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
budget 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.

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.

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.

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 believes if the goal is to reduce carbon emissions, regional connections should not automatically take priority over local connections (such as access to town centers) because local connections in many cases could engage more users.

   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