



# CHITTENDEN COUNTY RPC

*Communities Planning Together*

## ***Planning Advisory Committee***

**Wednesday, June 13, 2018**

**2:30pm to 4:00pm**

**CCRPC Main Conference Room, 110 West Canal Street, Winooski**

WIFI Info: Network = CCRPC-Guest; Password = ccrpc\$guest

## **Agenda**

**2:30**    **Welcome and Introductions, Joss Besse**

**2:35**    **Approval of May 9, 2018 Minutes\***

**2:40**    **Implementing Form Based Codes, Paul Conner, David White, Jessie Baker and Others**

As part of our Sharing Skill Sets agenda item your fellow planners will give a quick overview of their experiences thus far including what's worked well, what has been a challenge, and any observations in comparison to traditional zoning. Colchester, Shelburne and Jericho may chime in as well.

**3:10**    **Richmond Plan Review\*, Emily Nosse-Leirer**

The draft plan and maps can be found online here: <http://www.richmondvt.gov/documents/2018-town-plan-draft-information/>

- a. *Review Staff Summary*
- b. *Questions and Comments*
- c. *Recommendation to the CCRPC Board*

**3:40**    **Regional Act 250/Section 248 Projects on the Horizon, Committee Members**

**3:50**    **Other Business**

- a. ECOS Plan to be adopted and send to DPS for Determination of Energy Compliance. They have 60 days to review and act on our request.
- b. The VLCT Municipal Assistance Center recently developed a model highway access policy and drainage management best practice standards. You can find them here: <https://www.vlct.org/resource/highway-access-drainage-management-standards>

**4:00**    **Adjourn**

\* = Attachment

NEXT MEETING: July 11, 2018 at 2:30pm to 4:30pm.

CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE - MINUTES

DATE: Wednesday, May 9, 2018  
TIME: 2:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.  
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT

Members Present:

Victor Sinadinoski, Milton  
Everett Marshall, Huntington  
Ken Belliveau, Williston

Matt Boulanger, Williston  
Paul Conner, South Burlington  
Robin Pierce, Essex Junction (for a few minutes)  
Sarah Hadd, Colchester  
Alex Weinhausen, Hinesburg

Darren Schribler, Essex  
Sean Cannon, Colchester  
Meaghan Tuttle, Burlington

Staff:

Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager  
Melanie Needle, Senior Planner  
Emily Nosse-Leirer, Planner

**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 Weinhausen, to approve the December 6, 2018 minutes. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED. Darren Schribler abstained.

**3. Act 250/Section 248 Review Guidelines & Municipal Plan Review Guidelines**

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.

- 1 - There was a suggestion to add in a sentence about working with an applicant after CCRPC's 45 day notice  
2 letter, and before the full PUC hearing because it can be more effective and efficient (for all parties) to work  
3 through these things outside of the more formal process. CCRPC will make this addition.  
4

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

10  
11 There was also a discussion regarding the level of data update needed, now that the plans expire in 8 years rather than  
12 5. Regina Mahony showed the PAC the two relevant statutory sections for data:  
13

14 4382(c):

15 (c) Where appropriate, and to further the purposes of subsection 4302(b) of this title, a municipal plan shall be  
16 based upon inventories, studies, and analyses of current trends and shall consider the probable social and  
17 economic consequences of the proposed plan. Such studies may consider or contain, but not be limited to:

18 (1) population characteristics and distribution, including income and employment;

19 (2) the existing and projected housing needs by amount, type, and location for all economic groups within  
20 the municipality and the region;

21 (3) existing and estimated patterns and rates of growth in the various land use classifications, and desired  
22 patterns and rates of growth in terms of the community's ability to finance and provide public facilities and  
23 services.

24 4302(d):

25 (d) All plans and regulations prepared under the authority of this chapter shall be based upon surveys of existing  
26 conditions and probable future trends, and shall be made in the light of present and future growth and  
27 requirements, and with reasonable consideration, for the landowner, to topography, to needs and trends of the  
28 municipality, the region and the State, to the character of each area and to its peculiar suitability for particular  
29 uses in relationship to surrounding areas, and with a view to conserving the value of buildings.  
30

31 Regina Mahony explained that these sections are a little bit hidden in 4382 (the elements) and 4302 (the goals).  
32 CCRPC will add these to our Appendix A; and will identify needed data updates in our initial plan reviews.  
33 However, we understand that some municipalities may want to rely on the actual census, or other more reliable data,  
34 rather than the most recent. For example, the ACS data may be more recent, but the margins of error can be quite  
35 high. Sarah Hadd explained that there is a JAPA article about how best to describe ACS data if you do use it, since  
36 the data itself is not very accurate. Sarah Hadd asked if CCRPC could provide a 1 pager on what data could/should  
37 be used. CCRPC will look into this.  
38

#### 39 **4. Input on Aviation Rules for Private Airports**

40 John Zicconi, Executive Secretary of the VT Transportation Board talked with the PAC about possible revisions to  
41 aviation facilities including those that govern private helipads, seaplane landing sites, and private airstrips. John  
42 explained that we are starting to see these more and more frequently and closer to residential, village areas. When the  
43 Transportation Board looks at these applications, there is a municipal approval check. And most of the municipalities  
44 don't have a process in place to review these. The Transportation Board is responsible for determining how this will  
45 serve the public interest; but they have no way to review this either. The Transportation Board would appreciate local  
46 feedback on how they should look at these by July 1.  
47

48 The PAC discussion included:

- 49 - What authority municipalities have in these matters. Municipalities don't have a right to weigh in on public  
50 airports, or private landing strips that the public has access to. These is a question about whether there is

- 1 enabling statute for municipalities to set up regulations for these totally private land strips and pads. As an  
2 example, municipalities don't have any authority to regulate sea planes on state waters.
- 3 - There was a discussion regarding what the FAA allows and covers. The FAA allows an operator to come and  
4 go a few times (i.e. a ski resort fixing a chair lift with a helicopter over a weekend); but once it becomes  
5 more frequent you need to go to the Transportation Board.
  - 6 - There was a suggestion for the Transportation Board to look at other State programs, where there is a  
7 municipal component of a use generally governed at the state level. As an example, salvage yards are  
8 generally prohibited across the state, however for existing yards there is a Certification of Location process  
9 that happens every five years that the SLBs/Legislative Bodies approve. This, and others like it, may be a  
10 useful model to review and learn from.
  - 11 - There was discussion about what avenues a municipality might use to review these types of uses: potentially  
12 kick it to ZBA/DRB if it is a use that isn't explicitly mentioned or allowed; an accessory use; review as a  
13 Conditional Use or Site Plan; develop and review against specific standards to determine if it would have an  
14 undue adverse impact or not; performance standards (i.e. noise). Suggestion that you do need to have some  
15 factual information in order to review as a Site Plan or CU, and the most important things will likely be  
16 performance measures like noise, etc. But it would help to have decibel levels and then you can start to  
17 standardize appropriate distances from those typical noise levels.
  - 18 - Currently, the state doesn't have any standards either, but they are looking at what other State's are doing.  
19 Hopefully this will be a two-way street of information between what the Transportation Board learns, and  
20 what the municipalities can help with. The Transportation Board could cover more of the technical standards.
  - 21 - The term used by the Federal government to describe these is 'restricted landing area'.
  - 22 - There was a discussion about the variety of levels that come into play – sometimes you can land in a grass  
23 field and so nothing is even built or constructed.
  - 24 - There was a question about data on the number of accidents or incidents. John indicated that there haven't  
25 been many accidents. The landing and take-off is covered by the FAA. The Transportation Board and the  
26 FAA can determine if the situation is safe.
  - 27 - There was a discussion about fuel storage? The Transportation Board looks to the Emergency Responders for  
28 feedback on this. Not all applicants ask for a location to store fuel because they may just rent/lease, but  
29 others do.
  - 30 - Transportation/Energy Plan – is this not consistent with those larger goals if there is a large increase in fuel  
31 for aircrafts. It isn't clear that it would use more energy depending on the trip and type of aircraft.
  - 32 - CCRPC will send the PAC John's contact info so they can respond to him with comments.
- 33

### 34 **5. 2017 Housing Numbers**

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

38

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

44

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

49

### 50 **6. Regional Act 250/Section 248 Projects on the Horizon**

51 Milton: Winterlane neighbors appealing the Act 250 and Town sand pit approval

52 Huntington: None

53 Williston: Finney Crossing amendments - bank will come in next and then a 100 room hotel. There is also another  
54 hotel at Blair Park Road/Williston Road that is approved by the DRB. Potential warehouse/store style business

1 coming. Potential new state police barracks. Channel 5 came in for preliminary review for consolidating operations  
2 from Plattsburgh and Colchester.  
3 South Burlington: Cider Mill II another attempt, currently between preliminary and final DRB review. Phase III of  
4 South Village has received final approval at the local level. There will be another three phases on Quarry Hill. Hotel  
5 at airport.  
6 Colchester: Holiday Inn Express at Exit 16 Water Tower Hill circle with 92 rooms; Lomartire Anna's Court Pt. II on  
7 Mallett's Bay – preliminary plat approval, already have partial Act 250. Some other Severance Corners projects, but  
8 they will probably be priority housing. Town's solar project on 0.9 acres.  
9 Essex: Solar project - 4.5 MW & 2 MW battery storage on Sand Hill Road. Already reviewed at the SLB and going  
10 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  
11 250 or not. Other small amendments.  
12 Hinesburg: Nothing new.  
13 Burlington: Nothing new on permitting; but seeing construction projects getting started.  
14

## 15 **7. Other Business**

- 16 a. Staff recommended that both Charlotte and Milton Town Plans be approved by the CCRPC Board as these  
17 Plans have been adopted at the local level and have not had any significant changes since the last PAC  
18 review. These plans were adopted by the CCRPC Board in March. You've also seen the initial plan reviews  
19 as well.
- 20 b. Discussion about whether an Essentials Training for our region (101 to planning & development review)  
21 would be helpful for new PC/DRB members? While there are some new members and this might be valuable  
22 information for them; it isn't likely that folks would come and some of the municipalities prepare their new  
23 members with the essentials already. Regina Mahony stated that this is helpful feedback and she'll keep  
24 thinking on what to do on this.
- 25 c. Drinking Water Protection Resources – Staff will post resources from a workshop on our website:  
26 <https://www.ccrpcvt.org/our-work/municipal-planning-assistance/comprehensive-plans/>
- 27 d. Act 171 guidance from ANR is final as of March 2018:  
28 <http://anr.vermont.gov/sites/anr/files/co/planning/documents/guidance/Act171Guidance.pdf>.
- 29 e. The Form-Based Codes Institute (FBCI) at Smart Growth America is looking for five communities to host  
30 our highly-regarded, [two-day classes](#) where you can learn the nuts and bolts of form-based codes. To host a  
31 [class](#) in your community, simply [email us \(info@smartgrowthamerica.org\)](mailto:info@smartgrowthamerica.org) by Friday, May 18 with your  
32 responses to the following questions: are folks interested, do we have a room to offer for 50 attendees, and  
33 identify two or three local organizations (like APA or CNU chapters, ULI district council, municipal league,  
34 or zoning association) in your area who you think would be interested in helping FBCI market the class. A  
35 few PAC members would potentially be interested; likely only for a day. There were some questions about  
36 whether this would be both the 201 and 301 level classes? Regina Mahony will look into this further.
- 37 f. There were two questions for Alex Weinhagen as the VPA Legislative Liaison:
  - 38 i. Accessory on farm businesses? The bill has the potential to move forward, but they are trying settle  
39 the bill between the different versions approved by the house and the senate. As drafted it will enable  
40 municipalities to have site plan review for on-farm businesses. Municipalities can't prohibit the uses,  
41 they are allowed, but they have to go through Site Plan approval (specifically not CU). There are no  
42 specific provisions regarding the number of events. There was talk of connecting these to the state  
43 water & wastewater rules which only allow for four or five events with porta-potties. There is no  
44 connection made in the bill, but the water & wastewater rules still stand.
  - 45 ii. Statute enabling distribution of plans and bylaw amendments digitally was in the Omnibus bill, but  
46 the Governor threatened to veto the bill. These have been added to S.94 which has a better chance of  
47 passage.

## 49 **7. Adjourn**

50 The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

52 Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony

**Staff Review of the 2018 Richmond Town Plan**

**Emily Nosse-Leirer, CCRPC Planner**

**June 5, 2018**

---

The Town of Richmond has requested, per 24 V.S.A. §4350, that the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (1) approve its 2018 Richmond Town Plan; and (2) confirm its planning process.

This draft 2018 Richmond Town Plan is an update and re-adoption of the 2013 Richmond Town Plan. In accordance with statute, re-adoption means that this is a fully compliant plan that will expire eight years after adoption by the Selectboard. The 2018 Richmond Town Plan is a complete rewrite with a new format, new priorities and new actions, as well as updated data. CCRPC's Planning Advisory Committee reviewed a previous draft of the plan in advance of the December 14, 2017 hearing, and CCRPC staff have reviewed individual sections since then. The PAC asked for changes to the plan in 2017, and the responses to those changes can be seen in the annotated memo (attached). Given the significant changes that have been made since the December 2017 review, another formal review is being conducted.

Following the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission's (CCRPC's) *Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans (2013)* and the statutory requirements of 24 V.S.A. Chapter 117, I have reviewed the draft 2018 Richmond Town Plan to determine whether it is:

- Consistent with the general goals of §4302;
- Consistent with the specific goals of §4302;
- Contains the required elements of §4382;
- Compatible with the 2013 Chittenden County Regional Plan and the 2018 Chittenden County Regional Plan (anticipated adoption on June 20, 2018), entitled the *Chittenden County ECOS Plan* (per §4350); and
- Compatible with approved plans of other municipalities (per §4350).

Additionally, I have reviewed the planning process requirements of §4350.

Staff Review Findings and Comments

1. The 2018 Richmond Town Plan is consistent with the general goals of §4302. See the attached Appendix A submittal that describes how the Plan is consistent with these goals.
2. The 2018 Richmond Town Plan is consistent with the specific goals of §4302. See the attached Appendix A submittal that describes how the Plan is consistent with these goals.
3. The 2018 Richmond Town Plan contains the required elements of §4382. See the attached Appendix A submittal that describes how the Plan is consistent with these goals.
4. The 2018 Richmond Town Plan is generally compatible with the planning areas, goals and strategies of the 2013 Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the *2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan*.
5. The 2018 Richmond Town Plan appears compatible with the municipal plans for Williston, Hinesburg, Huntington, Bolton, and Jericho, but more detail on this is necessary (see comment below).

