REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
Wednesday, October 17, 2018 - 6:00 p.m.
CCRPC Offices; 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202
Winooski, VT  05404

TRAINING – MPO Part 2 - 5:15 – 6:00 p.m. (Pizza will be available)

CONSENT AGENDA –
C.1 TIP Amendments

DELIBERATIVE AGENDA
1. Call to Order; Changes to the Agenda
2. Public Comment Period on Items NOT on the Agenda
3. Action on Consent Agenda - (MPO Business) (Action; 1 minute)
4. Approve Minutes of September 19, 2018 Meeting* (Action; 1 minute)
5. Transportation Survey Results* (Discussion; 30 minutes)
6. Transportation Performance Measures Report* - (MPO Business) (Action; 10 minutes)
7. FY20 Municipal Dues* (Action; 5 minutes)
8. ad hoc Committee on Commission on Act 250 Appointments* (Action; 10 minutes)
9. Winooski Tactical Basin Plan * (Action; 20 minutes)
10. Chair/Executive Director Report (Discussion; 5 minutes)
   a. Cabinet for a Day
   b. Building Homes Together results
   c. Public Utility Commission meetings
   d. Legislative Breakfast
11. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports * (Information, 2 minutes)
    a. Executive Committee (draft minutes October 3, 2018)*
       i. Act 250 Sec 248 letters*
    b. Transportation Advisory Committee (draft minutes, October 2, 2018)*
    c. CWAC & MS4 Subcommittee (draft minutes, October 2, 2018)*
    d. Planning Advisory Committee (draft minutes, September 12, 2018)*
12. Members’ Items, Other Business (Information, 5 minutes)
13. Adjourn

The October 17th Chittenden County RPC streams LIVE on YouTube at https://www.youtube.com/Channel17TownMeetingTV. The meeting will air on Sunday, October 21, 2018 at 1 p.m. and is available on the web at https://www.cctv.org/watch-tv/series/chittenden-county-regional-planning-commission.

In accordance with provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, the CCRPC will ensure public meeting sites are accessible to all people. Requests for free interpretive or translation services, assistive devices, or other requested accommodations, should be made to Emma Vaughn, CCRPC Title VI Coordinator, at 802-846-4490 ext. *21 or evaughn@ccrpcvt.org, no later than 3 business days prior to the meeting for which services are requested.
Upcoming Meetings - Unless otherwise noted, all meetings are held at our offices:

- Transportation Advisory Committee - Tuesday, November 6, 2018; 9:00 a.m.
- Clean Water Advisory Committee - Tuesday, November 6, 2018; 11:00 a.m.
- CWAC MS4 Subcommittee - Tuesday, November 6, 2018; 12:15 a.m.
- Planning Advisory Committee - Wednesday, November 7, 2018; 2:30 p.m.
- Executive Committee - Wednesday, November 7, 2018; 5:45 p.m.
- **HAPPY THANKSGIVING!** Thanks for all you do.
- CCRPC Board Meeting - Wednesday, **November 28, 2018; 6:00 p.m.**

Tentative future Board agenda items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Agenda Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 28, 2018</td>
<td><strong>MPO Training Session in advance of Meeting (5:15 p.m.)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY18 Audit – Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UPWP Process Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>greenride bikeshare Update – Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vermont Climate Action Pledge - Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VTrans Project Selection &amp; Prioritization Process - Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 11, 2018</td>
<td>Legislative Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30-9:00 a.m.</td>
<td><strong>Trader Duke’s Hotel</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 16, 2019</td>
<td>Mid-Year Budget Adjustment - Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECOS Annual Report?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
October 17, 2018
Agenda Item C1a: Consent Item

FY2019 Transportation Improvement Program Amendments

Issues
Add the following 2018 VTrans Bicycle & Pedestrian Program awards to the FY2019-2022 TIP:

Federally Funded Projects

Village South Sidewalk Additional Funds, Hinesburg (Project BP098, Amendment FY19-01).
- Add $114,400 in federal funds in FY20 for construction of a sidewalk on VT116 from the Community School to Friendship Lane. This project was also awarded a Bicycle & Pedestrian Program award in 2016 of $120,500. Additional funds are needed to address stormwater issues.

Cherry Street Sidewalk Additional Funds, Milton (Project BP105, Amendment FY19-02).
- Add $28,000 in federal funds in FY20 for construction of a sidewalk on Cherry Street between Turner Avenue and the railroad. This project was also awarded a $52,800 CCRPC Sidewalk award in FY14.

Irish Hill Road Pedestrian Bridge and Sidewalk, Shelburne (Project BP107, Amendment FY19-03).
- Shelburne was awarded $579,200 in federal funds for installation of a prefabricated pedestrian bridge and construction of new sidewalk along Irish Hill Road. Add $124,108 in federal funds for PE in FY19 and $455,064 for construction in FY20.

State Funded Projects – this information is provided for reference. These projects do not need to be listed in the TIP

North Avenue Raised Intersection, Burlington - $65,850 (state funds - 50% local match)
Village of Essex Junction Rectangular Rapid Flash Beacon Installations, Essex Junction - $8,600 (state funds - 50% local match)
VT Route 2A Crosswalk and Sidewalk, St. George - $20,500 (state funds - 50% local match)
Expanding Greenride Bikeshare, Phase 2 Stations, South Burlington - $24,000 (state funds - 50% local match)

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

Staff Recommendation: Recommend that the Board approve the proposed TIP amendment.

For more information, contact: Christine Forde
cforde@ccrpcvt.org or 846-4490 ext. *13
FY2019 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment

Issues

Make the following project substitution in the FY2019-2022 TIP:

Substitute Bayside Intersection Roundabout and Stormwater Improvements, Colchester (Project HP139, Amendment FY19-01) for Severance Road Path and Intersection Improvements, Colchester (Project HP117)

- The Severance Road Path and Intersection Improvements project is a Phase III CIRC Alternative project and was developed as part of the Colchester-Essex Network Transportation Study completed in 2014. The project was added to the TIP in FY2015 and was added to the VTrans Transportation Capital Project as a Bicycle & Pedestrian Program Candidate project in 2016.

- The Bayside Intersection Roundabout and Stormwater Improvements project was developed in the Malletts Bay Transportation and Stormwater Scoping Study completed in 2017. A roundabout was selected as the preferred alternative.

- VTrans allows project substitutions for candidate projects in the Transportation Capital Program according to procedures detailed in Attachment II of the Legislative Report Project Prioritization and Addition of New Projects for the State Transportation Program, December 1, 2008.

- Colchester has determined that the Bayside Intersection project is a higher priority for the town at this time and requests to advance this project.

- Approval of this TIP amendment signifies CCRPC support for the substitution.

- The funding schedule for this project is to be determined.

Additional Information:

For reference the full list of FY19 Chittenden County projects on the Candidate list is provided below.

Paving
- Richmond-Bolton US2

Interstate Bridge
- Colchester BR75
- Richmond BR55S
- Richmond BR53N

Park and Ride
- Williston North of I-89

Town Highway Bridge
- Charlotte BR31 on Dorset Street
- Huntington BR10 on Main Road
- Jericho BR15 on Browns Trace
- Underhill BR7 on Pleasant Valley Road
Roadway

- Burlington Railyard Enterprise
- Essex VT117 - Safety/Armoring (CIRC Alternative)
- Circ Williston (old CIRC project)
- South Burlington Exit 12B
- South Burlington Airport Drive
- Underhill Pleasant Valley Road
- Williston Mountain View Road (CIRC Alternative)
- South Burlington Exit 13
- Williston-Essex-Colchester (old CIRC project)

Bike and Pedestrian Facilities

- Burlington Waterfront North (grant)
- Colchester - Mill Pond/Severance Road (to be substituted)
- Essex VT15 Path -Old Stage Rd to Essex Way (CIRC Alternative)
- Williston US2 - Taft Corners to Village (CIRC Alternative)
- Williston VT2A Taft Corners Area (CIRC Alternative)

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

Staff Recommendation:
Recommend that the Board approve the proposed TIP amendment.

For more information, contact:
Christine Forde
cforde@ccrpcvt.org or 846-4490 ext. *13
DATE: Wednesday, September 19, 2018
TIME: 6:15 p.m.
PLACE: CCRPC offices, 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404
PRESENT: Bolton: Sharon Murray Buel's Gore: Absent
Burlington: Rob Fish, Alt. Charlotte: Jim Donovan
Colchester: Jeff Bartley Essex: Jeff Carr
Essex Jct. Dan Kerin Hinesburg: Andrea Morgante
Huntington: Barbara Elliott Jericho: Catherine McMains
Milton: Tony Micklus Richmond: Bard Hill
St. George: Absent Shelburne: John Zicconi
So. Burlington: Chris Shaw (6:33 p.m.) Underhill: Brian Bigelow
Westford: VACANT Williston: Chris Roy
Winooski: Mike O'Brien VTrans: Amy Bell
Bus/Industry: Absent Cons/Env: Don Meals
Socio/Econ/Housing: Justin Dextradeur Agriculture: Tom Eaton
Others: Wayne Howe, Jericho Alt. Scott Moody, CCTV
Staff: Charlie Baker, Executive Director Dan Albrecht, Senior Planner
Pam Brangan, GIS, IT, Data Mgr. Jason Charest, Sr. Trans. Engineer
Peter Keating, Sr. Trans. Planner Regina Mahony, Planning Prog. Mgr.
Emily Nosse-Leirer, Sr. Planner

[Note: This CCRPC meeting was preceded by a 45-minute training session on MPO basics. The October and November meetings will also be preceded by training sessions delving into more specific MPO duties and responsibilities.]

1. Call to order; changes to the Agenda. The meeting was called to order at 6:15 p.m. by the chair, Chris Roy. There were no changes to the agenda.

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

3. Action on Consent Agenda. There were no consent agenda items.

4. Approve Minutes of July 18, 2018 CCRPC meeting. MIKE O'BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CATHERINE MCMAINS. Catherine McMains asked that line 8 on page 2 be corrected to say “by category” rather than “be category.” MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. Appoint Agriculture Sector Representative to Board. Charlie noted that CCRPC has regional board members representing various sectors. We have been without a representative from Agriculture for many years. We were recently contacted by the Champlain Valley Farmer Coalition with a candidate – Tom Eaton. Charlie met with Tom to discuss the position and both he and the Executive Committee recommend that we appoint Tom Eaton to represent the Agriculture Sector. JEFF CARR MADE A
MOTION, SECONDED BY JIM DONOVAN, TO APPOINT TOM EATON AS AGRICULTURE REPRESENTATIVE TO THE CCRPC. Andrea Morgante noted that much of Mr. Eaton’s experience is with dairy farmers and wants to be sure he will include the interests of vegetable and other specialty farmers. Mr. Eaton works with all types of farmers. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

6. St. George Town Plan Public Hearing and Approval. SHARON MURRAY MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDREA MORGANTE, TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 6:19 P.M. Emily gave a brief history of this process noting that in November 2017 the PAC reviewed the plan and found it meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC approval; that the municipality’s planning process meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC confirmation; and, recommending it be sent to the Board for approval. This plan was approved by the St. George Selectboard on February 15, 2018. DAN KERIN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY TONY MICKLUS, TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 6:22 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

SHARON MURRAY MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JIM DONOVAN, THAT THE CCRPC BOARD APPROVE THE 2018 ST. GEORGE TOWN PLAN AND CONFIRM THE TOWN OF ST. GEORGE’S PLANNING PROCESS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ATTACHED RESOLUTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY ALL MUNICIPAL REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT. (The signed resolution is appended to these minutes.)

7. Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans Review. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ROB FISH, THAT THE CCRPC BOARD ADOPT THESE GUIDELINES AS EDITED. Emily noted that CCRPC’s 2018 ECOS Plan received a “Determination of Energy Compliance” from the Vermont Department of Public Service (DPS) on August 9, 2018. CCRPC is now able to review municipal plans and grant affirmative Determinations of Energy Compliance. The edits in the Guidelines are proposed to reflect this new process. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

8. Winooski Tactical Basin Plan Overview. Dan Albrecht noted that this plan was written by D.E.C. staff. Dan presented a slideshow describing the Purpose & Content of Tactical Basin Plans (TBP); role of RPCs in the TBP development; the plan content: geography, assessments, stressors, actions, and monitoring objectives; implementation of the TBP; CCRPC comment and conformance letter and next steps. All TBPs contain the same basic information. The Winooski TBP also includes: phosphorus reduction targets for the Winooski River Basin to minimize pollution into Lake Champlain. CCRPC staff has been reviewing the draft plan for the last few months. There will be a public meeting on the plan in October. Dan then reviewed maps showing the geography of the entire Winooski Basin; the geography of the Winooski Basin in Chittenden County; and water resource assessments for several local brooks and ponds describing whether they were impaired, stressed or altered waters and the planned actions. He then reviewed the phosphorus base load and reduction targets to meet TMDL; the top objectives of the Basin Plan; specific strategies for sub-basin; and reviewed how the strategies and actions are implemented. Vermont statute requires an analysis and formal RPC recommendation on conformance with the goals and objectives of applicable regional plans. Regina noted that 3 out of the 8 ECOS Plan strategies support and move toward the same goals of the Winooski Tactical Basin Plan: #2. Develop in areas planned for growth; #3. Water quality protection and restoration; and #4. Rural lands and habitat protection. Next steps: On Sept. 25th staff will send the draft CCRPC Regional Plan conformance & comments letter to CWAC for pre-meeting review. October 2nd at 11 a.m. – DEC staff will attend the CWAC meeting and answer questions on the TBP. The CWAC recommends a conformance letter and forwards to full Commission. October 2nd at 6:00 p.m. a public forum on the draft Winooski TBP will be co-hosted by CCRPC and the DEC at the Williston Police Station. At the October 17th CCRPC Board
meeting, CCRPC will take public comments and act upon a conformance letter and final comments to DEC.

Justin Dextradeur said the big question is who will come up with the priority projects to add to the database. How are these being developed? Is it coming from the state or local communities? Dan said the state has identified projects that have come from the TBP. What is a challenge is that the state has set the broad framework. Discussion ensued about how these will get funds to develop a project. Right now this looks like municipalities will apply for grants. Charlie said the Lamoille TBP named over 1,000 projects and so it isn’t easy to prioritize. He noted that Secretary of ANR, Julie Moore, has testified that 90% of the clean water challenge will be achieved through permit compliance.

From the regional analysis in the basin plan, the prioritization is largely left to the municipalities based on some guidance in their permits. Discussion continued about how projects are prioritized.

Andrea Morgante said the Winooski basin doesn’t include Charlotte at all, but we should at least include Charlotte on the map. These are DEC maps and we should let them know. Figure 23 should be labeled as to whether the roads included are in the town or the basin itself. Jim Donovan questioned whether agriculture is a major source in this basin.

9. Clean Water Advisory Committee (CWAC) Membership. Charlie noted that we’ve had a CWAC for several years. It started as an ad hoc committee but was added to our bylaws as a standing committee in 2017. The CWAC membership from CCRPC bylaws states: “There shall be members and representatives of organizations as follows:

- 1 CCRPC Board member or Alternate (who may also represent their municipality)
- Representatives of the County’s 19 municipalities
- University of Vermont
- Vermont Agency of Natural Resources (ANR)
- Vermont Agency of Transportation
- Burlington International Airport
- Other voting or non-voting members as may be determined appropriate by the CCRPC after a recommendation from the CWAC.”

Charlie noted that we have a standard contract with DEC, covering all RPCs, to assist with tactical basin plans and water quality planning. At the end of August, we received the FY19 contract, and language was added that states that: “Each RPC will have an advisory committee that includes municipalities, conservation districts, watershed groups, and other interested parties to provide recommendations regarding TBPs and related water quality issues (existing committees, such as Natural Resource or Clean Water committees may serve this role).” The state is trying to show the legislature it is consistent. Our membership does not currently include watershed groups or conservation districts. We are unique because we are the first to have a CWAC and we also have a unique MS4 situation. Staff is concerned that we will not comply with the grant agreement requirement in FY19 when the Winooski Basin Plan is considered by the CWAC at their October meeting. At their last meeting, the CWAC recommended that the membership be kept as is until we can establish guidelines for membership.
Charlie reviewed the comments received regarding the staff recommendation he had sent to the board and CWAC members. Based on these comments the new staff recommendation is:

“That the Board add Friends of the Winooski, Lewis Creek Association, and Winooski Natural Resource Conservation District to the CWAC as voting members. Interim guidelines to guide future CWAC recommendations as to membership are: 1) the organization’s primary focus is on watersheds that are within Chittenden County; 2) that they are established non-profit organizations with a track record of participating as partners with our municipalities on water quality project education, monitoring, and/or implementation; 3) that they are not political or legal advocacy groups; and, 4) that at least two municipalities nominate the organization based upon their partnerships with the organization. These guidelines may be updated by the CWAC as they determine in the future.”

We’re talking about inviting these organizations and they may decide not to join. Don Meals noted that the CWAC had about five minutes to discuss this. He personally feels we are taking too narrow a view of who should be at the table, but he also feels there are many avenues for organizations to comment on the basin plans. He also objects to #4 (above). Chris Roy feels that is covered in #2 (above). Discussion ensued. Charlie noted that municipal members were concerned that membership could be recommended from outside sources. Jeff Carr questioned why not “ex-officio” vs. “voting” members. His understanding is that voting members bear responsibility for decisions. It was noted that the CWAC would only recommend action to the CCRPC board and none of these organizations have representation on the board, even if CWAC membership expanded, municipal control is at this table. Charlie said they may not be financing a project, but these three organizations do apply for and receive grants. He suggested voting because they actively seek funding for water quality projects in our region. A lengthy discussion continued. Chris Roy feels that these would be the interim and the CWAC would come up with more permanent guidelines. Dan Kerin feels it’s a slippery slope because what if more groups come along down the road. Discussion continued about the fact that this commission does have the vote on whether to adjust the members of a committee. Bard Hill said he would trust the CWAC to make the recommendation based on what the bylaws already say. Charlie is trying to have some place for the CWAC to start. Rob Fish supports them being voting members because they’ll be more likely to participate; and the board makes the final decision. Jeff Carr would support them being voting members if we have guidelines fully vetted by the CWAC so he suggested we add them as non-voting and ask the CWAC whether they should be voting members. Discussion continued. Chris Roy said this is a requirement of our grant agreement with ANR and it says these organizations will participate in our CWAC. We are the only RPC that doesn’t include these organizations. Mike O’Brien feels we might be moving too fast because of the other voting comments in the bylaws. Shouldn’t we let the CWAC make a recommendation. Discussion continued that we do have a recommendation from the CWAC to leave membership as is. However, our grant agreement states we’ll include these organizations. DON MEALS MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JOHN ZICCONI, THAT THESE THREE ORGANIZATIONS (FRIENDS OF THE WINOOSKI, LEWIS CREEK ASSOCIATION AND WINOOSKI NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION DISTRICT) BE INVITED TO PARTICIPATE AS FULL MEMBERS OF THE CWAC ; AND 2) THE CWAC BE INSTRUCTED TO COME UP WITH REASONABLE POLICIES AND CRITERIA TO GUIDE FUTURE NOMINATIONS. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT TO ADD THAT THE CWAC WOULD PRESENT CRITERIA TO THE BOARD FOR FUTURE MEMBERSHIP. DON AND JOHN ACCEPTED THE FRIENDLY AMENDMENT. It was noted that there are no non-voting members now. Jeff Carr asked if he could offer a friendly amendment to say that the number of non-municipal members will not exceed 6. Don would not support that. Andrea said she is a board member of the Lewis Creek Association. They have representation from Shelburne, Charlotte and Hinesburg and some towns in Addison County. There is only a small portion of the Winooski Basin in Shelburne. The CWAC includes MS4 towns and it’s
important for rural towns to participate in that. The staff in rural communities are not able to
come more conversation for the rural municipalities.
VOTE: MOTION CARRIED WITH DAN KERIN AND JEFF CARR VOTING NO.

10. Comment Letter on DEC Draft Stormwater permitting Rule. Dan Albrecht said we are commenting
on the process and we’ve had time to review and prepare comments. Jeff Carr questioned comment
#22 and asked why we’d want to increase the fee for each acre of impervious surface. Charlie said
these are for private developers who are not paying enough to cover the cost of retrofitting stormwater
systems. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY DON MEALS TO APPROVE THE STAFF
RECOMMENDATION TO APPROVE THE COMMENT LETTER AND SUBMIT IT TO DEC. MOTION CARRIED
WITH JEFF CARR VOTING NO.

11. National Highway System Changes. Jason Charest and Marshall Distel presented the updates to the
NHS maps. Overview: The NHS consists of roadways that are important to the nation’s economy,
defense and mobility. The vast majority of the US population lives within 5 miles of an NHS route. In
Chittenden County the NHS includes the interstate, other NHS routes and intermodal connectors. Why
does the NHS matter? It establishes a well-connected and efficient transportation system; supports
intermodal transportation planning and economic development; and there may be funding implications
if pavement and bridge condition targets are not met. MAP-21 added 43.9 miles of new NHS routes
many of which do not meet the purpose of the NHS. VTrans has since removed all MAP-21 NHS
additions outside of Chittenden County. Chittenden County NHS mileage pre-MAP-21 was 120.9 miles;
MAP-21 – it rose to 164.8 and CCRPC staff recommendation is to reduce it to 137.4 miles. The approval
process included TAC recommendation in June, Executive Committee approval in August and we are
looking for board approval tonight. CCRPC will then submit the official request to VTrans and VTrans will
submit the official request to FHWA headquarters for review and approval. CCRPC staff has been
working with VTrans and they are on board with these recommendations. CCRPC staff recommendation
is that “the Board accept the final CCRPC staff recommendation as presented (Proposed NHS Map) with
the additional intermodal connection to the Burlington Downtown Transit Center and the understanding
that it will be reviewed and amended as necessary as the transportation system changes; and that the
Board request that VTrans consider these changes as presented for submittal to FHWA.” Jason showed
the maps of the Existing NHS system and the Proposed NHS System side by side.

