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

ANNUAL MEETING AGENDA
Wednesday, June 20, 2018, 6:00 pm
ECHO, Leahy Center for Lake Champlain, 1 College Street, Burlington, VT

DRAFT AGENDA

5:00 p.m.- Social Hour, hors d’oeuvres, cash bar
6:00 pm - Joint Meeting with GBIC, CCRPC Business Meeting
6:30 p.m. – continuation of social hour

GBIC Awards
CCRPC Recognition

1. Call to Order

2. Changes to the Agenda (Action; 1 min.)

3. ECOS Regional Plan (including MTP and CEDS) Adoption *
   a. ECOS Metropolitan Transportation Plan Adoption (MPO Action: 1 min.)
   b. ECOS Regional Plan Adoption (Action; 1 min.)

4. Board and Staff Recognition/Resolutions * (Action; 1 min.)

5. Public Comment Period on Items NOT on the Agenda

6. Approve Minutes of May 16, 2018 Meeting * (Action; 1 min.)

7. Warn Public Hearing for FY19-22 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) * (MPO Action: 1 min.)

8. Election of Officers and Executive Committee for FY19 * (Action: 2 min.)

9. Chair/Executive Director’s Updates (Information; 1 min.)

10. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports * (Information; 1 min.)

   a. Planning Advisory Committee (draft minutes May 9, 2018)*
   b. Transportation Advisory Committee (draft minutes June 5, 2018)*
   c. Clean Water Advisory Committee (draft minutes June 5, 2018)*
   d. MS4 Subcommittee (draft minutes June 5, 2018)*
   e. Executive Committee (draft minutes June 6, 2018)*

11. Adjournment

   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 emma.vaughn@ccrpcvt.org, no later than 3 business days prior to the meeting for which services are requested.
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 emma.vaughn@ccrpcvt.org, no later than 3 business days prior to the meeting for which services are requested.
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 emma.vaughn@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:
- Executive Committee – Wednesday, July 18, 2018; 5:30 p.m.
- Planning Advisory Committee - Wednesday, July 11, 2018 2:30 p.m.
- CCRPC Board Meeting & TIP Public Hearing- Wednesday, July 18, 2018; 6:00 p.m.
- Transportation Advisory Committee - Tuesday, August 7, 2018; 9:00 a.m.
- Clean Water Advisory Committee - Tuesday, August 7, 2018; 11:00 a.m.

Tentative future Board agenda items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Agenda Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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  
CCRPC Committee Appointments & FY19 Calendar |
| NO AUGUST MEETING |                                                                                  |
| September 19, 2018 | MPO Training prior to official meeting start  
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 |
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
June 20, 2018
Agenda Item 3: 2018 ECOS Plan Adoption

Issues: After two years of work on the 2018 ECOS Plan, and the two required public hearings, the 2018 ECOS Plan is ready for adoption as the Regional Plan, Metropolitan Transportation Plan and the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy.

The plan is available here: http://www.ecosproject.com/2018-ecos-plan/. Currently the latest version posted is the second public hearing draft, because we haven’t made any changes to it since publishing that version. We will likely create the final versions and post them by the end of this week or early next week. There will be no content changes between the second public hearing draft and the final.

Attached you will find a resolution for CCRPC adoption, and for your information a GBIC resolution to adopt the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy.

Immediately after adoption the Plan will be sent to our municipalities. The Plan will take effect on July 25th, so long as we don’t receive a veto from a majority of our municipalities (we are not anticipating this).

The TAC, Long Range Planning Committee and Executive Committee all recommended the advancement of the second public hearing draft of the ECOS Plan in March. Since the Plan has not changed since then, those recommendations still stand.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends adoption of the 2018 ECOS Plan in accordance with the attached resolution.

Staff Contact: Contact Regina Mahony with any questions: rmahony@ccrpcvt.org, 846-4490 ext. 28.
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC)
Resolution
Adoption of the 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan – the Regional Plan, Metropolitan Transportation Plan & the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy

WHEREAS, CCRPC engaged in a two-year planning process from 2011 to 2013, known as ECOS, to update Chittenden County’s Regional Plan, Metropolitan Transportation Plan and the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy through the ECOS process; and

WHEREAS, the ECOS process was driven by a 65 member Steering Committee made up of the 19 municipalities and various government, non-profit and business organizations; and

WHEREAS, the ECOS process resulted in the ECOS Plan, adopted by CCRPC on June 19, 2013 and GBIC on June 25, 2013, which contains the required Regional Plan elements as described in VSA, Title 24, Chapter 117, Section 4348a, the required Metropolitan Transportation Plan elements as described in 23 CFR Part 450.324, and the required Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy elements as described in 13 C.F.R. part 303.7; and

WHEREAS, in 2016 CCRPC undertook a process to amend components of the Regional Plan, and in compliance with 24 V.S.A. § 4348, CCRPC adopted these amendments on May 18, 2016, and in compliance with 13 CFR 303.6, CCRPC supported the adoption by GBIC, on June 16, 2016, of the ECOS Plan as the Chittenden County Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy; and

WHEREAS, the CCRPC has undergone a two-year process to develop an Enhanced Energy Plan as incorporated into the 2018 ECOS Plan, update the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, update a few other sections of the Regional Plan, and along with GBIC update the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy; and

WHEREAS, the CCRPC held two warned public hearings to review and seek comments on the draft 2018 ECOS Plan, preceded by 30 day public comment periods, on February 21, 2018 and on May 16, 2018 at the CCRPC offices at 101 W. Canal Street, Suite 202 in Winooski VT.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION, that, in compliance with 24 V.S.A. § 4348, and 23 CFR Part 450, CCRPC adopts the 2018 ECOS Plan; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION, that, in compliance with 13 CFR 303.6, CCRPC supports the adoption by GBIC of the 2018 ECOS Plan.

Dated at Burlington, this 20th day of June, 2018.

CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

________________________________________
Chris Roy, Chair
Greater Burlington Industrial Corporation (GBIC)
Resolution

Adoption of the 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan – the Regional Plan, Metropolitan Transportation Plan & the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy

WHEREAS, GBIC engaged in a two-year planning process from 2011 to 2013, known as ECOS, to update Chittenden County’s Regional Plan, Metropolitan Transportation Plan and the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy through the ECOS process; and

WHEREAS, the ECOS process was driven by a 65 member Steering Committee made up of the 19 municipalities and various government, non-profit and business organizations and led by the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC); and

WHEREAS, GBIC was specifically engaged in the ECOS process as the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) Committee; and

WHEREAS, the ECOS process resulted in the ECOS Plan, adopted by CCRPC on June 19, 2013 and GBIC on June 25, 2013, which contains the required Regional Plan elements as described in VSA, Title 24, Chapter 117, Section 4348a, the required Metropolitan Transportation Plan elements as described in 23 CFR Part 450.324, and the required Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy elements as described in 13 C.F.R. part 303.7; and

WHEREAS, in 2016 CCRPC undertook a process to amend components of the Regional Plan, and in compliance with 24 V.S.A. § 4348, CCRPC adopted these amendments on May 18, 2016, and in compliance with 13 CFR 303.6, CCRPC supported the adoption by GBIC, on June 16, 2016, of the ECOS Plan as the Chittenden County Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy; and

WHEREAS, the CCRPC has undergone a two-year process to develop an Enhanced Energy Plan as incorporated into the 2018 ECOS Plan, update the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, update a few other sections of the Regional Plan, and along with GBIC update the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy; and

WHEREAS, the CCRPC held two warned public hearings to review and seek comments on the draft 2018 ECOS Plan, preceded by 30 day public comment periods, on February 21, 2018 and on May 16, 2018 at the CCRPC offices at 101 W. Canal Street, Suite 202 in Winooski VT.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE GREATER BURLINGTON INDUSTRIAL CORPORATION, that, in compliance with 13 CFR 303.6, GBIC adopts the 2018 ECOS Plan as the Chittenden County Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE GREATER BURLINGTON INDUSTRIAL CORPORATION, that, GBIC supports the adoption by CCRPC of the 2018 ECOS Plan as the Chittenden County Metropolitan Transportation Plan and the Chittenden County Regional Plan.

Dated at South Burlington, this 20th day of June, 2018.

