minutes April 4, 2018)*
      i. Act 250/Sec 248 letters *
10. Member’s Items
11. Adjournment

*Attachment

The April 18th Chittenden County RPC meeting will air on Thursday, April 26, 2018 at 8:00 p.m. and repeat on Friday, April 27, 2018 at 1 a.m. and 7 a.m. It will also be available online at: https://www.cctv.org/watch-tv/programs/chittenden-county-regional-planning-commission-76
**Upcoming Meetings** - *Unless otherwise noted, all meetings are held at our offices:*
- Transportation Advisory Committee – Tuesday, May 1, 2018; 9:00 a.m.
- Clean Water Advisory Committee – Tuesday, May 1, 2018; 11:00 a.m.
- MS4 Subcommittee – Tuesday, May 1, 2018; 12:30 p.m.
- Joint Executive & Finance Committee - Wednesday, May 2, 2018; 5:45 p.m.
- Planning Advisory Committee – Wednesday, May 9, 2018; 2:30 p.m.
- CCRPC Board Meeting - Wednesday, May 16, 2018; 6:00 p.m.

**Tentative future Board agenda items:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Agenda Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| May 16, 2018  | University of Vermont presentation  
|               |  
|               | ECOS Plan Update Public Hearing #2  
|               |  
|               | FY19 UPWP and Budget Public Hearing and Vote  
|               |  
|               | Board Development Committee – report on FY19 Officers nominations  
|               |  
|               | Guidelines and Standards for Reviewing Act 250 and Section 248 Applications  
|               |  
|               | Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans Review  
|               |  
|               | National Highway Systems Update  
|               |  
|               | Approve Amendment to MS4 Agreement  
| June 20, 2018 | Election of Officers  
|               |  
|               | ECOS Plan Update adoption  
|               |  
|               | Warn FY19-22 TIP Public Hearing for July  
| July 18, 2018 | FY19-22 TIP Public Hearing and Adoption  
|               |  
|               | Guidelines and Standards for Reviewing Act 250 and Section 248 Applications Action  
|               |  
|               | Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans Action  
| NO AUGUST MEETING |  
| September 19, 2018 | greenride bikeshare update  

*In accordance with provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, the CCRPC will ensure public meeting sites are accessible to all people. Requests for free interpretive or translation services, assistive devices, or other requested accommodations, should be made to Emma Vaughn, CCRPC Title VI Coordinator, at 802-846-4490 ext. *21 or evaughn@ccrpcvt.org, no later than 3 business days prior to the meeting for which services are requested.*
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
April 18, 2018
Agenda Item C1: Consent Item

FY2018 Transportation Improvement Program Amendments

Issues
Make the following changes to the FY18 TIP:

The projects below were awarded 2018 Transportation Alternatives Grants. Note that all TA funding for FY18 and FY19 is reserved for environmental mitigation projects relating to stormwater and highways, including eligible salt and sand shed projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY18-12</td>
<td>OT039</td>
<td>Implementation of Stormwater Best Management Practices in Moorings Stream Watershed, Colchester</td>
<td>$295,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18-13</td>
<td>OT040</td>
<td>Stormwater System Retrofit with Infiltration Systems and Stabilized Outfalls for Three Cul-De-Sacs, Essex</td>
<td>$271,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18-14</td>
<td>OT041</td>
<td>Vacuum Flusher/ Pipeline Truck, Essex Junction</td>
<td>$283,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18-15</td>
<td>OT042</td>
<td>Vactor Truck, Milton</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18-16</td>
<td>OT043</td>
<td>Sub-surface Stormwater Infiltration and Detention System Construction, South Burlington</td>
<td>$242,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18-17</td>
<td>OT044</td>
<td>Expansion of Kennedy Drive Stormwater Pond, South Burlington</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18-18</td>
<td>OT045</td>
<td>Allen Brook Watershed Culverts Scoping Study, Williston</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

For more information, contact: Christine Forde
cforde@ccrpcvt.org or 846-4490 ext. *13
1. Call to order; changes to the agenda. The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by the Chair, Chris Roy. There were no changes to the agenda.

2. Public Comment Period for items NOT on the agenda. There were no members of the public present.

3. Action on Consent Agenda: There was one minor amendment to the FY18 TIP to add federal funds awarded to Essex for road erosion inventory. Also listed in the memo were FY19 Vermont Better Roads grants with state funding only. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA, SECONDED BY JOHN ZICCONI. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. Approve Minutes of February 21, 2018 Board Meeting. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CHRIS SHAW, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 21, 2018. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. Public Hearing on 2018 Milton Town Plan Approval and Certification of the Planning Process. The public hearing was opened at 6:02 p.m. Regina noted that Milton is asking for approval of their 2018 Town Plan. The PAC has reviewed it and is recommending that the board approve it. The Milton selectboard adopted it on February 5, 2018. This is a fairly comprehensive update. When asked if towns make changes we recommend, Regina said CCRPC is notified a couple of years ahead of plan expiration and we make suggestions of things to include, which most municipalities do. When the PAC reviewed this plan, they made suggestions for things not required to be in this update, but to
consider for the next update. Jeff Carr suggested that we perhaps approve a plan provisionally if municipalities do not include our suggestions. Regina noted that the PAC will be looking at changes to our review process once the ECOS Plan is adopted, since municipal plans are now on an 8-year update schedule. JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JEFF CARR, TO APPROVE THE 2018 MILTON COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND CONFIRM THE TOWN OF MILTON’S PLANNING PROCESS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ATTACHED RESOLUTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. (Tony Micklus wanted to abstain since he helped write the plan, but members felt he should vote for it.)

