REGULAR MEETING & PUBLIC HEARINGS AGENDA  
Wednesday, May 16, 2018, 6:00 pm  
CCRPC Offices at 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202  
Winooski, VT  05404

CONSENT AGENDA:  None

DELIBERATIVE AGENDA

1. Call to Order; Changes to the Agenda
2. Public Comment Period on Items NOT on the Agenda
3. Action on Consent Agenda (MPO Business) - None
4. Approve Minutes of April 18, 2018 Meeting*  (Action; 2 min)
5. University of Vermont Presentation  (Information; 25 min)
6. ECOS Plan Update Public Hearing #2*  (Action: 10 min)
7. FY19 Draft UPWP & Budget Public Hearing (keep public hearing open) and Vote*  (Action: 15 min)
8. Approve Amendment to MS4 Agreement*  (Action: 5 min)
9. Guidelines & Standards for Reviewing Act 250 and Section 248 Applications Review*  (Discussion: 20 min)
10. Board Development Committee – report on FY19 Officers nominations*  (Information: 2 min.)
11. Chair/Executive Director’s Updates  (Information; 15 min)
    a. 2018 Brownfield Grant
    b. Regional Dispatch
    c. Clean Water
    d. Legislative Updates
12. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports  (Information; 2 min)
    a. Transportation Advisory Committee (draft minutes May 1, 2018)*
    b. Clean Water Advisory Committee (draft minutes May 1, 2018)*
    c. Executive Committee (draft minutes May 2, 2018)*
       i. Act 250/Sec 248 letters
    d. Brownfields Committee (Draft minutes May 2, 2018)*
    e. Energy Sub-Committee (Draft minutes May 7, 2018)*
    f. Board Development Committee (Draft minutest May 9, 2018)*
13. Member’s Items
14. Adjournment

*Attachment

The May 16th Chittenden County RPC meeting will air on Saturday, May 19, 2018 at 1:00 p.m. It will also be available online at:  
https://www.cctv.org/watch-tv/programs/chittenden-county-regional-planning-commission-77
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.

Upcoming Meetings - Unless otherwise noted, all meetings are held at our offices:

- Transportation Advisory Committee – Tuesday, June 5, 2018; 9:00 a.m.
- Clean Water Advisory Committee – Tuesday, June 5, 2018; 11:00 a.m.
- MS4 Subcommittee – Tuesday, June 5, 2018; 12:30 p.m.
- Executive Committee - Wednesday, June 6, 2018; 5:45 p.m.
- Planning Advisory Committee – Wednesday, May 9, 2018; 2:30 p.m.
- CCRPC Annual Meeting - Wednesday, June 20, 2018; 5:00 p.m. at ECHO

Tentative future Board agenda items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Agenda Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| June 20, 2018 – Joint Annual Meeting With GBIC @ ECHO | Election of Officers  
Warn FY19-22 TIP Public Hearing for July |
| July 18, 2018         | FY19-22 TIP Public Hearing and Adoption  
National Highway System Update – Action  
Vermont Climate Pledge - Action  
Guidelines and Standards for Reviewing Act 250 and Section 248 Applications  
Review - Action  
Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans - Discussion |
| NO AUGUST MEETING     |                                                                             |
| September 19, 2018    | greenride Bikeshare Update  
Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans Review – Action  
Transportation Survey Results – Discussion  
Transportation Performance Measures - Discussion |

NO AUGUST MEETING
CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
DRAFT

Date: Wednesday, April 18, 2018
Time: 6:00 p.m.
Place: CCRPC Offices; 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT 05404

Members:
10 Bolton, Sharon Murray
11 Buels Gore, Absent
12 Burlington, Andy Montroll
13 Charlotte, Jim Donovan
14 Colchester, Jeff Bartley
15 Essex, Jeff Carr
16 Essex Junction, Dan Kerin
17 Hinesburg, Andrea Morgante
18 Huntington, Barbara Elliott
19 Jericho, Catherine McMains
20 Milton, Tony Miklus
21 Richmond, Absent
22 St. George, Absent
23 Shelburne, John Zicconi
24 S. Burlington, Chris Shaw
25 Underhill, Brian Bigelow
26 Westford, vacant
27 Williston, Absent
28 Winooski, Mike O’Brien, Vice Chair
29 VTrans, Amy Bell
30 Socio/Econ/Housing, Justin Dextradeur
31 Conservation/Environment, Absent
32 Industrial/Business, Absent

Ex-Officio (non-voting):
35 Burlington Int’l Airport, Absent
36 GMT, Absent
37 FHWA, Absent
38 FTA, Absent
39 Railroad Industry, Absent

Others:
41 Diane Meyerhoff, Third Sector Assoc.
42 Charlie Giannoni, CCTV
43 Ilona Blanchard, South Burlington
44 Kevin Dorn, So. Burl. City Manager
45 Michael Bissonette, Hinesburg Alt.
46 Rob Fish, Burlington Alt.
47 Bryan Osborne, Town of Colchester
48

Staff:
50 Forest Cohen, Sr. Business Mgr.
52 Marshall Distel, Transportation Planner
53 Christine Forde, Sr. Transportation Planner
54 Regina Mahony, Planning Program Mgr.
55 Dan Albrecht, Senior Planner
1. Call to Order; Changes to the Agenda
The meeting was called to order at 6:00PM by the Vice-Chair, Mike O’Brien. There were two changes to the agenda: switch items 6 and 7; add an item, 4A.

2. Public Comment Period on Items NOT on the Agenda
Chris Shaw remembered Pat Nowak, former South Burlington City Council Chair, as an avid community volunteer for 23 years. Pat passed away recently.

3. Action on Consent Agenda (MPO Business)
The consent agenda includes minor TIP Amendments. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, DULY SECONDED BY JIM DONOVAN, TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. Approve Minutes of March 21, 2018 Board Meeting
DAN KERIN MADE A MOTION, DULY SECONDED BY CATHERINE MCMAINS, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MARCH 21, 2018 WITH CORRECTIONS. John Zicconi offered the following clarification on page 5, line 29: “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.” THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH ONE ABSTENTION BY JIM DONOVAN.

4A. Vermont Planning Association Citizen Planner of the Year Award
Mike announced that board member Andy Montroll has been honored as Citizen Planner of the Year by the Vermont Planners Association.

5. South Burlington City Center Presentation
Kevin Dorn, South Burlington City Manager, described the history of City Center beginning in the 1970s. The City has been perceived as a pass-through municipality rather than a destination in itself. That will change with the development of the City’s new downtown, City Center.

Ilona Blanchard, Special Project Director, described the private and public partners working to develop City Center. She stated that many projects have been supported by work from CCRPC. A number of partnerships and projects are completed or underway, including: City Center Collaborative, Tesla charging stations, Street Infrastructure Plan, Adaptive Traffic Signal Control, and participation in the regional Bikeshare Program.

Ilona reviewed the Capital/TIF District Projects in planning/development: Market Street, City Center Park, Garden Street/Williston Road intersections, Williston Road streetscape, SoBu Spaces 2020 (Library, Senior Center, City Hall), and the Pedestrian/Bicycle Bridge over I-89 at US2/Exit 14. Private Sector development in planning/development includes: Trader Joe’s/Pier 1, 505 Market Street, CVS, Homewood Suites, Xfinity/Sleep by Number, Allard Square, Champlain Housing Trust (CHT) housing, and Snyder-Braverman LLC Market Street & Garden Street development.
Ilona and Kevin answered questions from members. Zoning requires that new developments on Market Street (from Dorset to Garden) include commercial development on the first floor. There was discussion of the inclusion of Exit 14 as part of the City Center boundary. University Mall is currently for sale and the announcement of a new owner is imminent. Ilona discussed possible population increases due to new development; it is difficult to predict population changes due to the unknown variable of household size. Justin Dextradeur commended the City’s work (as well as Winooski’s), noting that their form-based code creates a welcome environment for development without imposing extra requirements that can unintentionally prohibit development. The need for structured parking was discussed as well as a safer way for pedestrians to cross Dorset Street. Kevin Dorn concluded with a thank you to the CCRPC Board and staff for their funding and support of City Center.

6. Housing Data Update
Annually, the 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. Regina Mahony of the CCRPC staff explained that the county is experiencing a housing shortage, housing is unaffordable, and more county employees live outside of Chittenden County. Household size is shrinking and the county rental vacancy rate got to 3 percent for the last two years but is now down again in 2017. Jeff Carr noted that shrinking household size is the main reason for the housing demand. For 2017, there was a net residential growth of 490 units for 2017 and there was a net gain of 308 beds at UVM. There was discussion of how best to count population specific living units, as a 120+ senior living project was included in the 2016 total. There was a suggestion that only units that are reasonably available to others should be included. Regarding ECOS Strategy 2, for 2017 we are just shy of the 80% growth in areas planned for growth at 79%. The amount of development in the rural planning area is consistent over the last 5 years, but the overall total is lower so the rural comes up as a higher percentage. Previously, from 2010 to 2016, 86 percent of development occurred in areas planned for growth. Justin Dextradeur noted that any increase in rural growth is a move in the wrong direction. Justin Dextradeur also added that the development growth we achieved in previous years was due in large part to low interest rates; with interest rates going up we are not going to see as much development going forward.

7. Review FY19 Draft UPWP & Budget and Warn for Public Hearing
JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, DULY SECONDED BY CHRIS SHAW, TO WARN A PUBLIC HEARING ON THE DRAFT FY2019 UPWP FOR MAY 16, 2018 AT 6:00PM. During discussion, Regina noted that the UPWP Committee met three times. It was an unusual year in that we did not receive more requests than we were able to fund. The UPWP did have outstanding questions about a project in Colchester. The TAC and Executive Committee reviewed that project and ultimately recommended adding it in to the UPWP. Therefore, Colchester’s stormwater infrastructure inventory project is included in the draft FY19 UPWP program. Forest Cohen of the CCRPC staff provided an overview of the budget, noting a $94,000 projected deficit due to the indirect rate. Jeff Carr explained that the Finance Committee is working to smooth out the highs and lows of the indirect rates, perhaps with a mid-year correction. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
8. Chair/Executive Director’s Updates
Regina presented the Executive Director’s updates: 1) Charlie Baker is working with the Board Development Committee for nominations; 2) The Clean Water bill, S.260, establishes a committee (including two municipal representatives) to look at long-term funding strategies. If the committee cannot agree on funding, there will be a water quality occupancy surcharge instituted in 2020; 3) VELCO will release a draft of the 2018 long-range transmission plan update on April 20th. This document identifies system reliability concerns and alternatives to address these challenges; 4) Staff member Bryan Davis helped launch the new regional bikeshare program today – greenride bikeshare.

9. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports. Draft committee minutes are included in the board packet.

10. Members’ Items
Jeff Carr noted that Massachusetts will not be looking at NH, or VT’s TDI Clean Energy Link for transmission of the HydroQuebec power to the state, despite the line in VT being fully permitted. Sharon Murray noted that the TDI Clean Energy Link project was going to provide money for the lake clean-up effort.

11. Adjournment
JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, DULY SECONDED BY DAN KERIN, TO ADJOURN AT 7:27PM. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted, Diane Meyerhoff
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
May 16, 2018
Agenda Item 6: Draft ECOS Plan Public Hearing #2

**Issues:**
As you are aware we’ve been working on the 2018 ECOS Plan for about two years, with specific updates to the MTP, CEDS, enhanced energy planning, forest integrity and other minor edits. As a reminder, the policies/strategies associated with the original 2013 ECOS Plan have largely stayed the same.

The CCRPC Board warned this second public hearing in March, and the documentation was sent out to the municipalities and other statutory parties on April 10, 2018. We have not received any comments on this second public hearing draft.