GREATER BURLINGTON INDUSTRIAL CORPORATION

________________________________________
Paul Plunkett, Chair
CHITTENDEN COUNTY
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

In Recognition of 10 Years of Service

TO

JIM DONOVAN

FOR
REPRESENTING THE TOWN OF CHARLOTTE
ON THE
CCMPO BOARD OF DIRECTORS FROM JULY 2008 – JUNE 2011
AND
CCRPC BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS SINCE JULY 2011

Dated this 20th day of June, 2018 in Burlington, Vermont

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

In Recognition of 20 Years of Service

TO

ANDREA MORGANTE

FOR


Dated this 20th day of June, 2018 in Burlington, Vermont

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

In Recognition of 20 Years of Service

TO
MICHAEL O’BRIEN

FOR
REPRESENTING THE CITY OF WINOOSKI
ON THE
CCMPO BOARD JANUARY 1998-June 2011
AND
CCRPC BOARD SINCE JULY 2011
AND
ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AS
SECRETARY-TREASURER FROM JULY 2003 – JUNE 2005
AT-LARGE REPRESENTATIVE JUNE 2007 – JUNE 2008
SECRETARY-TREASURER JULY 2015 – JUNE 2016
VICE CHAIR SINCE JULY 2016

Dated this 20th day of June, 2018 in Burlington, Vermont

_________________________________________
CHRISTOPHER D. ROY, CHAIR
WHEREAS, THE CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANING COMMISSION, WHOSE ORGANIZATIONAL VISION IS TO BE A PRE-EMINENT, INTEGRATED REGIONAL ORGANIZATION THAT PLANS FOR HEALTHY, VIBRANT COMMUNITIES, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, AND EFFICIENT TRANSPORTATION OF PEOPLE AND GOODS WHILE IMPROVING THE REGION’S LIVABILITY, HIRED CHARLIE IN JUNE 2008; AND

WHEREAS, CHARLIE BAKER HAS FAITHFULLY SERVED THE CCRPC FOR TEN YEARS AS ITS EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR; AND

WHEREAS, THE CCRPC SERVES AS THE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO) FOR THE REGION AND CHARLIE BAKER BECAME THE MPO’S DIRECTOR AND HAS FAITHFULLY SERVED IN THAT ROLE SINCE 2015; AND

WHEREAS, CHARLIE BAKER, HAS PROVIDED OUTSTANDING LEADERSHIP FOR CCRPC BOARD AND STAFF; AND

WHEREAS, CHARLIE BAKER HAS CREATED, LED AND CHAMPIONED MANY INITIATIVES AT THE CCRPC INCLUDING:

OVERSEEING THE SUCCESSFUL MERGER OF THE CHITTENDEN COUNTY MPO AND RPC;
DEVELOPING THE ECOS PROJECT AND PLAN AND IT’S IMPLEMENTATION THROUGH RELATIONSHIP BUILDING;
EXPANDING PARTNERSHIPS OUTSIDE OF TRADITIONAL FIELDS, SUCH AS THE HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES COMMUNITY;
ADVANCING THE WORK OF THE ORGANIZATION AS A SERVICE TO THE MUNICIPALITIES IN MANY AREAS INCLUDING WATER QUALITY;
COLLABORATING WITH KEY PARTNERS ON HOUSING TO ADDRESS THE REGION’S HOUSING SHORTAGE; AND
PROVIDING BACKBONE SUPPORT TO REGIONAL EFFORTS SUCH AS THE CHITTENDEN COUNTY OPIOID ALLIANCE AND REGIONAL DISPATCH

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

IT THANKS CHARLIE BAKER FOR HIS OUTSTANDING WORK, DEDICATION, PROFESSIONALISM AND HIGH ETHICAL STANDARDS IN THE LEADERSHIP OF THE CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION THEREBY EARNING THE RESPECT OF HIS PEERS, THE PUBLIC AND PUBLIC OFFICIALS.

DATED THIS 20TH DAY OF JUNE 2018 IN BURLINGTON, VERMONT

CHRISTOPHER D. ROY, CHAIR
WHEREAS, THE CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION, WHOSE ORGANIZATIONAL VISION IS TO BE A PRE-EMINENT, INTEGRATED REGIONAL ORGANIZATION THAT PLANS FOR HEALTHY, VIBRANT COMMUNITIES, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, AND EFFICIENT TRANSPORTATION OF PEOPLE AND GOODS WHILE IMPROVING THE REGION’S LIVABILITY, HIRED FOREST IN JULY 2008; AND

WHEREAS, FOREST COHEN HAS FAITHFULLY SERVED THE CCRPC FOR TEN YEARS AS BUSINESS MANAGER AND SENIOR BUSINESS MANAGER; AND

WHEREAS, FOREST COHEN, HAS PROVIDED OUTSTANDING FINANCIAL AND BUSINESS MANAGER SUPPORT FOR CCRPC BOARD AND STAFF; AND

WHEREAS, FOREST COHEN HAS CREATED, LED AND CHAMPIONED MANY INITIATIVES AT THE CCRPC INCLUDING:
INNOVATIVE PERSONNEL AND ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES
SOUND BUDGETING AND FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT RESULTING IN CLEAN AUDITS FOR MANY YEARS
FINANCIAL SUPPORT OF PARTNER PROGRAMS SUCH AS CHITTENDEN COUNTY OPIOID ALLIANCE, REGIONAL PREVENTION PARTNERSHIP
SUCCESSFUL INCORPORATION OF ALL CCRPC PROGRAM AREAS INTO ANNUAL WORK PROGRAMS

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

IT THANKS FOREST COHEN FOR HIS OUTSTANDING WORK, DEDICATION, PROFESSIONALISM AND HIGH ETHICAL STANDARDS IN THE LEADERSHIP OF THE CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION THEREBY EARNING THE RESPECT OF HIS PEERS, THE PUBLIC AND PUBLIC OFFICIALS.

DATED THIS 20TH DAY OF JUNE, 2018 IN BURLINGTON, VERMONT

CHRISTOPHER D. ROY, CHAIR
CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

- RESOLUTION HONORING DAN ALBRECHT -

WHEREAS, THE CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION, Whose Organizational Vision is to be a Pre-eminent, Integrated Regional Organization that plans for healthy, vibrant communities, economic development, and efficient transportation of people and goods while improving the region’s livability, hired Dan in August 2003; and

WHEREAS, Dan Albrect has Faithfully served the CCRPC for fifteen years as Senior Planner; and

WHEREAS, Dan Albrect, has provided outstanding hazard mitigation, byway, brownfields and water quality support for CCRPC Board and Staff; and

WHEREAS, Dan Albrect has created, led and championed many initiatives at the CCRPC including:
   Leading the Lake Champlain National Scenic Byway/Heritage Corridor efforts and grants
   Providing staff assistance to member municipalities
   Successful brownfield grant awards to aid in redevelopment projects
   Development of all hazard mitigation plans to ensure our municipalities are prepared for disasters
   Leads MS4 program to address two critical permit requirements on behalf of member municipalities
   Established new water quality programs to implement the Lake Champlain TMDL

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

IT THANKS DAN ALBRECHT FOR HIS OUTSTANDING WORK, DEDICATION, PROFESSIONALISM AND HIGH ETHICAL STANDARDS IN THE LEADERSHIP OF THE CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION THEREBY EARNING THE RESPECT OF HIS PEERS, THE PUBLIC AND PUBLIC OFFICIALS.

DATED THIS 20TH DAY OF JUNE, 2018 IN BURLINGTON, VERMONT

CHRISTOPHER D. ROY, CHAIR
WHEREAS, THE CHITTENDEN COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (CCMPO), WHICH WAS DESIGNATED BY THE GOVERNOR OF VERMONT TO MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF FEDERAL LEGISLATION, IS RESPONSIBLE FOR MANAGING THE CONTINUOUS, COOPERATIVE AND COMPREHENSIVE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING PROCESS IN CHITTENDEN COUNTY HIRED CHRISTINE IN DECEMBER 1998; AND

WHEREAS, CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION MERGED WITH CCMPO IN 2012; AND

WHEREAS, CHRISTINE FORDE HAS FAITHFULLY SERVED THE CCMPO/CCRPC FOR TWENTY YEARS AS AN EMPLOYEE; AND

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

WHEREAS, CHRISTINE FORDE HAS CREATED, LED AND CHAMPIONED MANY INITIATIVES AT THE CCMPO/CCRPC INCLUDING: DEVELOPING AND MAINTAINING THE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM; OVERSEEING SCOPING, CORRIDOR AND NETWORK TRANSPORTATION STUDIES; DEVELOPING AND MANAGING THE PROJECT PRIORITIZATION PROCESS; AND PARTICIPATING IN NUMEROUS LOCAL AND STATE INITIATIVES

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

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

DATED THIS 20th DAY OF JUNE 2018 IN BURLINGTON, VERMONT

CHRISTOPHER D. ROY, CHAIR
CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

- RESOLUTION HONORING PETER KEATING -

WHEREAS, THE CHITTENDEN COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (CCMPO), WHICH WAS DESIGNATED BY THE GOVERNOR OF VERMONT TO MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF FEDERAL LEGISLATION, IS RESPONSIBLE FOR MANAGING THE CONTINUOUS, COOPERATIVE AND COMPREHENSIVE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING PROCESS IN CHITTENDEN COUNTY HIRED PETER IN OCTOBER 1988; AND

WHEREAS, AND CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION MERGED WITH CCMPO IN 2012; AND

WHEREAS, PETER KEATING HAS FAITHFULLY SERVED THE CCMPO/CCRPC FOR THIRTY YEARS AS AN EMPLOYEE; AND

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

WHEREAS, PETER KEATING HAS CREATED, LED AND CHAMPIONED MANY INITIATIVES AT THE CCMPO/CCRPC INCLUDING:

STAFFING THE TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC);
MANAGING THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN;
OVERSEEING THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PARK & RIDE AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PLANS;
MANAGING SCOPING AND FEASIBILITY TRANSPORTATION STUDIES;
ACTING AS STAFF LIAISON TO GREEN MOUNTAIN TRANSIT AUTHORITY; AND
INVOLVED IN REGIONAL AND LOCAL BIKE AND PEDESTRIAN PROJECTS AND INITIATIVES;

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

IT THANKS PETER KEATING FOR HIS OUTSTANDING WORK, DEDICATION, PROFESSIONALISM AND HIGH ETHICAL STANDARDS, AND SUPPORT OF THE LEADERSHIP OF THE CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION THEREBY EARNING THE RESPECT OF HIS PEERS, PUBLIC OFFICIALS, AND THE PUBLIC.