6. CHARLOTTE TOWN PLAN APPROVAL AND CERTIFICATION OF THE PLANNING PROCESS. Regina noted that the PAC is recommending approval. The plan was approved on Town Meeting Day – March 6, 2018. JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO APPROVE THE 2018 CHARLOTTE TOWN PLAN AND APPROVE THE TOWN OF CHARLOTTE’S PLANNING PROCESS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ATTACHED RESOLUTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

7. Review changes to Draft ECOS plan and warn public hearing #2 for May. Regina noted that last month we held the first public hearing and received comments which we responded to. We are hopeful that we can take action to warn the 2nd public hearing for our May 16th meeting and adopt the plan at the Annual Meeting in June. If substantial changes are made to this draft at the second public hearing, we would need to hold a 3rd public hearing. We received about 100 comments from approximately 30 individuals/agencies/organizations/municipalities including VTrans, Vermont Dept. of Housing and Community Development, Vermont ANR, VT Gas, Colchester and Winooski. The Energy Sub-committee, Transportation Advisory Committee, Long Range Planning Committee and Executive Committee have reviewed these comments. Regina then reviewed a summary of comments addressed:

Metropolitan Transportation Plan (Supplement 5):
- Adjustment of the implementation schedule of some short-term transportation projects to be more realistic given potential project development challenges
- Incorporate by reference the Active Transportation Plan, Intelligent Transportation Systems Plan, and the All-Hazards Mitigation Plan
- Editorial and clarification edits suggested by VTrans

Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (Supplement 4):
- Various editorial/clarification edits
- Identified increased regionalization as an economic strength
- Clarification on how water quality is described in the CEDS

Energy (Supplement 6 & throughout):
- Various correction/clarification edits to text and data analysis
- ONLY added renewable natural gas in this statement to the key issues section “The economic viability of renewable natural gas, its impacts on climate change, and its classification as a “renewable” resource should be analyzed in future updates to this plan.”

Other Sections:
- Add references to the introduction to the health strategy
- Clarification edits to the Top Ten Actions
- Additions/Clarifications to the Forest Integrity sections
- Incorporate by reference the All-Hazards Mitigation Plan
- Update from Chittenden Solid Waste District on their programs
- Additions to the ECOS online map
Additional edits include:

- Replaced the TMDL with phosphorus pollution as the threat in the CEDS
- Cell tower data on the utility map
- Adding links to the online Scorecard to Supplement 2
- Correcting 3-phase power on the energy maps
- Minor formatting corrections

There was a brief discussion of what these changes entailed. Regina then gave a summary of comments NOT addressed:

- Request to shift off of fossil fuels completely within this Plan, particularly in relation to the transportation section
- The TAC and LRPC looked at these and think we are as far as we want to go right now and since we review the plan every five years, it'll be addressed in future versions.
- Request from Vermont Gas to accommodate natural gas as a bridge fuel, and a shift to renewable natural gas as a method for meeting the state’s energy goals
- Some folks are just not comfortable with this.

Board members complimented staff on the ECOS Annual Report and recommend that we widely distribute it to all of our municipalities/partners. CHRIS SHAW MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JOHN ZICCONI, TO ACCEPT THIS DRAFT WITH THE EDITS DISCUSSED TONIGHT AS THE SECOND PUBLIC HEARING DRAFT, AND WARN THE SECOND PUBLIC HEARING FOR MAY 16, 2018. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

8. SFY2020 Transportation Project Prioritization and Town Highway Bridge Pre-Candidate Prioritization. Christine explained why we do this. Each year the Vermont Legislature requires that projects in the Transportation Capital Program be prioritized. Specifically, they directed VTrans to develop a numerical grading system to assign a priority ranking to all paving, roadway, safety and traffic operations, state bridge, interstate bridge, and town highway bridge projects. A committee has been working to revamp VTrans’ Project Selection & Prioritization Processes (VSP2) for several reasons: The existing process is about ten years old; feedback from RPCs that they don’t feel their input is meaningful; evaluation criteria needed to be reviewed/revised, and VTrans is moving towards holistic corridor management. So next year when we’re asked to prioritize our projects, there should be a new process. This year we will use the process we have been using. The methodology is a collaborative effort between VTrans and RPCs. Asset management-based factors are scored by VTrans and functional importance of the facility economically and socially are scored by RPCs. Each RPC has developed its own methodology which is directed by the legislature to consider:

a. Impact of the project on congestion and mobility
b. Availability, accessibility and usability of alternative routes.

c. Importance of the facility in the local, regional or state economy.
d. Importance of the facility in the social and cultural life.
e. Conformance to local and regional plans.
f. Local support for the project.

Christine then reviewed the list of projects from the Capital Program that were reviewed. The Capital Program is the state budget for projects. Our TIP is the planning budget for the next four years. She then described the sections of the Capital Program, which include Front of the Book (preliminary plan development completed, expected to have construction spending during the
bodely year and/or the following three years); Development and Evaluation (Preliminary plans within 12-24 months, preliminary engineering and/or right-of-way spending expected in the budget year); and Candidate List (scoping likely not initiated, no significant spending expected during the budget year, construction year unknown.) Christine then described VTrans Program Categories; an overview of the methodology; CCRPC scoring categories, and the scoring, as well as types of projects that score highly using this methodology. Christine reviews each project and sends the list to the TAC members to review the projects in their municipalities to see if they agree. Then the list is presented at a TAC meeting for action. We are asking the board to approve the prioritization. Kurt Johnson noted that he doesn’t believe Underhill’s bridge on Green Street should be #5 on the Town Highway Bridge Pre-Candidate List. It serves only one home and he’d recommend it be put lower on the list, especially if we can only put ten bridges on it. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE 2020 PROJECT RANKINGS, WITH THE CHANGE FROM UNDERHILL, AND SUBMIT THEM TO VTRANS. MIKE O’BRIEN SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