Assuming no further changes are needed, we will ask the CCRPC Board to adopt the 2018 ECOS Plan at the June Annual Meeting along with GBIC.

**Staff Recommendation:**
No need for action at this time.

**Staff Contact:**
Contact Regina Mahony with any questions: rmahony@ccrpcvt.org, 846-4490 ext. *28.
CCRPC Board Meeting
May 16, 2018
Agenda Item 7: Action Item

FY19 Unified Planning Work Program & Budget

Background:

Each year the CCRPC undertakes the development and implementation of a Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). The Board of Directors of the CCRPC has established a Committee process for the development of the UPWP. The following FY 18 UPWP Committee members were appointed by the Chair:

- Board: Mike O’Brien, Chair; John Zicconi, Michael Bissonette
- PAC: Ken Beliveau; Joss Besse
- TAC: Barbara Elliott, Justin Rabidoux
- VTrans: Amy Bell
- Ex-Officio: Chris Jolly, FHWA; Jon Moore, GMT

The UPWP Committee met on January 25th, February 22nd, and March 22nd to discuss and evaluate all project applications from Chittenden County municipalities, partner organizations and the public.

At their April 18th meeting, the CCRPC Board voted to warn the FY 19 UPWP & Budget Public Hearing for Wednesday, May 16, 2018 at 6:00 p.m. The public hearing draft documents were posted on the CCRPC website (http://www.ccrpcvt.org/about-us/commission/annual-work-plan-budget-finances/), sent to all municipalities and the Burlington Free Press. As expected, small adjustments were made to the UPWP after the public hearing documents were posted as more details were known for the upcoming fiscal year.

Adjustments to the draft before you include:
- Staff hour adjustments
- Addition of the 2018 Brownfields Grant
- Change from $10,000 to $26,000 from Winooski for the Municipal Plan Support project (Task 2.1.1.6)

The public hearing notice was distributed late, so we need to keep the public hearing open until Monday, May 21st to satisfy the 25 notice period.

Recommendations:

**UPWP Committee:**
The UPWP Committee recommended the FY19 UPWP and Budget to the CCRPC Board at their March 22nd meeting.

**Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC):**
The TAC recommended the FY19 UPWP and Budget to the CCRPC Board at their May 1st meeting.

**Executive Committee:**
The Executive Committee recommended the FY19 UPWP and Budget to the CCRPC Board at their May 2nd meeting.

**CCRPC Staff:**
Staff recommends that the Board keep the public hearing open until May 21st, and approve the FY19 UPWP & Budget as presented conditional on further public comments.
For more information contact: Charlie Baker, cbaker@ccrpcvt.org or 861-0115 or Marshall Distel, mdistel@ccrpcvt.org or 861-0121
Regional Stormwater Agreement Amendment

Background:

In 2016, the Legislature approved, and the Governor signed H.249, an act relating to intermunicipal services. This law (24 V.S.A. § 4345b) allows for municipalities to contract with their regional planning commission for the provision of services after the RPC amends its bylaws to authorize it to enter into intermunicipal service agreements and the agreement is approved by each municipal legislative body that wants to participate in the service.

In the spring of 2017, the twelve MS4 permittees in Chittenden County formally adopted an agreement that merged the Regional Stormwater Education Program (RSEP) and the Chittenden County Stream Team (CCST), two regional efforts for which CCRPC has acted as the Lead Agency. Participation in this agreement helps your municipality to meet Minimum Measure #1 (Public Education & Outreach) and Minimum Measure #2 (Public Participation & Involvement) of your MS4 permit.

However, we recently noticed that the executed agreement is in conflict with 24 V.S.A. § 4345b(f)(2) because it precludes the CCRPC from charging for our full costs. That section of statute specifically notes: “A commission shall not use municipal funds or grants provided for regional planning services under this chapter to cover the costs of providing services under any service agreement under this section.” Because the original agreement precluded the charging of indirect costs, CCRPC has been subsidizing this intermunicipal service agreement with other funds.

Attached is an edited version of the Regional Stormwater Agreement proposing a minor change to be clear that CCRPC will not be subsidizing this work consistent with state statute. All other parties to this agreement have reviewed and approved the amendment.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of the Agreement Amendment.

For more information, contact: Dan Albrecht dalbrecht@ccrpcvt.org or 846-4490 ext. *29
Preamble

This Stormwater Program Agreement (“Agreement”) is entered into by and between a group of Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (“MS4”) permittees (“MS4 Permittees”) and the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (“CCRPC”) to operate an MS4 Stormwater Program (“Program”) that conforms with and satisfies the relevant requirements of both Minimum Control Measure One (Public Outreach and Education) and Minimum Control Measure Two (Public Involvement and Participation) of the Phase II NPDES Permit issued by the Vermont Department of Environmental Conservation (“DEC”) on December 2012 through General Permit 3-9014 (“MS4 Permit”), as these requirements may be continued, renewed, amended, or otherwise modified during the term of this Agreement.

1. **Prior Agreements** – Effective July 1, 2017, this Agreement

   a. supersedes an MOU signed by the CCRPC and twelve MS4 permittees, effective March 10, 2013 through March 9, 2018, governing the operation of a Regional Stormwater Education Program to satisfy the relevant requirements of Minimum Control Measure One (Public Outreach and Education), and

   b. supersedes an MOU signed by the CCRPC and eleven MS4 permittees, effective July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2016, and an amendment to this MOU extending its effective date through June 30, 2017, governing the operation of a Regional Stormwater Public Involvement and Participation Program to satisfy the relevant requirements of Minimum Control Measure Two (Public Involvement and Participation).

2. **Service Agreement** – This Agreement constitutes a service agreement pursuant to 24 V.S.A. § 4345b (Intermunicipal Service Agreements).

3. **Definitions**—For purposes of this Agreement, the term “MS4 Permittees” includes the Vermont Agency of Transportation, which on December 28, 2016 became eligible for coverage under General Permit 3-9007 for Stormwater Discharges from the State Transportation Separate Storm Sewer System (TS4).

4. **Parties** – The following are the parties to this Agreement:

   a. **MS4 Permittees** – the undersigned MS4 Permittees, and

   b. **CCRPC** – the undersigned regional planning commission.

5. **MS4 Steering Committee**

   a. **Composition** – The Members of the Steering Committee shall consist of one representative from each of the signatory MS4 Permittees to this Agreement. Another MS4 permittee may request
to join this Agreement if approved by a two-thirds vote of the Members. The Members shall be appointed either by the governing bodies of their municipalities at publicly warned meetings or, if a Member representing an MS4 Permittee is non-municipal agency, via a process consistent with that agency’s policies. At its first meeting, the Steering Committee shall elect a Chair by a majority vote. The Chair shall serve until such time as the Chair resigns or the Steering Committee elects a new Chair.

b. **Duties** – The Steering Committee shall direct the CCRPC on the development and performance of Program Services in particular and on all other matters bearing on the administration of this Agreement. All actions of the Steering Committee shall be by majority vote unless otherwise specified in this Agreement.

c. **Organization of Meetings** – The Steering Committee shall meet on a quarterly basis at a minimum. The CCRPC shall provide Steering Committee Members with reasonable notice of meetings. Notice shall include a meeting agenda and draft meeting minutes. In addition, the CCRPC shall post notice of Steering Committee meetings on its website and on the Program website.

6. **CCRPC**

a. **Duties** – The CCRPC shall:

1) Administer this Agreement and agreements with contractors (including executing contracts approved by the Steering Committee, receiving and disbursing funds, and monitoring the provision of services) for the benefit of the MS4 Permittees.

2) Provide other services contributing to the operation of the Program (including, but not limited to, social media management, public relations, grant writing, creating and managing a Program website, organizing meetings as set forth in Section 4.c, above, etc.) as directed by the Steering Committee; and at a level consistent with each year’s Program Budget as described in Section 8.b, below.

3) Provide a quarterly budget report to the Steering Committee detailing expenses the CCRPC incurred and the payments it has received.

4) Pay contractors and vendors for charges consistent with the relevant contract, using funds from the Program Budget, as defined in Section 8, below.

5) Upon approval of the Steering Committee or its designee, reimburse itself for personnel and other expenses for charges consistent with its duties, using funds from the Program Budget.

6) Consult with the Steering Committee prior to authorizing any contractor activities or charges outside the scope of work of a contract.

7) Notify the Steering Committee when 75% of the annual budget (as defined in Section 8, below) for an individual category of expenses (e.g., contractors, CCRPC fees, advertising, etc.) is reached. When these levels are reached, subsequent expenditures by the CCRPC in that category shall be reviewed and approved by the Steering Committee Chair in advance.
8) At the request of the Steering Committee, assign any or all contracts that the CCRPC has entered into pursuant to this Agreement to the MS4 Permittees who are signatories to this Agreement at the time or to another contractor of the Steering Committee’s choosing.

9) Comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws, including Burlington’s Livable Wage Ordinance as applicable.

b. **Compensation** – Through the Program Budget, the MS4 Permittees shall compensate the CCRPC for the actual costs of performing its duties defined in Section 5.a, above; provided, however, that the CCRPC shall not be entitled to compensation that would exceed ten percent (10%) of the Program Budget as specified in Section 8.b, below, without the prior approval of a majority of the Steering Committee.

c. **Invoices** – The CCRPC shall invoice the Program to cover personnel charges, mileage reimbursement, and other direct expenses necessary to perform its duties. Personnel charges for CCRPC staff shall be calculated at a rate of salary plus fringe **plus CCRPC’s applicable indirect rate as required by 24 V.S.A. § 4345b.** The CCRPC shall not charge the Program an Indirect Rate. As set forth in Section 5.b, above, upon approval of the Steering Committee or its designee, the CCRPC may reimburse itself for charges consistent with its duties, using funds from the Program Budget.

7. **Selection of Contractors**

a. The CCRPC, in consultation with the Steering Committee, shall competitively bid for contract(s) for Program services that collectively satisfy the requirements for Minimum Control Measure One (Public Outreach and Education) and Minimum Control Measure Two (Public Involvement and Participation) of the Phase II NPDES Permit then in effect. The parties to the contracts shall be the contractors and the CCRPC. All contracts shall require the contractor to indemnify and hold harmless the MS4 Permittees from any claims related to the contract and to procure and maintain liability insurance for all services performed under the contract.

b. All contracts shall be awarded based on qualifications, price, and the ability of the entity to provide services that meet the relevant MS4 Permit requirements. The selection of contractors shall comply with the procurement policy of the CCRPC and with applicable state and federal procurement laws and procedures.

c. Contracts shall generally be 1 to 5 years in length and shall include, but not be limited to, a Maximum Limiting Amount and the right of the CCRPC to 1) cancel a contract if services are not being adequately provided, 2) specify that payments to contractors shall be made only for services rendered, 3) specify the annual scope of work and budget as approved by the Steering Committee, 4) allow a contract extension if desired, and 5) assign the contract to the MS4 Permittees that are signatories to this Agreement at the time of the assignment or to a contractor of the Steering Committee’s choosing.

d. Contracting for services under this Agreement shall comply with the Fair Employment Act and Americans with Disabilities Act: the CCRPC shall comply with the requirement of Title 21 V.S.A Chapter 5, Subchapter 6, relating to fair employment practices, to the full extent applicable. The
e. The CCRPC and the Steering Committee recognize the important contribution and vital impact which small businesses have on the State’s economy. In this regard, the CCRPC shall ensure a free and open bidding process that affords all businesses equal access and opportunity to compete, except under circumstances where competitive bidding may not be practicable and is not required by applicable procurement policies. The CCRPC and the Steering Committee also recognize the existence of businesses owned by minorities and women, and the CCRPC shall make a good faith effort to encourage these firms to compete for contracts involving state or federal funds and comply with applicable law relating to civil rights and disadvantaged business enterprises.