DATED THIS 20th DAY OF JUNE 2018 IN BURLINGTON, VERMONT

CHRISTOPHER D. ROY, CHAIR
DATE: Wednesday, May 16, 2018
TIME: 6:00 p.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404

Burlington: Andy Montroll Charlotte: Absent
Colchester: Jacki Murphy, Alt. Essex: Jeff Carr
Essex Jct.: Dan Kerin Hinesburg: Andrea Morgante
Huntington: Barbara Elliott Jericho: Catherine McMains
Milton: Absent Richmond: Bard Hill
St. George: Absent Shelburne: John Zicconi
So. Burlington: Chris Shaw Underhill: Brian Bigelow
Westford: Vacant/Absent Williston: Absent
Winooski: Mike O’Brien VTrans: Amy Bell
Bus/Industry: Absent Socio/Econ/Housing: Justin Dextradeur
Cons/Env.: Don Meals
Others: Joe Speidel, UVM Richard Galbraith, UVM
   Tom Gustafson, UVM Mike Blissonette, Hinesburg Alternate
   Scott Moody, CCTV cameraman
STAFF: Charlie Baker, Executive Director Dan Albrecht, Senior Planner
   Bryan Davis, Sr. Trans. Planner Peter Keating, Sr. Trans. Planner
   Regina Mahony, Planning Prog. Mgr. Melanie Needle, Senior Planner

1. Call to Order; changes to the Agenda. The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by the Vice-Chair, Mike O’Brien. There were no changes to the agenda.
2. Public Comment Period on Items NOT on the agenda. There were none.
3. Action on Consent Agenda. There were no consent agenda items.
4. Approve Minutes of April 18, 2018 Meeting. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CATHERINE McMAINS, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF APRIL 18, 2018 WITH CORRECTIONS. Jeff noted a correction on page 3, line 7 under item 6. Housing Data update. Change “housing demand” to “housing unit shortage.” MOTION CARRIED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES WITH THAT CORRECTION, WITH ABSTENTIONS FROM DON MEALS, JACKI MURPHY AND DAVID SCHERR.
5. University of Vermont Presentation. Charlie introduced Joe Speidel, Director Local Government and Community Relations at UVM. Mr. Speidel introduced Richard Galbraith, M.D., PhD. who is the Vice President for Research; and Tom Gustafson, who is Vice-President for University Relations and Administration. Mr. Speidel distributed fact sheets about UVM’s student population and UVM’s annual economic impact in Vermont. They are a high-cost and high student aid institution. Student debt is less than the national average. UVM is a net importer of students and many of them stay. UVM has a two-year housing requirement and they found that it helps with retention.
Dr. Galbraith said his real title is Vice President of Research, Scholarship and Related Arts. He then noted that UVM is making an effort to teach students how to start businesses, etc. UVM’s original charter two hundred years ago talks about having an impact on the community and back then it was how we feed ourselves and it concentrated on agriculture. They try to get funding and then take that to see whether it’s helping others in the community. They are working with businesses to see what they need from the students to work for them. He showed the list of UVM startup companies. Vermont was #5 in startups in the nation, but last in the number who grew and scaled up. He showed charts showing startups for UVM, Chittenden County and State of Vermont. He noted we have a lot going on, but are not really in touch with what is going on around us. He noted what they’re trying to deal with. Scientists are rarely good CEOs.

Tom Gustafson noted that they’re talking about ways to deal with the Trinity College Campus because it hasn’t worked for first year students since it’s away from the main campus. However that area is zoned differently than the rest of the university and they are working with the City of Burlington to change the zoning. They also hope to start the new multi-purpose facility soon as student population (10,500) has outgrown the other facilities that were built when the census was 3,500 students. When asked the outlook for the future, Mr. Gustafson said it is guarded. UVM is trying to expand into larger metro areas because New England population is decreasing. They still accept every qualified Vermont student, but need to have out-of-state students to keep the cost for in-state students down. Lengthy discussion continued with members asking questions. He noted that it’s important to keep a good reputation to make ourselves distinguishable since there are 4,500 colleges in the U.S. Andrea Morgante said we value all of the UVM facilities located throughout the county; and, suggested better communication with local communities for research projects that might be happening in those communities – not just major projects but perhaps a class research effort in a municipality.

Joe Speidel will send Charlie his presentation and ways to contact them. Charlie noted that since our members are the municipalities, we’d be happy to facilitate communication with our communities and UVM. Charlie also talked about various transportation projects that we’d like input on from UVM. Members thanked Mr. Speidel, Dr. Galbraith and Mr. Gustafson for coming.

6. **ECOS Plan Update Public Hearing #2.** JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 6:50 P.M. JOHN ZICCONI SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Regina Mahony said that since we published the 2nd draft of the plan, we have not received any comments, so we feel we are good to go and will take action at the June Annual Meeting. Jeff Carr wondered if we need to keep the public hearing open until we take action. Regina feels we have had plenty of public input over the past several months so that is not necessary. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JOHN ZICCONI, TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 6:52 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

7. **FY19 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) and Budget Public Hearing.** SHARON MURRAY MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JOHN ZICCONI, TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 6:53 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Charlie reviewed the UPWP development process. He noted that we have a couple of minor adjustments to the draft. Staff hour adjustments since Lee is on a leave of absence as Shelburne’s Interim Town Manager; addition of the 2018 Brownfields Grant; and a change from $10,000 to $26,000 from Winooski for the Municipal Plan Support project. When asked whether we could have done more outreach to get more project requests, Charlie said in talking to municipal folks there weren’t as many things they wanted to be done and they were trying to be more realistic about what they could get through the pipeline. He thinks everyone’s plates are full, especially
dealing with the water quality issues. Lengthy discussion ensued. Mike O’Brien noted that municipalities are much more aware these days that they can come to CCRPC for help. **JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JOHN ZICCONI TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 7:05 P.M. BUT KEEP THE PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD OPEN UNTIL CLOSE OF BUSINESS ON MAY 21, 2018. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE FY19 UPWP & BUDGET WITH THE ADJUSTMENTS NOTED EARLIER, ON THE CONDITION THAT NO COMMENTS ARE RECEIVED BY THE CLOSE OF THE PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD ON MAY 21ST. IF COMMENTS ARE RECEIVED THEY CAN BE ADDRESSED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AT THEIR JUNE 6TH MEETING UNLESS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS FEEL COMMENTS NEED TO BE ADDRESSED BY THE FULL BOARD. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

8. **Approve Amendments to MS4 Agreement.** Charlie noted that this agreement was approved last year after we amended our bylaws to allow CCRPC to contract with municipalities for intermunicipal services. 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. We need to amend that paragraph as noted: **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. All of the MS4 parties to the agreement have signed off on the amendment, so now we need board approval. **JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY DON MEALS, TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE MS4 AGREEMENT AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIR TO SIGN IT. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

9. **Guidelines & Standards for Review Act 250 & Section 248 Applications Review.** Regina noted 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. These guidelines include comments received from the Executive committee and the PAC. Emily reviewed the proposed changes and members made suggestions for changes and spelling and grammatical corrections. CCRPC will be asked to take action at the July board meeting after the ECOS plan is adopted. The PAC will review this again at their June meeting. A revised document will be provided in the July meeting packet.

10. **Board Development Committee – report on FY19 Officer nominations.** Andy Montroll, chair of the Board Development Committee, along with Jeff Carr and Catherine McMains met to come up with a slate of officers. Their recommendation includes:
   - Chris Roy, Chair
   - Mike O’Brien, Vice-Chair
   - John Zicconi, Secretary-Treasurer
   - Catherine McMains, At large for towns over 5,000
   - Barbara Elliott, At Large for towns under 5,000
   - Andy Montroll, Immediate Past Chair

   Election of officers will take place at the June Annual Meeting and nominations will be accepted from the floor at that time.

11. **Chair/Executive Director’s Update.**
   a. **2018 Brownfields Grant.** Charlie thanked Dan Albrecht and Emily Nosse-Leirer for their work in procuring this new Brownfields grant.
   b. **Regional Dispatch.** The new Chittenden County Public Safety Authority held its second meeting this morning. They are preparing an RFP to hire a dispatch/PSAP service development support and operations management company to help develop recommendations to the local governments before they spend any human resources or dollars. There is a lot of work that has to happen before regional dispatch becomes a reality.
   c. **Clean Water/legislative update.** Charlie noted that our legislative priority was long-term funding for the clean water efforts. That didn’t happen. Thing are lining up to be dealt with in 2019 and EPA gave a one-year extension to figure this out. The Governor is still adamant about no new property taxes. The legislature did approve a bill for the inclusion that electronic notification about things to other municipalities or regions is now okay. New Act 250 recommendations will also happen in 2019. There will be a series of public meetings to get input about Act 250 process and state agency permits related to Act 250.