9. Vermont Climate Pledge Coalition. Regina noted that Chris Shaw brought this to our attention to include in the ECOS plan update. The LRPC discussed CCRPC’s participation in this and felt that it didn’t belong in the plan, and that the Board should discuss whether or not to join. There was a brief discussion about whether this should go to the Energy Sub-Committee recommended by the Executive Committee, since they had not planned to meet again. Chris Shaw said this pledge came from his town’s energy committee which is trying to work on energy efficiency town by town in response to the U.S. pulling out of the Paris Agreement. If members read the memo we’re just asking CCRPC to sign onto the pledge. This would support what we already have in our energy plan. The other piece is that it would look for 26-28% reduction in greenhouse gases by 2025. Lengthy discussion continued. Chris Roy noted that the question the Executive Committee had was if it was the role of the CCRPC, because as a group we don’t have the means to reach those goals. How do you see the RPC’s role? Chris Shaw suggested we should take the lead for our smaller communities and get them moving in that direction and give them a sense of urgency. We heard David Blittersdorf comments about the future if we don’t take action. Perhaps the other communities haven’t had a chance to join yet. South Burlington’s committee is trying to make housing much more energy efficient, but they haven’t got a handle on transportation yet. Lengthy discussion continued. Andrea Morgante said transportation is our biggest job and we can support our municipalities in trying to look at solutions to support public transit, carpooling, etc. That’s the purpose of the new project in Hinesburg to determine how to increase ridership on the transit route they already have. CCRPC has a responsibility to help fund these projects by including them in the UPWP and perhaps not widening I-89 which will just keep people in their cars. Chris Roy said we don’t have to have a decision tonight, so we will ask the Energy Sub-committee to review this and make a recommendation to the board.

10. CCRPC Comment Letter on MS4 Draft Permit. Dan Albrecht reviewed his memo regarding the MS4 comment letter. He briefly described the purpose of the permit (described in the memo) and the talking points developed by the MS4 sub-committee. If the board approves, he will send the letter to the DEC Stormwater Program tomorrow. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION THAT THE BOARD APPROVE THE COMMENT LETTER AND SUBMIT IT TO THE DEC. ANDY MONTROLL SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED.

11. Chair/Executive Director’s Update. Charlie was stuck in D.C., so Regina made his report:
a. **Clean Water.** We’ve been following S.260 which is trying to figure out long-term funding for clean water. We’ve provided some comments on this. VNRC has asked Charlie to write a letter of support.

b. **ECOS Annual Report.** Staff distributed the Annual Report. Our ECOS partners are listed on the front.

c. **Regional Dispatch.** Six of seven communities have voted to join the Union Municipal District. They will begin to move forward and we’re not sure how much involvement CCRPC will have in the process.

d. **Legislative Update.** The money for RPC’s to do municipal level energy plans is in the House budget, so we’re hopeful we’ll receive funding.

e. **Burlington’s Let’s Talk Program.** Regina noted that last night she participated with Champlain Housing to talk about housing issues. It was well attended.

f. **Greenride bikeshare kickoff.** Bryan Davis is excited to announce that he has been working with a local team (CATMA, UVM, Champlain College) to plan and launch a public, regional bikeshare system. Phase 1, to officially launch April 18, will feature 105 7-speed bikes and 17 stations located in Burlington, South Burlington and Winooski. CATMA has contracted with Gotcha Bikes as the vendor. Initial funding is being provided by UVM, Champlain College, Ben & Jerry’s, Seventh Generation, the three municipalities and others. They are finalizing a pricing schedule to discourage using these bikes for long-term rides and will encourage visitors to rent bikes from local bike shops. A local bike shop will be responsible for moving the bikes around and maintenance.

12. **Committee/Liaison Activities/Reports.** Draft minutes for various committees are in the packet.

13. **Members’ Items:**
   a. Chris Shaw wants to be sure our plan includes completing regional bike routes so there are no dead ends that currently exist. He wants to be sure we incentivize and make sure we have connections prioritized to be sure they’re done. Eleni will make sure this is addressed in the plan. John Zicconi feels we might be better served to make local connections (such as access to town centers) before the regional connections.

   b. Chris Shaw understood that the Town of Hinesburg is looking at the cost of open land vs. developed land and he feels this is timely for all. Does developed space pay for itself? Regina said there are some studies that have been done over time. We have looked at this and it’s very difficult to come up with. It’s not easy to answer because it all depends on the town and specific services and the infrastructure. Andrea said it would be helpful for RPC to emphasize to town planning commissions when they talk about development that they know that the infrastructure capacity and maintenance is related. It would help the town weigh the pros and cons. Lengthy discussion continued. Andrea suggested we collect some hard data on this to help our communities make these decisions. It may be difficult, but rather than rely on intuitive reasoning, we can look at the rural areas in other states to help make decisions. Don Meals said another question is “How do communities use open space?” Burlington has been willing to fund acquisition of open space.

14. **Adjournment.** DON MEALS MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CHRIS SHAW TO ADJOURN AT 7:32 P.M. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC)
Resolution
Milton's 2018 Comprehensive Plan & Planning Process

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CHRITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

[Signature]
Christopher D. Roy, Chair
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC)
Resolution
2018 Charlotte Town Plan & Planning Process

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

Christopher D. Roy, Chair
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission  
April 18, 2018  
Agenda Item 6: Action Item  

FY19 Unified Planning Work Program & Budget Public Hearing  

Issues: Each year the CCRPC undertakes the development and implementation of a Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). The UPWP serves as the annual work plan for local and regional transportation projects and other planning activities in Chittenden County. The Board of Directors of the CCRPC has established a Committee process for the development of the UPWP. The Committee members appointed by the Chair consists of the following members:  

**Board:** Michael O’Brien, Winooski (Chair), John Zicconi, Shelburne  
Mike Bissonette, Hinesburg, Jeff Bartley, Colchester, Bard Hill, Richmond  

**PAC:** Jessica Draper, Richmond, Ken Belliveau, Williston  

**TAC:** Justin Rabidoux, South Burlington, Barbara Elliott, Huntington  

**VTrans:** Amy Bell  

**FHWA:** Chris Jolly, ex-officio  

**GMT:** Jon Moore, ex-officio  

The FY19 UPWP Committee meetings were held on the following dates: January 25th, February 22nd and March 22nd.  

UPWP Committee Recommendation:  
On March 22nd, the UPWP Committee made a recommendation to advance the FY19 UPWP to the Executive Committee and Board and ask the TAC to discuss the Colchester Inspection and Inventory of its Existing Stormwater System for consideration during the FY19 mid-year UPWP adjustment.  

TAC Recommendation:  
On April 3rd, the TAC made a recommendation to advance the FY19 UPWP to the Executive Committee and Board with the addition of the Colchester Inspection and Inventory of its Existing Stormwater System.  