Lengthy discussion ensued about why we would want to decrease the mileage. Amy Bell said the
important thing is that the number of miles on the NHS meet the criteria of the NHS. We need a
regional network that is sustainable. Eleni Churchill said there are some specific issues that if we don’t
reach targets on the NHS there is a penalty that is associated with it. The state receives funding to
address NHS issues. The state has been able to take funding from NHS and change it to give to other
projects in the federal-aid system. If we don’t meet the targets it’ll have to be spent just on the NHS.
We are not getting more money into the system. We get $120M for NHS and the more mileage we
have, it’ll dilute those dollars. We don’t have enough money to fix everything. Jim Donovan wondered
why the connection from Winooski to Burlington isn’t included. Jason said staff feels it is redundant.
Lengthy discussion continued. Charlie noted that we’ve asked a lot of these questions - like are we
taking funding away from our area? The federal pot of money has been flexed to do a lot of other things
in Chittenden County such as transit etc. VTrans will still flex funding as needed. We were hoping that
we wouldn’t put any more burden on the municipalities. John Zicconi said it’s a double-edged sword as
we really don’t know what the future will bring. There is a lot of flexibility right now. MOTION:
BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CATHERINE MCMAINS, TO APPROVE THE STAFF
RECOMMENDATION THAT THE BOARD ACCEPT THE FINAL CCRPC STAFF RECOMMENDATION AS PRESENTED (PROPOSED NHS MAP) WITH THE ADDITIONAL INTERMODAL CONNECTION TO THE BURLINGTON DOWNTOWN TRANSIT CENTER AND THE UNDERSTANDING THAT IT WILL BE REVIEWED AND AMENDED AS NECESSARY AS THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM CHANGES; AND THAT THE BOARD REQUEST THAT VTRANS CONSIDER THESE CHANGES AS PRESENTED FOR SUBMITTAL TO FHWA. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. (THIS IS MPO BUSINESS SO ONLY MUNICIPAL REPS AND VTRANS VOTED.)

12. Transportation Performance Measures (TPM) Report. Peter Keating noted that the Board will be asked to act on these targets in October. Tonight, he presented the background. TPM is part of Federal Law (MAP-21, 2012; FAST ACT, 2015); national goals were established for: safety; infrastructure condition (pavement and bridges); congestion; system reliability; freight; environmental sustainability (air emissions); and reduce project delivery delays. Rulemaking set performance measures, identified roles and responsibilities, and set target deadlines. The targets require coordination among key parties: VTrans, CCRPC and GMT. The General Rule – CCRPC has 180 days after VTrans sets targets for specific measures to either: agree to support VTrans statewide targets, OR establish our own targets. The board adopted safety targets at their February 2018 meeting.

Eleni Churchill then reviewed the new measures and targets we must consider. The first is Infrastructure Condition Measures and Targets including % interstate pavement in good/poor condition; % non-interstate NHS pavement in good/poor condition and % NHS bridges in good/poor condition. VTrans submitted targets around April 30th so we have a deadline of October 27, 2018 to adopt them. Eleni reviewed the VTrans statewide targets.

![Pavement Condition Table]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NHS Pavement Condition as of 12/31/2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interstate System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of pavements of the Interstate in <strong>Good</strong> Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of pavements of the Interstate in <strong>Poor</strong> Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target: 173.3 miles 27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target: 13.27 miles 2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Maximum: 5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Interstate NHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of pavements of the non-Interstate in <strong>Good</strong> Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of pavements of the non-Interstate in <strong>Poor</strong> Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target: 101.55 miles 22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target: 51.25 miles 11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Maximum: 10.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The penalty for not meeting these targets for three consecutive years would be that VTrans would lose the flexibility of using these funds on other NHPP projects and have to spend more money on interstate and NHS maintenance projects. If the targets are met, we can flex up to 50% on other federal aid projects.
The bridges are all bridges on NHS and not just on the interstate.

The next measure is NHS system reliability measures and targets. System Reliability: % person miles traveled (PMT) on Interstate that are reliable; and % PMT on non-interstate NHS that are reliable. Freight: Truck travel time reliability index (interstates). VTrans submitted this on May 14th and CCRPC deadline is November 10, 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bridges</th>
<th>NHS Bridge Condition by Deck Area as of 12/31/2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VTrans</td>
<td>All NHS Bridges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of NHS Bridges classified as in <strong>Good</strong> Condition:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current: 47.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of NHS Bridges classified as in <strong>Poor</strong> Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current: 2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal Maximum: 10%1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eleni said this is an annual target and we don’t have much data except for 2017 and soon 2018.
Preliminary staff recommendation: board should adopt the VTrans statewide targets for: NHS pavement and bridge condition measures; NHS system Reliability Measures – time travel reliability and freight movements. Reasons for staff recommendation: no practical policy or funding benefits or negative implications; extra work and coordination would be required with no clear benefits; no historic
data for pavement conditions on the municipally owned NHS highway in the state, including Chittenden County; available data for the non-interstate NHS routes in Chittenden County is unreliable; and, as we collect and monitor data under this category the Board will have the opportunity to set targets for the MPO area in the future. Amy noted that if CCRPC adopted our own targets, we’d have to do our own analysis. VTrans anticipates that as data gets better they will revise the targets.

The Congestion Reduction and Environmental Sustainability – the measures under these goals do not apply to VT or Chittenden County as we do not meet the minimum population threshold or air quality status. Reduced Project Delivery Delays – measures are TBD. Next steps: TAC will review these at their October 2nd meeting and the Board will be asked to act upon them on October 17, 2018.

13. Chair/Executive Director’s Report.
   a. Chris Roy presented service awards to Jim Donovan for 10 years and to Mike O’Brien and Andrea Morgante for 20 years of service on the CCRPC/CCMPO board.
   b. Charlie has been scheduling times on selectboard agendas. He’s sending them their individual annual report and would like the municipal rep to join him at those meetings. He will let members know when he’ll be visiting their towns.
   c. The Commission on Act 250 held a workshop in Burlington last week and about 80 people attended. They will be making recommendations by the end of this calendar year. We will be asking for members to serve on an ad hoc committee to review those recommendations. They have offered to give us the material to present a workshop.
   d. Cabinet for a Day in Chittenden County. The Governor has been traveling the state to have his cabinet meet with regional and local officials. They will be coming to Chittenden County on Wednesday, September 28th. There may be some opportunity to get together. The Commissioner of Public Service will meet with us next Wednesday afternoon. We’ll also meeting with Transportation Secretary, Joe Flynn that morning.
   e. Building Homes Together. There will be a press conference on October 10th with the latest status report. We’re hosting another housing convening in October as well.
   f. Legislative breakfast will be coming up in December although a date has not been set.

14. Committee/Liaison Activities and Reports. Various committee meeting minutes were included in the board packet.

15. Members’ Items, Other Business:
   a. Jeff Carr encouraged all members to attend the next board training prior to the October meeting. It’s an important 45 minutes and you will get fed.

16. Adjourn. JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JIM DONOVAN, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:50 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC)  
Resolution  
2018 St. George Town Plan & Planning Process

WHEREAS, Title 24, V.S.A.§ 4350 in part requires that CCRPC shall review the municipal planning process of our member municipalities including review of plans; that each review shall include a public hearing which is noticed as provided in 24 V.S.A.§ 4350(b); and that before approving a plan the Commission shall find that it:
   1. is consistent with the goals established in Section 4302 of this title;
   2. is compatible with its Regional Plan;
   3. is compatible with approved plans of other municipalities in the region;
   4. contains all the elements included in § 4382(a)(1)-(12) of this Title.

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

WHEREAS, The Town of St. George, Vermont is a member municipality of this Commission; and

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

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

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

WHEREAS, though the 2018 St. George Town Plan as adopted refers to expired town plans and the expired 2006 Regional Plan in describing its compatibility with the plans of adjoining municipalities and the regional plan, CCRPC staff have confirmed that the 2018 St. George Town Plan is compatible with the current adopted municipal plans of adjoining municipalities and with the adopted 2018 ECOS Plan; and

WHEREAS, The Town of St. George Selectboard adopted the 2018 St. George Town Plan at a warned public hearing on February 15, 2018; and

WHEREAS, the CCRPC held a warned public hearing at the CCRPC, located at 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, Vermont on September 19, 2018, to receive comments on the Plan;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION, that, in compliance with 24 V.S.A.§ 4350 and the Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans, CCRPC approves the 2018 St. George Town Plan and the Commission finds that said Plan:
   1. is consistent with the goals established in Section 4302 of Title 24;
   2. is compatible with the 2018 Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the ECOS Plan, adopted June 20, 2018;
   3. is compatible with the approved plans from other adjacent Chittenden County municipalities; and
   4. contains all the elements included in § 4382(a)(1)-(12) and/or is making substantial progress toward attainment of the elements of this subsection;

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

Dated at Winooski, this 19th day of September, 2018.

CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

[Signature]
Christopher D. Roy, Chair
Background:

Since 2000, the CCRPC has regularly assessed the public’s attitudes on transportation. Previous public surveys were undertaken in 2000, 2006 and 2012. The surveys are collected from a random sampling of CC residents in order to achieve results that can be reliably extrapolated, within a margin of error, to the entire County population.

The latest survey, conducted this past April/May, largely replicated the previous versions to note any historical attitudinal shifts. The purpose of the survey is to objectively measure public opinion regarding performance of the region’s transportation system and identify strategies to address existing and future deficiencies. Relative to performance, questions measure opinion on how well the transportation system serves the public’s travel needs, affects issues of livability, promotes economic development and opportunity, and impacts the environment. Regarding possible improvement strategies, the survey garners opinion on a variety of alternatives such as highway capacity, public transportation, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, transportation demand management measures (TDM) and land use strategies. Broader questions related to transportation policy and financing are also part of the mix.

The primary objectives of the survey are to measure satisfaction with the county’s transportation system among those who live and work here and gather opinion on how future transportation investments should be made – as well as to track any changes in responses over time. By asking respondents their opinion on a wide range of transportation issues including road maintenance, sidewalk quality, public transportation, and bike infrastructure, the CCRPC is better able to identify the public’s desired transportation priorities.

For the 2018 survey the CCRPC contracted with WBA Research of Crofton, MD. Kevin Pullis of WBA will be present to go over survey highlights.

For more information contact: Peter Keating
846-4490 ext. *14 or pkeating@ccrpcvt.org
Background: The most recent federal transportation bills, Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) Act and Fixing America’s Transportation System (FAST) Act, place considerable emphasis on system performance and direct State Departments of Transportation (DOTs), Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and Public Transit Providers to evaluate how well the transportation system is performing. At the national level, performance management has become part of the Federal Highway Administration’s (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration’s (FTA) Transportation Performance Management (TPM) program. The TPM program is a strategic initiative that uses system information to direct investments and implement polices to help achieve national performance goals. The intent is to measure progress towards the national goals through a reliable data-driven process.

FHWA has established measures in the following areas:

- Safety
- Infrastructure Condition (Pavement & Bridges)
- Congestion
- System Reliability (NHS Performance)
- Freight Movements (Interstate)
- Environmental Sustainability
- Reduced Project Delivery Delay

Once the performance measures were established at the federal level, it is up to state DOTs and MPOs to set quantifiable targets to gauge progress towards state and national goals. The schedule to establish targets, varies by measure. Federal regulations generally have state DOTs set performance targets in the various categories and then give MPOs another 180 days to either agree to the State targets or establish their own.