12. **Committee/Liaison Activities and Reports.** Minutes from various committees were included in the meeting packet and questions should be directed to staff.

13. **Members Items:** There were none.

14. **Adjournment.** DON MEALS MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY AMY BEL, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:45 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc
Chittenden County Transportation Advisory Committee
June 20, 2018
Agenda Item 7: Action Item

FY2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Program

Issues: Federal regulations require the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC), as the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for Chittenden County, to develop and maintain a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The TIP contains funding information for transportation projects proposed to spend federal transportation funds in Chittenden County. Projects must be listed in the TIP to spend federal transportation funds. The TIP includes all modes of transportation including highways, bicycle and pedestrian facilities and transit.

The TIP covers a four-year period and it must be fiscally-constrained. It is typically updated every year with the assistance of the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC), the Vermont Agency of Transportation (VTrans), Green Mountain Transit (GMT) and Burlington International Airport.

The TIP lists federal funding amounts in the federal fiscal year when they are expected to be needed. It should be noted that the TIP is a planning and not a budget document. The TIP represents the intent to construct or implement a specific project and the anticipated flow of federal funds. Funds correspond to the following project development phases:

- Scoping – a process that develops safe and effective alternatives based on documented rational that meet the stated purpose and need while minimizing environmental impacts
- Preliminary Engineering – detailed design of the preferred alternative
- Right-of-Way - process of determining if land rights are needed for construction and negotiation of appropriate compensation
- Construction

The Draft Fiscal Year 2019–2022 Transportation Improvement Program is provided as a separate attachment.

Staff Recommendation: Recommend that the Board warn a public hearing for July 18 at 6pm on the FY2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Program.

TAC Recommendation: Recommend that the Board warn a public hearing for July 18.

For more information contact: Christine Forde
846-4490 ext. *13 or cforde@ccrpcvt.org
Election of Officers and Executive Committee Members for FY19

From: Andy Montroll (Board Development Committee Chair)

The Board Development Committee met on May 9th and recommends 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.
1. **Welcome and Introductions**

Paul Conner called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m.

2. **Approval of December 6, 2017 Minutes**

Sarah Hadd made a motion, seconded by Alex Weinhagen, to approve the December 6, 2018 minutes. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED. Darren Schribler abstained.


Regina Mahony stated that we are updating these two CCRPC guidance documents to match changes that we’ve made to the ECOS Plan (slated for adoption in June). The changes include the new enhanced energy component, Determination of Energy Compliance, and the 8-year timeframe for municipal plans. This is an initial review and then we’ll ask for a recommendation to the Board in July. We are hoping the Board can adopt the changes to the Act 250/Section 248 guidelines in July and can adopt the changes to the Plan Review guidelines in September, because while the new ECOS Plan will (hopefully) be adopted in June, the Certification of Energy Determination won’t happen until August.

Emily Nosse-Leirer went through the amendments to the Act 250/Section 248 Review Guidelines, namely:

- CCRPC does not intend to review the constraints for Act 250 projects since those are already covered by local and state review.
- Regarding the Section 248 process, CCRPC will review all of the 45 day advance notice period projects and provide information to the potential applicants within this time period so they are aware of the constraints in the regional plan before they file their petition. For state constraints we will defer to the State regulating authorities.
- If the constraints are not addressed in the petition, CCRPC will follow-up by participating in the PUC’s hearing, or requesting a hearing.
- There is also a new section describing how CCRPC will determine “preferred site” status for net metered projects.

The PAC discussion included:

- There was consensus that it makes sense for CCRPC to not review the constraints in Act 250.
- Discussion regarding the constraints changing at the municipal level; and whether we would change the ECOS Plan accordingly. CCRPC will eventually amend the ECOS Plan to try to ensure consistency with the municipal plans if the targets and other goals can still be met.
- Discussion about which Town’s participate in the 45 day advance notice period for Section 248 projects. Hinesburg, Essex and Williston do. Others do to some extent.
There was a suggestion to add a sentence about working with an applicant after CCRPC’s 45 day notice letter, and before the full PUC hearing because it can be more effective and efficient (for all parties) to work through these things outside of the more formal process. CCRPC will make this addition.

Emily Nosse-Leirer went through the amendments to the Municipal Plan Review Guidelines. Emily stated the process for CCRPC approving the Determination of Energy Compliance for municipalities has been added. Essentially, we’ll follow the same process we do now for municipal plan approvals and plan amendments. CCRPC asks that the municipalities submit the Act 171 requirements checklist, which will help CCRPC understand how the enhanced energy planning standards are met.

There was also a discussion regarding the level of data update needed, now that the plans expire in 8 years rather than 5. Regina Mahony showed the PAC the two relevant statutory sections for data:

4382(c):
   (c) Where appropriate, and to further the purposes of subsection 4302(b) of this title, a municipal plan shall be based upon inventories, studies, and analyses of current trends and shall consider the probable social and economic consequences of the proposed plan. Such studies may consider or contain, but not be limited to:
   
   (1) population characteristics and distribution, including income and employment;
   
   (2) the existing and projected housing needs by amount, type, and location for all economic groups within the municipality and the region;
   
   (3) existing and estimated patterns and rates of growth in the various land use classifications, and desired patterns and rates of growth in terms of the community’s ability to finance and provide public facilities and services.

4302(d):
   (d) All plans and regulations prepared under the authority of this chapter shall be based upon surveys of existing conditions and probable future trends, and shall be made in the light of present and future growth and requirements, and with reasonable consideration, for the landowner, to topography, to needs and trends of the municipality, the region and the State, to the character of each area and to its peculiar suitability for particular uses in relationship to surrounding areas, and with a view to conserving the value of buildings.

Regina Mahony explained that these sections are a little bit hidden in 4382 (the elements) and 4302 (the goals). CCRPC will add these to our Appendix A; and will identify needed data updates in our initial plan reviews. However, we understand that some municipalities may want to rely on the actual census, or other more reliable data, rather than the most recent. For example, the ACS data may be more recent, but the margins of error can be quite high. Sarah Hadd explained that there is a JAPA article about how best to describe ACS data if you do use it, since the data itself is not very accurate. Sarah Hadd asked if CCRPC could provide a 1 pager on what data could/should be used. CCRPC will look into this.

4. Input on Aviation Rules for Private Airports

John Zicconi, Executive Secretary of the VT Transportation Board talked with the PAC about possible revisions to aviation facilities including those that govern private helipads, seaplane landing sites, and private airstrips. John explained that we are starting to see these more and more frequently and closer to residential, village areas. When the Transportation Board looks at these applications, there is a municipal approval check. And most of the municipalities don’t have a process in place to review these. The Transportation Board is responsible for determining how this will serve the public interest; but they have no way to review this either. The Transportation Board would appreciate local feedback on how they should look at these by July 1.

The PAC discussion included:

- What authority municipalities have in these matters. Municipalities don’t have a right to weigh in on public airports, or private landing strips that the public has access to. These is a question about whether there is
enabling statute for municipalities to set up regulations for these totally private land strips and pads. As an example, municipalities don’t have any authority to regulate sea planes on state waters.

- There was a discussion regarding what the FAA allows and covers. The FAA allows an operator to come and go a few times (i.e. a ski resort fixing a chair lift with a helicopter over a weekend); but once it becomes more frequent you need to go to the Transportation Board.

- There was a suggestion for the Transportation Board to look at other State programs, where there is a municipal component of a use generally governed at the state level. As an example, salvage yards are generally prohibited across the state, however for existing yards there is a Certification of Location process that happens every five years that the SLBs/Legislative Bodies approve. This, and others like it, may be a useful model to review and learn from.

- There was discussion about what avenues a municipality might use to review these types of uses: potentially kick it to ZBA/DRB if it is a use that isn’t explicitly mentioned or allowed; an accessory use; review as a Conditional Use or Site Plan; develop and review against specific standards to determine if it would have an undue adverse impact or not; performance standards (i.e. noise). Suggestion that you do need to have some factual information in order to review as a Site Plan or CU, and the most important things will likely be performance measures like noise, etc. But it would help to have decibel levels and then you can start to standardize appropriate distances from those typical noise levels.

- Currently, the state doesn’t have any standards either, but they are looking at what other State’s are doing. Hopefully this will be a two-way street of information between what the Transportation Board learns, and what the municipalities can help with. The Transportation Board could cover more of the technical standards.

- The term used by the Federal government to describe these is ‘restricted landing area’.

- There was a discussion about the variety of levels that come into play – sometimes you can land in a grass field and so nothing is even built or constructed.