Executive Committee Recommendation:  
On April 4th, the Executive Committee made a recommendation to concur with the TAC and move the FY19 UPWP forward to the Board with the addition of the Colchester Inspection and Inventory of its Existing Stormwater System as voted at the TAC. The EC also recommended to advance the FY19 budget to the Board as well.  

Staff Recommendation:  
Staff is asking the board to vote to warn the public hearing on the draft FY2019 UPWP for May 16th at 6 pm.  

For more information contact:  
Charlie Baker, cbaker@ccrpcvt.org or 846-4490 ext. 23 OR  
Marshall Distel, mdistel@ccrpcvt.org or 846-4490 ext. 26
CCRPC Board  
April 18, 2018  
Item 7: Preliminary Housing 2017 Data  

Background: Annually CCRPC works with municipal staff to count the number of housing units built to measure progress on ECOS Strategy #2 and the Building Homes Together goal of building 700 units each year by 2021. Tables 1 and 2 describe the number of housing units built and demolished in calendar 2017. The data is reported both by municipality, planning area, and by areas planned for growth. Together the suburban, metro, center, enterprise, and village planning areas are our ‘areas planned for growth’.  

Please keep in mind that CCRPC defines built as those units which received an approved certificate of occupancy (C/O). For those towns that do not issue C/Os, zoning permits serve as a substitute.  

Although not reported in the tables below, the University of Vermont demolished two dormitories (391 beds) and replaced them with a new dormitory (699 beds) creating a net gain of 308 beds for 2017.  

Staff Contact: Melanie Needle, Senior Planner  mneedle@ccrpcvt.org  

Table 1. 2017 Housing Development by Planning Area  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>New Residential Growth (housing units)</th>
<th>Percent of New Residential Growth</th>
<th>Demolitions</th>
<th>Net Residential Growth (new growth - demolitions)</th>
<th>Percent Net Residential Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Center</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas Planned for Growth</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 2. 2017 Housing Development by Town

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOWN</th>
<th>Accessory Unit</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>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Junction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinesburg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jericho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelburne</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Burlington</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-75</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underhill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westford</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williston</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winooski</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>408</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>165</strong></td>
<td><strong>-97</strong></td>
<td><strong>490</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UPWP Committee Meeting 3

March 22, 2018

Attendees:
Mike O’Brien, Committee Chair
Amy Bell, VTrans
Barbara Elliot, TAC
Ken Belliveau, PAC
Jeff Bartley, Board
Jessica Draper, PAC
John Zicconi, Board
Michael Bissonnette, Board

Staff:
Justin Rabidoux, TAC
Charlie Baker
Regina Mahony
Eleni Churchill
Forest Cohen
Marshall Distel
Bernie Ferenc

Chris Jolly, FHWA

Committee Chair Mike O’Brien opened the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

Introductions were made.

The minutes from meeting two were reviewed and approved with no changes. Barbara made the motion and Michael Bissonnette seconded.

The Committee reviewed updates to partner requests. Justin appreciates Local Motion cutting back their request, but expressed that the hourly cost for VEIC staff seems to be much more expensive than our other partner organizations. Eleni explained that the cost is in line with other consultants and that we’re provided with senior professionals that have unique skills to help with energy, autonomous vehicles and planning for EVs. John felt that VEIC more closely resembles a traditional consultant than a partner organization. The Committee decided to keep the request in the FY19 UPWP, but would like staff to discuss with VEIC their role as a partner organization for future requests.

The Committee then reviewed the Bike Share scope of work and discussed when the work would begin.

Marshall provided details related to CATMA’s overall budget.

Charlie then started to go through the draft FY19 UPWP and explained that CCRPC is projected to have enough PL funds to cover all the new PL-eligible requests for FY19.

Charlie and Regina discussed the Land Value/Public Infrastructure project and how South Burlington has committed $20,000, but around $80,000 from other municipalities would have to be raised for this project to move forward. Ken reiterated that the timing of this project doesn’t make sense for this year since municipal budgets have already been formed. Charlie explained that this project should remain in the UPWP so that we can continue to develop the scope and municipal budget requests more thoroughly for FY20.

Chris mentioned that Local Motion looks to be billing indirect costs as direct administrative costs. Charlie explained that it isn’t unusual to have it billed as a separate direct item.

John would like to see the Way to Go! data that show whether employers are continuing to utilize alternative transportation options after the annual competition.

Amy would like to highlight in the UPWP that the VT116/Charlotte Rd Intersection Improvement Project is within Hinesburg.

Charlie explained how water quality projects are funded through the 3.2.3 task after John asked...
Charlie described how the request for the Inspection & Inventory of the Existing Stormwater System in Colchester is unusual compared to our other typical requests. Mike O’Brien expressed his concern about the precedence of this project. Bernie explained how the local match could be increased. Justin conveyed that this seems more like a maintenance request rather than a project that should be funded through the UPWP. Chris explained that the data collection and inventory work for planning purposes would be a PL-eligible request. Ken wondered whether this sort of project should be vetted through the TAC. Ultimately, the Committee decided not to include this project within the FY19 UPWP. Although, there will be the opportunity to reevaluate this for the mid-year adjustment after more discussions are held. Two basic ideas were discussed: either doing this with other municipalities to perhaps lower the per unit cost, or to conduct it as a pilot so that findings could be shared with other municipalities. Essentially, the committee would like to see this be more regional in nature. The committee is asking that the TAC members work on this and make a recommendation for consideration at the mid-year adjustment.

Justin made the motion to advance the FY19 UPWP to the Executive Committee and Board with the recommended modifications that were discussed within the meeting. Ken seconded the motion. All in favor.

Amy made motion to adjourn and Barbara seconded. All in favor.

The meeting adjourned at 7:05.
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CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

DATE: Wednesday, March 28, 2018
TIME: 5:45 p.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices; 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404
PRESENT: Brian Bigelow, Secretary-Treasurer  Michael O’Brien, Vice-Chair
Jeff Carr
Staff: Charlie Baker, Executive Director  Forest Cohen, Senior Business Manager

The meeting was called to order at 5:45 p.m. by the Finance Committee Chair, Brian Bigelow.