VTrans, in collaboration with the CCRPC, developed the statewide targets for NHS bridge and pavement performance; NHS travel time reliability for passenger vehicles; and Interstate travel reliability for freight movements. Statewide targets for performance measures for all relevant Vermont categories are listed below:

**Infrastructure Condition - Pavement**

- Percentage of pavement on the Interstate in good condition: **35%**
- Percentage of pavement on the Interstate in poor condition: **4.9%**
- Percentage of pavement on the non-Interstate NHS in good condition: **30%**
- Percentage of pavement on the non-Interstate NHS in poor condition: **9.9%**
Infrastructure Condition - *Bridges*
- Percentage of NHS bridges in good condition: **35%**
- Percentage of NHS bridges in poor condition: **6.0%**

**National Highway System Reliability**
- Percent of Interstate System person-miles traveled that are reliable: **90%**
- Percent of non-Interstate NHS person-miles traveled that are reliable: **80%**

**Freight Movements and Economic Vitality**
- Interstate System Truck Travel Time Index: **Less than 1.75**

For more information on performance measures and targets and the reasons for the staff recommendation please see the CCRPC Performance Management Report in the September meeting packet, which is still accessible on our website.

**TAC & Executive Committee Recommendation:**
The TAC and the Executive Committee recommends that the CCRPC Board agrees to the statewide targets set by VTrans for all performance measures under the NHS Infrastructure Condition (pavement and bridges), NHS Time Travel Reliability, and Interstate Freight Movement categories.

**Staff contacts:**
- Eleni Churchill, echurchill@ccrpcvt.org
- Peter Keating, pkeating@ccrpcvt.org
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission

October 17, 2018

Agenda Item 7: FY20 Municipal Dues

FY2020 Municipal Dues

Background:

Each year the CCRPC assesses municipal dues that are primarily used to match federal transportation dollars for municipal and regional projects in Chittenden County.

The municipal dues assessment amounts are distributed among the member municipalities based on the Equalized Education Grand List (EEGL). Even with no increase in total dues, the dues for each municipality are adjusted each year consistent with their proportion of the EEGL. The most recent EEGL issued by the State of Vermont for Chittenden County is shown in Table 1 as January 2018.

The CCRPC had kept municipal dues level for fiscal years 2012 through 2014 following the merger. The dues were increased by 1.8% in FY15 based on the change in the Employment Cost Index (ECI) for State and Local Government employee Compensation, which is published by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). The Commission decided to level fund the dues again for FY16, FY17, FY18, and FY19. In summary, municipal dues have only been increased once in the last 8 fiscal years.

The increase in ECI for state and local government workers during the 12-month period ending June 2018 was 2.3%. Table 1 shows the FY20 dues with a proposed 2.3% increase over the FY19 dues. The overall dollar amount of a 2.3% increase is $5,630, for a total assessment of $250,400.

Recommendations:

The Executive Committee recommends increasing municipal dues by 2.3% for FY20. The Executive Committee recommends the Full Commission approve the FY20 dues as shown in Table 1.

For more information contact:

Forest Cohen
fcohen@ccrpcvt.org, 846-449 ext. 19
Proposed 2.3% increase based on US BLS Employment Cost Index - Increase in Local Government Compensation June 2017 to June 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>EEG List January 2017</th>
<th>% of County</th>
<th>EEG List January 2018</th>
<th>% of County</th>
<th>1/17 - 1/18 $</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>CCRPC FY19 Assessment</th>
<th>2.3% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td>1,256,970</td>
<td>0.59%</td>
<td>1,273,400</td>
<td>0.58%</td>
<td>$16,430</td>
<td>-2.13%</td>
<td>$1,454</td>
<td>$1,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buels Gore</td>
<td>31,050</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>31,870</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>$820</td>
<td>-0.81%</td>
<td>$36</td>
<td>$36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>44,365,230</td>
<td>20.97%</td>
<td>46,527,460</td>
<td>21.25%</td>
<td>$2,162,230</td>
<td>1.34%</td>
<td>$51,326</td>
<td>$53,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>9,265,070</td>
<td>4.38%</td>
<td>9,342,670</td>
<td>4.27%</td>
<td>$77,600</td>
<td>-2.61%</td>
<td>$10,719</td>
<td>$10,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>22,026,060</td>
<td>10.41%</td>
<td>22,907,990</td>
<td>10.46%</td>
<td>$881,930</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
<td>$25,482</td>
<td>$26,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Jct.</td>
<td>11,138,290</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>11,493,970</td>
<td>5.25%</td>
<td>$355,680</td>
<td>-0.27%</td>
<td>$6,230</td>
<td>$6,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Town</td>
<td>14,795,180</td>
<td>6.99%</td>
<td>15,590,660</td>
<td>7.12%</td>
<td>$795,480</td>
<td>1.81%</td>
<td>$23,772</td>
<td>$24,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinesburg</td>
<td>5,887,620</td>
<td>2.78%</td>
<td>5,936,370</td>
<td>2.71%</td>
<td>$48,750</td>
<td>-2.62%</td>
<td>$6,811</td>
<td>$6,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td>2,148,000</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
<td>2,166,750</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
<td>$18,750</td>
<td>-2.57%</td>
<td>$2,485</td>
<td>$2,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jericho</td>
<td>6,356,590</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>6,439,820</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>$83,230</td>
<td>-2.13%</td>
<td>$7,354</td>
<td>$7,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>11,468,680</td>
<td>5.42%</td>
<td>11,801,690</td>
<td>5.39%</td>
<td>$333,010</td>
<td>-0.55%</td>
<td>$13,268</td>
<td>$13,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>4,680,120</td>
<td>2.21%</td>
<td>4,813,070</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>$132,950</td>
<td>-0.61%</td>
<td>$5,414</td>
<td>$5,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelburne</td>
<td>15,707,070</td>
<td>7.42%</td>
<td>15,824,720</td>
<td>7.23%</td>
<td>$117,650</td>
<td>-2.70%</td>
<td>$18,171</td>
<td>$18,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Burlington</td>
<td>30,318,410</td>
<td>14.33%</td>
<td>31,022,220</td>
<td>14.30%</td>
<td>$693,810</td>
<td>-0.22%</td>
<td>$35,075</td>
<td>$35,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George</td>
<td>741,200</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
<td>755,620</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
<td>$14,420</td>
<td>-1.49%</td>
<td>$857</td>
<td>$864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underhill</td>
<td>3,863,200</td>
<td>1.83%</td>
<td>3,908,840</td>
<td>1.79%</td>
<td>$45,640</td>
<td>-2.26%</td>
<td>$4,469</td>
<td>$4,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westford</td>
<td>2,379,700</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
<td>2,444,790</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
<td>$65,090</td>
<td>-0.71%</td>
<td>$2,753</td>
<td>$2,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williston</td>
<td>19,098,270</td>
<td>9.03%</td>
<td>20,256,630</td>
<td>9.25%</td>
<td>$1,158,360</td>
<td>2.45%</td>
<td>$22,095</td>
<td>$23,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winooski</td>
<td>6,049,870</td>
<td>2.86%</td>
<td>6,098,030</td>
<td>2.79%</td>
<td>$48,160</td>
<td>-2.65%</td>
<td>$6,999</td>
<td>$6,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$211,576,580</strong></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td><strong>$218,916,570</strong></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td><strong>$7,339,990</strong></td>
<td>3.35%</td>
<td><strong>$244,770</strong></td>
<td><strong>$250,400</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each town is assessed dues using their percentage of the Equalized Education Grand List. Their amount is determined by taking the total dues and multiplying it by the municipality's percentage of the total Grand List.

Equalized Education Grand List can be accessed at the Vermont Department of Taxes
http://tax.vermont.gov/content/report-pvr-2018-education-grand-list-equalized-xls
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
October 17, 2018
Agenda Item 8: Chair Action Item

ad hoc Commission on Act 250 Committee Appointments

Issues: In 2017, the Legislature created The Commission on Act 250: the Next 50 Years. It is a six-member legislative committee that is to examine and report by December 15, 2018 on a broad list of issues relating to the State land use law known as Act 250, originally passed in 1970 and codified at 10 V.S.A. chapter 151.

As draft recommendations begin to be circulated, it would be beneficial for CCRPC to have a committee review the recommendations and suggest any positions to the CCRPC for consideration.

From the Bylaws: Article VII.B. “The Chair shall ... with concurrence of the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission, establish and appoint committees and their members.”

Article XI: “All Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission Board members are encouraged to participate in a minimum of at least one standing committee. The Chair may appoint ad hoc committees for a specific purpose with the approval of the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission. Committees should include subject matter experts as needed to provide advice to the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission Board.”

As of October 9th, the following Board Members had volunteered to serve on this committee:

- Justin Dextradeur, Socio/Econ/Housing;
- Jim Donovan, Charlotte;
- Tony Micklus, Milton;
- Andy Montroll, Burlington; and,
- Chris Roy, Williston.

Proposed Chair Action: To appoint the members listed above (or as may be modified in the meeting) to an ad hoc Commission on Act 250 Committee for the purpose of providing recommendations to the CCRPC in early 2019.

For more information contact: Charlie Baker
846-4490 ext. 23 or cbaker@ccrpcvt.org
CCRPC Board of Directors  
October 17, 2018  
Agenda Item 9: Winooski Tactical Basin Plan

Background: DEC formally issued its draft Winooski Tactical Basin Plan on October 1, 2018 with a deadline for comments of October 31st. As noted in last month’s staff presentation to the Board on September 19th, CCRPC is providing recommendations to the Agency of Natural Resources regarding tactical basin plans pursuant to the following sections of Vermont Statutes Title 10, Chapter 47, §1253(d):

(2)(G) … the Secretary [of Natural Resources] shall: develop, in consultation with the regional planning commission, an analysis and formal recommendation on conformance with the goals and objectives of applicable regional plans.

The attached draft letter was prepared by CCRPC staff and reviewed and approved by both the Clean Water Advisory Committee and the Executive Committee at their October 2nd and October 3rd meetings, respectively.

The letter determines that the “draft Winooski Tactical Basin Plan is in conformance with and supportive of the 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan...” The letter details this conformance especially with regards to how the TBP endorses strategies in sync with ECOS Strategy #3: Improve the safety, water quality, and habitat of our rivers, streams, wetlands and lakes in each watershed.

CWAC Recommendation: The Committee voted on October 2nd to recommend approval of the draft letter.

Executive Committee Recommendation: The Committee voted on October 3rd to recommend approval of the draft letter.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of the draft letter.

Staff Contact: Dan Albrecht, Senior Planner, dalbrecht@ccrpcvt.org  Direct Line: 861-0133
Date: October 18, 2018

To: Vermont Agency of Natural Resources, Department of Environmental Conservation

From: Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission

Re: RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING CONFORMANCE OF THE DRAFT WINOOSKI TACTICAL BASIN PLAN WITH THE 2018 CHITTENDEN COUNTY ECOS PLAN

CCRPC would like to commend Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) Watershed Coordinator Karen Bates, on the comprehensive presentation and analysis contained in the Draft Winooski Tactical Basin Plan (TBP). We appreciate the opportunity to work with her and other DEC staff to strengthen municipal and public participation in TBP development. We look forward to continued cooperation with DEC and with the Agency of Natural Resources as a whole on future TBPs, as well as water quality outreach and education and other activities.

BACKGROUND

CCRPC has the opportunity to provide recommendations to the Agency of Natural Resources regarding tactical basin plans pursuant to the following sections of Vermont Statutes Title 10, Chapter 47, §1253(d):

- (2)(G) ... the Secretary [of Natural Resources] shall: develop, in consultation with the regional planning commission, an analysis and formal recommendation on conformance with the goals and objectives of applicable regional plans.
- (3)(D) ... [the regional planning commissions are to] assist the Secretary in implementing a project evaluation process to prioritize water quality improvement projects within the region to assure cost effective use of State and federal funds.