- There was a question about data on the number of accidents or incidents. John indicated that there haven’t been many accidents. The landing and take-off is covered by the FAA. The Transportation Board and the FAA can determine if the situation is safe.

- There was a discussion about fuel storage? The Transportation Board looks to the Emergency Responders for feedback on this. Not all applicants ask for a location to store fuel because they may just rent/lease, but others do.

- Transportation/Energy Plan – is this not consistent with those larger goals if there is a large increase in fuel for aircrafts. It isn’t clear that it would use more energy depending on the trip and type of aircraft.

- CCRPC will send the PAC John’s contact info so they can respond to him with comments.

5. 2017 Housing Numbers
Melanie Needle explained that we were hoping to finalize this after this meeting, but we are likely going to need another week or two. Some corrections are being made in South Burlington. The ECOS Plan Strategy 2 is the 80% smart growth goal, the 2017 housing numbers with demolitions is just shy of this at 79%.

There was a discussion about what exactly we are counting, and whether it makes sense to count housing starts rather than occupancy. There was an ask regarding how many new home zoning permits don’t get built? Williston and South Burlington don’t see many that don’t get built. Hinesburg noted that it can take a long time between zoning permit and CO. Colchester only issues a condo CO once the unit is sold, so it is later than when it becomes online or available. The municipalities typically report housing starts, and not occupancy.

There was also a discussion about units that are truly assisted living, and spaces with shared kitchens like dorms. These units are counted as group quarters and may not be included in the total “new home” count. Senior independent living is in a gray area. If they are functionally independent, call them dwelling units. Quarry Hill is more like a fancy hotel room and maybe should just be listed as group quarters.

6. Regional Act 250/Section 248 Projects on the Horizon
Milton: Winterlane neighbors appealing the Act 250 and Town sand pit approval
Huntington: None
Williston: Finney Crossing amendments - bank will come in next and then a 100 room hotel. There is also another hotel at Blair Park Road/Williston Road that is approved by the DRB. Potential warehouse/store style business
coming. Potential new state police barracks. Channel 5 came in for preliminary review for consolidating operations from Plattsburgh and Colchester.

3. South Burlington: Cider Mill II another attempt, currently between preliminary and final DRB review. Phase III of South Village has received final approval at the local level. There will be another three phases on Quarry Hill. Hotel at airport.

4. Colchester: Holiday Inn Express at Exit 16 Water Tower Hill circle with 92 rooms; Lomartire Anna’s Court Pt. II on Mallett’s Bay – preliminary plat approval, already have partial Act 250. Some other Severance Corners projects, but they will probably be priority housing. Town’s solar project on 0.9 acres.

5. Essex: Solar project - 4.5 MW & 2 MW battery storage on Sand Hill Road. Already reviewed at the SLB and going to PC. 287 River Road will be used as the staging area for the Rte. 117 paving project - not sure if that will go to Act 250 or not. Other small amendments.


7. Burlington: Nothing new on permitting; but seeing construction projects getting started.

7. Other Business

a. Staff recommended that both Charlotte and Milton Town Plans be approved by the CCRPC Board as these Plans have been adopted at the local level and have not had any significant changes since the last PAC review. These plans were adopted by the CCRPC Board in March. You’ve also seen the initial plan reviews as well.

b. Discussion about whether an Essentials Training for our region (101 to planning & development review) would be helpful for new PC/DRB members? While there are some new members and this might be valuable information for them; it isn’t likely that folks would come and some of the municipalities prepare their new members with the essentials already. Regina Mahony stated that this is helpful feedback and she’ll keep thinking on what to do on this.

c. Drinking Water Protection Resources – Staff will post resources from a workshop on our website:

https://www.ccrpcvt.org/our-work/municipal-planning-assistance/comprehensive-plans/

Act 171 guidance from ANR is final as of March 2018:


e. The Form-Based Codes Institute (FBCI) at Smart Growth America is looking for five communities to host our highly-regarded, two-day classes where you can learn the nuts and bolts of form-based codes. To host a class in your community, simply email us (info@smartgrowthamerica.org) by Friday, May 18 with your responses to the following questions: are folks interested, do we have a room to offer for 50 attendees, and identify two or three local organizations (like APA or CNU chapters, ULI district council, municipal league, or zoning association) in your area who you think would be interested in helping FBCI market the class. A few PAC members would potentially be interested; likely only for a day. There were some questions about whether this would be both the 201 and 301 level classes? Regina Mahony will look into this further.

f. There were two questions for Alex Weinhein as the VPA Legislative Liaison:

i. Accessory on farm businesses? The bill has the potential to move forward, but they are trying settle the bill between the different versions approved by the house and the senate. As drafted it will enable municipalities to have site plan review for on-farm businesses. Municipalities can’t prohibit the uses, they are allowed, but they have to go through Site Plan approval (specifically not CU). There are no specific provisions regarding the number of events. There was talk of connecting these to the state water & wastewater rules which only allow for four or five events with porta-potties. There is no connection made in the bill, but the water & wastewater rules still stand.

ii. Statute enabling distribution of plans and bylaw amendments digitally was in the Omnibus bill, but the Governor threatened to veto the bill. These have been added to S.94 which has a better chance of passage.

7. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony
DATE: Tuesday, June 5, 2018
TIME: 9:00 a.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal St. Winooski, VT

Members Present
Dick Hosking, VTrans
Matt Langham, VTrans
Bruce Hoar, Williston
Dennis Lutz, Essex
Brian Bigelow, Underhill
Jon Rauscher, Winooski
Luke Valentine, St. George
Amy Bell, VTrans
Brendan Atwood, CATMA
Elizabeth Gohring, Burlington
Larry Lackey, Burlington Airport
Richard Watts, Hinesburg
Bryan Osborne, TAC Chair, Colchester
Rachel Kennedy, GMT
Bob Henneberger, Seniors
Allegre Williams, Local Motion
Geoff Urbanik, Richmond
Joss Besse, Bolton
Dave Allerton, Milton

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

Others
John Olin, Hoyle Tanner
Jon Moore, GMT
Kara Yelinek, VTrans
Edward Lincoln, WVPD
Sharon Beebe
Jennifer Townley
Meghan Cope
Megan Rigoni
Carl Fowler
Chapin Kaynor, GMT Board
Lucille Malaney
Andrea Todd

Bryan Osborne called the meeting to order at 9:00AM and asked for a round of introductions.

1. Consent Agenda
No items this month.

Bryan Osborne noted a change in the meeting agenda to move the GMT NextGEN presentation from item #6 to #3A.

2. Approval of Minutes
BOB HENNEBERGER MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY AMY BELL, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 1, 2018 TAC MEETING. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. Public Comments
Andrea Todd remarked about how important it is for transit planning to coordinate with other planning efforts.

3A. GMT’s NextGEN Transit Plan
Jon Moore provided an update to this effort looking to revise routes and schedules to increase ridership and improve efficiencies. The work is split into three phases: 1) Cost neutral service improvements, 2) enhancements with a focus on areas already served, and 3) geographic expansion to new areas. Phase #1
was the primary focus of Jon’s presentation – changes that can occur over the next few years. Over the
course of the study several focus areas emerged as priorities for improvement. These included:
simplifying service, more direct routing, service level consistency, regular/predictable headways and
improved service/route branding. Jon then went into more specific Chittenden County local bus
recommended changes. These included:

- Interlining the North Ave and Williston routes and the Shelburne and Essex routes
- 20-minute headways throughout the day on major routes
- More evening service on major routes
- Improved weekend service
- Fewer route variants on selected routes
- Directly connect downtown Burlington to the Airport by extending College St. Shuttle
- Discontinue some poorly performing route segments including services to Williston Village and
  beyond Essex Center
- Adjust schedule times to better match commuting patterns for the Link services.

Jon repeated that these changes can occur within the existing budget, are designed to provide improved
service for most users, and should attract new riders. He also acknowledged that these changes come
with some trade-offs by reducing or eliminating some service areas and times.

Several members of the public attended to specifically comment on the NextGEN recommendations.
Comments heard included:

- Hundreds of farm related jobs at the Winooski Valley Park District/Ethan Allen Homestead with
  many needing transportation. No sidewalks extend out there and transit could benefit with a
  significant number of new riders by serving the area.
- Poor Williston links to the Amtrak station and poor evening connections between Burlington and
  Williston.
- The interlining recommendations are good and perhaps could work with other route combinations
  (Jon mentioned they are looking at this for Pine St. and Winooski/Riverside).
- The Williston 1V Village service has only four runs which could be why ridership is so low.
  Also, it only loops in one direction. Reconsider its recommended elimination by expanding
  service, running in both directions and tweaking its timing to coordinate with UVM and school
  schedules.
- Williston 1V time checks should take place while UVM and town schools are in session.
- How will implemented changes be monitored/evaluated? Jon responded that ridership levels and
  on-time performance will be examined for changes.
- Keep the Shelburne bus on South Union to Pearl rather than circling downtown.
- Fix notification signs at transit center for better information.
- Consider downsizing vehicles on lower ridership routes
- Consider the increasing amount of housing development, especially elderly housing, in Williston
  before cutting back service there.
- Align service recommendations to parking constraints in Burlington. Take advantage of UVM
  eliminating parking.
- Consider the municipal government investment in financially/politically supporting routes that
  are now recommended for reduction or elimination.
- VTrans will be opening two new park and rides in the coming years. GMT should plan to service
  these locations.

Jon thanked attendees for the comments and noted that the next steps include finalizing the
recommendations based on comments and Advisory Committee review, GMT Board approval of the
changes, followed by further public meetings in affected communities before any change goes into
effect.

4. National Highway System (NHS)
Peter and Jason noted that this was presented last month in detail and that we are now seeking a TAC recommendation to approve the NHS changes. Jason noted more information in the meeting packet as well. Dick Hosking made the case that VT RT 117 from the Circumferential Highway west to Essex Junction Five Corners should be part of the system as well as it serves as an intermodal connector to Amtrak. Dennis Lutz concurred with this as well and noted the significant industrial area around Global Foundries that VT RT 117 serves. Amy Bell recommended that this change be forwarded to Jonathon Croft at VTrans. After discussion, DENNIS LUTZ MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BRUCE HOAR, THAT THE TAC RECOMMEND THE NHS AS PROPOSED, (WITH THE ADDITION OF VT RT 117 BETWEEN THE CIRCUMFERENTIAL HIGHWAY AND FIVE CORNERS ADDED), TO THE CCRPC BOARD FOR APPROVAL. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY WITH VTRANS ABSTAINING.

5. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
Christine Forde began by putting the TIP into larger context flowing from the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, through corridor or scoping studies before ending up on the TIP list. She went on, explaining how from the TIP (where funding is identified and obligated) a project leads to design and construction. She then defined the TIP, described how projects get on it, and noted that projects also need to be on the State’s Transportation Capital Program. She noted that the TIP is a planning and not a budget document. It represents the intent to construct or implement a specific project and the anticipated flow of federal funds. Using a sample page from the draft TIP Christine described how the document should be read and identified the content of its various sections. She noted more recent changes from Burlington projects like the Champlain Parkway were not in the draft sent before the meeting but are in the version handed out. There were also other Burlington projects that should be reflected in the new draft related to bike ped projects. Christine then presented the anticipated level of funding expected over the coming 4 years:

- FY19 -- $69.2 million, FY20 -- $67.2 million, FY21 -- $52.5 million, FY22 -- $53.1 million

Christine explained the ups and downs of year-to-year funding by looking at funding history back to 2009 in a bar chart. She then broke down the TIP content in finer detail describing transportation project categories and the amounts of funding in each. She displayed a pie chart revealing the 4-year spending by project use category. This led to discussion of the difficulties in clearly slotting projects into categories that might be included in two or even three different categories. There is a bit of gray are when it comes to assigning projects to these categories. She next reported on CIRC alternatives project status and then anticipated construction projects scheduled over the next two years. Following discussion, DENNIS LUTZ MADE A MOTION THE TAC APPROVE THE FY2019-2022 TIP WITH THE ADDITIONS OF THE CHAMPLAIN PARKWAY CHANGES AND ADDITIONAL BURLINGTON BIKE PED PROJECTS AND FORWARD IT TO THE BOARD FOR ADOPTION. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY RICHARD WATTS AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

6. VT Culverts
This item was postponed to a future meeting.

7. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports
Peter referred members to the project list on the reverse side of the meeting agenda.

8. CCRPC May Board Meeting Report
Peter referred members to the item description on the agenda

9. Chairman’s/Members’ Items
Chris Dubin gave an update on the MRGP and other stormwater related items.

The meeting adjourned at 11:05 a.m.

Respectfully submitted, Peter Keating
I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Annie Costandi.

II. Review and action on draft minutes of May 1, 2018

After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, Chelsea Mandigo made a motion, seconded by Christy Witters to approve the minutes with corrections as follows: Jenna was not in attendance. MOTION PASSED with Olson, Lovell, Sherrard, Harris and Urbanik abstaining.

III. Implementation/interpretation of 2017 VT Stormwater Manual: Kevin Burke, DEC

Kevin Burke provided an overview of how the changes to the stormwater manual have been working. Only seeing more applications in the winter and spring under the new requirements. Seeing a lot of disconnections and projects utilizing swales. If you can’t infiltrate the next go to has been gravel wetlands. Folks have been interested in non-infiltrating bioretention but there have been some concerns about what soil types to use. Gravel wetlands also been used more because the location of the water table isn’t a factor. They have also seen some Tier 3 designs coming in (like wet ponds). The application review for these is significantly lengthened. The designers are being told that they should have used a higher performing design (Tier 1 & 2); and asking them to re-think the solution. Some of these designers may not have realized that the rules have changed.

There was some discussion regarding the comment from some designers that there isn’t enough room on the site for the Tier 1 or 2 practices, and perhaps the proposed development will need to be downsized to adequately treat the stormwater. In some circumstances it may make sense to make some accommodations for wastewater systems.

There has been some confusion regarding a net reduction in impervious. A net reduction in impervious is not exempt from the permit coverage. The reduction helps you meet the regulations, but you are still required to get a permit.

Municipal projects that meet the definition of public transportation are eligible to apply the design elements of this section (Sub-section 6).

There are some questions that they still need to work through to meet the post-construction soil depth and quality standard. Who is testing the soils? What soils/materials can be used?
Has there been any thought to adequate isolation distances from these designs and the buildings? Issues with downslope toward the buildings. Also concerns about infiltration into basements. And maintenance easements that abut a home. There is nothing in the manual to address this exactly.

How are we doing about assessing compliance? How are we ensuring that the BMPs are meeting the intended goals? Sometimes the treatment systems aren’t even built, but the self-certification and compliance paperwork has been submitted. In these circumstances, definitely let the State now because they take these very seriously.

Are we seeing any more decentralized stormwater management rather than one gravel wetland? The State hasn’t seen much of this, but they do suggest the disconnections when it makes sense.

The web-based permit notification system (Environmental Notice Bulletin) has been great and very helpful.

4. Updates
   a. **S.260 as signed.** There is more representation on the Board which is helpful; but no funding. Three acre permit will go into effect in 2023 for Lake Champlain basins. Expired permits will be handled under the new stormwater rule, which should be filed with ICAR in July, then LCAR. There is going to be a lot in this rule making round. It will be helpful for DEC to come to the CWAC to present the draft rule making changes. The ½ acre threshold will go into effect in 2022. It will cover ½ acre of new development, not expansions to ½ acre (right now expansions that go to 1 acre do require a permit). Changes to the ½ acre threshold are not included in this round of rule changes.

   b. Winooski TBP process: Dan provided an overview of the anticipated timeline for review and recommendation on the Winooski Tactical Basin Plan (TBP). Dan explained the crosswalk between the Winooski TBP and the ECOS Plan (Chittenden County Regional Plan). The ANR deadline for signing off on the TBP is December 31\(^{st}\), but the schedule shows an ANR signature by November 15\(^{th}\) which is very close to the public comment period. Suggested language should be provided to DEC when we review the final plan, so that they can easily incorporate it. WNRCD is looking at the draft plan this week and will get comments to Karen this week. Discussion about providing top priority projects on the 5-year Winooski TBP. Burlington wouldn’t want to be tied to a certain list of projects. Ultimately there will be a process in place to help prioritize the lists in the big watershed database, but that won’t be ready yet. There was CWAC consensus that the projects will change within the five-year timeframe, and the BMPs aren’t necessarily defined for each project. Further the CWAC agreed that the general language about prioritizing projects based on the TMDLs and permits is the most useful way to identify these projects in the TBP. MRGP, FRP and PCPs should all be referenced. Phosphorus Control Plans should be added to the list of priorities for MS4 communities. Or make it more general that all MS4 required TMDLs should be referenced.

   c. Chris Dubin provided an overview of the changes to the Grants in Aid program this year:
      a. A Selectboard member or authorized personnel can sign the application.
      b. Don’t need to certify the connected roadway miles.
      c. Must pay MRGP fee by July 1 (except for MS4s).

   d. Intern work will be done this summer to track what work has been done, and what is intended to be done this year. The implementation table is due December 31, 2018 for the MRGP. The database is still being tested, and a few things need to be worked out. The “implementation table” is essentially an online database. There will likely be an outlet id associated with each road segment so those can be tracked appropriately for permit compliance.

5. Items for Tuesday, July 3rd meeting
   No agenda items identified.

Adjournment
   The meeting adjourned at 12:14 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony & Dan Albrecht
DATE: Tuesday, June 5, 2018
SCHEDULED TIME: 12:30 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT
DOCUMENTS: Minutes, documents, and presentations discussed accessible at:
http://www.ccrpcvt.org/meetings/clean-water-advisory-committee/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Members in Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burlington: Jenna Olson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester: Karen Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex: Annie Costandi, Co-Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Junction: Chelsea Mandigo, Co-Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC: Christy Witters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Attendees: DEC: Helen Carr, Emily Schelley, Kevin Burke; UVM-EPSCOR: Sam Christopher, Alexandra Cole; WNRC: Corrina Parnapy; Pluck: Dave Barron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCRPC Staff: Dan Albrecht, Regina Mahony</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Call to Order:** Chelsea Mandigo called the meeting to order at 12:25 p.m.

2. **Changes to the Agenda** – None

3. **Review and action on draft minutes of April 3, 2018**
   After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, Jenna Olson made a motion, seconded by Karen Adams to approve the minutes. Corrections: date: change to read “April 3, 2018.”; attendance: Jenna indicated she was not present for that meeting, and section 8 by Jennifer: change to read “Stone Environmental & Stantec.”
   MOTION PASSED. Polly Harris and Jenna Olson abstained.

4. **Spring-Summer Media Campaign, Dave Barron, Pluck**
   Dave described recent and upcoming efforts related to the campaign. This spring he has made many edits and upgrades to the website based upon member input. He has taken measures to integrate Mailchimp via templates with the website, for example for event signups. He’s produced three, new 30 second animated spots and completed the artwork for Rain Garden signage. With regards to advertising, the videos are now also being advertised via YouTube advertising (see link: [https://www.youtube.com/user/SmartWaterways](https://www.youtube.com/user/SmartWaterways)) which is becoming more common lately. He’s also begun to rollout video to social media. In terms of upcoming work, he’ll be working with the co-chairs to see if we can coordinate our efforts with the timing of Clean Water Week; funds & ads are again being held at the ready for potential deployment of a mini-campaign in the event of an algae bloom; he’ll start planning the fall ad buy and continuing to work on ongoing updates and ad rollouts as needed. Members complimented Dave on the look of the advertisements.

5. **Draft MS4 Permit**
   a. Update on permit. Christy Witters indicated she has completed the response summary to the comments received on the draft and forwarded it to the DEC legal staff for review. Once the permit is formally issued, previous permitees will have 180 days to a file a NOI, a revised SWMP, and all necessary attachments. April 1, 2019 will be the deadline for the submission of the first annual report regarding Phosphorus Control Plans.
   Subcommittee members made various suggestions for improvement.
6. **Updates**
   a. New Winooski NRCD staff: Holly Kreiner is departing the WNRC for new opportunities out west. Her replacement, Kristin, will start the week of June 18th

7. **Items for Tuesday, July 3rd meeting**
   Dan will work with the co-chairs on a possible agenda should a meeting be called although at this point a meeting may be unlikely to occur

10. **Adjournment**
    The meeting adjourned at 1:40 p.m.

*Respectfully submitted, Dan Albrecht*
DATE: Wednesday, June 6, 2018
TIME: 5:45 p.m.
PLACE: CCRPC offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404
PRESENT: Chris Roy, Chair Mike O’Brien, Vice-Chair
Brian Bigelow, Secretary-Treasurer John Zicconi, At-Large
Barbara Elliott, At-Large Andy Montroll, Immediate Past Chair
Staff: Charlie Baker, Executive Director Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager

The meeting was called to order at 5:45 p.m. by the Chair, Chris Roy.

1. Changes to the Agenda/Members’ Items: There were no changes to the agenda.

2. Approval of May 2, 2018 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MAY 2, 2018 WITH CORRECTIONS. Barbara noted a change on page 3, line 23 to remove “be amended” as it is redundant. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS CORRECTED.

3. Act 250/Section 248 Applications. Regina noted that there are 6 letters today. However, the order in the packet does not agree with the numbering on the agenda, so we will follow the packet. Apparently there are financing structure changes coming on July 1st which prompted a flurry of applications. Since three of these applications are on Roosevelt Highway in Colchester, Regina brought up an aerial map on the screen to show where each was located.

   e. 2800 Roosevelt Highway – Aegis Renewable Energy/Town of Colchester – Case #18-1329-AN. This application is for a 150kW solar project at 2800 Roosevelt Highway. In this case we note potential constraints and are asking for additional information. She noted a minor correction on page 2 to change “requested” to “requesting”. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O’BRIEN, TO APPROVE THE LETTER WITH THAT CHANGE. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

   f. 3943 Roosevelt Highway Solar, Colchester, Case #18-1329-AN. This application is for a 500 kW solar array in Colchester. We noted several possible constraints that state agencies may address. ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JOHN ZICCONI, TO APPROVE THE LETTER. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

   b. ER Jericho Landfill Solar, Jericho – Case #18-1366-AN. This project is for a 500kW solar array off of Browns Trace Road in Jericho. We did not find any constraints. It was noted that the reference to “Ferry Road” in the application should be corrected to say “Browns Trace Road.” MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE LETTER WITH THAT CORRECTION. BARBARA ELLIOTT SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

   c. ER Pond Brook Solar, Colchester, Case #18-1367-AN. This application is for a 500kW solar array at 4259 Roosevelt Highway in Colchester. There is no information provided on how this site will be accessed. Since there are some constraints near the array, we are asking for more information on how this site will be accessed. The project narrative describes the upgrade of an existing driveway off Malletts Bay Avenue, but the project is located on Roosevelt Highway. We will correct page two of the letter to say “Roosevelt Highway” instead of “Colchester Avenue”. JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION,
SECONDED BY BRIAN BIGELOW, TO APPROVE THE LETTER WITH THAT CHANGE. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

d. Jolina Court Solar Carport, Richmond, Case #18-1391-AN. This is an application from Aegis Renewable Energy/Buttermilk LLC for a 50kW solar project off Jolina Court in Richmond. This is the site we’ve talked about before related to brownfields and the proposed Richmond Senior Center. They intend to put a roof over the parking area with the solar array on top. Members made suggestions to change some language in the Suitability Policies to change “meets” the suitability policies, to “advances”. Also expand “...parking lots” to read “rooftops and parking lots.” We will bold the last paragraph on page 1 for emphasis to highlight that this is the type of place we want to see solar projects. We will also correct location in the first paragraph from Malletts Bay Avenue in Colchester to Jolina Court in Richmond. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO APPROVE THE LETTER WITH THOSE CHANGES. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

a. Green Mountain Power Airport Substation, South Burlington, Case #18-1423-AN. This project is for relocation and rebuilding of GMP’s Airport substation to 5 & 7 Shamrock Road in South Burlington. The location avoids most constraints, but we did note a couple of constraints that may be impacted – ag soils and high priority forest blocks. Mike O’Brien voiced his frustration about having to mention ag soils in areas that have existing development. Discussion ensued about including the planning area language that we include in Act 250 letters to indicate first and foremost this is a good and logical location for this type of development. BRIAN BIGELOW MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O’BRIEN, TO APPROVE THE LETTER WITH ADDITION OF PLANNING AREA LANGUAGE. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. CCRPC Organizational Development. Charlie asked the members for some input as a follow-up to other conversations he’s had. We may have a little staff time available because there were not as many requests from communities. Staff discussed whether we should have a retreat and do some more strategic planning. He noted when Challenges for Change happened we did a survey of board members and partners to see how CCRPC was working. There were some minor concerns that we addressed. Is this a good year to do some organizational feedback? There are some tools from NADO (National Association of Development Officials) which we belong to that may help with staffing, board, etc. We’re involved in much more than we were in 2011, which is when we last discussed this. Transportation staff will be able to focus on working with VTrans on the transportation project prioritization process.

Discussion ensued. Andy Montroll noted we had a check-in after the merger to see if we wanted a retreat and it was decided we were doing okay. John Zicconi said it’s good for staff to have flexibility of where to put their time. Barbara Elliott suggested that it would be nice if staff could spend more time on professional development – conferences, reading, etc. Discussion continued. Chris Roy noted that soliciting input is different than having a formal retreat. We should solicit input from municipalities and our partners. Barbara feels communities and agencies have a duty to come to us if they have a problem. Andy noted that one thing that came out of the Board Development Committee this year was that we need to focus on transportation training for board members this fall. Mike O’Brien suggested that perhaps we invite our partners to come to the board meetings periodically to let members know what they’re doing. It was agreed that we don’t need a retreat, but can use board meetings to get to know our partners (e.g. UVM). Mike O’Brien noted that when we invite a partner to come to the board meetings to provide information, we should be respectful of the fact that they are our invited guests and limit questions and/or comments to items that help clarify the information being presented. It was agreed to have transportation training this fall prior to board meetings and then bring in other partners. Chris Roy suggested hearing from the Lake Champlain Basin Program to see how our water quality efforts fit together.
5. Chair/Executive Director’s Report.
   a. Legislative update. Charlie noted if the state budget does not get approved by July 1st it could affect our contracts with state agencies.
   b. VTrans fire. There was a brief discussion about the fire in VTrans offices in National Life building over the weekend. Apparently the worst damage was on the 4th floor in the highway division where most computers will have to be replaced because of water damage. Luckily the data is backed up on the state system. They are temporarily relocating staff to other VTrans offices. Planning and the finance departments are on the 5th floor and were not affected.
   c. VELCO Long-Range Transmission Plan. Regina noted that this is a 20-year outlook plan but it’s updated every three years. At this point VELCO doesn’t envision any infrastructure changes, but with all the wind and solar projects they may have to address that in the next update in three years.
   d. Burlington Projects. Charlie noted that we are having some difficulties with the Burlington Amtrak Train Storage and Servicing study, as well as the Railyard Enterprise Project. Most waterfront property owners (Main St. Landing and Vermont Rail) are concerned about where the train will stay at night. Vermont Rail System is not interesting in storing the train on their property. Eleni Churchill is at a public meeting tonight on this issue.