1. Approve February 21, 2018 Finance Committee Minutes. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O’BRIEN, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 21, 2018. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

   a. Balance Sheet. Cash in checking (operating) account is $85,655; Savings (match) is $166,612; money market/CDs (reserve) is $216,799. Current assets over liabilities is $690,066. Total available for match is $136,681. Income Statement: ACCD staff time funds are 63% expended through 58% of the budget year. The transportation staff billing line is catching up to the budget at almost 56% expended. Our time and resources are increasing in the natural resources lines because of the new water quality grants. Emergency management and health programs are tracking close to budget. Salaries and benefits expenses are slightly under budget, as are overall expenses. Our technology costs such as equipment and software and telephone/internet continue to increase slightly. Our net income through January is ($52,966). We did reduce the deficit by $5,600 in January and expect to end the year better than the projected deficit of ($98,137).
   b. Cash Flow through February 2018. Forest noted that we ahead of projections through February. The disbursement of CCOA funds occurred in January which accounts for most of the change in cash balance from the end of December to the end of January. Based on this cash statement it appears that we won’t have to reduce our reserve balance through the fiscal year.

3. Review the Draft FY19 Budget. Forest noted that this budget is the worst-case scenario using a 60% indirect rate, which predicts a $180,345 deficit for FY19. He submitted our indirect rate proposal to VTrans on Monday asking for a 68% rate, which would reduce the deficit by $80,000. We have to wait for a decision from the chief of audit, who makes the indirect cost rate determination. Members briefly discussed wanting to get out of the huge swings from year to year. Jeff Carr would prefer to see “excess revenue over expenses” rather than income. He suggested changing references of “income” to “revenue”. When asked what our break even indirect rate is, Charlie said around 70%, which could fluctuate 1 or 2% each year, but not the 10% here. Our finances are set up to get our costs reimbursed. A brief discussion ensued about reviewing the indirect rate mid-year if we see we’re over collecting. Members agree we would like to see our rate stay within 1-2% each year; and staff will continue to tweak it. The Finance Committee will review the budget again at a Joint Executive/Finance Committee meeting on May 2nd. We should have the indirect rate approved by VTrans and an updated budget.

4. Adjourn: JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O’BRIEN, TO ADJOURN AT 6:15 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted, Bernadette Ferenc
Peter Keating called the meeting to order at 9:00AM and asked for a round of introductions.

1. Consent Agenda
After a brief update from staff, JUSTIN RABIDOUX MOVED TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA. BARBARA ELLIOT SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

2. Approval of Minutes
BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BRUCE HOAR TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 9, 2018 TAC MINUTES. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. Public Comments
There were none.

4. FY19 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) (Information Item)
Marshall Distel provided UPWP development process updates. General discussion ensued regarding the specific Colchester project that was initially denied. Bryan Osborne gave further background and clarification on the intent of this project. Bryan Osborne asked the TAC to put this project back into the draft FY19 UPWP. Further discussion ensued. Justin Rabidoux spoke on behalf of the UPWP subcommittee as to why they initially denied it. Bryan expressed concern of kicking the can down the road in delaying this project to the mid-year adjustment – needing to freeze local funds. Bryan discussed how subsequent phases of this project will be completely covered by local funds, and that this is a multi-year project. He added that Colchester will make a point to share the results and lessons learned from this process so it has a regional benefit. Justin spoke to justify his reasoning on why he did not move to initially accept the project. He spoke about the fact that there is more to the UPWP than eligibility and there was a bit of shock at the cost of this project. He talked more on if Colchester could complete this in a scaled down or different way, or if at the mid-year adjustment, we could have more information to make
this decision to include it then. Justin reiterated that process wise, the decision on the inclusion of this project was not short shifted. Charlie Baker spoke on UPWP criteria and overall UPWP budget. Bryan clarified technical questions about the project. Bruce Hoar stated that he didn’t want to see the UPWP to become more onerous with a more demanding application. Bruce thought the project should have been funded initially. The committee discussed potential alternatives to how this project could be achieved. Dean Pierce asked if we are willing to re-look at this project, should we be doing the same for the other unfunded project. Chris Jolly spoke about FHWA eligibility. Amy Bell said that they wanted to see that this project had some immediate benefit to the region and not just Colchester. Discussion continued regarding UPWP application criteria as it pertains to this project, and future ones. After discussion, BARBARA ELLIOT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BRUCE HOAR, THAT THE TAC RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD INCLUDE THE COLCHESTER INSPECTION AND INVENTORY OF ITS EXISTING STORMWATER SYSTEM PROJECT IN THE UPWP. Further discussion ensued. VOTE: MOTION CARRIED WITH ABSTENTIONS FROM AMY BELL, JASON VAN DREISCHE AND DEAN PIERCE. JUSTIN RABIDOUX VOTED NO.

5. Real Time Travel Data Using Bluetooth (Information item)
Sai Sarepalli presented and answered questions. Some discussion ensued regarding the use of this data, and how this project will be used in the future.

6. Systemic Local Roads Safety (SLRS) Program
Sai Sarepalli presented and answered questions.

7. Bike Share Update
Bryan Davis gave a brief update on the Bike Share system rollout and answered questions.

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

The meeting adjourned at 10:40 a.m.

Respectfully submitted, Chris Dubin
I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Annie Costandi.

2. Review and action on draft minutes of March 7, 2018

After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, Brian Bigelow made a motion, seconded by James Sherrard to approve the minutes with corrections as follows: Correct arrival time for Claire Forbes to 10:35 a.m. corrected the time she arrived. MOTION PASSED with Polly Harris abstaining.

3. Quick overview of CCRPC Road Erosion Inventory on-line Database (Chris Dubin, CCRPC)

Mr. Dubin provided a presentation of the county-wide MRGP data in ArcGIS’s Insights tool and asked for feedback on how the data was presented. No action by the Committee.