8. **Program Services** – The Steering Committee, assisted by the CCRPC and its contractors, shall implement a unified Program that satisfies the relevant requirements of Minimum Control Measure One (Public Education and Outreach) and Minimum Control Measure Two (Public Involvement and Participation) of the MS4 Permit.

The Program Content for each Program Year shall be as defined in writing by a majority of the Steering Committee. The Program Year shall be the State of Vermont’s fiscal year. The Program Content shall implement the following deliverables:

a. **Public Education and Outreach** – Elements shall include, at a minimum:

   1) operating the Program’s website, www.smartwaterways.org, or its equivalent; and

   2) advertising in various media.

b. **Public Involvement and Participation** – Elements shall include, at a minimum:

   1) operating the Program’s website, www.ccstreamteam.org, or its equivalent;

   2) hosting and/or organizing workshops, projects, and other events to engage the public; and

   3) recruiting volunteers to support projects, promote events, and/or engage the public.

c. **End of MS4 permit year annual reporting** – Elements shall include preparation of a narrative report 25 business days prior to the MS4 Permittees’ reporting deadline to DEC.
9. **Program Dues, Budget, Costs, and Payments**

   a. **Dues**

   1) For State Fiscal Year, FY18, July 2017-June 2018, the annual dues for each of the undersigned MS4 Permittees shall be $5,500.

   2) For the following fiscal years, the annual dues shall be set by a two-thirds majority by October 15th of the preceding calendar year. In the absence of agreement, the dues shall remain at $5,500.

   3) The CCRPC shall invoice each MS4 Permittee on or about July 1st of each year with payment to the CCRPC due 30 days later.

   4) All Members shall pay equal dues.

   b. **Program Budget**

   1) The annual Program Budget shall consist of the sum of the annual payments for each Program Year made by MS4 Permittees, plus any funds from other sources made available to the Program by majority vote of the Steering Committee.

   2) Prior to the start of each Program Year, the Steering Committee shall adopt a Program Budget governing expenditures for the subsequent Program Year. Budget categories shall include, but not be limited to: CCRPC Duties, Contractual Services, and Expenses.

   3) Once the Program Year starts, a majority of the Steering Committee may amend the Program Budget as needed, for example to reflect any surplus or deficits from the prior Program Year, receipt of new sources of funds, or a desired change in the Program Budget, subject to Section 8.a, above.

   4) In the event that costs are less than anticipated or that grants or other funding sources become available, a majority of the voting Members of the Steering Committee may decide to reduce each Member’s payment by an equal amount or to credit all or part of the following Program Year assessment to each MS4 Permittee.

   c. **Maximum Annual Costs and Payments** – Except as otherwise provided by this section, each MS4 Permittee shall within 30 days of receipt of an invoice make a single annual dues payment, as provided by Section 8.a, above.

   d. **Other Funds** – Any funds made available to the Program shall be dedicated to reducing the annual costs of each MS4 Permittee participating in the Program, except as a majority of the voting Members of the Steering Committee may decide.

   e. **Excess Funds** – Any funds remaining at the end of a Program Year shall be carried over to the next Program Year, unless a majority of the voting Members of the Steering Committee decides otherwise.
f. **Non-appropriation** – The obligations of each MS4 Permittee to make payments under this Agreement shall constitute a current expense of the MS4 Permittee and shall not in any way be construed to be a debt of the MS4 Permittee in contravention of any applicable constitutional or statutory limitation or requirement, or the MS4 Permittee’s charter or articles of incorporation; nor shall anything contained in this Agreement constitute a pledge of the credit or tax revenues, funds, or monies of the MS4 Permittee. The decision whether or not to budget and appropriate funds during each fiscal year of the MS4 Permittee is within the discretion of the governing body of the MS4 Permittee. The obligations of a MS4 Permittee under the Agreement are subject to annual appropriations by the governing body of the MS4 Permittee, except as provided by Section 12 of this Agreement. An MS4 Permittee cannot choose to not appropriate funds and then withdraw in a manner that shifts prior contractual obligations on to the others. Non-appropriation will be considered withdrawal and must be prospective in fairness to all signatories as per Section 13.

10. **Contract Approval** – All CCRPC contracts shall be conditioned upon approval by a majority of the voting Members of the Steering Committee and shall be consistent with Section 6, above.

11. **Termination of CCRPC** – The CCRPC on its own or the Steering Committee by a majority vote of its full Membership may elect to terminate the CCRPC’s future participation in this Agreement by providing 90 days’ written notice to the other. In the event of termination under this section, the CCRPC shall continue to administer and comply with each existing contract, and the MS4 Permittees shall continue to reimburse the CCRPC from the Program Budget for the actual costs of administering and complying with each contract, as provided by this Agreement, unless and until the CCRPC assigns the contract pursuant to Sections 5.a.8 and 6.c of this Agreement.

12. **Termination of Agreement**

   a. This Agreement shall become null and void with no further obligation of the parties if:

      1) Two-thirds of the Members of the Steering Committee vote to end participation, or

      2) DEC determines that the Program outlined in this Agreement does not meet the relevant requirements for Minimum Control Measure One (Public Education and Outreach) or Minimum Control Measure Two (Public Involvement and Participation), and the parties to this Agreement are unable to craft a Program to satisfy DEC.

   b. In the event of termination, any funds remaining in the Program Budget (after payment of obligations to vendors or to satisfy debts) shall be reimbursed to the MS4 Permittees with each MS4 Permittee receiving a share proportional to the number of MS4 Permittees at the time of termination. For example, if there are twelve MS4 Permittees at the time of termination, each MS4 Permittee shall receive a 1/12th share.

13. **Withdrawal of Member** – An MS4 Permittee may withdrawal from participation in this Agreement only at the end of a state fiscal year. If an MS4 Permittee wishes to withdrawal from participation, it shall provide at least 90 days’ notice to the other MS4 Permittees and the CCRPC. After withdrawal, a MS4 Permittee shall remain responsible for its share of the costs of contracts that the Steering Committee approved prior to the effective date of the withdrawal.
14. **Effective Date and Duration of Agreement** – The effective date of this Agreement shall be July 1, 2017, and this Agreement shall terminate June 30, 2022.

15. **Amendment** – This Agreement may be amended only upon unanimous action of all the Members.

16. **Counterparts** – This Agreement may be executed in multiple counterparts, each of which is deemed an original and all of which constitute one and the same document. Each such counterpart may be a facsimile or PDF copy, and such facsimile or PDF copy shall be deemed an original.

17. **Public Records** – Any and all records submitted to the CCRPC or MS4 Permittees - including Bids, Proposals, Qualifications, Contracts, etc.-- whether electronic, paper, or otherwise recorded, are subject to the Vermont Public Records Act.

---

**Signature of CCRPC**

Christopher D. Roy, Board Chair, Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission  
Date

**Signatures of Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Town of Shelburne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>The City of South Burlington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Vermont Agency of Transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>The University of Vermont</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>The Town of Williston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>The City of Winooski</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As you are aware, the adoption of the 2018 ECOS Plan will necessitate changes in our review guidelines for Act 250 and Section 248 applications. These changes will provide guidance for CCRPC to review applications in light of adding “known constraints” and “possible constraints” to the ECOS Plan.

The proposed changes differentiate between CCRPC’s review of Act 250 applications and Section 248 application.

1. Act 250 review will remain largely unchanged. During Act 250 review, the known and possible constraints listed in the ECOS Plan are reviewed by municipalities and state agencies. CCRPC will defer to the relevant municipality or state agency with jurisdiction over the constraint, rather than submit separate comments on constraints. CCRPC will continue to focus review on land use and transportation.

2. During Section 248 review, some, but not all, known and possible constraints listed in the ECOS Plan are reviewed by municipalities and state agencies. CCRPC will defer to state agencies to review relevant constraints but will review and provide comments on local constraints when municipal plans do not have substantial deference. This review will take the form of submitting comments on advance notices and may include commenting on applications during hearings, intervening in hearings or requesting hearings on applications.

Under Section 248, applicants must distribute an “advance notice” at least 45 days before an application is submitted. CCRPC must submit any comments on the advance notice within 40 days of receiving it. Commenting gives CCRPC a chance to raise potential issues before the application is submitted to the Public Utilities Commission.

Comment letters for two advance notices were written following these draft guidelines and distributed to the applicants following Executive Committee approval on May 2. These letters are included in your packet under Item 12c.

This draft of the review guidelines incorporates comments and suggestions from the Executive Committee meeting on May 2 and the Planning Advisory Committee meeting on May 9.

**Staff Recommendation:** No action needed at this time, but comments are appreciated.

**Staff Contact:** Contact Emily Nosse-Leirer and Regina Mahony with any questions: enosse-leirer@ccrpcvt.org or rmahony@ccrpcvt.org, 846-4490 ext. *15 or *28.
INTRODUCTION

History of Act 250

Vermont experienced new growth in the 1960’s, which brought many important planning issues to the forefront. This period of new growth was characterized by the following:

- Completion of Interstate Highway 89 and the southern Vermont section of Interstate Highway 91;
- IBM locating a primary facility in Essex Junction; and
- A growing tourist industry.

Vermonters are sensitive to the link between the natural and human environments. Many people were concerned that this link was threatened and, in the absence of a mechanism to protect or strengthen this relationship, development was proceeding apace. The steadfastness of concerned Vermont natives began to gain recognition with the State government in the late 1960’s.

Prior to Act 250, there were no State-level environmental regulations or land use controls in Vermont. In 1970, Vermont enacted the Land Use and Development Law (commonly known as Act 250). That law created nine District Commissions and an Environmental Board tasked to review development applications based on 10 criteria specified in Act 250.

Why Does CCRPC Review Act 250 Applications?

CCRPC reviews Act 250 development applications as part of an effective regional planning process for the betterment of Chittenden County. Each of Vermont’s eleven Regional Planning Commissions is a party by right which may appear and participate in the Act 250 proceeding of a proposed development whose site is located either in or on the boundaries with a municipality that is a member of that Regional Planning Commission [“Act 250 Environmental Board Rule 14(A)(3)”]. In addition, pursuant to 24 V.S.A. § 4345a(13) all RPCs “shall appear before district environmental commissions to aid them in making a determination as to the conformance of developments and subdivisions with the criteria of 10 V.S.A. § 6086.”
CCRPC REVIEW PROCESS

In General

The CCRPC’s Executive Committee (“EC”) and designated CCRPC staff are responsible for the review of Act 250 applications.

CCRPC staff shall initially review each application before the District 4 Environmental Commission (with specific attention given to those applications going to a hearing) for the purpose of identifying for the EC:

1. whether the proposed project is or is not in conformance with the provisions of the current Chittenden County ECOS Plan- (hereafter referred to as the Regional Plan), with specific attention given to the Planning Areas section of the Regional Plan; and

2. whether the proposed project fails to comply with one or more of the 10 Act 250 criteria, 10 V.S.A. §§ 6086 (a) (1) through (10), with specific attention paid to the criteria dealing with transportation and/or traffic and the other criteria within CCRPC’s expertise based on approved technical reports and/or in-house technical expertise or expert opinion of individuals consulted by in-house staff, and

3. whether the proposed project avoids known constraints or minimize impacts to possible constraints identified in the Regional Plan. The constraints are identified in the current Regional Plan and are based on statewide or local policies that are currently adopted or in effect. Because these constraints are protected at the state and local level already, CCRPC will defer to the relevant municipality or state agency with jurisdiction over the constraint.

More detailed descriptions of each constraint are available in Appendix A: Local Constraint Language. This appendix will guide CCRPC in providing comments and participating in hearings before the District Environmental PUCCommission.