6. Agenda Review – June 20, 2018 Annual Board Meeting. Members discussed the proposed agenda for the annual meeting and made suggestions. Charlie noted that the Governor has been invited, but has not confirmed.

7. Other Business. It was decided that since the 1st Wednesday in July is the 4th, that we will hold the Executive Committee meeting at 5:30 p.m. right before the July 18th board meeting.

8. Executive Session – for the purpose of discussing personnel matters. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O’BRIEN, TO GO INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION AT 6:45 P.M. WITH CHARLIE BAKER PRESENT. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BRIAN BIGELOW, TO COME OUT OF EXECUTIVE SESSION AT 7:12 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O’BRIEN, THAT THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE RECOGNIZE EMPLOYEE ACHIEVEMENT AND AUTHORIZES THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO SPEND UP TO 100% OF THE FY19 SALARY BUDGET AS DETERMINED BY THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FOR STAFF AND AS DETERMINED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

BRIAN BIGELOW MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:13 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted.

Bernadette Ferenc
June 7, 2018

Eric Phaneuf, Director of Business Development  
Aegis Renewable Energy, Inc.  
340 Mad River Park, Suite 6  
Waitsfield, VT 05673  
ephaneuf@aegis-re.com

RE: Advance Notice of Petition for Aegis Renewable Energy/Town of Colchester’s Proposed 150 kW Project in Colchester, Vermont – 2800 Roosevelt Highway (Case #18-1329-AN)

Dear Mr. Phaneuf:

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 at 2800 Roosevelt Highway in Colchester, 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 proximate to existing 3-phase power and is in an area with adequate grid capacity.
- The project location has been endorsed by the Colchester Select Board in a letter to the Public Utilities Commission dated August 23, 2017.
- The project is located outside of Colchester’s Designated Growth Center and Designated New Town Center.

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. Based on our review of this project’s location using the ANR Natural Resources Atlas, it appears that there are DEC River Corridors, Wetlands and Surface Water Buffers 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.

However, it appears that some constraints may be impacted by this project.
- **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.
- **Highest Priority Forest Blocks and Highest Priority Wildlife Crossings:** Based on the information shown for these constraints on the ANR Biofinder Map, it appears that this project may impact highest priority forest blocks and highest priority wildlife crossings. CCRPC will defer to the Vermont Fish and Wildlife Department in determining the impact of this development on highest priority forest blocks and highest priority wildlife crossings. CCRPC is not requesting further information or action related to this constraint 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
Sarah Hadd, Director of Planning and Zoning, Colchester
June 7, 2018

Eric Phaneuf, Director of Business Development
Aegis Renewable Energy, Inc.
340 Mad River Park, Suite 6
Waitsfield, VT 05673
ephaneuf@aegis-re.com

RE: Advance Notice of Petition for Aegis Renewable Energy’s Proposed 500kW Solar Array near 3943 Roosevelt Highway in Colchester, VT (Case #18-1330-AN)

Dear Mr. Phaneuf:

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 500 kW solar array located 1,100 feet west of 3943 Roosevelt Highway in Colchester, 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 policies 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 rare, threatened and endangered species, DEC River Corridors, Class II Wetlands, wetland buffers, highest priority forest blocks and slopes over 20% near the proposed array, 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.**

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

- **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.**

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  
Sarah Hadd, Director of Planning and Zoning, Colchester
June 7, 2018

Phillip D. Foy
General Counsel
Encore Renewable Energy
110 Main Street, Suite 2E
Burlington, VT 05401

RE: Advance Notice of Petition for ER Jericho Landfill Solar, LLC’s Proposed 500kW Solar Array off of Browns Trace Road in Jericho, VT (Case #18-1366-AN)

Dear Mr. Foy:

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 500kW solar array off of Browns Trace Road in Jericho, 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 on a previously impacted site and is located on a state-designated preferred site for net metering.
- 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 Class II Wetlands and Primary Agricultural Soils 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.**

This project located on the Mobbs Farm property, an area conserved by the Town of Jericho. Conserved lands in general are a possible constraint. However, the Jericho Selectboard has approved the use of town land for the solar project. **CCRPC is not requesting further information or action related to this constraint.**

**The project narrative lists Ferry Road as the access point for the array. However, the site plan seems to show access from an unnamed road off of Brown’s Trace. Please clarify this project’s access point.**

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
    Katherine Sonnick, Jericho Planning Coordinator
June 7, 2018

Phillip D. Foy
General Counsel
Encore Renewable Energy
110 Main Street, Suite 2E
Burlington, VT 05401

RE: Advance Notice of Petition for ER Pond Brook Solar, LLC’s Proposed 500kW Net Metered Solar Array at 4259 Roosevelt Highway, Colchester, VT (Case #18-1367-AN)

Dear Mr. Foy:

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 500kW net metered solar array at 4259 Roosevelt Highway in Colchester, 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 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 DEC River Corridors, Rare, Threatened and Endangered Species, Class II Wetlands, FEMA Special Flood Hazard Areas, highest priority forest blocks, slopes over 20%, and wetland and surface water buffers on the parcel, but not impacted by the proposed array. We mention the presence of these nearby constraints for your information, given that our review is based on data that have not been verified by on-the-ground studies. **However, given the presence of constraints near the array, CCRPC requests more information on how the project will be accessed. The conceptual site plan does not show an access route. The project narrative describes the upgrade of an existing driveway off Mallets Bay Avenue, but the project is located off Roosevelt Highway.**

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
    Sarah Hadd, Director of Planning and Zoning, Colchester
June 7, 2018

Eric Phaneuf, Director of Business Development
Aegis Renewable Energy, Inc.
340 Mad River Park, Suite 6
Waitsfield, VT 05673
ephaneuf@aegis-re.com

RE: Advance Notice of Petition for Aegis Renewable Energy/Buttermilk LLC’s Proposed 50kW Solar Carport Facility Project at 74 Jolina Court in Richmond, VT (Case #18-1391-AN)

Dear Mr. Phaneuf:

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 50kW solar project at 74 Jolina Court in Richmond, Vermont. 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 advances the following suitability policies:

• The project is located proximate to 3-phase power in an area with adequate grid capacity.
• The project is located on a previously impacted area.
• The project is located in an area planned for growth.

The 2018 ECOS Plan strongly supports the building of renewable energy facilities on areas that are already impacted, including rooftops and parking lots. Therefore, the 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.”

This project will be located on a parking lot that will be built as part of a project approved by the Town of Richmond Development Review Board on April 11, 2018. Therefore, CCRPC finds that this project complies with the siting constraint policies in the ECOS Plan.

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
    Jessica E. Draper, Richmond Town Planner
June 7, 2018

Timothy Upton, Manager of Environmental Services
Green Mountain Power
163 Acorn Lane
Colchester, VT 05446

RE: Advance Notice of Petition for Green Mountain Power’s Relocation and Rebuild of the Airport Substation at 5 and 7 Shamrock Road in South Burlington, VT (Case #18-1423-AN)

Dear Mr. Upton:

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 the relocation and rebuilding of Green Mountain Power’s Airport Substation to 5 and 7 Shamrock Road in South Burlington, 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.

The project is located within the Enterprise Planning Area as defined in the Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan (the Plan) (Please note that this location will remain in the Enterprise Zone in the Draft 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan). We find this project to be consistent with this Planning Area for the following reasons:

1. The Enterprise Planning Area is identified in the Plan as an area planned for growth, and therefore this project helps implement Strategy #2 of the Plan which calls for 80% of new development in the areas planned for growth. Additionally, this project supports electric infrastructure that serves development in areas planned for growth. Therefore, we find this project to be generally in conformance with the Planning Areas of the 2013 Chittenden County Regional Plan.

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 substation will increase efficiency and allow for future installations of distributed renewable energy generation.
Constraints
The 2018 ECOS Plan states that development should be located to avoid state and local known constraints that have been field verified, and to minimize impacts to state and local possible constraints that have been field verified (Strategy 3, Action 1.f and Strategy 4, Action 1.f and Action 2.e).

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.

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

- **Agricultural Soils**: Based on the agricultural soils layer shown on the ANR Natural Resources Atlas, it appears that this project may impact primary agricultural soils. 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.**

- **Highest Priority Forest Blocks and Highest Priority Wildlife Crossings**: Based on the information shown for these constraints on the ANR Biofinder Map, it appears that this project may impact highest priority forest blocks and highest priority wildlife crossings. CCRPC will defer to the Vermont Fish and Wildlife Department in determining the impact of this development on highest priority forest blocks and highest priority wildlife crossings. **CCRPC is not requesting further information or action related to this constraint 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