4. Update on Winooski TBP process: How Best to Incorporate Municipal and Regional Priorities

Albrecht reviewed a memo he had recently submitted to Karen Bates of DEC with his initial comments on incorporating the region’s priorities in the Winooski TBP. The memo indicates that the clear priorities for the MS4s are the flow restoration plans (FRP) and phosphorus control plans. The memo also includes some specific comments received from a few of the MS4s. The non-MS4 towns’ priorities are the MRGP, addressing runoff from private roads and driveways, and how to enable appropriate investment/development in Village areas while protecting water quality. The memo also includes priorities from the Stormwater Master Plans that have been done. Regarding regional priorities, the memo includes the same general comments that we submitted for the Lamoille TBP (best phosphorus reduction/cost, and co-benefits). Albrecht further explained that we still don’t have a good way to interact with the larger project database; or the ERP grant applications.

He noted that DEC has indicated there will be an initial “pre-draft” out in mid-April 2018. Similarly, to the Lamoille TBP, the implementation table may include categories of actions rather than actual projects. Charlie Baker added that we have still been pushing DEC to refine the prioritization system to ensure we are funding the right projects, rather than simply funding what is ready. Ethan Swift at DEC is working on this, and we are hoping for a better system by this Fall. Christy Witters added that there does need to be some more thought about where we should prioritize. Currently the Plans are not very specific. Charlie Baker stated that this will be a slow evolution in DEC from a grant awarding agency to a capital planning agency.

Dan asked the MS4s if they have a five-year plan of what projects they want to get done from their FRPs and several indicated that yes, they do. Dan suggested that perhaps those could be prioritized and added to the Plan.
5. Legislative Update (Charlie Baker, CCRPC)

S. 260 – Charlie Baker explained that both James testified at the House, and Charlie presented what we voted on at the CCRPC Board last January. Take a look at what came out of the Senate – looks like they are asking for another Committee study to figure out how to fund long-term water quality protections by Nov. 15th of 2018 including draft legislation. James Sherrard heard that it was stalled and may not go anywhere this year. He added that we’ve missed the EPA milestone to finalize a plan for long-term funding. We don’t yet know how EPA will respond to that yet. Charlie Baker heard that the $15 million that has been used is going to run out as it is needed for other capital projects in the state. VLCT will not support any legislation that will open municipalities to suit. Sounds like anyone with a grievance can take suit against the municipality (or a farmer or other landowner) for not following the permit. This already exists, but this may allow a person to not have to prove harm in order to file suit. Lastly, he and the other RPCS also trying to ask for pre-capital money to facilitate project development, not sure if they’ll have any luck with this. And a good chunk of funding is being talked about for Lake Carmi.

James asked if anyone has any comments on: H. 576 – 3 acre rule and ½ acre impervious. It was passed by the House and is now in the Senate. It doesn’t sound like there is any additional funding for DEC to do this additional work. The permit fee revenue will go to the general fund.

Tom DiPetro asked Christy Witters if DEC has any schedule for the release of the 3 acre permit. Christy Witters indicated that she is not aware.

6. Items for Tuesday, May 1st meeting

Winooski Tactical Basin Plan Draft?

Tom DiPetro asked if Kevin could come in to discuss how things are going under the new Stormwater Manual. Particularly discussion on installations under the new Stormwater Manual – have we been seeing more Tier 1 & 2 projects like intended? Also general thoughts or questions about how it is being interpreted.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:47 a.m.

Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony & Dan Albrecht
1. Call to Order: Chelsea Mandigo called the meeting to order at 12:07 p.m.

2. Changes to the Agenda – The Chair received an email update from Holly Kreiner at WNRC which she’ll provide after the discussion of the survey results. Annie Costandi asked for a discussion of the use of consultants to write stormwater management plans and the Chair added this item.

3. Review and action on draft minutes of March 7, 2018
   After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, Tom DiPietro made a motion, seconded by James Sherrard to approve the minutes. Correction to Line 41 to read MCM#1 instead of #21. MOTION PASSED. Polly Harris abstained.

4. Results of 2018 Stormwater Awareness Survey, Dr. Rich Clark, Castleton University
   Dr. Clark recapped the results of the random sample survey (see draft report and a copy of his presentation posted at the Subcommittee page). Some key insights comparing the 2018 results with the 2013 results:
   - A higher percentage in comparison thought that Lake Champlain and local waterway were more polluted than 10 years ago;
   - A higher percentage in comparison thought that run-off from farms has a great impact on water quality;
   - A lower percentage in comparison used commercial fertilizers on their lawn.
   - For all 4 questions related to dog waste disposal (in neighborhood, in a park, in the winter, in your yard), there was an increase in the percentage of respondents reporting they had disposed of the waste in the trash compared to 2013.
   - Only 15% of respondents indicated they would be willing to be charged $0 per month to deal with stormwater problems compared to 30% in 2013.
   - Albrecht noted some interesting points from the same survey but with respondents solicited via Front Porch Forum and Facebook posts and encouraged via a $300 gift card raffle. More than 1,000 responses were received in about 10 days. A significant portion of the responses were from women.
   - Albrecht concluded the discussion noting that the final report would be wrapped this month. He and Dr. Clark will confer on the cost of potential additional analysis (such as comparing responses from each of the 9 MS4 towns with the 8 others.).
5. Stream Team Update

Chelsea Mandigo read the following information provided by WNRCD via email.

Mailchimp newsletter and press release for Trees for Streams planting event will go out tomorrow (4/4). The event will take place on 5/4. I will send google event invitation to MS4s. It would be a good photo opp and fun day if some of you wanted to come out.

I contacted Burlington schools and scouts groups to find student volunteer group to clean Coast Guard Station rain garden for Day in the Dirt event on 4/28. Waiting to hear back.

Will table at Kids Day for Burlington outreach event on 5/5

We have been asked by DEC Staff to drop TSS from our sampling plan this year due to financial strain and limited staff for the LaRosa program. If you are able, please decide with the group today whether or not to replace TSS with Turb meters (perhaps just a few units for stormwater impaired streams only?) or just to drop that parameter entirely. I will need to draft and submit a QAPP before the next meeting.