The CCRPC reviewed the Draft Winooski Tactical Basin Plan that was issued for RPC review on August 28, 2018 and the formal draft issued on October 1, 2018. The Winooski Basin includes major portions of the Chittenden County towns of Bolton, Colchester, Essex, Essex Junction, Essex, Huntington, Jericho, Richmond, Shelburne, South Burlington, Williston and Winooski and small portions of Burlington, Hinesburg, Underhill and Westford.

The 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan serves as the County’s Regional Plan. The ECOS Plan also serves as the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) for the County.

The purpose of this memorandum is to analyze the relative conformance of the Draft Winooski Tactical Basin Plan with the relevant Goals, Strategies and Recommended Actions of the ECOS Plan and to provide recommendations regarding project prioritization.

CONFORMANCE WITH THE REGIONAL PLAN

The draft Winooski Tactical Basin Plan is in conformance with and supportive of the 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan, specifically with the following ECOS Plan Goals and Strategies:
Goals:

**Natural Systems** – Design and maintain a strategically planned and managed green infrastructure network composed of natural lands, working landscapes, and open spaces that conserve ecosystem values and functions, and provide associated benefits to our community.

**Built Environment** - Make public and private investments in the built environment to minimize environmental impact, maximize financial efficiency, optimize social equity and benefits, and improve public health.

1. Ecological Systems (Habitats, Water Quality, Air Quality) - Conserve, protect and improve the health of native species habitats, water quality and quantity, and air quality.

12. Working Lands - Support the growth and vitality of working farms and managed forests; and sustainably manage sand and gravel extraction operations.

16. Infrastructure - Ensure adequate infrastructure and facilities (i.e. water supply, wastewater treatment, stormwater treatment, broadband coverage and solid waste recovery and recycling) to support areas planned for growth while conserving resources.

Strategies:

#2: Strive for 80% of new development in areas planned for growth, which amounts to 15% of our land area.

#3: Improve the safety, water quality, and habitat of our rivers, streams, wetlands and lakes in each watershed.

#4 Increase investment in and decrease subdivision of working lands and significant habitats, and support local food systems.

The following table details how the Basin Plan’s top objectives and strategies are in conformance with and supportive of specific Actions of the ECOS Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Draft Winooski Tactical Basin Plan, Objectives and Strategies</strong></th>
<th><strong>Conformance with select Actions of 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan (cf. applicable section)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protect river corridors and floodplains to increase flood resilience and allow rivers to reach equilibrium</td>
<td>Strategy 3. Action 1. River Hazard Protection. And multiple sub-actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase knowledge of water quality conditions in the basin, including the identification of high quality lakes</td>
<td>Strategy 3. Action 2. Non-point source pollution prevention and treatment. The ECOS Plan does not specifically list high priority lakes, but it does include implementation of the Winooski Tactical Basin Plan in Strategy 3, Action 1.e.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement agricultural Best Management Practices (BMPs)</td>
<td>Strategy 3. Action 2.b. includes &quot;Incentivize best management practices for agricultural uses; and encourage the Agency of Agriculture to better enforce their required agricultural practices.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage stormwater from developed areas through the development and implementation of stormwater master plans and Flow Restoration Plans in MS4 communities</td>
<td><strong>Strategy 3. and all Action 2. sub-actions</strong> which include data collection of areas producing water quality pollutants, help municipalities with regulatory measures (i.e. MRGP, developed lands permit, etc.), and help municipalities and partners with non-regulatory approaches (financial assistance for stormwater facility improvements).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Improve littoral zone habitat along Lake Champlain, and ponds in the Kingsbury Branch | **Strategy 3. Action 1.f.** - "To protect water quality, 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." These constraints include floodplains, municipal surface water setbacks, riparian areas and wildlife connectivity resources.  
**Strategy 4.** "Increase investment in and decrease subdivision of working lands and significant habitats, and support local food systems."  
**Strategy 4. Action 1.** Protect forest blocks, wildlife connectivity resources and crossings, surface waters, riparian areas and other significant habitats (e.g. wetlands) from development and fragmentation." |
| Inventory and prioritize municipal road erosion features that discharge into surface water and implement high priority actions in existing road erosion inventoried sites | **Strategy 3. Action 2** includes "CCRPC will work with the municipalities and other partners to implement these programs: Municipal Roads General Permit, Phosphorus reduction integration into the existing MS4 permit, and Developed Lands (3 or more acres of impervious). See Chittenden County’s Work Plan and ....All Hazard Mitigation Plan ... for more detail on these actions." |
| Provide technical and as available, financial assistance to wastewater treatment facilities | **Strategy 3. Action 3** discusses needed wastewater treatment plant upgrades. In addition, the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategies list includes specific wastewater treatment plant projects. |
| Prioritize wetland and floodplain restoration projects | **Strategy 3. Action 1.d.** "Support non-regulatory conservation and/or preservation of vulnerable areas through public and land trust investments, including identification of repetitively damaged structures and provide assistance to elevate, relocate or buy out structures, and identify where flood storage capacity may be restored and conserved." |
| Prioritize remediation of forest roads and log landings with high erosion risk | **Strategy 3.** Water Quality protection and restoration |
Assist municipalities in identifying areas of landslide hazards for benefit of future development

Preliminary data on areas of potential landslides are located in the Chittenden County Multi-Jurisdictional All Hazards Mitigation Plan which is incorporated by reference into the ECOS Plan.

PLAN CONFORMANCE CONCLUSION

The draft Winooski Tactical Basin Plan is in conformance with and supportive of the 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan.

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

1. As projects are developed, DEC and other agencies and organizations that provide funding, or implement projects directly, should prioritize projects that achieve a high phosphorus removed benefit per cost ratio. Additionally, projects that also provide co-benefits such as other TMDLs (i.e. Flow Restoration Plans, e.coli, mercury, etc.), hazard mitigation, transportation improvement, aquatic organism passage, and/or listed in municipal comprehensive plans and capital plans should also receive additional consideration in making funding decisions.

2. Given that phosphorus-loading concerns are the most critical problem in the watershed and given the requirements in the Lake Champlain TMDL are the most pressing, the Basin Plan should make it clear that some of the 11 “Top Objectives and Strategies” are more important than others. For example, we recommend that 6 of those strategies be recast as “Secondary Objectives and Strategies,” namely: Identify and protect high quality lakes; Protect and remediate lake shorelands; Reduce the spread of Aquatic Invasive Species; Increase knowledge of water quality conditions in the Basin; Address Toxics and Identify streams for reclassification.

3. While we respect the enthusiasm and determination of DEC to see projects implemented as can be seen in the following sections:

“(t)he Tactical Basin Plan actions are described in Chapter 5’s implementation table summary and the Watershed Projects Database and will be addressed over the five-year life of the Winooski Basin Tactical Basin Plan.” (p.2) and “(i)t is envisioned that the action items currently in the database as of the signing of the plan will be accomplished within the next five years as resources allow.” (p. 135).

We recommend that the language in those sections be softened to make it clear that only a relatively small proportion of the actions can be implemented given not only the relatively low level of funds available but also the sheer human capital needed to scope, design and implement the projects within the next five-year period.

4. CRPCC recommends that more funding be allocated towards project development at this early stage so that in subsequent years it will be easier to determine which projects reduce the most
phosphorous per dollar. Development of projects in Critical Source Areas for phosphorus loading should receive priority.

5. CCRPC recommends that for project implementation, priority be given to those projects that reduce the most phosphorus per dollar spent with priority given to those projects with additional co-benefits.

6. CCRPC recommends that RPCs, through their Clean Water Advisory Committee be allowed to provide input to DEC’s prioritization scoring system as intended by statute: Title 10, Chapter 47, §1253(d)(3)(D) ... [the regional planning commissions are to] assist the Secretary in implementing a project evaluation process to prioritize water quality improvement projects within the region to assure cost effective use of State and federal funds.

Additional comments regarding wastewater systems

According to the most recent Vermont Water Quality Funding 20-Year Projection developed by the “Working Group on Water Quality Funding, 2017 Act 73 Section 26 which submitted its report to the Vermont General Assembly in late 2017, below is a table that summarizes the cost by sector along with the required phosphorus load reduction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>20-Yr Cost ($M)</th>
<th>P-Reduction (tons)</th>
<th>$M/ton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>$143</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>$1.8M/ton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>$637</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>$4.5 M/ton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>$708</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$29.5 M/ton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Water Pollution</td>
<td>$1,039</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$45.2 M/ton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>$2,526</td>
<td>268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CCRPC recommends that the State looks for ways for phosphorus reduction investments to be made in the most cost-effective manner possible. Providing mechanisms for municipalities and other property owners with permits to invest in Natural Resource or Agriculture sector phosphorus reduction would clearly provide for much more phosphorus reduction per dollar spent.

Similarly, while the “all-in” approach to phosphorus reduction has a certain marketing appeal, it is clear both from a financial efficiency and efficacy standpoint that requiring multi-million-dollar upgrades to municipal wastewater plants to remove a relatively low amount of phosphorus is counterproductive to achieving the targets established in the Lake Champlain TMDL. Increasing these municipal operating costs will in turn further increase already high housing costs in Chittenden County, make it more difficult to build via infill or on brownfields, and drive development and housing sales further into greenfields and present risks to intact wetlands, streams and the watershed as a whole.

Strategy 7 [Develop financing and governance systems to make the most efficient use of taxpayer dollars and reduce costs] of the ECOS Plan notes that

Considering development and growth comes with both costs and benefits, this Plan attempts to reach a balance by directing growth in such a way that new infrastructure and long-term maintenance costs are minimized. For example: Promotion of and incentives for compact development in areas planned for growth will help keep rural areas open; this
can also minimize stormwater problems and prevent new watersheds from becoming impaired.

Simply put, the imposition of additional costs (at a poor phosphorus per pound removal rate) on municipal wastewater systems (and to some extent municipal stormwater systems) will make it difficult for Chittenden County communities to develop appropriately and to meet key Strategies outlined in the 2018 ECOS Plan, especially #1 - #4.

1. Improve and strengthen the economic systems of our region...
2. Strive for 80% of new development in areas planned for growth...
3. Improve the safety, water quality, and habitat of our rivers, streams, wetlands and lakes...
4. Increase investment in and decrease subdivision of working lands and significant habitats...

Thank you for your consideration of our recommendations. If you desire clarification on this letter, please do not hesitate to contact Dan Albrecht, dalbrecht@ccrpcvt.org or 802-846-4490, Ext. *29.

Note: The CCRPC will plan to provide additional staff level comments prior to the formal comment deadline of October 31st.
The meeting was called to order at 5:46 p.m. by the Chair, Chris Roy.

1. Changes to the Agenda, Members’ Items. Charlie asked that Item 7 (transportation performance measures) be moved up on the agenda prior to Item 3, as Eleni has to leave early.