CCRPC Actions

The EC may take action on an application only if there is an affirmative vote by the majority of those present. In the absence of such an affirmative vote, the EC and Executive Director will jointly bring the matter forward to the full CCRPC Board for action. To the best of our ability we will take action within a posted meeting – however, if participation is required before a meeting of either the EC or the full CCRPC Board can be held Staff will send the letter to Act 250 only if no objections have been heard from the Executive Committee. Formal review and action will be taken on the letter at the first available meeting following submittal of the letter.

CCRPC staff shall review all applications as required by 24 V.S.A. § 4345a(13) (with specific attention given to those applications going to a hearing) and will recommend one or more of the following actions to the EC:

Letters: The EC may submit one or more letters to the District Environmental Commission or Environmental Division of Vermont Superior Court to represent the position of CCRPC that accomplish one or more of the following purposes:
- Request clarification of specific matters in the application,
- Indicate if the proposed development is in conformance with the current Regional Plan, or
The Full CCRPC Board may submit one or more letters to the District Environmental Commission or Environmental Division of Vermont Superior Court to represent the position of CCRPC that accomplish one or more of the following purposes:

- Indicate if the proposed development is not in conformance with the current Regional Plan, or
- Indicate if the proposed development does not comply with one or more of the ten Act 250 criteria, or
- Request a hearing.

**Hearings:** If the EC determines it is beneficial for CCRPC to actively participate in a District Environmental Commission hearing, the EC will designate the Executive Director, CCRPC staff, or an EC member to attend and represent CCRPC at the District Environmental Commission hearing.

**Pre-Submission and Post-Submission Discussions**

In order to improve the likelihood that a project will be consistent with the Regional Plan, CCRPC staff shall have a discussion with the Planning and/or Zoning staff of its member municipalities at the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) meetings on at least a quarterly basis and inquire if any new projects currently under municipal planning and zoning review appear likely to have an Act 250 hearing. When CCRPC staff learns of such a project, CCRPC staff shall request a meeting with municipal staff and the project applicant, so that any regional issues, concerns or potential impacts may be identified and addressed at the earliest stages. These discussions are intended to provide information and not formulate CCRPC’s position on specific applications.

**Appeals**

The Environmental Division of Vermont Superior Court is responsible for reviewing appeals of District Environmental Commission rulings. Before CCRPC may be a party in an appeal of a District Environmental Commission decision to the Environmental Division of Vermont Superior Court (either to contest a District Environmental Commission decision or to support a District Environmental Commission decision that is contested by others), the Commission must approve such action, following recommendations made by the Executive Committee. Before CCRPC may be a party in an appeal of an Environmental Division of Vermont Superior Court decision to the Vermont Supreme Court (either to contest an Environmental Court decision or to support an Environmental Court decision that is contested by others), the Commission must approve such action, following recommendations made by the Executive Committee.
CCRPC Participation in the Section 248 Process

INTRODUCTION

The Vermont Public Service Board Utilities Commission (“PSBPUC”) is a State quasi-judicial board with jurisdiction over public utilities, cable television, water utilities, electric utilities, water carriers, gas utilities, telephone utilities, and resellers of telephone services, as described in 30 V.S.A. § 203. An entity that proposes to construct certain types of new/renovated gas or electric facilities must obtain a Certificate of Public Good from the PSBPUC pursuant to 30 V.S.A. § 248. The PSBPUC may not issue a Certificate of Public Good unless it finds (among other conditions) that the “…facility will not unduly interfere with the orderly development of the region with due consideration having been given to the recommendations of the municipal and regional planning commissions.” 30 V.S.A. § 248(b)(1). In addition, 24 V.S.A. § 4345a(14) requires regional planning commissions to “appear before the public service board to aid the board in making determinations under 30 V.S.A. § 248.”

The Regional Plan received a Determination of Energy Compliance from the Public Service Department on August X, 2018. This means that the PUC should give the plan “substantial deference.” “Substantial deference” means that a land conservation measure or specific policy shall be applied in accordance with its terms unless there is a clear and convincing demonstration that other factors affecting the general good of the State outweigh the application of the measure or policy. The known and possible constraints and suitability policies identified in the Regional Plan will receive substantial deference in PUC proceedings.

More detailed descriptions of each constraint are available in Appendix A: Local Constraint Language. This appendix will guide CCRPC in providing comments and participating in hearings before the PUC.

CCRPC REVIEW PROCESS

Criteria for CCRPC Review

In reviewing petitions for Certificates of Public Good, CCRPC will focus its review on:

1. Compliance or non-compliance of the petition or plan for the proposed facility with the provisions of the current Regional Plan, with specific attention given to the Planning Areas section of the Regional Plan; or and

2. Whether the proposed facility will or will not unduly interfere with the orderly development of the region. While the statute does not provide specific criteria for review (such as the 10 Act 250 criteria), CCRPC will review the petition with specific attention paid to transportation and/or traffic, the suitability policies identified in the Regional Plan, and the other criteria within CCRPC’s expertise based on approved technical reports and/or on in-house technical expertise or expert opinion of individuals consulted by in-house staff.

3. Whether the proposed facilities avoid known constraints or minimize impacts to possible constraints identified in the Regional Plan. The constraints are identified in the current Regional Plan and are based on statewide or local policies that are currently adopted or in effect. When constraints are already protected at the state level or in a municipality with a plan that has received a Determination of Energy Compliance, CCRPC will defer to the relevant municipal or state agency review of the constraint. When a constraint is protected at
During review, CCRPC may also ask for clarification of specific matters in the petition or plan for the proposed facility.

### CCRPC RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE PUC DURING THE 45-DAY NOTICE PERIOD

At least 45 days before filing a Section 248 petition with the Commission, an applicant must provide advance notice of the proposed project to the municipal and regional planning commissions and the municipal legislative bodies in the town where the project will be located.

A regional planning commission must make any recommendation to the PUC and to the petitioner within 40 days of the submittal of the advance notice. CCRPC will make such recommendations after staff review and EC approval. Although § 248 is silent with respect to the nature of a regional planning commission’s recommendations, CCRPC’s policy is that any recommendations made by CCRPC will be expressed in a letter that provides the PUC and the petitioner with information about CCRPC’s preliminary determination on the review criteria identified above, along with requests for any additional information needed to make that determination. Following the comment letter, CCRPC may correspond further with the applicant and host municipality during the advance notice period to address concerns before the petition for a Certificate of Public Good is filed.

### CCRPC PARTICIPATION AFTER A PETITION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC GOOD IS FILED

When a Petition for a CPG is filed, CCRPC will review the Petition in light of any comments submitted during the advance notice period. CCRPC may:

1. Hold a CCRPC hearing
2. Submit comments during a PUC hearing
3. Intervene in a PUC hearing and becoming a party to the case
4. Request a hearing.

During any step, CCRPC may request that the Department of Public Service exercise its authority to retain experts and other personnel to review the proposed facility.

### CCRPC Hearing

Although 30 V.S.A. § 248(f) specifically authorizes regional planning commissions to hold a public hearing on the plan for the proposed facility that is the subject of a §248 petition, it does not specify any additional details on the nature or requirements of such a hearing. It is CCRPC’s policy to limit the hearing to requesting more information or presenting of evidence regarding the review criteria identified above. CCRPC shall attempt to hold its public hearing at locations and times that are convenient to members of the public who are most likely to be interested in the outcome of the petition.

### Submitting Comments during a PUC Hearing
When notified of a hearing before the PUC, CCRPC staff will make a recommendation to the Executive Committee (EC) regarding the petition, with a particular emphasis on any issues raised during the advance notice period. If all issues have been adequately addressed, CCRPC will submit comments stating that and will not participate further.

**Intervening in PUC Hearings**

When notified of a hearing before the PUC, CCRPC’s Executive Committee (EC) and staff will review the petition, with a particular emphasis on any issues raised during the advance notice period. If issues raised in the advance notice period have not been addressed, CCRPC’s EC and staff will work with the affected municipality to determine whether further participation is needed.

CCRPC may intervene in a PUC hearing. The EC has the authority to decide that it is beneficial for CCRPC to intervene in a PUC hearing, or the EC may decide to bring the decision to the full CCRPC Board. If the CCRPC Board agrees, it shall designate a representative to attend and represent CCRPC at the Public Service Board hearing.

To participate in a PUC hearing beyond providing comments on the petition (as noted above), CCRPC must be granted “intervenor status” by the PUC. Although 30 V.S.A.§ 248 does not automatically recognize that regional planning commissions are parties in PUC hearings, the current practice of the PUC is to allow entities that receive copies of the application according to 30 V.S.A. § 248(4)(C) an opportunity to submit a request to be named as a party when they file a Notice of Appearance. If CCRPC deems that it is necessary to participate in hearings governed by 30 V.S.A. § 248, it shall accompany its Notice of Appearance submission with a letter requesting Intervenor Status. If this request is denied and CCRPC continues to deem it necessary to participate, CCRPC may submit a Motion to Intervene.

CCRPC’s participation in a PUC hearing will be limited to the review criteria identified above.

**Requesting a PUC Hearing**

When notified that a petition has been submitted to the PUC, CCRPC will review the petition in consultation with the affected municipality, with a particular emphasis on any issues raised during the advance notice period. If the issues raised have not been addressed and a hearing has not been scheduled, CCRPC is able to request a hearing. The EC has the authority to decide that it is beneficial for CCRPC to request a PUC hearing, or the EC may decide to bring the decision to the full CCRPC Board. If the CCRPC Board agrees, it shall designate a representative to attend and represent CCRPC at the Public Service Board hearing.
DETERMINING PREFERRED SITES FOR SOLAR GENERATION FACILITIES

Vermont’s net metering rules (5.100 Rule Pertaining to Construction and Operation of Net-Metering Systems) allows Regional Planning Commissions and municipalities to identify preferred sites for net metering projects by identifying a preferred site in a joint letter of support from the municipal legislative body and the municipal and regional planning commission. Upon request, CCRPC’s Executive Committee and staff will review the site’s consistency with the review criteria identified above. CCRPC will participate in a joint letter if the criteria are met.

[NOTE: this process may change based on legislative changes in the 2018 session.]
ACT 250/SECTION 248 MONTHLY REPORTS

The EC shall use its monthly draft minutes to the full Commission to provide information pertaining to Act 250 and Section 248 applications in which a letter and/or testimony was submitted. In addition, the letters will be presented to the full Commission in the monthly meeting packets. For each application the EC minutes shall identify:

1) the project name, location, and a brief description,
2) note any hearing dates on the project, and
3) any actions the EC decided to exercise.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Real or apparent conflicts of interest will be guided by CCRPC Bylaws, Article XII Resolving Conflicting Interests.
Report on Nominations for FY19

From: Andy Montroll (Board Development Committee Chair)

The Board Development Committee met on May 9th and recommended the following the slate of officers for FY2019.

- Chris Roy, Chair
- Mike O’Brien, Vice-Chair
- John Zicconi, Secretary/Treasurer
- Catherine McMains, At-large for Towns over 5,000
- Barbara Elliot, At-large for Towns under 5,000
- Andy Montroll, Immediate Past Chair

The Election of Officers will occur at the CCRPC Board’s Annual Meeting on June 20, 2018. The bylaw provisions regarding election of Officers and the Executive Committee are as follows (please note that Article VII, Section C. specifies the inclusion of the Immediate Past Chair as a member of the Executive Committee):

ARTICLE VII. OFFICERS & EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
A. Election of Officers and Executive Committee
   The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission shall annually elect three officers, a Chair, Vice-Chair, and Secretary/Treasurer. In addition, the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission shall annually elect two municipal Board members to the Executive Committee. One municipal Board member of the Executive Committee shall represent a community of 5000+ population; the other, a community of less than 5000 population, based on information from the latest census or population estimate completed by the US Census Bureau.