After a brief discussion, committee members indicated they were okay with WNRCD purchasing Turbidity Meters. They also encouraged WNRC to move up the T-shirt purchase so they are ready for distribution at the May 4th tree planting event at Muddy Brook.

6. Update on planned spring-summer advertising

Dan Albrecht recapped the two slides sent over by Dave Barron, one detailing the planned ad buy and the other showing some of the planned creative. Ads would run from April 23rd thru June 11. Chelsea Mandigo noted that Dave is finalizing the last of the creative including a website revamp in the next few days including a small ad for the Stream Team. On a recommendation from Tom DiPietro, the Chair would relay to Dave to add some advertising on ESPN radio to counteract all the Scotts fertilizer ads running right now. He also asked and the Committee concurred that in the fall we should reevaluate the various placements such as which radio stations we use.

7. Updates

Christy Witters indicated that she is putting together the DEC’s preliminary response to the various comments received on the draft MS4 permit. Members discussed having a separate meeting of MS4s to focus on the issue of P-reduction targets and credits.

Dan intends to work on a press release regarding the survey results and will circulate it via email for approval.

The Green Infrastructure roundtable is looking for “success stories” to publicize. Dan will circulate the request via email.

It was noted that there is a UVM student research conference on April 19th and it includes a GSI session.

8. Use of consultants to draft stormwater management plans

Annie Costandi asked if anyone was using consultants to write stormwater management plans. Jennifer indicated that Stone Enviromental had written one for the State’s TS4 permit while it was noted that Krebs & Lansing wrote one for UVM. Chris Robinson suggested we try to put together a standardized RFP for production of a Phosphorus Control Plan. Members agreed but felt it best to wait until after the permit was finalized.

9. Items for Tuesday, May 1st meeting

MS4 permit

10. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 1:18 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Dan Albrecht
The meeting was called to order at 5:45 p.m. by the chair, Chris Roy.

1. Changes to the Agenda; Members’ Items. Since we have a guest, Bryan Osborne from Colchester, we will take up item 4 now.

4. Review Draft FY19 UPWP and Budget. Charlie noted that as in the past couple of years we have color coded the new projects in the draft: green for transportation projects; blue for other planning projects; pink indicate projects that might be deleted as they could be completed before June 30th; yellow cells indicate staff review is needed. This year we did not get more requests than funding. Other than making a recommendation to the board, members need to review the Colchester Inspection & Inventory of its Existing Stormwater System project. It is an eligible project for PL funds and Colchester is asking for $160,000. The UPWP committee opted not to include it at this time. At the TAC meeting yesterday, it came up and there was further discussion and they recommended including the Colchester project in the draft UPWP. Colchester agreed to include a deliverable that they will share the information with other towns after its completed. Mike O’Brien said at the UPWP committee the angst was that it was more maintenance that planning. The UPWP committee agreed to leave it off the draft until we got more information when we could add it in at mid-year. The TAC is now recommending its inclusion. Barbara Elliott said the TAC discussed that the UPWP committee should have had Bryan come in and speak to this project. She doesn’t think the UPWP committee had all the information, so she made the TAC motion to put this back into the draft UPWP. Another concern had been that this was a significant amount of money. She did some research today and said although this is a large project, if you look over the past few years some communities have multiple projects vs. one that equal those dollars. She feels we should add this because it is eligible and the name change helps clarify the project. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JOHN ZICCONI, THAT THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONCUR WITH THE T.A.C. AND MOVE THIS FORWARD TO THE BOARD WITH THE ADDITION OF THE COLCHESTER INSPECTION AND INVENTORY OF EXISTING STORMWATER SYSTEM PROJECT AS VOTED AT THE T.A.C.

Bryan Osborne said they would always be willing to share their findings with others on any project. John Zicconi said a part that hasn’t been mentioned was not that a town would receive this amount of money. There was some thought that it is a maintenance project vs. planning. Those on the UPWP committee who understand maintenance and public works suggested that other towns will
be wanting to do very similar types of expensive projects. That’s when the committee decided to take this to the TAC as that’s where the public works experts are. He said the UPWP committee felt if it was okay with the TAC, they’d be okay with it, especially since we have the money. Mike O’Brien agreed and said the biggest point was the precedence setting issue. Is this maintenance vs. planning, which is why they put it to the TAC. Discussion continued. Barbara Elliott said it was clarified at the TAC that Phase 1 is an inventory project and Phase 2 would be maintenance, which the town would pay for. If every other town comes in and says this same inventory offers the biggest bang for the buck, we should include it if it is the town’s priority. Bryan Osborne said the underlying issue is not whether it’s maintenance or not, but whether it’s eligible for PL funds. Chris Roy said one thing we have to talk about are the once hard lines between transportation and stormwater, or maintenance and planning – going forward we’re finding these projects are interconnected and the lines are getting fuzzier. We need to have a good internal discussion about where we want the towns to focus their energies on in projects. Charlie said this was in the language in the guidelines sent to the towns last fall. Barbara said the discussion should include: do we have a funding cap on projects? Different matches? Types of projects we’ll fund. Andy Montroll feels the process worked in that the UPWP committee reviewed it and then it was moved to the TAC and they agreed it should be included. John Zicconi said he is still concerned with maintenance vs. planning and we’re still struggling with it and it’ll give us more time by the next UPWP cycle for us to review it as to how we should deal with it in the future. All of these questions still exist and when other towns look at this we can say we are in the process of analyzing it. Mike O’Brien asked if Bryan could describe it but in terms of the future we should have a subcommittee take up this issue sooner rather than later and not wait until the next UPWP cycle. Perhaps in the fall we could deal with this before the letters go out to the communities. Chris Roy asked why we think Phase 1 is a planning issue vs. maintenance. Bryan Osborne said they see it as the same as any inventory that CCRPC does to make planning program such as the recent assessment for the inventory for the MRGP permits, pavement conditions, and culvert assessments. They’re looking at inventories and conditions of their system. The difference is how the condition assessment is being done. They are not putting anything into the pipes or flushing them out. All they’re doing is taking a piece of camera equipment and putting it down a manhole to take close-up pictures of the conditions of the pipes, which gives a better perspective than having an engineer put his head down in the manhole. VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Draft FY19 Budget. Charlie noted that this is the first draft of the FY19 Budget. The Finance Committee reviewed it last week. The bottom line is that we are projecting a $181,000 deficit. As usual we started off conservatively and we’ll be working to get this number to a better place before the public hearing. The real issue is the indirect rate. Doing the strict math we used an indirect rate of 60%. We sent VTrans our request a couple of weeks ago where we’re asking for indirect rate of 68% to help mitigate the swings from year to year. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BRIAN BIGELOW, TO SEND THIS DRAFT BUDGET TO THE BOARD. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

2. Approval of Minutes of March 7, 2018 Executive Committee Meeting. ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O’BRIEN, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MARCH 7, 2018 AS WRITTEN. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. Act 250 & Sec. 248 Applications:
   a. Spear Meadows, Inc., South Burlington #4C1173-2. Regina said this is a project on Spear Street that has been on the books for a while. It has been approved by the town but is under appeal. The applicant has decided to go forward with Act 250 anyway. Staff feels the project is
consistent with the regional plan, Criterion 9(L) and there are no traffic issues. Members reviewed the site plan for the location on Spear Street. BRIAN BIGELOW MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO APPROVE THE LETTER TO THE D.E.C. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. Chair/Executive Director Report.
   a. Charlie gave a staff update that the Shelburne Selectboard voted to hire Lee Krohn as the interim town manager; and we’re negotiating what that will look like. Whether he will take a leave of absence for the summer and be hired by Shelburne or whether it will be a contract for services with Shelburne. John Zicconi feels it may be a long hiring process. Charlie said we’ve been trying to be helpful to our communities when they’ve lost staff such as zoning assistance in Underhill and Charlotte. Charlie said there are a lot of legal issues to work out.
   b. The airport is continuing to work on its Noise Compatibility Plan. Since we’ve been on this committee their staff has been trying to participate with our committees. We may have the airport come in September when they complete the Noise Compatibility Plan and also give us an update on the F-35’s. At the same time we told them about the I-89 study that we’re undertaking that they should be involved with. Soon they’ll begin their Master Plan update and they need to involve other communities & CCRPC to be sure the plan is compatible with regional and local plans.
   c. Legislature.
      i. Charlie reported that the long-range funding for water quality is still kicking around. The Senate will be sending this to committee and the House will be taking this up.
      ii. Charlie will be testifying on the Public Safety bill sharing our experience with the regional dispatch. When asked the status of regional dispatch, Charlie said we are getting close to the 30-day appeal period for the Town Meeting Day approvals. The new board will be meeting on April 18th. There is a lot of work to be done to get this off the ground. It appears that we will not need to provide administrative support as they will dole out various aspects to different members (i.e. financing & budget to one; HR to another, etc.)
      iii. John Zicconi mentioned H.644 which the bill for a study committee on the regionalization of the airport. Sen. Mazza has taken an interest and is trying to have it included in the Transportation Bill. It does speak to CCRPC involvement. Mike O’Brien noted that a couple of towns are interested in that. We don’t know where it’ll go.

6. Draft Agenda Review – April 18th board meeting. It was noted that both Chris Roy and Charlie will be out of town for this meeting. Mike O’Brien will chair the meeting. Members reviewed the agenda – Charlie noting that items 6, 7 and 8 were suggestions. South Burlington confirmed that the project manager is available to talk about the City Center project. Eleni noted that GMT may be ready to talk about changes in service (new item). Regina said the Housing Data should be available for 2017 and would be a very short presentation. The report includes number of completed units with Certificates of Occupancy issued. We’re also keeping track of demolitions. Mike O’Brien would be interested to know how many housing units have been proposed and permitted. He feels there are about 3,000 units always in the pipeline waiting to be built. Some communities track this and in others it’s difficult to get the information. Mike feels if we need 6,000 units over the next ten years and have 4,500 approved and permitted, it might be good to know. Lengthy discussion ensued. Charlie feels when we talk about those large numbers, people get scared and he hasn’t found it beneficial to include it. John noted that if we have
3,000 on the books but only 400 get built that tells us something. Discussion continued about having the right type of housing for the market.

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

8. **Executive Session.** JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BARBARA ELLIOTT, TO GO INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION AT 6:50 P.M. WITH CHARLIE PRESENT TO DISCUSS PERSONNEL MATTERS. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BARBARA ELLIOTT, TO COME OUT OF EXECUTIVE SESSION AT 7:15 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. **Adjournment.** BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JOHN ZICCONI, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:16 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc
April 6, 2018

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

RE: Spear Meadows, Inc.; South Burlington; Application #4C1173-2

Dear Ms. Lomonaco:

The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission’s Staff and Executive Committee have reviewed this Act 250 application for a project described as the demolition of an existing dwelling at 1302 Spear Street and construction of 47 dwelling units with related site improvements. The project is located on 1350 Spear Street in South Burlington, Vermont. The project was approved by the City of South Burlington on August 1, 2017. However, CCRPC understands that the approval was subsequently appealed to the Vermont Superior Court Environmental Division and that the case is ongoing. We offer the following comments:

The project is located within the Suburban 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 Suburban 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.
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). 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.

The project makes efficient use of land, energy, roads, utilities, and other supporting infrastructure. The project is located in an area with significant existing residential development, it is served by existing utilities and public transportation infrastructure, and development within the site will be compact. A portion of the parcel will be conserved as public open space, which will be maintained as a park. The development incorporates walking and biking infrastructure including a path along the eastern project boundary that is planned to eventually connect to the existing Swift Street path. There is also a roadway...
connection being made to Vale Dr which will eliminate a cul-de-sac and increase street connectivity. Therefore, the project does not contribute to strip development, and the requirements of Criterion 9(L) are met.

Regarding transportation, we concur with the overall findings of the Traffic Impact Assessment dated June 14, 2016 and its addendum dated March 23, 2018 conducted by Lamoureux & Dickinson Consulting Engineers, Inc.

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