2. Approval of August 29, 2018 Joint Executive & Finance Committee Minutes. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE FINANCE COMMITTEE PORTION OF THE MINUTES. JOHN ZICCONI SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Catherine McMains noted a correction on Page 1, line 23 to change “and” to “an.” BARBARA ELLIOTT asked for clarification of a long sentence on page 3, line 37. It will be changed to read “There is a requirement to coordinate with VTrans on the development of the targets and also include performance measures and adopted targets in the MTP and TIP. Performance measures and adopted targets will be included in a separate document that will be referenced in any future MTP and TIP document.” MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CATHERINE MCMAINS, TO APPROVE THE AUGUST 29, 2018 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES AS CORRECTED. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

7. Transportation Performance Measures. Eleni Churchill noted that she gave the TAC the same presentation board members received at the September meeting. The TAC voted to recommend the State targets for all measures. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, THAT THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS THAT THE CCRPC BOARD AGREE TO THE STATEWIDE TARGETS FOR ALL PERFORMANCE MEASURES UNDER THE NHS INFRASTRUCTURE CONDITIONS, NHS TIME TRAVEL RELIABILITY, AND INTERSTATE FREIGHT MOVEMENT CATEGORIES. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. Act 250 & Sec. 248 Applications.
   a. Ratify – UVM PFG Complex, Burlington (Case #4CO348-7). Charlie noted that this letter has been sent after review by the Executive Committee via email. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO RATIFY THE LETTER TO THE DISTRICT #4 COORDINATOR. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
   b. Clearview Estates; Milton, Application #4C1117R-2). Charlie noted that this is a project described as Phase III of Clearview Estates including the creation of 21 lots and 41 residential units comprised of a mixture of single family and two-family structure units. It’s located off Westford Road in Milton. Charlie noted that he has asked Emily to amend line 4 of the letter to insert “District” Commission so as not be confused with CCRPC. We don’t have a problem with the project. A brief discussion about the scope of the hearing being limited to 9B (primary
agricultural soils) and that the applicant has not yet sought approval from the Town. Chris Roy noted that it’s not unusual for a developer to present preliminary plans on a particular criterion before completing the design. JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O’BRIEN, TO APPROVE THE LETTER TO THE ACT 250 COORDINATOR. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. FY 20 Municipal Dues. Forest Cohen noted that Table 1 had not been included in the printed version of the meeting packet, so we distributed it. He asked members if they are satisfied with the way we distribute the dues based on the Equalized Education Grand List (EEGL). Members are comfortable with it. We have not had a dues increase since FY15 and staff is proposing an increase for FY20 of 2.3% which is based on the Employment Cost Index (ECI) for State and Local Government Employee Compensation. Table 1 shows the increase of $5,630 overall and how it would affect each municipality. The new total would be $250,400. Table 2 shows what the distribution would be with no increase. As noted previously, the dollars vary each year for each municipality because of changes in the EEGL. Members agreed that the increase seems reasonable. JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BARBARA ELLIOTT, TO RECOMMEND THE BOARD INCREASE THE ANNUAL DUES BY 2.3% FOR FY20. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. Administrative and Operating Policies and Procedures Amendment. Forest Cohen reviewed the memo. Part of our Procurement Policy includes a rule about micro-purchases. This includes supplies or services that don’t exceed a certain dollar threshold based on what is set in federal law. The State of Vermont does not have a micro-purchase policy. Right now our policy states a $3,000 limit. The federal law has changed several times and may be increased to $10,000. Staff is proposing that rather than including a dollar amount we revise our micro-purchase policy to say “as defined by federal statute.” After a brief discussion, it was agreed that “statute” should be “law.” And that we should delete the reference to the $3,000 limit in the first paragraph as well. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JOHN ZICCONI, TO APPROVE THIS AMENDMENT INCLUDING THE TWO CHANGES DISCUSSED. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

6. Winooski Tactical Basin Plan Comment Letter. Charlie distributed a slightly revised letter which incorporates some minor changes that the CWAC made yesterday. John Zicconi asked that next time we present a revised document, that it include tracked changes so we know what changed. Charlie said there was some clean up language. Andy Montroll noted that the paragraph on page 5 that begins with “similarly...” added language in the last sentence regarding brownfields. John Zicconi said we’re asking them to lay off housing and focus on farmers. Charlie suggested that rather than spend millions of dollars on wastewater treatment upgrades that has a lower return on dollar spent, wouldn’t it be more beneficial to spend the money on other areas to get to clean water sooner. There would still be a cost to our urban residents, but we would make faster progress towards clean water. It was noted that there is no priority list of projects and it should have more language to define how we spend the limited dollars. The basin program is still in its infancy and we don’t have data on every project to be able to make better decisions. Catherine asked if it’s possible to determine how much phosphorus comes from a particular farm? Charlie said there is modelling of general locations where more phosphorus may be coming from, but not individual properties. There are formulas developed to show if you put in a 300-foot buffer, you should be reducing phosphorus by so much. Discussion ensued about homeowners paying fees to upgrade wastewater treatment plants when we could spend less on farmland and have greater results in phosphorus reduction. CATHERINE MCMAINS MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BARBARA ELLIOTT, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE LETTER TO THE BOARD. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
8. Chair/Executive Director’s Report.
   a. **CWAC membership guidelines.** Charlie said the CWAC tabled action as several vocal members were not in attendance. When asked if representatives from the three watershed groups attended, Charlie noted that the conservation district attended and Marty Illick was there, although she was representing Charlotte and not Lewis Creek Association.
   b. **Governor’s Cabinet for a Day.** Members of the Governor’s cabinet visited Chittenden County last Wednesday. Winooski had a presentation on Main Street and another event on Opportunity Zones in the evening. There was a tour of Market Street in South Burlington. Sec. Joe Flynn met with Charlie and Eleni; and Sec. Tierney met with staff that afternoon. There was some good conversation.
   c. **Legislative Breakfast Topics.** Charlie noted that we have scheduled the breakfast for Tuesday, December 11th from 7:30 – 9:00 a.m. He’s been thinking about topics for that event. 1) Perhaps more water quality conversation about funding and prioritization. There have been spending $15M a year on bonding capacity which will come to an end in 2020. 2) Commission on Act 250 is coming up with recommendations, but we haven’t seen them yet; 3) VTrans is going to present legislation around electric vehicles and autonomous vehicles. John said VTrans is considering using Vermont as a test ground because of our terrain. Catherine said it was nice to see the State investing in more EV charging stations around the State.
   d. **Building Homes Together.** There will be a press conference on October 10th to present the latest results on how we’re doing related to building more housing.
   e. **CCRPC Lease.** Charlie noted that our lease expires in May 2019 – we’ll have been here ten years. We did have a broker look at 25 different properties that meet the square footage, but at this point it didn’t look that there was comparable space the was near town center, transit and had parking. Unless the Executive Committee feels differently, he would like to negotiate a lease with Redstone to stay here. The Executive Committee concurred.
   f. **Personnel update.** Our finance assistant, Michelle Thibault has resigned to take a full-time position. We are looking to replace that part-time position with a full-time position that could incorporate more of the duties currently done by Bernie, as she prepares to retire next year. We are looking at a different staff position – such as Business Office Administrator. Charlie asked members if they had any objections to our beginning to advertise at the end of October before we have a job description approved by the Executive Committee. Members were okay with that. He noted that we might end up spending a little more on those salaries this fiscal year, but probably spend less in the next fiscal year. We’d like to get someone on board in January. Members agreed. (John Zicconi left the meeting.)

9. Review Agenda for October 17, 2018 Board Meeting. Since the CWAC tabled action on the guidelines, we will remove that from the agenda. Since we have our consultant coming to report on the Transportation Survey, we will move that item up to after approval of the minutes; and move the Transportation Performance Measures to come right after that. Charlie has heard from a few board members who would like to serve on the Act 250 Ad Hoc Committee. Andy indicated it would serve if we needed someone else.

10. Other Business. There was no other business.
11. Executive Session. There was none needed.
12. Adjournment. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 6:50 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc
September 28, 2018

Stephanie Monaghan
District #4 Coordinator
111 West Street
Essex Junction, VT  05452

RE: UVM Patrick Forbush Gutterson Complex Expansion; Burlington; Application #4C0348-7

Dear Ms. Monaghan:

The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission’s Staff and Executive Committee have reviewed this Act 250 application for a project described as improvements to the Patrick Forbush Gutterson (“PFG”) Complex including a new 96,681 square foot addition at the east side of the building for use as a multipurpose events center including a 3,000 seat basketball stadium; a 17,331 square foot building addition at the north side of the building for use as a health and wellness activity space; a 5,087 square foot infill of the existing racquetball courts; a 7,909 square foot addition to the south side of the Gutterson Field House for seating and new pedestrian concourse; and utility, landscaping, site and parking modifications. The project is located at 97 Spear Street in Burlington, VT. The City of Burlington’s Development Review Board approved the project on July 5, 2018. **We offer the following comments:**

The project is located within the Center Planning Area as defined in the Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the *2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan*. We find this project to be consistent with the Planning Areas for the following reasons:

1. The Center Planning Area encompasses regional centers or traditional downtowns that serve the County and beyond and contain a mix of jobs, housing, and community facilities. Places within Center Planning Areas are served by wastewater facilities, other infrastructure, and offer a variety of transportation options, including non-motorized modes. The expansion of the PFG Complex aligns with this description.
2. The Center 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.
3. The project is consistent with the local regulations, as shown by the project’s City of Burlington Zoning Permit.

Therefore, we find this project to be in conformance with the Planning Areas of the *2018 Chittenden County Regional Plan*.

Additionally, we find that this project complies with Criterion 9(L), as it is located in an existing center that is compact in form and size; that contains a mixture of uses that include a substantial residential component and that are within walking distance of each other; that has significantly higher densities than densities that occur outside the settlement; and that is served by municipal infrastructure including water, wastewater, sidewalks, paths and transit.

The application indicates there will be no new trips, as the number of spectator seats in the new stadium remains the same. We therefore have no comments related to traffic.

Due to the detailed level of development review in most Chittenden County municipalities and the environmental permit reviews at the Department of Environmental Conservation, CCRPC will give specific attention in its Act 250
reviews to the type of use and the Planning Areas section of the 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan. While there are many other topics covered in the 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan, there has been significant analysis at the Regional level regarding transportation impacts. The CCRPC will also focus its attention on transportation, where appropriate, in accordance with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, which is within the 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan.

These comments are based on information currently available; we may have additional comments as the process continues. Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Charlie Baker
Executive Director

Cc: CCRPC Board
   Certificate of Service
October 9, 2018

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

RE: Clearview Estates; Milton; Application #4C1117R-2

Dear Ms. Lomonaco:

The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission’s Staff and Executive Committee have reviewed this Act 250 application for a project described as Phase III of Clearview Estates, including the creation of 21 lots and 41 residential units comprised of a mixture of single family and two-family structure units. The project is located on Westford Road, in Milton, Vermont. The District Commission intends to narrow the scope of the hearing to 9B (primary agricultural soils) unless that scope is expanded by the District Commission at the hearing. We understand that this project has not sought local approval from the Town of Milton. We offer the following comments:

The project is located within the Metro Planning Area as defined in the Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan. We find this project to be consistent with the Planning Areas for the following reasons:

1. The Metro Planning Area is identified in the Plan as an area planned for growth, and therefore this project helps implement Strategy #2 of the Plan which calls for 80% of new development in the areas planned for growth.
2. The project is located in an area served by municipal water and sewer service.

Therefore, we find this project to be in conformance with the Planning Areas of the 2013 Chittenden County Regional Plan.

Because the scope of this hearing is limited to Criterion 9(B), only limited information was made available in advance of this hearing. CCRPC will defer comments on other issues, including Criterion 9(L) and traffic impacts, until more information is available.