CCRPC Formal Staff & PAC Review and Hearing – 2018 Richmond Town Plan  
June 13, 2018 PAC Meeting

6. Richmond has a planning process in place that is sufficient for an approved plan. In addition, Richmond has provided information about their planning budget and CCRPC finds that Richmond is maintaining its efforts to provide local funds for municipal and regional planning.

**Additional Comments/Questions:**

**Plan Strengths:**

- The public engagement process for this plan was exceptional, and I hope the website at <http://richmondvtfuture.weebly.com> will stay up so it can be used as an example for other processes. It's useful that each technical plan identifies the ways in which the text addresses the plan's vision.
- In late 2017, the PAC raised concerns about the Future Land Use technical plan in the draft Richmond Town Plan. The section has since been completely rewritten using a robust community process, and the comments have been addressed.

**Changes Needed to Meet Statutory Requirements**

- The plan should have more detail on the plan's compatibility with adjoining municipal plans and the regional plan. The plan only briefly mentions some of its adjoining municipalities (Williston, Huntington, Hinesburg and Bolton) in "Current Land Use" on page 22. This discussion should be improved. This would be easily fixed by adding a few sentences in the plan stating that the plan is compatible with the land uses planned by adjoining municipalities and the ECOS Plan. The language on page 99 of the 2013 Richmond Town Plan is still accurate, except for some minor changes (Part of the border with Bolton is now a proposed West Bolton Hamlet district, Huntington has renamed their adjoining districts as Rural Residential and Flood Hazard Overlay, and Jericho has rezoned for Forestry, Agriculture, Rural Residential and Open Space).

**Suggested Edits (Not Required for CCRPC Approval and Confirmation):**

- To improve readability, the plan should better define the difference between *river corridors* and *river corridor protection areas* in the Emergency Resilience and Natural Resources section. The Emergency Resilience section mentions River Corridor Protection Areas on page 16, but elsewhere, River Corridors are mapped and discussed, not RCPAs. The description of RCPAs is correct on page 16, but I think it will be confusing for the reader to discuss RCPAs in one section and then River Corridors everywhere else, especially since RCPAs aren't mapped. Consider adding something like the sentence below to clarify: "River corridor protection areas are the areas a river or stream naturally move through to establish equilibrium, and they do not necessarily align with floodplains, so current regulations do not necessarily prevent development in these critical areas. The Natural Resources Technical Plan calls for Richmond to regulate the river corridor (the river corridor protection area with an additional buffer to allow for water movement)."
- By the time this plan is adopted, the 2018 ECOS Plan should be adopted, so make sure to remove "Draft" from its name after the end of June.

**Energy Planning Comments**

- My understanding is that Richmond intends to seek a Determination of Energy Compliance after the planned adoption of the plan in November 2018. Although CCRPC cannot formally review the plan until after it is adopted and after the 2018 ECOS Plan receives its own Determination of Energy Compliance, I reviewed this draft against the Department of Public Service's Energy Planning Standards for Municipal Plans and suggest only one change necessary to meet the standards.

**CCRPC Formal Staff & PAC Review and Hearing – 2018 Richmond Town Plan**  
**June 13, 2018 PAC Meeting**

- The energy data section includes references to “maps in this section,” but the maps are not included in the text. Please change it to refer to the map names/map numbers in the plan, and indicate page numbers or links.
- It’s not a change that needs to be made to gain a Determination of Energy Compliance, but the inclusion of “trails” in the list of local possible constraints is confusing. All other local constraints are supported by specific actions in the Natural Resources technical plan. It’s not clear what the town is hoping to avoid. Do you simply not want solar panels or wind turbines to be built directly on trails? Are there buffers around trails that you hope won’t be developed? For a policy that can be clearly applied during PUC proceedings, consider strengthening this policy in a future version of the plan.

Proposed Motion & Next Steps:

**PROPOSED MOTION:** The PAC finds that the draft 2018 Richmond Town Plan, as submitted and with the edit described above, meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC approval, and that the municipality's planning process meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC confirmation.

Upon notification that the Plan has been adopted by the municipality, CCRPC staff will review the plan, and any information relevant to the confirmation process, for changes. If staff determines that changes are substantive, those changes will be forwarded to the PAC for review. Otherwise the PAC recommends that the Plan, and the municipal planning process, should be forwarded to the CCRPC Board for approval.



## MEMORANDUM

**To:** Richmond Planning Commission

**From:** Emily Nosse-Leirer, Planner

**Date:** December 12, 2017 — **Annotated 5/30/18**

**Re:** CCRPC Planning Advisory Committee Review of the 2018 Richmond Town Plan

---

Per CCRPC's *Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans*, CCRPC Staff and Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) reviewed the Draft 2018 Richmond Town Plan in advance of the plan's intended adoption on Town Meeting Day 2018. Staff and the PAC have found that the draft needs a **few small changes to ensure consistency with the State planning goals and required elements**:

### Changes Needed to Meet Statutory Requirements:

1. Referencing basin planning is a new statutory requirement for town plans. The plan includes an action related to basin planning, but only mentions the Lake Champlain Basin Plan. Most of town is in the Winooski Tactical Basin. Please add a reference to the Winooski Tactical Basin Plan to the list of regional efforts on page 32 and to Goal 1, Objective F, Action 1. Complete
2. Planning to maintain forest blocks and habitat connectors is a new statutory requirement for town plans. The plan includes a map of the highest priority interior forest blocks on the Conservation map. Habitat connectors (wildlife travel corridors) are discussed in the narrative of the Natural and Working Lands Technical Plan. To ensure that this requirement is met, you should add forest blocks to the Ecological Areas and Resources segment, either as one of the conservation priorities in the Habitat and Wildlife category or as its own category (page 31-32). This requirement could also be met by adding forest blocks as a category to Goal 1, Objective A, Action 2. The plan discusses the Contiguous Habitat Units and Habitat Connectors as studied by the Science to Action Report. Per the guidance of Vermont Fish and Wildlife staff, local studies are generally more accurate than state-wide datasets. Identifying and protecting these resources in the Plan meets the requirements of Act 171.
3. To ensure that the plan is meeting statutory requirements, the plan should better define the difference between river corridors and river corridor protection areas in the Community Resilience and Development section (for example, in the discussion of fluvial erosion on page 38). The maps show both categories already. CCRPC can provide sample language if needed. The plan addresses all inaccuracies, but one instance remains where clarification would be helpful (discussed in the new review).
4. To ensure that the plan meets the statutory requirement to plan for compact village and urban centers separated by rural countryside, a stronger link should be made between the Future Land Use and Natural and Cultural Resources technical plans. Goals, targets and actions that implement the goals of the Future Land Use technical plan are found

elsewhere in the plan, mostly the Natural and Cultural Resources technical plans. The Future Land Use technical plan needs to be clear that relevant implementation items are included elsewhere. We suggest two specific locations:

- a. Page 13 has a section called “Constraints and Possibilities” which states that some areas in Richmond are already constrained, but says that the town “needs to identify ideal future land uses” for the rest. This could be a good place to explain that actions elsewhere in the plan set up a basis for this, especially the Natural and Cultural Resources technical plan and Economic Development technical plan.
- b. Page 17 has the “Taking Action” section for the Future Land Use technical plan. There aren’t any actions listed here because all the Future Land Use actions are in other parts of the plan (Natural and Cultural Resources, etc.). It would be helpful to communicate where those actions are in the plan.