   The Board Development Committee shall render its report of nominations to fill ensuing vacancies prior to the June meeting. The Board Development Committee may nominate one or more candidates for each office. Candidates may also be nominated from the floor.

   The officers of the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission shall be elected by a two-thirds majority of the Board members present and voting pursuant to 24 V.S.A. § 4343(b). The results of the voting shall be announced at the June meeting of each year. In the event a majority for any office is not reached, the top two vote getters will have a run-off election and the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission will continue to vote until a majority is reached.
DATE: Tuesday, May 1, 2018
TIME: 9:00 a.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal St. Winooski, VT

Members Present
Dean Bloch, Charlotte
Matt Langham, VTrans
Bruce Hoar, Williston
Maryann Michaels, Rail
Brian Bigelow, Underhill
Ashley Bishop, VTrans District 5
Barbara Elliot, Huntington
Amy Bell, VTrans
Sandy Thibault, CATMA
Nicole Losch, Burlington
Karen Yacos, Local Motion
Joss Besse, Town of Bolton
Bob Henneberger, Seniors
Luke Valentine, St. George
Justin Rabidoux, South Burlington
Bryan Osborne, TAC Chair, Colchester
Barbara Elliot, Huntington
Amy Bell, VTrans
Sandy Thibault, CATMA
Nicole Losch, Burlington
Karen Yacos, Local Motion
Joss Besse, Town of Bolton
Bob Henneberger, Seniors
Luke Valentine, St. George
Justin Rabidoux, South Burlington
Bryan Osborne, TAC Chair, Colchester

Staff Present
Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
Christine Forde, Senior Transportation Planner
Eleni Churchill, Transportation Project Manager
Sai Sarepalli, Transportation Planning Engineer
Bryan Davis, Senior Transportation Planner

Others
Jon Kaplan, VTrans

Bryan Osborne called the meeting to order at 9:00 AM.

1. Consent Agenda
No items this month.

2. Approval of Minutes
Peter noted that revised minutes for the April meeting were sent via email yesterday and replaced those that went out last week. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JOSS BESSE TO APPROVE THE REVISED MINUTES OF THE APRIL 3, 2018 TAC MEETING. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. Public Comments
There were none.

4. Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Transition Plans
Jon Kaplan of VTrans reported on the responsibilities municipalities have for ADA planning. Before beginning however, he handed out an announcement, and made brief comments, about this year’s Bicycle/Pedestrian Grant program.

His ADA talk was a wide ranging and detailed presentation that went over the following topics:
- Legal framework
- Civil rights legislation (the ADA and Rehabilitation Act)
- Standards
- Enforcement
- Funding
- Transition plan resources
Complaint process

There are two laws and their follow up regulations and standards that govern these issues. The laws are the Rehabilitation Act of 1073 and the ADA of 1990. Jon broke down each into more detail and then went into various sets of standards designed to implement accessibility for the disabled. Despite the amount of background information and seeming complexity, the basics are simpler to grasp. These are essentially:

- New construction & altered facilities must be “accessible to and usable by” people with disabilities
- Existing facilities, policies, & programs must be evaluated for discrimination & develop a modification plan (transition plan)
- Individual pedestrians must be reasonably accommodated, where necessary, for their use of a covered program. (curb ramps, sidewalks, crosswalks with stop control, on-street parking, at requested locations)

Jon then went over some ADA related court cases and settlements and identified possible funding sources to address ADA needs. These include highway funds and Housing and Urban Development grants. He noted as well that providing accessibility is an integral part of all projects that have a pedestrian component – regardless of the funding source. He next presented the elements of an ADA Self-Evaluation, a precursor to an actual ADA Transition Plan which must include the following:

- A list of barriers that limit accessibility
- Methods/changes needed to remove barriers
- A schedule to complete work
- The responsible party
- Public input
- A clear grievance/complaint process
- Remain a living document subject to regular updates

Jon gave more information on these plans citing assistance from an on-line ADA Action guide and noted the federal government’s involvement through the complaint process. He concluded his presentation identifying some avoidable mistakes (not having a plan, no documentation, ignoring complaints), the elements of an investigation, and the goal of FHWA’s division office: the voluntary compliance of responsible parties. The discussion following included issues around winter maintenance for which Jon will provide follow up information.

5. UPWP Recommendation

Peter reported that there was considerable discussion in April on this topic, mostly focused on adding the Colchester project for inventory and inspection of stormwater infrastructure. He noted that we also need a TAC recommendation to the Board that they approve of the draft FY19 UPWP.

BARBARA ELLIOT MADE A MOTION TO RECOMMEND UPWP APPROVAL TO THE CCRPC BOARD. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY JUSTIN RABIDOUX AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

With some new arrivals at this point, Peter asked for a round of TAC member introductions. Karen Yacos introduced herself as the new Executive Director at Local Motion and that new Local Motion staff Allegra Williams would attend future TAC meetings.

6. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Christine provided a primer on the annual TIP update process as a preview for TAC action in June. She handed out a marked-up version of the current TIP with the currently anticipated revisions needed for the coming year’s version. After explaining the handout details, she asked that members review it and send her any questions or updates that they have.

7. National Highway System (NHS) Update

Marshall and Jason reported on the on-going discussions and deliberations with VTrans, FHWA and municipalities on possible changes to the NHS. They began with a national overview of the system – its...
purpose, extent, establishment by Congress and noting that 90% of the country’s population lives within 5 miles of an NHS route. They next discussed the details of the NHS at the regional scale noting why the designation mattered and what the implications of designation are. This includes issues regarding:

- Funding Programs:
  - National Highway Performance (NHPP)
  - Surface Transportation (STP)
- Federal Performance Measures and Statewide/Regional Targets:
  - Infrastructure Condition
  - System Reliability
  - Freight Reliability
- Design Standards:
  - Vermont State Standards
- Project Prioritization

In 2012, the Chittenden County non-Interstate NHS expanded by nearly 50 miles. VTrans has since reduced the number of miles outside the region and, given the purpose of the NHS, a reduction in Chittenden County miles is also warranted. Jason next opened the CCRPC’s interactive on-line map to display the changes now proposed for the system. He noted what is recommended for removal, as well as some modifications and additions. The next steps in the process of implementing the proposed changes are:

- TAC Approval (June)
- Board Approval (July)
- CCRPC submits official request to VTrans
- VTrans submits official request to FHWA headquarters for final approval

In the brief discussion that followed Dennis Lutz asked about who makes the decisions to flex NHS funding to other programs. Matt Langham stated that VTrans does this and that shifting funds amongst programs is something that goes on throughout the year.

8. Transportation Performance Targets
Eleni reported on the recent discussions and decisions at VTrans related to performance target setting for pavement and bridges. She handed out a VTrans Asset Management & Performance Bureau fact sheet on the performance targets. Referring to this, she went over the target-setting deadlines for States and MPOs as well as the performance measures that the targets are paired with. The pavement measures are:

- % of Interstate pavement in good condition
- % of Interstate pavement in poor condition
- % of non-Interstate NHS pavement in good condition
- % of non-Interstate NHS pavement in poor condition

The bridge measures:

- % of deck area on NHS bridges in good condition
- % of deck area on NHS bridges in poor condition

Eleni described the process and results of the target-setting deliberations by VTrans and its partners and noted MPO deadlines coming in 180 days. This item will be on future TAC agendas and a TAC recommendation on pavement and bridge targets to the Board is anticipated in October.

9. Status of Projects
Peter referred members to the current project list on the back of the agenda page.

10. CCRPC April Board Meeting Report
Peter reported that the Board warned a public hearing for the FY19 UPWP.

11. Chairman’s/Members Items
Nothing reported.

The meeting adjourned at 10:45 a.m. Respectfully submitted, Peter Keating
DATE: Tuesday, May 1, 2018
SCHEDULED TIME: 11 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT
DOCUMENTS: Minutes, documents, and presentations discussed accessible at:
http://www.crrpcvt.org/meetings/clean-water-advisory-committee/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Members in Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bolton: Joss Besse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinesburg:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buels Gore:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntingdon: Darlene Palola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underhill: Brian Bigelow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jericho:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westford:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williston:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winooski: Tim Grover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelburne:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAOT: Jennifer Callahan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Junction: Chelsea Mandigo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Burlington:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VANR: Christy Witters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington Airport: Polly Harris-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stantec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of VT: Claire Forbes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCRPC Board: Don Meals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Attendees:</th>
<th>Winoski NRCD: Corrina Parnapy, DEC: Karen Bates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCRPC Staff:</td>
<td>Dan Albrecht, Charles Baker, Chris Dublin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Call to Order**  
The meeting was called to order by Don Meals.

2. **Review and action on draft minutes of April 3, 2018**  
After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, Brian Bigelow made a motion, seconded by Claire Forbes to approve the minutes with corrections as follows: Jenna was not in attendance. **MOTION PASSED with Harris, Meals and Palola abstaining.**

3. **Initial Analysis of April 2018 Winooski Tactical Basin Plan working draft (Dan Albrecht, CCRPC)**  
Albrecht provided an overview of the draft comments in the memo (see CWAC webpage) provided to the CWAC. The memo includes recommendations on improving the prioritization of projects and clarifying what can realistically be done in five years.

Darlene asked about a reclassification of Cobb Brook in Huntingdon. Karen Bates said that this has been added to the monitoring spreadsheet to begin the process. The goal is to maintain the water quality of the brook, and the first step will be monitoring.

Karen asked for input on the stressors, as community members may know that better. As well as helping to define the general strategies (which Karen refers to as best management practices).

Discussion regarding what would make projects a priority – flow restoration plans, top projects from the stormwater master plans, top projects from the river corridor studies, Phase II fluvial erosion geomorphology studies, etc. The point is not to get DEC to state that they’ll fund all these projects, but to identify and come to consensus on the projects that are more critical than others. Still not clear if the project themselves will stay in the database, and the Plan will stay at the general strategy level.

Karen suggested that if we can get more specific in the table on general strategy that would be great, but this isn’t a list of actions. There was a suggestion to include implementation of the Flow Restoration Plan and list the Towns that have those; and the Stormwater Master Plan projects?

Joss explained that on the PAC we’ve been focusing quite a bit on implementing plans in order to understand how to pick it up and use it. We’ve encouraged actions plans with schedules. Karen said these are strategies that are supported, but not necessarily going to be checked off in five years. The TBP indicates that they are implementing regulations that will help meet the phosphorus reduction targets; but we don’t know exactly know what projects will happen. DEC itself has a more specific list of what they are going to do (i.e. how...
many staff will be trained). Discussion on the last statement on page 132 that indicates that everything in the Plan will be accomplished in the next five years. Don Meals suggested that there also needs to be a higher level of prioritization between the Winooski and the other basins because the Missisquoi has a harder job than we do in the Winooski.

Jennifer suggested that ideally, we’d have all projects on the table and we’d be able to look at the most bang for the buck for all types of projects, because we aren’t just looking at road projects. We should be looking at all projects together in a basin. Also, not sure about putting all Flow Restoration Projects in the plan and call them a priority. Because they shouldn’t all be done in comparison to other projects. Ideally, we’d have phosphorus reduction and cost estimates completed so we can prioritize the full list of projects. But we don’t have the data yet. But can we prioritize which sectors should be prioritized so we can make the best recommendation to the Secretary about how to best accomplish water quality improvements in the basin.

There are more issues/pollutants in the Plan than phosphorus. All of these are identified in Table 4; this list will be updated with the 2018 list. Can we say these other issues are important, but at 5% or something?

Clean Water Fund Board is the group that decides where to put money at the larger sector level (i.e. agricultural v. developed lands). From CCRPC’s standpoint the conversation is the same and the TBP should also include our recommendation.

Table of strategies for different sectors – what it says for agriculture is exactly what we’ve been saying for decades. Business as usual has not gotten the job done; so we should distinguish between new things. Also don’t see any mention of tile drainage as a priority; there is new data coming out that this is a source of phosphorus.

4. Legislative Update (Charlie Baker)

S. 260 – Charlie Baker stated that S.260 is intended to identify long-term funding. Current bill includes an occupancy fee. Likely that the Governor will veto. Though they were thinking about postponing the fee raising, The House seemed more open to raising revenue. Hopefully this is all setting up for a productive conversation next year. We are not on a sustainable path. Cannot keep kicking the ball down the road. The EPA letter said we are okay for now but State needs to address the 3-acre permit and the long-term revenue source. If we don’t get this straightened out it will essentially shut-down any more development and wastewater treatment plants, etc.

Christy Witters does not have any more information on the 3-acre permit.

5. Updates

Charlie Baker sent around a letter from James Sherrard that he is going to submit on the Wetlands General Permit. May be critical that these issues are addressed in order to implement the stormwater improvement projects. The challenge is more of an issue around the buffers. James Sherrard is asking if CCRPC would consider supporting similar comments. Don Meals couldn’t support it without looking at if more. Chelsea is supportive as they’ve discussed this before. Jennifer added that they support it if it will help them improve their current BMPs. These are managed permits and the rule isn’t going to help them make the improvements in the buffer. Don Meals suggested that natural wetlands should not be used as a BMP for stormwater management. He would be okay with it, if you could ensure that the function of the wetland is not impacted but it is difficult to address that in a general permit. Comments are due in May. Dan will send this letter out to the rest of the CWAC and suggest that they submit comments on their own if they’d like. Charlie will discuss with the Executive Committee and it may end up on the Board agenda.

Grants in Aid – St. George and Burlington not likely to spend any of their money. All construction needs to be done by June 30th and invoices submitted in July. There will be another round of Grants in Aid funding, but you are only eligible if you pay your administrative fee of the MRGP permit on time.
Karen Bates showed a sample of the “rack card” for the Raise the Blade campaign.

6. Items for Tuesday, June 5th meeting
   Did not discuss.

Adjournment
   The meeting adjourned at 12:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony & Dan Albrecht
The meeting was called to order at 5:45 p.m. by the Chair, Chris Roy, after calling Jeff Carr to have him join the meeting.

1. Changes to the Agenda; Members’ Items: Charlie asked to discuss the wetlands letter he sent them earlier under the Executive Director’s report item 11.

2. Approval of April 4, 2018 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF APRIL 4, 2018 WITH CHANGES. Barbara gave Bernie several clarifying changes. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS CORRECTED.

3. Approval of March 28, 2018 Finance Committee Meeting Minutes. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MARCH 28, 2018 FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES. MIKE O’BRIEN SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.


   a. Balance Sheet/Income statement. Cash in checking (operating) $147,436; Cash in savings (match) $124,444; Cash in money market & CDs (reserve) 216,912; current assets over liabilities - $627,318. Deferred income communities (match) is $110,156 which should take us through the end of the fiscal year. Income notes – ACCD staff time are 83% expended through 75% of the year; transportation staff billing is at 72% expended. The ANR/HMGP river corridor project finished up in February and January was the last month with CCOA revenue/expense. We are under budget overall in our expense lines with just under 72% incurred. Net income through March is ($47,684). We continue to expect to end the year better than the projected deficit of $98,137.
   b. Cash position/targets. Forest reported that cash is looking okay – we’re about $200,000 better than we projected. We have not had to take cash out of our reserves; and are hopeful we will not have to for the rest of the year.
6. Review Draft FY19 UPWP and Budget. Charlie noted that his memo reviewed the UPWP process, and he noted a couple of changes. We were asking for $10,000 fee for Winooski Comprehensive Plan work, but that has been increased to $26,000. The second change is to add funds for a new Brownfields grant. Those two changes will change the budget slightly. We’re still showing a deficit of $90,108, but we hope these new revenues will reduce the projected deficit. We have budgeted conservatively and we’re hoping the deficit will be closer to $40,000. Forest did a good job working with VTrans to get an approved indirect rate of 68.12% which is more in line with our actual rate and should help reduce the drastic swings we’ve had recently. JOHN ZICONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BARBARA ELLIOTT, TO APPROVE THE FY19 DRAFT UPWP WITH THE INCREASE IN THE DOLLARS FOR THE WINOOSKI COMPREHENSIVE PLAN WORK AND TO ADD THE NEW BROWNFIELDS GRANT; AND RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE FULL BOARD. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O’BRIEN, TO APPROVE THE DRAFT BUDGET AND RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE FULL BOARD. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. (Jeff Carr left the meeting.) Chris Roy resumed as chair.

7. Personnel Policy Update. Charlie noted that staff is recommending increasing the Health Saving Account contribution for two-person and family policies from $4,000 to $5,000 annually beginning July 1st. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O’BRIEN, TO APPROVE THE INCREASE IN HSA CONTRIBUTION FROM $4,000 TO $5,000 FOR TWO-PERSON AND FAMILY POLICIES. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

8. Review Draft Act 250/Section 248 Review Policy. Staff noted that the adoption of the 2018 ECOS Plan will necessitate changes in our review guidelines for Act 250 and Section 248 applications. These changes will provide guidance for CCRPC to review applications in light of adding “known constraints” and “possible constraints” to development to the ECOS Plan. The proposed changes differentiate between CCRPC review of Act 250 applications and Section 248 applications.

1. Act 250 review will remain largely unchanged. During Act 250 review, the known and possible constraints listed in the ECOS Plan are reviewed by municipalities and state agencies. CCRPC will defer to the relevant municipality or state agency with jurisdiction over the constraint, rather than submit separate comments on constraints. CCRPC will continue to focus review on land use and transportation.

2. During Section 248 review, some, but not all, known and possible constraints listed in the ECOS Plan are reviewed by municipalities and state agencies. CCRPC will defer to state agencies to review relevant constraints but will review and provide comments on local constraints when municipal plans do not have substantial deference. This review will take the form of submitting comments on advance notices and may include commenting on applications during hearings, intervening in hearings or requesting hearings on applications.

Under Section 248, applicants must distribute an “advance notice” at least 45 days before an application is submitted. CCRPC must submit any comments on the advance notice within 40 days of receiving it. Commenting gives CCRPC a chance to raise potential issues before the application is submitted to the Public Utilities Commission. Regina noted that this will be a greater workload for staff. Emily Nosse-Leirer then reviewed the proposed changes to the Guidelines and Standards and members suggested minor changes. This draft will be presented at the May board meeting, but we won’t ask for adoption until July after the ECOS 2018 Plan is adopted. Members feel that responsibility for approval of any letters responding to the applicant be with the Executive Committee, the same as approving letters to for Act 250 applications.
   a. Kwiniaska Golf Club, Shelburne, Application #4C1312. Regina noted that this application only
      covers the changes to the golf course and not the bigger development planned for that site.
      Shelburne has not made a local decision on this yet, but we have no issues. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE
      A MOTION TO APPROVE THE LETTER TO THE DISTRICT ENVIRONMENTAL COMMISSION. JOHN
      ZICCONI SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
   b. GMP Essex Solar/Storage, LLC, Essex, Case #18-0944-AN. This is the first letter to a developer in
      response to the 45-day notice of a Section 248 Petition to the Vermont Public Utility Commission.
      The letter gives some background that adoption of our 2018 ECOS Plan is anticipated and staff has
      reviewed the project using the policies that may be in place at the time of the filing. The letter also
      gives a brief introduction into the ECOS Energy Goals, suitability policies and the constraints found on
      the proposed site. Emily reviewed the constraints that exist on this site using ANR Natural Resources
      Atlas and ANR Biofinder and they are not ground tested. This project site is located east of where
      VT289 hits VT 117. After a brief discussion and review of the staff comment sheet, ANDY MONTROLL
      MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE LETTER TO GREEN MOUNTAIN POWER REGARDING THE ESSEX
      SOLAR/STORAGE SITE. BARBARA ELLIOTT SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
   c. Town of Colchester/Aegis Solar, Colchester, Case #18-09523-AN. This letter follows the same
      format of the previous one. Based on the preliminary site plan, it doesn’t look like there are any
      constraints on or near the site, although staff used ANR Natural Resources Atlas and ANR Biofinder
      sites and they are not ground tested. This project is located off Malletts Bay Avenue on the Brigante
      farm and replaces the preferred site we had reviewed before. After discussion and suggestions for
      minor edits, BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE LETTER TO AEGIS RENEWABLE
      ENERGY, INC. BE APPROVED AS AMENDED. ANDY MONTROLL SECONDED AND THE MOTION
      CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

10. Draft Municipal Plan Review Policy. Staff prepared draft amendments to the Guidelines and
    Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans to add
    language for Granting Determination of Energy Compliance. These changes are in anticipation of
    adoption of the ECOS 2018 Plan, and CCRPC receiving a Determination of Energy Compliance from
    the Department of Public Service. The plan is expected to be adopted at the June board meeting, but
    the Determination of Energy Compliance isn’t expected until late summer, so final action on these
    changes will not be taken until September. A couple of minor edits were suggested.

11. Chair/Executive Director’s Report.
    a. Legislative Update. Charlie reported that we’ve been following S.260 regarding sustainable
       funding for clean water. However, the Governor has made it clear that he will not approve any
       funding increases, so we have no idea what will happen. There had been discussion in both the
       house and senate about regionalizing Burlington International Airport with CCRPC involvement, but it
       did not make it into the bill.
    b. Letter re. comments on draft Wetlands General Permit #3-9026. Charlie presented a letter from
       Williston’s stormwater coordinator giving comments on the Wetlands General permit proposed rules.
       There has been discussion and concern from MS4 communities and VTrans about the buffer around
       wetlands. There is general consensus that treating the water just outside the wetlands before it gets
       to the wetlands, helps and Williston’s letter suggests increasing those buffers. This letter was
       discussed at the CWAC yesterday, but they did not take a position or make any recommendations.
       Charlie wondered if the Executive Committee wanted him to support these comments by writing a
       letter. Members feel we do not have enough information for repeating these comments, but agreed
       Charlie could write a letter urging the Department of Environmental Conservation, Watershed
Management Division to look into the concerns of the MS4 communities and VTrans about the
wetland buffers. Members were okay with that.

12. **Agenda Review – May 16, 2018 board meeting.** Members reviewed and amended the board
agenda. Tom Gustafson of UVM will make a presentation. Andy Montroll will report on FY19
executive nominations.

13. **Other Business.** It was noted that the first Wednesday of July is the 4th. Members were inclined to
move the meeting back to July 11th or wait until the 18th, just prior to the July Board meeting. A final
decision will be made at the June 6th Executive Committee meeting.

14. **Executive Session.** MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BARBARA ELLIOTT, TO GO INTO
EXECUTIVE SESSION AT 7:20 P.M. WITH CHARLIE PRESENT TO DISCUSS PERSONNEL ISSUES. MOTION
CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO COME OUT OF EXECUTIVE
SESSION WITH NO ACTION AT 7:35 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

15. **Adjournment.** BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO ADJOURN
THE MEETING AT 7:35 P.M. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc
May 3, 2018

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

RE: Kwiniaska Golf Club; Shelburne; Application #4C1312

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 construction of 6 additional golf holes on the east side of Spear Street (four proposed as infill within the existing golf course footprint limits and two proposed to be located in northeast corner of property), as well as a parking lot expansion and the construction of a porch with an awning on the east side of the clubhouse. The project is located at 5531 Spear Street in Shelburne. We understand that this project is currently being reviewed by the Shelburne Development Review Board and that no decisions have been made yet regarding the application.

The project is located within the Rural Planning Area as defined in the Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan. The Rural Planning Area is identified in the Plan as an area where regional and town plans promote the preservation of Vermont’s traditional working landscape and natural area features, which provides for low density commercial, industrial, and residential that is compatible with working lands and natural areas. Development in the rural planning areas is also typically outside the sewer service area. We find this project to be consistent with the Planning Areas for the following reasons:

1. The project is a low density commercial development that is in conformance with the Rural Planning Area.
2. The project does not propose any changes to existing water or wastewater service.

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 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 because the expansion of the golf course facilities will take place on the existing Golf Club property. The
project will not necessitate the construction of any new utility or public transportation infrastructure. Finally, the project is limited to the existing Golf Club property, and does not contribute to the characteristics of strip development.

We have no comments or concerns regarding transportation as this project is simply restoring the golf course to its previous size of 18 holes.

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,

[Signature]

Charlie Baker
Executive Director

Cc:  CCRPC Board
Certificate of Service
May 3, 2018

Nils Behn, CEO
Aegis Renewable Energy, Inc.
340 Mad River Park, Suite 6
Waitsfield, VT 05673

RE: Advance Notice of Petition for Aegis Renewable Energy/Town of Colchester’s Proposed 150 kW Project in Colchester, Vermont (Case #18-0952-AN)

Dear Mr. Behn:

Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission has received the 45-day notice of a Section 248 Petition to be filed with the Vermont Public Utility Commission for a 150 kW solar project off of Mallets Bay Avenue in Colchester, VT. As you may know, CCRPC is currently in the final stages of drafting a new regional plan (the Draft 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan), with an anticipated adoption date of June 20, 2018, and an effective date of July 25, 2018. We will be seeking a Determination of Energy Compliance from the Vermont Department of Public Service after the plan is adopted. Given the timing of this application, we have reviewed it based on the policies in the Draft 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan. We hope this letter serves to alert you to the policies that may be in place at the time of you filing your petition.

ECOS Energy Goal
CCRPC finds that this project meets the intent of the Energy Goal (Goal #17) of the 2018 ECOS Plan: “Move Chittenden County’s energy system toward a cleaner, more efficient and renewable system that benefits health, economic development, and the local/global climate by working towards the State’s Comprehensive Energy Plan goals.”

Strategy 2, Action 4b of the ECOS Plan states “CCRPC supports the generation of new renewable energy in the County to meet the Vermont Comprehensive Energy Plan’s goals of using 90% renewable energy by 2050, in a manner that is cost effective and respects the natural environment”. Development of this solar facility helps implement this action. The Plan’s suitability policies help determine whether projects are cost effective, and the Plan’s constraint policies help determine whether projects respect the natural environment.

Suitability Policies
The 2018 ECOS Plan recommends the location of renewable energy generation facilities in appropriate locations, as defined by the polices in Strategy 2, Action 4b. The project as proposed meets the following suitability policies:

- The project is located in an area with adequate grid capacity.
- The project is outside of any state designated centers or historic districts.

CCRPC finds that the general location of this project meets the suitability policies of the 2018 ECOS Plan.

Constraints
The 2018 ECOS Plan states that ground mounted renewable energy generation is constrained in certain areas due to state and local restrictions on development. Strategy 2, Action 4b states: “Site renewable
energy generation to avoid state and local known constraints and to minimize impacts to state and local possible constraints, as defined in Strategy 3, Action 1.f, and Strategy 4, Action 1.f, and Action 2.e. Renewable energy generation sited on existing structures or parking lots complies with this policy.”

CCRPC has reviewed the constraints that exist on the site of the proposed project. Based on our review of this project’s location using the ANR Natural Resources Atlas, it appears that there are primary agricultural soils, hydric soils, highest priority forest blocks and slopes over 20% on the parcel, but not impacted by this project. We mention the presence of these nearby constraints simply for your information, given that our review is based on data that have not been verified by on-the-ground studies. **CCRPC is not requesting further information or action related to these constraints at this time.**

These comments are based on information currently available; we may have additional comments as the process continues. We understand that the project may change between the advance notice and the final application. CCRPC will review the project location again after the final application is submitted to confirm our initial findings above.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Charlie Baker  
Executive Director

cc: CCRPC Board
May 3, 2018

Kirk Shields  
Green Mountain Power  
163 Acorn Lane  
Colchester, VT 05446

RE: Advance Notice of Petition for GMP-Essex Solar/Storage LLC’s Proposed Project in Essex, Vermont (Case #18-0944-AN)

Dear Mr. Shields:

Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission has received the 45-day notice of a Section 248 Petition to be filed with the Vermont Public Utility Commission for a ±4.45 MW solar project with a 2 MW battery storage facility, to be known as the GMP-Essex Solar/Storage Project, on River Road in Essex VT. As you know, CCRPC is currently in the final stages of drafting a new regional plan (the Draft 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan), with an anticipated adoption date of June 20, 2018, and an effective date of July 25, 2018. We will be seeking a Determination of Energy Compliance from the Vermont Department of Public Service after the plan is adopted. Given the timing of this application, we have reviewed it based on the policies in the Draft 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan. We hope this letter serves to alert you to the policies that may be in place at the time of you filing your petition.

ECOS Energy Goal
CCRPC finds that this project meets the intent of the Energy Goal (Goal #17) of the 2018 ECOS Plan: “Move Chittenden County’s energy system toward a cleaner, more efficient and renewable system that benefits health, economic development, and the local/global climate by working towards the State’s Comprehensive Energy Plan goals.”

Strategy 2, Action 4b of the ECOS Plan states “CCRPC supports the generation of new renewable energy in the County to meet the Vermont Comprehensive Energy Plan’s goals of using 90% renewable energy by 2050, in a manner that is cost effective and respects the natural environment”. Development of this solar facility helps implement this action. The Plan’s suitability policies help determine whether projects are cost effective, and the Plan’s constraint policies help determine whether projects respect the natural environment.

Suitability Policies
The 2018 ECOS Plan recommends the location of renewable energy generation facilities in appropriate locations, as defined by the polices in Strategy 2, Action 4b. The project as proposed meets the following suitability policies:

- The project is located in an area with 3-phase power and adequate grid capacity.
- The project is a reuse of a previously disturbed sand pit.
- The project is located in one of Chittenden County’s areas planned for growth (Enterprise District) but is not located in a state designated center or a historic district.

CCRPC finds that the general location of this project meets the suitability policies of the 2018 ECOS Plan.

Constraints
The 2018 ECOS Plan states that ground mounted renewable energy generation is constrained in certain areas due to state and local restrictions on development. Strategy 2, Action 4b states: “Site renewable energy
generation to avoid state and local known constraints and to minimize impacts to state and local possible constraints, as defined in Strategy 3, Action 1.f, and Strategy 4, Action 1.f, and Action 2.e. Renewable energy generation sited on existing structures or parking lots complies with this policy.”

Based on the site plan included in the advance notice, CCRPC has reviewed the constraints that exist on the site of the proposed project. This location avoids most constraints.

- **River Corridors and Highest Priority Forest Blocks**: Based on our review of this project’s location using the ANR Natural Resources Atlas, it appears that there are River Corridors and Highest Priority Forest Blocks near the project, but not impacted. We mention the presence of these nearby constraints simply for your information, given that our review is based on data that have not been verified by on-the-ground studies.

However, it appears that some constraints may be impacted by this project.

- **Class 2 Wetland**: Based on the VSWI layer shown on the ANR Natural Resources Atlas, it appears that a Class II wetland will be impacted by this project. Class II wetlands are a state known constraint. CCRPC will defer to the Vermont Agency of Natural Resources in determining the location of wetlands and the impact of development. **CCRPC is not requesting further information or action related to this constraint at this time.**

- **Agricultural Soils**: Based on the agricultural soils layer shown on the ANR Natural Resources Atlas, it appears that statewide agricultural soils will be impacted by this project. CCRPC will defer to the Vermont Agency of Agriculture, Food and Markets in determining the impact of development on agricultural soils. **CCRPC is not requesting further information or action related to this constraint at this time.**

- **Slopes Higher than 20% and Slopes 15-20%**: Based on the slopes layer shown on the ANR Atlas and the contour lines shown on the submitted site plan, it appears that this project proposes clearing vegetation on an area of slopes over 20%. Slopes over 20% are a known constraint in the Town of Essex. Slopes 15-20% are a possible constraint in the Town of Essex. **CCRPC requests more information on the impact this project will have on slopes over 20% and slopes 15-20%, including any plans to stabilize the slopes after clearing and how the project could be reconfigured to avoid clearing on any slopes over 20%.**

CCRPC supports the development of renewable energy in Chittenden County, and we look forward to working with you to gain more clarity on this project’s impacts to steep slopes.

These comments are based on information currently available; we may have additional comments as the process continues. We understand that the project may change between the advance notice and the final application. CCRPC will review the project location again after the final application is submitted to confirm our initial findings above. Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Charlie Baker  
Executive Director

cc: CCRPC Board
Brownfields Advisory Committee  Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, May 2, 2018  3:00 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.
CCRPC Main Conference Room, 110 West Canal St., Suite 202 Winooski, VT

To access various documents referenced below, please visit:
http://www.ccrpcvt.org/our-work/economic-development/brownfields/#advisory-committee

Committee members in attendance:
Curt Carter, GBIC (Chair)  Kirsten Merriman-Shapiro, Burlington CEDO

Guests in attendance:
Dave Allerton, Town of Milton  Yves Bradley, 314 North Winooski Project – realtor
Maura Fitzgerald, 314 North Winooski Project – potential purchaser
Frank Gardner, US EPA (via phone)  Kurt Muller, Johnson and Co.
Dan Voisin, Stone Environmental  Miles Waite, Waite-Heindel

Staff in attendance:
Dan Albrecht, Emily Nosse-Leirer, CCRPC Jason Charest,

1.  **Call to Order, Introductions and Changes to the Agenda**
The meeting was called to order at 3:05 pm.

2.  **Public comments on items not on the Agenda**
None.

3.  **Review and action on March 19th meeting summary**
Dan summarized the minutes from the 3/19/18 meeting. There were no changes or objections to the minutes.

4.  **Action on Site Nominations/Assistance Requests**
   a.  314 North Winooski Avenue Burlington: Request for funding of Phase II ESA
   Dan Voisin summarized the results of the Phase I ESA. There was a gas station previously on the property, along with a number of spills on the site that have led to 7 RECs, including contaminated soils, used oil and open floor drains. Based on the results of the Phase I, Stone has provided a proposal for a Phase II ESA (included in meeting materials). The Phase II will focus on assessing vapor intrusion, sub-slab soil contamination and hazardous building materials. There may be PCBs in the fluid from the hydraulic lift present in the garage. This was relatively common in the past.

   Curt asked whether the landowners have signed their participation and site access agreements. Maura confirmed that they have. Maura reiterated that they want to ensure that the site is possible to remediate before purchasing. Yves explained the complicated ownership situation on the property. The potential purchaser has stated that they are willing to cover up to $100,000 of assessment and cleanup costs. Curt explained that the view of the Brownfields Advisory Committee is to ensure that the EPA money goes into the community and to increase economic development.

   Dan Albrecht asked Frank to give his opinion on whether this project is acceptable, given the lack of
redevelopment plans for the site. Frank explained that it is OK, because the EPA is aware that sometimes cleanup costs are revealed to be prohibitively expensive. And it’s beneficial to the community to know what kind of contamination exists. Dan Voisin also mentioned that they feel they need to find out whether there is groundwater contamination.