Due to the detailed level of development review in most Chittenden County municipalities and the environmental permit reviews at the Department of Environmental Conservation, CCRPC will give specific attention in its Act 250 reviews to the type of use and the Planning Areas section of the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan. While there are many other topics covered in the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan, there has been significant analysis at the Regional level regarding transportation impacts. The CCRPC will also focus its attention on transportation, where appropriate, in accordance with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, which is within the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan.
These comments are based on information currently available; we may have additional comments as the process continues. Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Charlie Baker
Executive Director

Cc: CCRPC Board
    Certificate of Service
CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE - MINUTES

DATE: Tuesday, August 7, 2018
TIME: 9:00 a.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal St. Winooski, VT

Members Present
Bruce Hoar, Williston
Brian Bigelow, Underhill
Jon Rauscher, Winooski
Justin Rabidoux, South Burlington
Amy Bell, VTrans
Bryan Osborne, Colchester, TAC Chair
Nicole Losch, Burlington
Bob Henneberger, AARP
Allegra Williams, Local Motion
Rachel Kennedy, GMT
Maryann Michaels, Rail
Dick Hosking, VTrans
Richard Watts, Hinesburg
Chris Jolly, FHWA

Staff Present
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
Charlie Baker, Executive Director

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

1. Consent Agenda
JUSTIN RABIDOUX MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BRIAN BIGELOW, TO APPROVE THE TWO TIP AMENDMENT ITEMS DESCRIBED IN THE CONSENT AGENDA MEMOS. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

2. Approval of Minutes
AMY BELL MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BOB HENNEBERGER, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 7, 2018 TAC MEETING. THE MOTION CARRIED.

3. Public Comments
None.

4. Transportation Performance Management (TPM)
Peter pointed TAC members to the memo and a report in their meeting packet and explained that the presentation will cover some of the same ground as well as points made in a previous presentation to the TAC this past February. Peter began by giving some background on TPM: Its basis in federal law, the national goal areas, and the rulemaking that set performance measures and target deadlines. He also noted the general rule that MPO’s, like the CCRPC, have 180 days following a VTrans established performance target to either:
- Agree to the VTrans statewide target, or
- Establish their own target
Peter described the safety targets that VTrans established last August that the CCRPC agreed to this past February. Peter then turned the presentation over to Eleni to describe more recent efforts at VTrans to establish targets in other areas. Eleni began with infrastructure condition for pavement and bridges where VTrans recently set targets for Interstate and non-Interstate NHS pavements in both good and poor condition. VTrans also did the same for bridges on the NHS. For illustrative purposes Eleni showed
Chittenden County level data for these as well, to compare with the VTrans statewide data. For these infrastructure condition targets, CCRPC has a deadline to act by October 27, 2018. Eleni then explained VTrans target setting for system reliability and freight. Using charts of both statewide and Chittenden County data, Eleni illustrated how VTrans determined their targets and why regional level data is not that reliable. She concluded with a draft motion for the TAC to consider and explained the rationale for the recommendation. She also noted two goal areas that Vermont does not need to develop targets for given our small population and air quality status. The next steps, following TAC action, are Board discussion and action on 10/17/18 and the submittal to VTrans and FHWA of the Performance Management report.

Some comments/discussion points included:

- Fatality rate data from VTrans and a recent uptick in fatality numbers
- The fatality rate target should be zero
- The TAC should consider a presentation of the Traffic Safety Alliance
- There should be a travel time for active transportation modes as well – consider a recommendation to FHWA on this.
- Comments during rule making may have addressed the active transportation mode issue – Chris Jolly will review those comments.

Following discussion, Richard Watts made the following motion, seconded by Bruce Hoar:

THE TAC ACCEPTS THE STATEWIDE TARGETS FOR NHS PAVEMENTS AND BRIDGE CONDITION, NHS TIME TRAVEL RELIABILITY, AND INTERSTATE FREIGHT MOVEMENTS AND RECOMMENDS THAT THE CCRPC BOARD AGREES TO THE STATEWIDE TARGETS FOR ALL PERFORMANCE MEASURES UNDER THESE CATEGORIES. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Winooski River Bridge Scoping Update

Peter began with background information on both this project as well as scoping in general. The subject bridge was built in 1928 following the 1927 flood, has three spans and saw major repairs in 1961, 1975 and 1997. Its unique bracket supporting sidewalks restricts any outward expansion of the bridge width.

Before describing the five bridge alternatives developed in the scoping process, Peter identified the Advisory Committee members and the outreach to the public as well as VTrans structures and resource staffs. The alternatives are:

1. Superstructure rehabilitation with separate bike/ped bridge
2. Superstructure replacement with separate bike/Ped bridge
3. Superstructure replacement with all modes on one bridge (widened piers upstream)
4. Superstructure replacement with all modes on one bridge (widened piers downstream)
5. Completely new two span, one pier bridge; includes all modes

Peter described the discussion at the Advisory Committee that modified the bike/ped facility for Alternatives 4 and 5, to be 12-foot shared use paths on both sides. He next showed the two-page evaluation matrix that compares each alternative under the dozens of criteria. Difficult to see but illustrated the complex evaluation process and comparison analysis. Peter also described the accelerated bridge program at VTrans and the use of a lateral slide technique to build the new bridge and minimize the length of time needed total bridge closure. Following extensive discussion at the last Advisory Committee, the following preferred alternative recommendation, and rationale, was agreed to: The Advisory Committee recommends both Alternatives 4 and 5 move forward as locally recommended alternatives and that the bridge should be constructed using an accelerated bridge construction method.

Decision factors:
1) The roadway configuration is identical for both Alternatives 4 and 5
2) Several unknowns at this point:
   • The condition of the existing substructure (piers and abutments)
   • Potential river access constraints from either side
   • The timeframe for construction.

Given the access restrictions to the site, the relatively high cost and the fact that the current substructure is still in remarkably good condition, this project is likely to be well off into the future before we see it under construction.
6. Bicycle Parking Bylaws

Bryan Davis presented “Model Bylaws for Short and Long-Term Bicycle Parking Facilities.” He provided some photo evidence of when and where bike parking is needed noting some unusual methods owners go to to secure their bikes. Within Chittenden County, bike parking is addressed to varying degrees in current bylaws – or not at all. He noted that examples are usually tied to car parking requirements. Bryan stated that “The goal is to get well-designed and usable racks as the standard. Towns and developers pay dearly for vehicle parking and traffic impacts; the cost of a good bike rack is a fraction of those.” He recommended towns add definitions to their bylaws, describe the bike parking they want, and identify an appropriate amount to be provided, keeping the site context in mind. He then went through the language in several local bylaws – Burlington, Milton and South Burlington - to compare and contrast what each are doing. He added that Burlington has their own separate bike parking guidelines while other towns have a section as part of their land development regulations. He next illustrated with photos a number of good and bad examples and concluded with a list of resources:

- CCRPC staff
- Free *ABPB Essentials of Bike Parking*
- Free Dero Bike Parking Guide
- APBP Bike Parking Guidelines - RPC has on file and willing to loan.

Bob Henneberger remarked that as the population ages, bike parking that includes charging stations for e-bikes as well as room for trikes, will be needed.

7. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports

Bryan Osborne referred members to the project list on the reverse side of the meeting agenda.

8. CCRPC September Board Meeting Report

Peter reported the Board met on 9/19 hearing a presentation, and taking action, on the proposed National Highway System (NHS). They also received an update on transportation performance management and upcoming deadlines for target setting. The meeting began with a 45-minute presentation on Board responsibilities as an MPO.

9. Chairman’s/Members’ Items

Bryan Davis mentioned upcoming Local Road workshops on designing pedestrian facilities for accessibility.

The meeting adjourned at 10:40 a.m.

Respectfully submitted, Peter Keating
CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

CLEAN WATER ADVISORY COMMITTEE – DRAFT MINUTES

DATE: Tuesday, October 2, 2018
SCHEDULED TIME: 11 a.m. to 12:15 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/

Committee Members in Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bolton:</th>
<th>Hinesburg:</th>
<th>St. George:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buels Gore:</td>
<td>Huntington: Darlene Palola</td>
<td>Underhill: Brian Bigelow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington:</td>
<td>Jericho:</td>
<td>Westford:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte: Marty Illick</td>
<td>Milton: Dave Allerton</td>
<td>Williston:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester: Karen Adams; Tom Douglas (intern)</td>
<td>Richmond: Jessica Draper</td>
<td>Winooski: Tim Grover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex: Annie Costandi</td>
<td>Shelburne:</td>
<td>VAOT:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Junction: Polly Harris (Stantec): arrived 11:15 a.m.</td>
<td>South Burlington: Tom DiPietro</td>
<td>VNR: Christy Witters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington Airport:</td>
<td>University of VT: Claire Forbes</td>
<td>CCRPC Board:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the Winooski River:</td>
<td>Lewis Creek Assoc:</td>
<td>Winooski NRCD: Kristen Balschunat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Attendees: unknown Winooski resident

CCRPC Staff: Dan Albrecht, Regina Mahony, Chris Dubin, Charlie Baker

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Annie Costandi.

2. Review and action on draft minutes of September 4, 2018

After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, Karen Adams made a motion, seconded by Tom DiPietro to approve the minutes. MOTION PASSED with Grover, Illick and Forbes abstaining.

3. Review & approve CCRPC comment letter on draft 2018 Winooski Tactical Basin Plan: Dan Albrecht, CCRPC Senior Planner

Dan Albrecht recapped the draft comment letter which the CWAC will finalize today, be examined tomorrow by the CCRPC Executive Committee and then voted on by the full Commission at its October 17th meeting. Overall, the letter demonstrates how the various objectives and strategies in the Winooski TBP are consistent with key strategies in the ECOS Plan, especially Actions identified under ECOS Strategy #3 “Improve the safety, water quality, and habitat of our rivers, streams, wetlands and lakes in each watershed.”

Albrecht noted several separate recommendations many of which were included in the CCRP’s comments on the draft 2016 Lamoille TBP. These include: prioritizing implementation of project with a high phosphorus remove benefit per cost ratio especially those with additional co-benefits such as hazard mitigation, transportation improvement, social benefit, etc; more work on scoping and design of projects in areas of high phosphorus loading and providing mechanisms (e.g. credit trading) by which municipalities and the private sector could invest in natural resources or agriculture projects so as to achieve the highest phosphorus reduction per dollar spent.

Albrecht took some extra time explaining the rationale behind recommendation #2 on page 4, namely that six non-phosphorus removal strategies in the TBP should be considered as Secondary Strategies. Members concurred with this point.

The letter also emphasizes that forcing municipal wastewater plants to spend millions in a non-cost-efficient manner to remove a relatively small amount of phosphorus will have negative effects (by driving up the cost of housing) and make it difficult to meet key strategies in the ECOS Plan especially #2, Strive for 80% of new development in areas for planned growth. Given an increase Darlene Palola suggested adding language noting that this would also make infill and brownfields redevelopment more expensive. Members agreed with this proposed revision.

Palola and Brian Bigelow noted that the references to towns in the Basin on page 1 should have Bolton, Huntington and Richmond added and that Underhill be listed as a town with only a small portion in the Basin.
Darlene Palola made a motion, seconded by Brian Bigelow to approve the letter as drafted with the minor additions just discussed. MOTION PASSED with Illick and Harris abstaining.

4. Recommend appointment guidelines for non-municipal representatives to CW: Charlie Baker, CCRPC Executive Director

Charlie Baker first apologized for the awkwardness of having the CCRPC Board going ahead with his recommendation to appoint Friends of the Winooski River, Lewis Creek Association and Winooski NRCD as CWAC members absent a formal CWAC recommendation. The short amount of time the CWAC had to discuss it at their September meeting and the requirements of the FY19 grant agreement led to an accelerated time frame and it is not how things are usually done.