The Future Land Use section has been completely reworked and greatly improved. It is now a full “technical plan” with specific land use areas. Each area’s current and future proposed land uses are described, and there are now goals and actions related to rewriting the zoning regulations and investing in infrastructure improvements. References to other sections of the plan remain, primarily for natural resources identification.

#### Next Steps:

At its meeting on December 6, 2017, the PAC found that the draft 2018 Richmond Town Plan, **with the edits described above**, meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC approval, and that the municipality's planning process meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC confirmation.

Upon notification that the Plan has been adopted by the municipality, CCRPC staff will review the plan, and any information relevant to the confirmation process, for changes. If staff determines that changes are substantive, those changes will be forwarded to the PAC for review. Otherwise the PAC recommends that the Plan, and the municipal planning process, should be forwarded to the CCRPC Board for approval.

#### Attachments:

CCRPC Staff Review of the 2018 Richmond Town Plan (dated November 30, 2017)  
December 6, 2017 Planning Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes (draft)

# Appendix A – Municipal Plan Review Tool

## Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission

### Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans

This form addresses the statutory requirements of the State of Vermont for town plans, as cited in the Vermont Municipal and Regional Planning and Development Act, Title 24 V.S.A Chapter 117 (the Act). It includes the 12 required elements found in § 4382 of the Act; the four planning process goals found in § 4302(b), the 14 specific goals found in § 4302(c); and the standard of review found in § 4302(f), which covers consistency with goals and compatibility standards.

During the Regional approval and confirmation process, specified in § 4350 of the Act, the regional planning commission is required to assess town plans and the process whereby they are developed according to the criteria of the Act. Sections of relevant statute are quoted at each question.

	<b>Required Elements § 4382</b>	<b>Met</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
1	Statement of Objectives, Policies, Programs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	Land Use Plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	Transportation Plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	Utility and Facility Plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5	Rare Natural Resources/Historic Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	Educational Facilities Plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7	Implementation Program	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8	Development Trends	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9	Energy Plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10	Housing Element	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11	Economic Development Element	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12	Flood Resiliency Plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	<b>State Planning Goals § 4302</b>	<b>Met</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
1	Development Pattern	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	Economy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	Education	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	Transportation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5	Natural and Historic Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	Quality of Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7	Energy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8	Recreation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9	Agriculture and Forest Industries	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10	Use of Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11	Housing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12	Public Facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13	Child Care	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14	Flood Resiliency	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## TOWN PLAN REQUIRED ELEMENTS

### Title 24 Chapter 117: Municipal and Regional Planning and Development

#### **24 V.S.A. § 4382. The plan for a municipality**

(a) A plan for a municipality may be consistent with the goals established in section 4302 of this title and compatible with approved plans of other municipalities in the region and with the regional plan and shall include the following:

**(1) A statement of objectives, policies and programs of the municipality to guide the future growth and development of land, public services and facilities, and to protect the environment.**

Comments: Objectives and policies are listed within each technical plan separately

**Met**

Pages: 8-10, 16-17, 22-26, 30-31, 32-35, 39-41

**(2) A land use plan, consisting of a map and statement of present and prospective land uses, that indicates those areas proposed for forests, recreation, agriculture (using the agricultural lands identification process established in 6 V.S.A. § 8), residence, commerce, industry, public and semi-public uses and open spaces, areas reserved reserved for flood plain, and areas identified by the State, the regional planning commission, or the municipality that require special consideration for aquifer protection; for wetland protection, for the maintenance of forest blocks, wildlife habitat, and habitat connectors; or for other conservation purposes; sets forth the present and prospective location, amount, intensity and character of such land uses and the appropriate timing or sequence of land development activities in relation to the provision of necessary community facilities and service; identifies those areas, if any, proposed for designation under chapter 76A of this title, together with, for each area proposed for designation, an explanation of how the designation would further the plan's goals and the goals of § 4302 of this title, and how the area meets the requirements for the type of designation to be sought; and indicates those areas that are important as forest blocks and habitat connectors and plans for land development in those areas to minimize forest fragmentation and promote the health, viability, and ecological function of forests.**

Comments: Other sections besides those listed here contain some land use information but these listed are primary sections dedicated to land use.

**Met**

Pages: 16-17; 22-26; Future Land Use Map, Richmond Zoning Map, Current Land Use Map

MAPS

Current Land Use ☒

Future Land Use ☐

**(3) A transportation plan, consisting of a map and statement of present and prospective transportation and circulation facilities showing existing and proposed highways and streets by type and character of improvement, and where pertinent, parking facilities, transit routes, terminals, bicycle paths and trails, scenic roads, airports, railroads and port facilities, and other similar facilities or uses, with indications of priority of need;**

Comments:

**Met**

Pages: 36-28; Transportation Map

MAP

Transportation ☐

(4) A utility and facility plan, consisting of a map and statement of present and prospective community facilities and public utilities showing existing and proposed educational, recreational and other public sites, buildings and facilities, including hospitals, libraries, power generating plants and transmission lines, water supply, sewage disposal, refuse disposal, storm drainage and other similar facilities and activities, and recommendations to meet future needs for community facilities and services, with indications of priority of need, costs and method of financing;

Comments:

**Met**

Pages: 39-41; 14-15 Utilities and Facilities Map, Education Map

MAP

Utilities and Facilities ☒

(5) A statement of policies on the preservation of rare and irreplaceable natural areas, scenic and historic features and resources;

Comments:

**Met**

Pages: 32-35

(6) An educational facilities plan consisting of a map and statement of present and projected uses and the local public school system;

Comments:

**Met**

Pages: 14-15

MAP

Education ☒

(7) A recommended program for the implementation of the objectives of the development plan;

Comments:

**Met**

Pages: 42-52

(8) A statement indicating how the plan relates to development trends and plans of adjacent municipalities, areas and the region developed under this title;

Comments:

**Met**

Pages: 3-7, 22-26

(9) An energy plan, including an analysis of energy resources, needs, scarcities, costs and problems within the municipality, a statement of policy on the conservation of energy, including programs, such as thermal integrity standards for buildings, to implement that policy, a statement of policy on the development of renewable energy resources, a statement of policy on patterns and densities of land use likely to result in conservation of energy;

Comments:

**Met**

Pages: 18-21

(10) A housing element that shall include a recommended program for addressing low and moderate income persons' housing needs as identified by the regional planning commission pursuant to subdivision 4348a(a)(9) of this title. The program should account for permitted accessory dwelling units, as defined in subdivision 4412(1)(E) of this title, which provide affordable housing.

Comments:

Met

Pages: 30-31; 22-26

(11) An economic development element that describes present economic conditions and the location, type, and scale of desired economic development, and identifies policies, projects, and programs necessary to foster economic growth.

Comments:

Met

Pages: 11-13

(12)(A) A flood resilience plan that:

(i) identifies flood hazard and fluvial erosion hazard areas, based on river corridor maps provided by the Secretary of Natural Resources pursuant to 10 V.S.A. § 1428(a) or maps recommended by the Secretary, and designates those areas to be protected, including floodplains, river corridors, land adjacent to streams, wetlands, and upland forests, to reduce the risk of flood damage to infrastructure and improved property; and

(ii) recommends policies and strategies to protect the areas identified and designated under subdivision (12)(A)(i) of this subsection and to mitigate risks to public safety, critical infrastructure, historic structures, and municipal investments.

(B) A flood resilience plan may reference an existing local hazard mitigation plan approved under 44 C.F.R. § 201.6.

Comments:

Met

Pages: 16-17

---

## GOALS AND STANDARDS OF REVIEW

### GOALS

#### 24 VSA § 4302

(a) General purposes . . .

(b) It is also the intent of the legislature that municipalities, regional planning commissions and state agencies shall engage in a continuing planning process that will further the following goals:

(1) To establish a coordinated, comprehensive planning process and policy framework to guide decisions by municipalities, regional planning commissions, and state agencies.

(2) To encourage citizen participation at all levels of the planning process, and to assure that decisions shall be made at the most local level possible commensurate with their impact.

(3) To consider the use of resources and the consequences of growth and development for the region and the state, as well as the community in which it takes place.

(4) To encourage and assist municipalities to work creatively together to develop and implement plans.

(c) In addition, this chapter shall be used to further the following specific goals:

#### Goal 1:

To plan development so as to maintain the historic settlement pattern of compact village and urban centers separated by rural countryside.

(A) Intensive residential development should be encouraged primarily in areas related to community centers, and strip development along highways should be discouraged.

(B) Economic growth should be encouraged in locally designated growth areas, or employed to revitalize existing village and urban centers, or both.

(C) Public investments, including construction or expansion of infrastructure, should reinforce the general character and planned growth patterns of the area.

**Consistent**

Pages:  
22-26; 32-35

How has the Town Plan addressed this goal: Future Land Use, Natural Resources contribute primarily to this goal

If the goal is not relevant or attainable, how does the plan address why:

#### Goal 2:

To provide a strong and diverse economy that provides satisfying and rewarding job opportunities and that maintains high environmental standards, and to expand economic opportunities in areas with high unemployment or low per capita incomes.

**Consistent**

Pages:  
11-13; 22-26

How has the Town Plan addressed this goal: Economic Development and Future Land Use contribute primarily to this goal

If the goal is not relevant or attainable, how does the plan address why:

**Goal 3:**

To broaden access to educational and vocational training opportunities sufficient to ensure the full realization of the abilities of all Vermonters.

**Consistent**

Pages: 14-15

How has the Town Plan addressed this goal: Education contributes primarily to this goal

If the goal is not relevant or attainable, how does the plan address why:

**Goal 4:**

To provide for safe, convenient, economic and energy efficient transportation systems that respect the integrity of the natural environment, including public transit options and paths for pedestrians and bicyclers.

**Consistent**

Pages: 36-38

- (A) Highways, air, rail and other means of transportation should be mutually supportive, balanced and integrated.

How has the Town Plan addressed this goal: The Transportation section primarily addresses this goal

If the goal is not relevant or attainable, how does the plan address why:

**Goal 5:**

To identify, protect and preserve important natural and historic features of the Vermont landscape including:

**Consistent**

Pages: 32-35; 27-29

- (A) significant natural and fragile areas;
- (B) outstanding water resources, including lakes, rivers, aquifers, shorelands and wetlands;
- (C) significant scenic roads, waterways and views;
- (D) important historic structures, sites, or districts, archaeological sites and archaeologically sensitive areas

How has the Town Plan addressed this goal: The Natural Resources and Historic Resources sections address this goal

If the goal is not relevant or attainable, how does the plan address why:



**Goal 6:**

To maintain and improve the quality of air, water, wildlife, forests and other land resources.

How has the Town Plan addressed this goal: The Natural Resources Section addresses this goal

If the goal is not relevant or attainable, how does the plan address why:

**Consistent**

Pages: 32-35

**Goal 7:**

To encourage the efficient use of energy and the development of renewable energy resources.

How has the Town Plan addressed this goal: The Energy section addresses this goal

If the goal is not relevant or attainable, how does the plan address why:

**Consistent**

Pages: 18-21

**Goal 8:**

To maintain and enhance recreational opportunities for Vermont residents and visitors.

(A) Growth should not significantly diminish the value and availability of outdoor recreational activities.

(B) Public access to noncommercial outdoor recreational opportunities, such as lakes and hiking trails, should be identified, provided, and protected wherever appropriate.

How has the Town Plan addressed this goal: The Natural Resources section and Community Development section address this goal

If the goal is not relevant or attainable, how does the plan address why:

**Consistent**

Pages: 8-10; 32-35

**Goal 9:**

To encourage and strengthen agricultural and forest industries.

(A) Strategies to protect long-term viability of agricultural and forestlands should be encouraged and should include maintaining low overall density.

(B) The manufacture and marketing of value added agricultural and forest products should be encouraged.

(C) The use of locally-grown food products should be encouraged.

(D) Sound forest and agricultural management practices should be encouraged.

(E) Public investment should be planned so as to minimize development pressure on agricultural and forest land.

How has the Town Plan addressed this goal: The natural resources section primarily addresses this goal

If the goal is not relevant or attainable, how does the plan address why:

**Consistent**

Pages: 32-35

**Goal 10:**

To provide for the wise and efficient use of Vermont's natural resources and to facilitate the appropriate extraction of earth resources and the proper restoration and preservation of the aesthetic qualities of the area.

**Consistent**

Pages: 22-26, 32-35

How has the Town Plan addressed this goal: Future Land Use and Natural resources address this goal

If the goal is not relevant or attainable, how does the plan address why:

**Goal 11:**

To ensure the availability of safe and affordable housing for all Vermonters.

**Consistent**

Pages: 22-26; 30-31

(A) Housing should be encouraged to meet the needs of a diversity of social and income groups in each Vermont community, particularly for those citizens of low and moderate income.

(B) New and rehabilitated housing should be safe, sanitary, located conveniently to employment and commercial centers, and coordinated with the provision of necessary public facilities and utilities.

(C) Sites for multi-family and manufactured housing should readily available in locations similar to those generally used for single-family conventional dwellings.

(D) Accessory apartments within or attached to single family residences which provide affordable housing in close proximity to cost-effective care and supervision for relatives or disabled or elderly persons should be allowed.

How has the Town Plan addressed this goal: Future Land Use and Housing primarily address this goal

If the goal is not relevant or attainable, how does the plan address why:

**Goal 12:**

To plan for, finance and provide an efficient system of public facilities and services to meet future needs.

**Consistent**

Pages: 39-41

(A) Public facilities and services should include fire and police protection, emergency medical services, schools, water supply and sewage and solid waste disposal.

(B) The rate of growth should not exceed the ability of the community and the area to provide facilities and services.

How has the Town Plan addressed this goal: Utilities and Facilities primarily addresses this goal

If the goal is not relevant or attainable, how does the plan address why:

**Goal 13:**

To ensure the availability of safe and affordable child care and to integrate child care issues into the planning process, including child care financing, infrastructure, business assistance for child care providers, and child care work force development.

**Consistent**

Pages: 14-15, 8-10

How has the Town Plan addressed this goal: The Community Development and Education sections address this goal

If the goal is not relevant or attainable, how does the plan address why

**Goal 14:**

To encourage flood resilient communities.

(A) New development in identified flood hazard, fluvial erosion, and river corridor protection areas should be avoided. If new development is to be built in such areas, it should not exacerbate flooding and fluvial erosion.

(B) The protection and restoration of floodplains and upland forested areas that attenuate and moderate flooding and fluvial erosion should be encouraged.

(C) Flood emergency preparedness and response planning should be encouraged.

**Consistent**

Pages: 16-17

How has the Town Plan addressed this goal: The Emergency Resilience section primarily addresses this goal

If the goal is not relevant or attainable, how does the plan address why:

---

---

## STANDARD OF REVIEW

### 24 V.S.A. § 4302(f)

(1) As used in this chapter, "consistent with the goals" requires substantial progress toward attainment of the goals established in this section, unless the planning body determines that a particular goal is not relevant or attainable. If such a determination is made, the planning body shall identify the goal in the plan and describe the situation, explain why the goal is not relevant or attainable, and indicate what measures should be taken to mitigate any adverse effects of not making substantial progress toward that goal. The determination of relevance or attainability shall be subject to review as part of a consistency determination under this chapter.

(2) As used in this chapter, for one plan to be "compatible with" another, the plan in question, as implemented, will not significantly reduce the desired effect of the implementation of the other plan. If a plan, as implemented, will significantly reduce the desired effect of the other plan, the plan may be considered compatible if it includes the following:

(A) a statement that identifies the ways that it will significantly reduce the desired effect of the other plan;

(B) an explanation of why any incompatible portion of the plan in question is essential to the desired effect of the plan as a whole;

(C) an explanation of why, with respect to any incompatible portion of the plan in question, there is no reasonable alternative way to achieve the desired effect of the plan, and

(D) an explanation of how any incompatible portion of the plan in question has been structured to mitigate its detrimental effects on the implementation of the other plan.

**Details of CCRPC's review process can be found in "Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans," as adopted October 19, 2016.**



**TOWN OF RICHMOND**  
**RICHMOND TOWN CENTER**  
203 Bridge Street, P.O. Box 285  
Richmond, Vermont 05477



May 21<sup>st</sup>, 2018

Charlie Baker, Executive Director  
Regina Mahony, Senior Planner  
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission  
110 West Canal Street Winooski, VT 05404

Dear Charlie and Regina,

The Town of Richmond has recently undertaken the task of rewriting our town plan. The last Richmond Town Plan was a re-adoption of the 2005 town plan in 2012. In preparation of the expiration of the 2012 plan, the town planning department undertook an extensive outreach program to increase community involvement in the recreation of the new plan for 2017-18. This process began in 2014 and we now have submitted to you our draft new draft town plan which was completed on May 16<sup>th</sup>, 2018.

The plan we have created is far different in structure and approach than our previous plans. The outreach process resulted in community feedback that warranted such a change. We are proud to say that the hands of many Richmond community members have touched this plan. Included in this plan are some new sections: From Vision to Action and Richmond Almanac. From Vision to Action outlines the process and results of our outreach, and the Richmond Almanac contains the traditional town data and information that was previously found throughout our previous plans.

The Richmond Planning Commission will be hosting its hearing for the plan on June 25<sup>th</sup>, 2018 in order to gain feedback. They will then pass the plan on to the selectboard for their meeting on July 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2018 where they will decide whether to hold their own hearings for the plan in late summer. The intent is to hold a town wide vote to adopt the plan on November 6<sup>th</sup> 2018.

The Town of Richmond would like to request that the Planning Advisory Committee formally review our new town plan at their meeting on Wednesday, June 13<sup>th</sup>, 2018. Any questions or concerns can be directed to Jessica Draper, 802-434-2430 [townplanner@gmavt.net](mailto:townplanner@gmavt.net).

Respectfully,

*Jessica E. Draper*

Jessica E. Draper, Town Planner

**Town of Richmond  
FY2015 Budget Worksheet  
Final for Town Report**

Expense Budget Accounts	Budget FY 2013	Actual FY 2013	Budget FY 2014	Budget FY 2015	FY14/15 Change
<b>LISTERS</b>					
10-7-12-0-10.00 Salaries	8,000	12,411	16,000	16,000	0.00%
10-7-12-0-11.00 SS/Medicare	600	949	1,200	1,200	0.00%
10-7-12-1-20.00 Office Supplies Listing	-	368	850	850	0.00%
10-7-12-1-27.00 Training/Education	-	-	400	400	0.00%
10-7-12-1-29.00 Travel	-	-	400	400	0.00%
10-7-12-1-45.00 Contract Services Listing	1,000	1,643	2,000	17,000	750.00%
10-7-12-3-47.00 Tax Map Maintenance	3,500	150	1,500	1,500	0.00%
10-7-90-1-91.00 Reappraisal Reserve	9,100	9,100	5,600	5,600	0.00%
<b>Total - Listers</b>	<b>22,200</b>	<b>24,621</b>	<b>27,950</b>	<b>42,950</b>	<b>53.67%</b>
<b>PLANNING AND ZONING</b>					
10-7-15-0-10.00 Salaries	69,900	65,224	69,900	70,000	0.14%
10-7-15-0-11.00 SS/Medicare - Adm.	4,000	4,990	4,625	5,355	15.78%
10-7-15-0-12.00 Municipal Retirement	3,100	3,261	3,100	3,300	6.45%
10-7-15-0-15.00 Health Insurance	15,000	15,041	17,000	14,000	-17.65%
10-7-15-0-15.03 Long Term Disability	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100	0.00%
10-7-15-1-20.00 Office Supplies	1,000	-	2,900	2,400	-17.24%
10-7-15-1-21.00 Postage - PZ	300	-	1,200	900	-25.00%
10-7-15-1-24.00 Advertising - PZ	1,500	-	4,200	4,200	0.00%
10-7-15-1-27.00 Training/Education	175	-	175	250	42.86%
10-7-15-1-29.00 Travel - PZ	400	-	725	600	-17.24%
10-7-15-1-42.00 Association Dues	-	-	-	0	-
10-7-15-1-45.00 Contract Services Planning and Zo	2,700	-	3,100	3,100	0.00%
10-7-15-3-43.00 Legal	15,000	-	7,700	7,700	0.00%
<b>Total - Planning and Zoning</b>	<b>114,175</b>	<b>89,616</b>	<b>115,725</b>	<b>112,905</b>	<b>-2.44%</b>

Tax Rate Estimate FY2015					
Current Fiscal Year	Grandlist Estimate	Amount To Be Raised		Tax Rate	
FY 2013 - 2014	At Town Meeting 2013 was 4,369,554				
7/1/13	\$ 4,423,972	\$ 2,756,354	\$ 0.6230	GF rate for tax billing purposes	
		\$ 20,000	\$ 0.0045	Depot Street Funding	
		\$ 2,776,354	\$ 0.6276	Total calculated rate	
			\$ 0.6276	Town rate/SB Approved 7/1/2013	
Next Fiscal Year					
FY 2014 - 2015	4/1/14	\$ 4,427,038	\$ 2,833,874	\$ 0.6401	GF rate for tax billing purposes
(Estimated April 2014 GL)			\$ 2,833,874	\$ 0.6401	Total calculated rate
				\$ 0.6401	Town Rate/SB - To be set July 2014
				\$ 0.0125	
				2.00%	

Amount to be Raised from FY14 Property Taxes	
\$ 1,720,948	GF Expense
\$ (250,135)	GF Non-Property Tax Revenues
\$ 1,470,813	GF Property Taxes to be Raised
\$ 1,502,711	Highway Expense
\$ (139,650)	HWY Non-Property Tax Revenues
\$ 1,363,061	HWY Property Taxes to be Raised
\$ 2,833,874	Total Amount to be Raised

11/30/17

08:08 am

TOWN OF RICHMOND General Ledger  
FY-2014 Pd: 12 - Budget Status Report  
GENERAL FUND

Page 1 of 1  
Finance

Account	Adjusted Budget	Actual Actual % of Budget
<b>10-7-15 Planning and Zoning</b>		
10-7-15-0-10.00 PZ Salaries	69,900.00	68,309.94 97.73%
10-7-15-0-11.00 PZ SS/Medicare	4,625.00	5,250.78 113.53%
10-7-15-0-12.00 PZ Retirement	3,100.00	2,450.92 79.06%
10-7-15-0-15.00 PZ Health Insurance	17,000.00	9,654.52 56.79%
10-7-15-0-15.01 PZ Health Insurance Opt O	0.00	576.93 100.00%
10-7-15-0-15.03 PZ Long Term Disability	1,100.00	321.30 29.21%
10-7-15-1-20.00 PZ Office Supplies	2,900.00	2,880.56 99.33%
10-7-15-1-21.00 PZ Postage	1,200.00	387.74 32.31%
10-7-15-1-24.00 PZ Advertising	4,200.00	3,694.14 87.96%
10-7-15-1-27.00 PZ Training	175.00	200.00 114.29%
10-7-15-1-29.00 PZ Travel	725.00	689.26 95.07%
10-7-15-1-42.00 PZ Association Dues	0.00	0.00 0.00%
10-7-15-1-45.00 PZ Contract Services	3,100.00	1,465.00 47.26%
10-7-15-3-43.00 PZ Legal	7,700.00	5,212.50 67.69%
<b>Total Planning and Zoning</b>	<b>115,725.00</b>	<b>101,093.59 87.36%</b>
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>115,725.00</b>	<b>101,093.59 87.36%</b>
<b>Total GENERAL FUND</b>	<b>-115,725.00</b>	<b>-101,093.59</b>
<b>Total All Funds</b>	<b>-115,725.00</b>	<b>-101,093.59</b>

11/30/17  
08:08 am

TOWN OF RICHMOND General Ledger  
FY-2015 Pd: 12 - Budget Status Report  
GENERAL FUND

Page 1 of 1  
Finance

Account	Adjusted Budget	Actual Actual % of Budget	
<hr/>			
<b>10-7-15 Planning and Zoning</b>			
10-7-15-0-10.00 Salaries PZ	70,000.00	55,673.29	79.53%
10-7-15-0-11.00 PZ SS/Medicare	5,355.00	4,131.13	77.15%
10-7-15-0-12.00 PZ Retirement	3,300.00	2,083.95	63.15%
10-7-15-0-15.00 PZ Health Insurance	14,000.00	40.15	0.29%
10-7-15-0-15.01 PZ Health Insurance Opt O	0.00	4,423.13	100.00%
10-7-15-0-15.03 PZ Long Term Disability	1,100.00	246.89	22.44%
10-7-15-1-20.00 PZ Office Supplies	2,400.00	1,841.59	76.73%
10-7-15-1-21.00 PZ Postage	900.00	339.35	37.71%
10-7-15-1-24.00 PZ Advertising	4,200.00	2,290.50	54.54%
10-7-15-1-27.00 PZ Training	250.00	530.00	212.00%
10-7-15-1-29.00 PZ Travel	600.00	907.18	151.20%
10-7-15-1-42.00 PZ Association Dues	0.00	80.00	100.00%
10-7-15-1-45.00 PZ Contract Services	3,100.00	0.00	0.00%
10-7-15-3-43.00 PZ Legal	7,700.00	1,935.00	25.13%
<hr/>			
<b>Total Planning and Zoning</b>	<b>112,905.00</b>	<b>74,522.16</b>	<b>66.00%</b>
<hr/>			
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>112,905.00</b>	<b>74,522.16</b>	<b>66.00%</b>
<hr/>			
<b>Total GENERAL FUND</b>	<b>-112,905.00</b>	<b>-74,522.16</b>	
<hr/>			
<b>Total All Funds</b>	<b>-112,905.00</b>	<b>-74,522.16</b>	
<hr/>			

11/30/17

08:09 am

TOWN OF RICHMOND General Ledger  
FY-2016 Pd: 12 - Budget Status Report  
GENERAL FUND

Page 1 of 1  
Finance

Account	Adjusted Budget	Actual Actual % of Budget
<b>10-7-15 Planning and Zoning</b>		
10-7-15-0-10.00 Salaries PZ	68,500.00	68,507.97 100.01%
10-7-15-0-11.00 PZ SS/Medicare	5,240.00	4,147.11 79.14%
10-7-15-0-12.00 PZ Retirement	3,000.00	2,043.59 68.12%
10-7-15-0-15.00 PZ Health Insurance	0.00	41.40 100.00%
10-7-15-0-15.01 PZ Health Insurance Opt O	5,000.00	5,000.06 100.00%
10-7-15-0-15.03 PZ Long Term Disability	1,100.00	245.88 22.35%
10-7-15-1-20.00 PZ Office Supplies	2,400.00	2,478.84 103.29%
10-7-15-1-21.00 PZ Postage	900.00	900.00 100.00%
10-7-15-1-24.00 PZ Advertising	4,200.00	2,690.79 64.07%
10-7-15-1-27.00 PZ Training	455.00	90.00 19.78%
10-7-15-1-29.00 PZ Travel	600.00	261.62 43.60%
10-7-15-1-42.00 PZ Association Dues	210.00	80.00 38.10%
10-7-15-1-45.00 PZ Contract Services	3,100.00	1,961.00 63.26%
10-7-15-3-43.00 PZ Legal	7,700.00	3,200.00 41.56%
<b>Total Planning and Zoning</b>	<b>102,405.00</b>	<b>91,648.26 89.50%</b>
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>102,405.00</b>	<b>91,648.26 89.50%</b>
<b>Total GENERAL FUND</b>	<b>-102,405.00</b>	<b>-91,648.26</b>
<b>Total All Funds</b>	<b>-102,405.00</b>	<b>-91,648.26</b>



11/30/17  
08:09 am

TOWN OF RICHMOND General Ledger  
Previous Year Pd: 12 - Budget Status Report  
GENERAL FUND

Page 1 of 1  
Finance

Account	Adjusted Budget	Actual Actual % of Budget	
<hr/>			
<b>10-7-15 Planning and Zoning</b>			
10-7-15-0-10.00 Salaries PZ	58,000.00	47,637.72	82.13%
10-7-15-0-11.00 PZ SS/Medicare	4,600.00	3,536.63	76.88%
10-7-15-0-12.00 PZ Retirement	3,000.00	2,321.42	77.38%
10-7-15-0-15.00 PZ Health Insurance	0.00	37.95	100.00%
10-7-15-0-15.01 Health Ins Opt Out PZ	5,000.00	5,123.14	102.46%
10-7-15-0-15.03 PZ Long Term Disability	600.00	256.41	42.74%
10-7-15-1-20.00 PZ Office Supplies	2,400.00	3,418.81	142.45%
10-7-15-1-21.00 PZ Postage	900.00	288.95	32.11%
10-7-15-1-24.00 PZ Advertising	4,200.00	1,609.63	38.32%
10-7-15-1-27.00 PZ Training	455.00	60.00	13.19%
10-7-15-1-29.00 PZ Travel	600.00	109.11	18.19%
10-7-15-1-42.00 PZ Association Dues	210.00	40.00	19.05%
10-7-15-1-45.00 PZ Contract Services	3,100.00	1,451.25	46.81%
10-7-15-3-43.00 PZ Legal	5,000.00	11,796.31	235.93%
<b>Total Planning and Zoning</b>	<b>88,065.00</b>	<b>77,687.33</b>	<b>88.22%</b>
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>88,065.00</b>	<b>77,687.33</b>	<b>88.22%</b>
<b>Total GENERAL FUND</b>	<b>-88,065.00</b>	<b>-77,687.33</b>	
<b>Total All Funds</b>	<b>-88,065.00</b>	<b>-77,687.33</b>	

11/30/17

08:09 am

TOWN OF RICHMOND General Ledger  
Current Yr Pd: 5 - Budget Status Report  
GENERAL FUND

Page 1 of 1

Finance

Account	Adjusted Budget	Actual Actual % of Budget
<b>10-7-15 Planning and Zoning</b>		
10-7-15-0-10.00 Salaries PZ	59,160.00	20,525.19 34.69%
10-7-15-0-11.00 PZ SS/Medicare	4,600.00	1,758.01 38.22%
10-7-15-0-12.00 PZ Retirement	2,500.00	813.52 32.54%
10-7-15-0-15.00 PZ Health Insurance	0.00	17.25 100.00%
10-7-15-0-15.01 Health Ins Opt Out PZ	5,000.00	1,319.23 26.38%
10-7-15-0-15.03 PZ Long Term Disability	350.00	67.14 19.18%
10-7-15-1-20.00 PZ Office Supplies	2,800.00	952.79 34.03%
10-7-15-1-21.00 PZ Postage	900.00	81.06 9.01%
10-7-15-1-24.00 PZ Advertising	4,200.00	205.50 4.89%
10-7-15-1-27.00 PZ Training	1,500.00	53.45 3.56%
10-7-15-1-29.00 PZ Travel	600.00	211.44 35.24%
10-7-15-1-42.00 PZ Association Dues	210.00	0.00 0.00%
10-7-15-1-45.00 PZ Contract Services	4,000.00	1,636.24 40.91%
10-7-15-3-43.00 PZ Legal	5,000.00	1,275.00 25.50%
<b>Total Planning and Zoning</b>	<b>90,820.00</b>	<b>28,915.82 31.84%</b>
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>90,820.00</b>	<b>28,915.82 31.84%</b>
<b>Total GENERAL FUND</b>	<b>-90,820.00</b>	<b>-28,915.82</b>
<b>Total All Funds</b>	<b>-90,820.00</b>	<b>-28,915.82</b>

Town of Richmond  
FY19 Budget Expense Worksheet  
01-16-18

Expense Budget Accounts	Budget FY 2017	Actual FY 2017	Budget FY 2018	Budget FY 2019	FY17/18 Change	%
10-7-10-3-44.00 Independent Auditors	22,000	26,101	22,000	26,000	18.18%	
10-7-10-3-46.00 Engineering Review	3,000	5,213	3,000	3,000	0.00%	
10-7-10-3-48.00 General Insure/VLCT PACIF	121,800	148,253	139,000	157,000	12.95%	
10-7-10-3-80.00 County Tax	22,000	21,739	22,000	22,000	0.00%	
10-7-10-3-80.03 Emergency Management	1,000	2,297	1,000	500	-50.00%	
10-8-90-5-95.12 Transportation Svcs -SSTA	2,200	1,308	2,300	2,000	-13.04%	
10-8-90-5-95.03 Flags	650	900	650	1,000	53.85%	
10-8-90-5-95.15 Front Porch Forum	100	100	100	100	0.00%	
10-7-10-2-43.01 Fire Protection	14,570	14,570	32,796	45,637	39.15%	
10-8-90-5-95.10 Richmond Rescue	68,289	68,289	70,680	72,800	3.00%	
<b>Total - Town Administration</b>	<b>671,061</b>	<b>715,793</b>	<b>716,636</b>	<b>750,566</b>	<b>4.73%</b>	
<b>Assessors</b>						
10-7-12-1-20.00 Office Supplies Listing	850	666	850	850	0.00%	
10-7-12-1-27.00 Training/Education	400	50	400	0	-100.00%	
10-7-12-1-45.00 Contract Services Listing	21,600	19,695	21,600	21,600	0.00%	
10-7-12-3-47.00 Tax Map Maintenance	1,500	2,718	1,500	1,500	0.00%	
10-7-90-1-91.00 Reappraisal Reserve	7,000	7,000	7,000	6,000	-14.29%	
<b>Total - Listers</b>	<b>31,350</b>	<b>30,129</b>	<b>31,350</b>	<b>29,950</b>	<b>-4.47%</b>	
<b>PLANNING AND ZONING</b>						
10-7-15-0-10.00 Salaries	58,000	47,638	59,160	65,484	10.69%	
10-7-15-0-11.00 SS/Medicare - Adm.	4,600	3,537	4,600	5,042	9.61%	
10-7-15-0-12.00 Municipal Retirement	3,000	2,321	2,500	2,385	-4.59%	
10-7-15-0-15.00 Health Insurance		38	0	4,513	100.00%	
10-7-15-0-15.01 Health Insurance Opt-Out	5,000	5,123	5,000	1,261	-74.78%	
10-7-15-0-15.03 Long Term Disability	600	256	350	375	7.14%	
10-7-15-1-20.00 Office Supplies	2,400	3,419	2,800	2,800	0.00%	
10-7-15-1-21.00 Postage - PZ	900	289	900	400	-55.56%	
10-7-15-1-24.00 Advertising - PZ	4,200	1,610	4,200	3,000	-28.57%	
10-7-15-1-27.00 Training/Education	455	60	1,500	800	-46.67%	
10-7-15-1-29.00 Travel - PZ	600	109	600	600	0.00%	
10-7-15-1-42.00 Association Dues	210	40	210	210	0.00%	
10-7-15-1-45.00 Contract Services Planning and Zoning	3,100	1,451	4,000	4,000	0.00%	
10-7-15-3-43.00 Legal	5,000	11,796	5,000	5,000	0.00%	
10-8-90-5-95.08 Regional Planning Dues	5,800	5,537	5,800	5,800	0.00%	
<b>Total - Planning and Zoning</b>	<b>93,865</b>	<b>83,224</b>	<b>96,620</b>	<b>101,671</b>	<b>5.23%</b>	