Kirsten mentioned that the assessed value currently is $247,800 for land and building, and the site pays $7,000 in property taxes annually. Yves mentioned that he thinks that the property will sell for up to $350,000. Curt remembered that it was not scored well by CCRPC staff based on the lack of housing and the lack of clear redevelopment opportunities. Dan Albrecht explained that the scoring provides a guide but does not dictate how much money should be provided.

Dan Albrecht reminded the committee members that there is about $31,000 left in hazardous assessment funds in this grant, with $200,000 additional in hazardous materials that will be available as of July 1. No petroleum money can be used for this site, due to past practices.

Stone Environmental quoted approximately $29,000 for the Phase II.

Kirsten asked the representatives for the 314 N. Winooski project if they would still pursue to project without brownfields funding, or with only partial funding, from CCRPC. There was no clear answer.

There is approximately $27,000 left in the hazardous materials fund, and the present committee members suggested that the money be allocated to the project. Staff will distribute information to the full committee to calculate exactly how much money is left and how much will be distributed to the project.

b. Milton Grange, 135 River Street: Phase I ESA

The municipality wants to buy the property after a 20-year lease and wishes to complete a due diligence Phase I ESA on the property. Dan Albrecht asked Frank to confirm whether the Phase I is appropriate for a lease-to-own situation. The Town wants to start the lease in the next 30 days. Kirsten questioned whether the Phase I, hazardous building materials assessment and QAPP is possible in that short timeframe. General consensus was that the Phase I is possible, but a materials assessment and QAPP are not.

Frank stated that he is open to potentially paying for the full Phase I with petro money, given that the hazardous building materials assessment will be funded fully with hazardous money.

The committee members agreed that funding this project will have an immediate effect, and the project should be fully funded with petro money.

c. Town of Milton: Phase I ESAs, acquisition and demo of buildings for “hourglass” road ROW
   i. 204-210 US Route 7: Parent property
   ii. 214-218 US Route 7: Papaseraiphim property

Dave explained that the current intersection configuration is very dangerous. The hourglass intersection would require the demolition of two buildings. Dan Albrecht asked whether TIF funds can be used for environmental assessment. It is unclear right now. Miles and Dave confirmed that there will need to be a subdivision that occurs before the town can acquire the property for the southern leg of the intersection.

Kirsten asked what the schedule and constraints are for the project. VTrans hopes to have the project completed
by 2020, with construction during 2019. Both property owners involved have already agreed to sell. General consensus is that the project is ready to go. Both properties need a due diligence Phase I ESA and a hazardous building materials assessment due to age, but nothing too bad is expected. The biggest concern will likely be asbestos during demolition. For decision making purposes, consultants in the room predicted that Phase I assessments for the three buildings would be about $3,000, and the project would be about $6,000 total for the two properties.

Frank reminded consultants that any work that requires sampling will require a QAPP.

The committee members agreed that funding these projects will have an immediate effect, and the projects should be fully funded.

5. **Updates**

FY18 Brownfields Assessment Grant application was successful! CCRPC was granted an additional $200,000 for Hazardous Substances and $100,000 for Petroleum.

Kirsten suggested scheduling summer meeting ASAP to work around vacations.

6. **Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 4:29pm.
1. Welcome + Introductions
The meeting began at 5:06pm.

2. Review February 20, 2018 Minutes
Keith Epstein made a motion to approve the minutes. Jeff Forward seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Presentation on Renewable Natural Gas: Tom Murray, VP-Customers and Communities Vermont Gas

Tom Murray from Vermont Gas attended to give an overview of renewable natural gas (presentation attached). Renewable natural comes from any natural source of gas, including wastewater and decomposition. As background, Tom said that the number of biogas projects that use natural gas as fuel (instead of electricity generation) is expected to double over the next few years.

To use biogas to generate electricity, the fuel can be about 60% methane. For it to go in a pipeline, it needs to be closer to 92% methane. The 2018 supply comes from EBI Landfill in Quebec, which serves the Montreal area. In the future, there is a VT farm biodigester that may be coming online in 2018 or 2019, as well as another 300,000 MMBTU flowing into the system from RNG over the next 5 years – this is in comparison with 7,666,209 MMBTU total used in Chittenden County in 2015. Tom reports that this is 5% of their total “firm” consumer base. The accounting protocol will essentially be like retiring a REC for electricity. However, digesting processes for manure don’t get rid of phosphorus at all.

An engineering company will be completing a verification that the process is “legit.” This validation process will hopefully lead to a “green E” stamp in the future. Their auditing company audits things for Green E certification. Jeff asked if the verification process will account for methane leakage. Tom stated that he did not know because the audit occurs at the delivery end, when the TCPL delivers to Highgate.

The Vermont Gas adder for RNG is $1.1749/ccf. This brings the cost up to the average commodity cost for RNG. The commodity cost for RNG is approximately $1.70/ccf.

Emily asked how energy use for cleaning up the biomethane for the pipeline compares to other extraction energy use.

Keith asked how VGS will determine how much to buy for resale. Tom explained that if VGS overbuys compared to what
consumers want, they will be able to sell it wholesale, for example to customers who would otherwise buy carbon offsets. The committee asked for confirmation on the issue of whether it’s carbon dioxide neutral or not. Tom said that Vermont Gas views the GHG saved from not extracting natural gas as making the RNG carbon neutral. The committee reiterated that they would like to know how much energy is used to clean up the biomethane to see how it compares. Tom said that he can find out more information.

Another potential source of biomethane is from gasification of wood, in which heating wood produces gas without burning it. Jeff stated that he thinks this is not an effective process at the moment.

Tom said that hydrogen injection into the system is a new technology that people are experimenting with, in which electricity is taken off the electric grid and turned into hydrogen. This theoretically stores energy without batteries. This theoretically also allows you to combine hydrogen with CO$_2$ from carbon capture systems to make CH$_4$.

Tom stated that he thinks that the state’s goals should not be about renewable technology, but rather about CO$_2$ reduction.

Melanie asked if the state will be counting it in their renewable energy targets. Tom stated that they likely will not. Melanie reiterated that she is concerned with how municipalities will be able to count there towards their generation goals. The committee agreed that it would be very helpful to hear how much RNG is being used in each municipality annually.

Melanie asked about what size farms need to be to produce an adequate amount of RNG. A farm needs to have about 1,000 head of cattle for producing RNG to be profitable for them.

Jeff asked if CCRPC staff are proposing new ECOS Plan language based on this. Melanie confirmed that we are not, this is an educational opportunity for the committee and staff.

Keith asked how Tier III requirements fit into this. Tom said that electric utilities could choose to pay the premium for RNG for customers – it will be a Tier III measure that utilities can choose to purchase.


### 4. Vermont Climate Pledge

At the March Board meeting, the board asked the Energy Sub-Committee to make a recommendation on CCRPC joining the [Vermont Climate Pledge Coalition](https://www.ccrpcvt.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/RNG-CCRPC-April-2018.pdf). Sharon was not able to attend the meeting, but supported CCRPC joining the Climate Pledge coalition, if more specific actions are available.

Melanie gave the following context:

Chris Shaw, South Burlington Representative, in reviewing the Draft ECOS Plan asked the CCRPC to consider joining the Vermont Climate Pledge Coalition. The Executive Committee discussed this at the March 7th meeting and decided to put this on the Board agenda and recommended the Board ask the Energy Sub-Committee to make a recommendation on whether CCRPC should join the Climate Pledge. The Board agreed.

The Vermont Climate Pledge Coalition, coordinated by the City of Burlington and the Energy Action Network, is a group
totaling 45 organizations consisting of Vermont municipalities, non-profits, colleges and universities, businesses, farms, and other community organizations committed to reducing carbon emissions and help Vermont meet the U.S. pledge to reduce greenhouse gas emissions levels from 2005 by 26-28% by 2025. One central purpose of the Coalition is to demonstrate a commitment to the Paris Agreement despite the Federal government’s withdrawal. Additionally, coalition members are encouraged to make pledges via the Climate Pledge Tracker. If CCRPC becomes a member, CCRPC can record actions already taken and pledge to take new actions which may include ongoing activities and accomplishments such as encouraging transportation alternatives, developing enhanced energy plans, and installing EV charging equipment.

Current coalition members include but are not limited to City of Burlington, City of South Burlington, Burton, Dealer.Com, Efficiency Vermont, Local Motion, Lake Champlain Regional Chamber of Commerce, University of Vermont Health Network, Vermont Businesses for Social Responsibility, Vermont Gas Systems, Vermont League of Cities and Towns, and Vermont Natural Resources Council. There may be a concern about CCRPC joining when only two of our municipalities have joined.

There may be benefits to joining the Vermont Climate Pledge Coalition. The Climate Pledge Tracker is a useful tool for sharing resources and educating others on planning for an energy future that is clean and affordable. By joining the coalition, CCRPC will elevate the work already being done on climate mitigation and lead by example in becoming a member. Additionally, the draft ECOS Plan includes an action encouraging entities to join the coalition. Strategy 2.4.a.vi. reads: “Use the Energy Action Network (EAN) Community Energy Dashboard to educate residents and municipalities about opportunities to reduce energy use and switch to renewable energy sources. Additionally, institutions (including municipalities, institutions of higher education, businesses and non-profits) can use the Vermont Climate Pledge Coalition Tracker to upload actions that will help the State achieve its 90% renewable energy 2050 goal.”

Jeff stated that he thought it would be just as hard or easy for CCRPC to take the pledge as any other commercial tenant that rents space. Catherine raised the issue of conflicts – would there ever be a situation whether there would be a conflict between CCRPC taking the pledge and a municipality not taking the pledge.

Jeff asked if CCRPC has an official energy conservation policy. He said that Richmond found it to be a useful exercise that provides good policies for them.

Will stated that he thought joining the pledge was successful in Essex because it was a grassroots effort, not something that the town was asked to do.

Will stated that he thought that the Vermont Energy Dashboard would be very useful for tracking the progress towards the pledge.

Jeff strongly felt that the CCRPC should join the pledge. He made a motion that the committee should recommend the adoption of the pledge to the board. The pledge will focus on our organizational energy use, not a regional policy. Keith seconded the pledge. It passed unanimously.

5. Next Steps
Melanie informed the committee that once the ECOS Plan is approved a formal request to review the ECOS Plan for a determination of energy compliance will be sent to the Department of Public Service. Melanie will inform the committee of the state’s public hearing. The meeting adjourned around 6:30pm.
Date: Wednesday, May 9, 2018
Time: 5:00 p.m.
Place: CCRPC offices; 110 W. Canal Street; Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404

Members present: Andy Montroll (Chair), Jeff Carr, Catherine McMains. Forest Cohen, staff

1. Committee Chair, Andy Montroll opened the meeting at 5:02 pm.

2. Jeff Carr motioned to approve the May 2, 2017 Board Development Committee Minutes. Catherine McMains seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

3. Andy provided a summary of his efforts to solicit Executive Committee appointments. Jeff motioned to recommend the slate of officers to the Board for FY 2019 as Chair – Chris Roy; Vice-Chair – Mike O’Brien; Treasurer – John Zicconi; Large Town – Catherine McMains; Small Town – Barbara Elliott; Past Chair – Andy Montroll. Catherine seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Jeff proposed that there should be some board education/training sessions in the coming year. Catherine and Andy agreed, and that the topic should be the MPO. Jeff suggested two 45-minute sessions, perhaps MPO 101A and MPO 101B. The committee agreed that the fall would be the best time for these sessions, probably directly before the October and November Full Board meetings. The committee felt they should encourage new board members, more tenured board members, and alternates to attend the sessions.

5. Catherine McMains motioned to adjourn. Jeff Carr seconded. Meeting was adjourned at 5:14 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Forest Cohen
May 9, 2017