The Board had a robust discussion of potential criteria and would like to hear back from the CWAC as to their recommendations. The four suggested guidelines in the staff memo to the CWAC come from both discussions at the September 2nd CWAC and September 19th full board meeting as well as from communications from individual CWAC members to him. [Note: These four guidelines are:

1) the organization’s primary focus is on watersheds that are within Chittenden County;
2) that they are established non-profit organizations with a track record of participating as partners with our municipalities on the implementation of water quality research, outreach and improvement projects;
3) that the organization be nominated by at least one CWAC municipal member; and
4) that the organization not be primarily engaged in political or lobbying activities.

Marty Illick noted that to her organization, Lewis Creek Association, it is not critical that they be able to vote. She views their group as a support group that enhance the capabilities of the municipalities. Kristen Balschunat echoed those statements noting that the organizations can help with grant implementation.

Members had no concerns with guidelines #1-#3. There was some discussion about removing #4 as first three guidelines would likely preclude membership from overtly political/lobbying groups. Karen Adams noted that #4 had primarily come from James Sherrard so we should wait to see how he feels about the issue. Members agreed to resume action on these guidelines at the next CWAC meeting.

5. Updates

None.

6. Items for November 6th meeting agenda

Continued work on guidelines for non-municipal CWAC members; status of 3-acre permit rule and preliminary list of potential regulated parcels.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Dan Albrecht
DATE: Tuesday, October 2, 2018
SCHEDULED TIME: 12:15 p.m. to 1:45 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/

Committee Members in Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burlington:</th>
<th>Burlington Airport: Polly Harris (Stantec)</th>
<th>Williston:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colchester:</td>
<td>Milton: Dave Allerton</td>
<td>Winooski: Tim Grover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex:</td>
<td>Annie Costandi, Co-Chair</td>
<td>VAOT: Jennifer Callahan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shelburne:</td>
<td>University of VT: Claire Forbes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Junction: Chelsea Mandigo, Co-Chair</td>
<td>South Burlington: Tom DiPietro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Attendees: WNRCD: Kristen Balschunat; Blue Stormwater Program: Juliana Dixon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCRPC Staff:</td>
<td>Dan Albrecht</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Call to Order:** Chelsea Mandigo called the meeting to order at 12:45 p.m.

2. **Changes to the Agenda** – At request of the Chair, add Update Winooski NRCD Executive Director after item #5.

3. **Review and action on draft minutes of September 4, 2018**
   After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, Karen Adams made a motion, seconded by Jenna Olson to approve the minutes with the correction to add Chris Robinson of Shelburne to the list of members present. **MOTION PASSED.** Polly Harris and Tim Grover abstained.

4. **Budget review and preliminary discussion of amendments to FY19 budget, proposed FY20 budget and proposed FY20 dues (Discussion)**
   Dan recapped the current budget situation via distribution of both the current FY19 budget and expenses and an initial discussion draft budget for FY20. The current budget for FY19 was originally approved at $68,911 and was changed slightly at the Sept 4th meeting to $68,996 as a result of revised ad buy totals for the fall plus the new winter ad buy. 'Total dues collected for FY19 was $66,000 however we budgeted for use of prior years’ surpluses. The estimated surplus after the closeout of FY18 expenses is approximately $18,496 with a true surplus of $15,496 once you factor in setting aside $3,000 towards the reserve for the 2023 survey. Note that the Subcommittee held off on confirming a spring ad buy of $19,186 compared to the normal ad buy of $15k in that time frame. Some of those costs were actually for ads running in early July so Dan will ask Dave to calculate a new number with those ads excluded. Also, noted was that Stream Team operations were progressing very well, and that Kristen has been doing a great job but that dollars for staff time are approaching their original allocations.  
   There was a brief discussion on the relative efficacy of generic advertising vs. person to person engagement via the Stream Team as well as discussion of increased overall public engagement efforts. Juliana Dixon of Blue Stormwater noted that in general when they conduct a home certification visit, for the majority of households this is the first time they’ve heard stormwater best practices messaging. Kristen Balschunat noted that most booth visitors they interact with had never heard of the Stream Team. No firm decisions were made at this time but the option of having more Stream Team specific advertising incorporated into the overall Rethink Runoff advertising was discussed.  
   The draft FY20 budget was discussed. An overall increase of about $6,000 to about $75,000 total is proposed due to increases in New Creative (FY19 was a “maintenance year”), Stream Team and Advertising. Tom DiPietro noted that yes, we want to make a difference and run a good program, but the program’s primary intent is to meet a permit requirement. Committee members noted the excellent work being done by Dave Barron of Pluck.
Dan presented two FY20 dues options: keeping dues current at $5,500 raises $66,000 while a $6,000 rate generates $72,000. He noted that this agenda item was warned as discussion only.

A motion was then made by Tom DiPietro, seconded by Karen Adams to preliminary establish member dues of $6,000 for FY20. The motion passed with Polly Harris abstaining. Formal action to establish the FY20 member dues will be considered at the November 6 meeting.

Dan indicated he will reach out to Dave to have him revise the Spring 2019 ad budget by removing costs associated with the first 3 week of July.

5. **Common language regarding MM-1 and MM-2 for use in development of Stormwater Management Plan to be filed by MS4s (Discussion)**

Christy recapped information she had distributed earlier via email. Each proposed BMP in your SWMP shall include a measurable goal and the rationale for why it was selected. DEC can then use this when reviewing your SWMPs to track your progress. In the case of MM-1 and MM-2, the language could reference the Rethink Runoff program, the website, etc. Dan indicated he would review the information from Christy and come up with some standardized language for use in each of the SWMPs.

6. **Standardized language for RFPs for development Phosphorus Control Plan (Discussion)**

It was noted that Colchester and Essex had completed RFPs recently. Dan will circulate them to the members.

7. **Update on Winooski NRCD Executive Director hiring**

Kristen announced the District had hired Gianna Petito. She has been working part-time for a few weeks and started full-time on October 1st. She holds a Master of Science degree in Conservation Ecology and Environmental Planning from the University of Michigan School of Natural Resources and Environment. She previously worked for different non-profits in Michigan and Montana.

8. **Further discussion of MS4 permit and additional coordination among permittees**

No discussion.

9. **Items for Tuesday, November 6th meeting agenda**

- review standardized BMP language for MM-1 and MM-2
- final action on FY20 dues
- review Google ad data per town and revised Spring 2019 ad budget

10. **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 1:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Dan Albrecht
1. Welcome and Introductions
Regina Mahony called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m.

2. Approval of July 11, 2018 Minutes
Dean Pierce made a motion, seconded by Everett Marshall, to approve the July 11, 2018 minutes. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED. Dean Pierce abstained.

3. Municipal Plan Review Guidelines
Emily Nosse-Leirer provided a brief overview of the amendments to these guidelines; and explained the changes since the last time the PAC saw the amendments in May. This document is used to review and approve municipal plans. It is being amended for two main reasons: review local plans for energy determination now that CCRPC has received its Determination of Energy Compliance; and an addition to the Appendix regarding the data needs for Plan updates. Emily Nosse-Leirer explained what data points we’d like to see – okay to not use ACS. The PAC had the following comments/questions:
   - Suggestion to call out the changes in Act 171 (forest integrity) and the criteria for Act 174 (energy planning) in Appendix A. Act 171 is fully incorporated into statute in the Appendix already and we’ll highlight that in the initial review memo. The link to the Act 174 criteria is in the memo, but it will be added to the Appendix so it is all in one place.

Dean Pierce made a motion, seconded by Alex Weinhagen, to recommend that the CCRPC adopt the Municipal Plan Review Guidelines with the amendments described above. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.

4. American Community Survey Data Guide
At the suggestion of Sarah Hadd, CCRPC staff have developed a guide to using ACS data, based on a Journal of American Planning Association (JAPA) article regarding the ethical use of this data. Melanie Needle provided an overview of this guide. The guide is organized based on the 5 key suggestions from the JAPA article: understand statistical reliability, report margins of error, indicate when margins of error are not reported, consider alternatives for reducing statistical uncertainty, conduct statistical testing when comparing ACS data.

There was a suggestion to simply say “don’t use bad data” rather than “consider alternatives for reducing statistical uncertainty”.

Melanie Needle explained the differences in the 1-yr (only available at the County level because we don’t have any municipalities that are large enough, less reliable because of the smaller sample size, most current), 3-yr (ACS is no longer updating this data set) and 5-yr ACS estimates (most reliable b/c sample size is larger, but least current).
Melanie Needle provided an overview of each of the five suggestions in the guide. There was some discussion regarding the use of ACS data generally - use the statistics correctly, and keep it simple as best as possible so that readers of the Plans don’t get intimidated and confused. As an example in Huntington, rather than including the complete commute to work data (with all of the margins of error and reliability), they choose to only report the percentage of those who commute to work alone as that is the only reliable piece of the data. The Plan then states: ‘the data for the other mode shares is not accurate enough to include’. CCRPC Staff reiterated that we are not saying you have to use ACS data in your Plans. If you have better data, definitely use it. However, in a lot of cases this is the only data available. Also, because other folks are using the ACS data to tell stories to the same audience the municipal plans are for, it is important to use it while following these guidelines.

Staff will make edits to the document to incorporate concepts from this discussion, and then distribute it.

5. Act 250 Commission: Next 50 Years

There are three opportunities to provide input into the Act 250: Next 50 Years effort. VPA’s survey is here: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/4533728/VERMONT-PLANNERS-ASSOCIATION-ACT-250-SURVEY. The Legislative Commission’s survey is here: https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/9CSPHY7. The Legislative Commission is also holding public forums throughout the State. The forum in our region is on September 12th in Burlington at the Elks Lodge (925 North Ave) from 6 to 8pm. The best location for information about these forums is here: https://www.facebook.com/Act250Next50/.

Regina Mahony added that CCRPC will likely pull a Permit Review Committee together once there is something from the Legislative Commission to respond to. If anyone would like to be on that Committee please let her know.

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

Winooski: Nothing definitive right now. Most of the possible developments are in the Neighborhood Development Area and they may do priority housing and not be required to do Act 250.

Williston: Nothing new. Finney Crossing is doing an amendment to add in a stormwater pond.

Hinesburg: nothing

Richmond: nothing

Huntington: nothing

Essex: couple minor things – adding green space to outlets at the Town Center; Starbucks at Susie Wilson and Rte. 15 and 4500 sq.ft. commercial building. Have been addressing traffic concerns.

Shelburne: Not so much new – Snyder project near the golf course. The Shelburne/South Burlington water issue has been resolved so this project will probably be moving forward.

7. Other Business

a. A number of our municipal plans will be expiring in early 2019. To make our review process easier, we may need to add an extra PAC meeting in February 2019. If you have a plan expiration coming up and would like us to review drafts before they are adopted, we’re happy to do that.

b. Williston Town Plan Amendment* - FYI regarding an amendment to Williston’s Town Plan; and a reminder of this CCRPC process.

c. CCRPC will host the next Housing Convening on Monday, October 29th at 6pm. The topic will be Housing Trust Funds. Please help spread the word.

d. VT Housing Conference will take place on Tuesday, November 13th and Wednesday, November 14th. This year’s conference has a municipal focus. It conflicts with our November PAC meeting, therefore I’ve suggested that we switch that meeting to the first Wednesday of November.

7. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony