REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
Wednesday, January 16, 2019 - 6:00 p.m.
CCRPC Offices; 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202
Winooski, VT 05404

CONSENT AGENDA – DRAFT

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 November 28, 2018 Meeting* (Action; 1 minute)
5. FY19 UPWP & Budget Mid-year Adjustment* (MPO & RPC Business) (Two Actions; 20 minutes)
6. Richmond Town Plan Approval, Confirmation of Planning Process, and Determination of Energy Compliance* (Action; 10 minutes)
7. Clean Water Advisory Committee Membership Guidelines Recommendation* (Action; 10 minutes)
8. Commission on Act 250 Recommendations (Discussion; 40 minutes)
9. Chair/Executive Director Report (Discussion; 10 minutes)
   a. Welcome Amy Irvin Witham, Business Office Associate
   b. Congratulating Lee Krohn, Shelburne Town Manager
   c. ECOS Annual Report
   d. Legislative Breakfast feedback
   e. Legislative Update
10. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports * (Information, 2 minutes)
    a. Executive Committee (draft minutes December 3, 2018 & January 2, 2019)*
       i. Act 250 Sec 248 letters*
    b. Planning Advisory Committee (draft minutes, December 12, 2018)*
11. Members’ Items, Other Business (Information, 5 minutes)
12. Adjourn

The October 17th Chittenden County RPC streams LIVE on YouTube at https://www.youtube.com/Channel17TownMeetingTV. The meeting will air on __________, 2019 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, February 5, 2019; 9:00 a.m.
- Clean Water Advisory Committee - Tuesday, February 5, 2019; 11:00 a.m.
- CWAC MS4 Subcommittee - Tuesday, February 5, 2019; 12:15 p.m.
- Planning Advisory Committee - Wednesday, December 12, 2019; 2:30 p.m.
- Executive Committee – February 6, 2019; 5:45 p.m.
- CCRPC Board Meeting - Wednesday, February 20, 2019; 6:00 p.m.

**Tentative future Board agenda items:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 20, 2019</td>
<td>Act 250 Commission Legislative Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water Quality Funding Legislative Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 20, 2019</td>
<td>GMT – proposed transit system changes and E&amp;D?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 17, 2019</td>
<td>Warn Public Hearing for FY20 UPWP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 15, 2019</td>
<td>FY20 UPWP and Budget Public Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 19, 2019</td>
<td>Annual Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warn FY20-23 TIP Hearing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Potential Guest Speakers:**

Airport,  
Air Guard,  
VTrans – Rail,  
UVM-MC Population Health

*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.*
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
January 16, 2019
Agenda Item C1: Consent Item

FY2019 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendments

Issues

Make the following changes to the FY2019-2022 TIP. These projects are located on I-89 and are classified as minor amendments according to CCRPC’s TIP Amendment Policy. I-89 projects are not subject to CCRPC’s fiscal constraint limit.

US2 Bridge over I-89, Richmond (Project BR059, Amendment FY19-07).
  • **TIP Change**: Increase funding for preliminary engineering from $180,000 (total) to $600,000 (total). Add $189,000 (federal) + $21,000 (state) funds in FY20 and $189,000 (federal) + $21,000 (state) funds in FY20.
  • **Reason for Change**: The original cost estimate for this bridge project was developed considering rehabilitation of the existing bridge. The rehabilitation option was a placeholder until a full assessment of the bridge condition was undertaken. Project scoping concluded that full reconstruction on a new alignment was the best alternative. Reconstruction requires a much greater design effort than rehabilitation.

I-89 Scoping Study, Richmond-Colchester (Project HC017, Amendment FY19-08).
  • **TIP Change**: Add $150,000 (total) for scoping for a study of I-89 between Richmond and Colchester. Add $67,500 (federal) + $7,500 (state) funds in FY19 and $67,500 (federal) + $7,500 (state) funds in FY20.
  • **Reason for Change**: The broad intent of this analysis, to be managed by CCRPC, is to assess the capacity of Interstate 89 (especially through the urban core of the county) and existing interchanges; identify current safety, operational and resiliency issues; assess future needs; develop and evaluate alternatives, including sketch level conceptual plans, that address identified issues for all modes of transportation; examine transportation and land use effects of mainline widening and/or new/expanded interchanges; evaluate climate change effects of alternatives (air quality, energy consumption, etc.); determine asset management/maintenance needs; and develop an implementation plan for interstate and interchange investments. This implementation plan will be developed and considered in the context of the broader 2018 ECOS Plan.

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

Staff Recommendation: Recommend that the TAC approve the proposed TIP amendments.

For more information, contact: Christine Forde cforde@ccrpcvt.org or 846-4490 ext. *13
The meeting was preceded by the third MPO training session.

1. **Call to order; changes to the agenda.** The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by the chair, Chris Roy. There were no changes to the agenda. Jeff Carr noted that he is also representing Essex Junction tonight as their alternate.

2. **Public Comment Period on Items NOT on the agenda.** There were no public comments.

3. **Action on Consent Agenda — MPO business.** The consent agenda included adding two VTrans FY19 Municipal Highway and Stormwater Mitigation Program awards to the FY19-2022 TIP. **JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O’BRIEN, TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

4. **Approve Minutes of October 17, 2018 Meeting.** **ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JEFF CARR, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES WITH CORRECTIONS, IF ANY. MOTION CARRIED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS WRITTEN. ABSTENTIONS FROM DAVE TILTON, JOHN ZICCONI AND JACKI MURPHY.**

5. **Accept FY18 CCRPC Audit.** Charlie introduced Fred Duplessis, managing partner at Sullivan Powers and Company who prepared our FY18 audit. Mr. Duplessis gave an overview of the audit which was done in accordance with, government auditing standards and compliance with each major federal program. This audit will be transmitted electronically to the federal government and put on the federal
clearinghouse website. He noted there was nothing new and nothing he sees coming that will affect us. He recommended reviewing the Management Discussion and Analysis (MD&A) that begins on page 4 and is a good summary of what happened during the year. The key is the last page which is what the state and feds look at first. There were no findings or material weaknesses. In their review of Federal Awards, especially the Highway Planning and Construction Funding, there are no material weaknesses or significant deficiencies. CCRPC continues to be a low risk auditee, which means we have had a clean audit for at least three years. It shows the state and feds that we have good systems in place. Jeff Carr questioned the Pension Liability Note on page 5 and noted that the state’s bond standing was downgraded - will it affect the assumptions in the pension liability? Fred said it won’t have an impact on the assumptions. VMERS (Vermont Municipal Employee’s Retirement System) is one of the better funded pension programs. It was down to 83.5% last year and he noted that there will be fluctuations over the years and that has an impact on the bond bank. He did note that the teachers and state employees’ pension funds have not been funded appropriately. Discussions are ongoing about retirees’ health benefits. VMERS does not have retiree health benefits. Chris Roy said it’s always an important process and he thanked Bernie and Forest for their hard work on getting a clean audit again. Jeff Carr echoed that and complimented our vendor who responded to our request to change audit managers to prepare our audit so that things are above-board. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO ACCEPT THE FY18 AUDIT AS PRESENTED. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

6. Greenride Bikeshare Update. Bryan Davis introduced Bob Dale, General Manager of Greenride Bikeshare. They brought one of the bikes to demonstrate. Bryan gave a brief slide presentation describing bikesharing which is a fleet of bicycles provided at a network of stations throughout an area. Right now we have stations in Burlington, South Burlington and Winooski. He gave a history of bikesharing which began in 1965, with advances in 1994, 2005, 2013 and to date. They took the smart dock from 2005 and put the information in a box on the back of the bike. The box gives us a lot of data – how far people are traveling, etc. Bikesharing is included in several area plans and our planning partners include CATMA (Chittenden Area Transportation Management Association); UVM, and Champlain College. Bryan gave a brief history of our region’s efforts to pull this together. In 2011 partners met with PBSC in Montreal and UVM, Champlain College and City of Burlington established “Bike Libraries.” In October 2016, an RFP was issued to develop a plan of action, and in April 2018 Greenride Bikeshare launched. Operations partners include The Gotcha Group (based in Charleston, SC); Old Spokes Home (maintenance and rebalancing); and CATMA which holds the contract with Gotcha. Bryan then reviewed the mission and current sponsors – especially Title Sponsors Ben & Jerry’s and Seventh Generation. Other sponsors include: UVM Medical Center; UVM Clean Energy Fund; Champlain College; Blue Cross/Blue Shield; GO Vermont; AARP; Healthy Living and the Cities of Burlington, South Burlington and Winooski.

Bob Dale reviewed the bike itself, which is made in Charleston, NC. The hubs use regular U racks painted bright green and includes a free-standing sign or window sticker. The sign includes local map, system information and system/hub sponsor logos. Phase 1 includes 105 bikes in 17 hubs in key locations in Burlington, South Burlington and Winooski primarily serving residents, commuters and employees. Bob then reviewed the proposed full system buildout; the cost structure, and how it works. Is it working? To date we have 687 active members; 864,712 calories burned; average time 18 minutes; 8,678 trips; reduced CO2 emissions reduced – 19,062.99 lbs.; average distance – 1.78 miles; total miles – 21,618; and dollars saved - $12,538. He then reviewed summer hub usage (June-August) and then fall hub usage (Sept-Nov) when students returned. He also reviewed concerns about helmets, hills, weather and rebalancing.
Bryan then reviewed the next steps. CCRPC included funds in our FY19 UPWP to review what is happening. He will work with Toole Design Group on this review. We have received a grant from the State of Vermont for system expansion. Bob Dale will work on expanding “Greenride for All”; and they’ve applied for another grant to pilot “Prescribe a Bike Program” and will work on expanding members/ridership. Wayne Howe asked for more information on funding and how it will fund itself in five years. Bryan said we hope that membership will keep us going. He also noted that we’re looking at electric assist bikes that will help with the hills in Burlington and increase members and ridership.

7. Introduction to I-89 2050 Study to begin in FY19. Eleni gave a brief update – this will be a 2-3 year study and we are in the process of securing a consultant. Our 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) investments include proposed projects: a) a third lane on I-89 between Exits 14 and 15; b) Exit 12 B placeholder (14, 14N or other); and c) future I-89 scoping study between exits 12-16. In talking with VTrans, we agreed that we need to do much more on the corridor level and not just a specific interchange, so we will be studying the entire I-89 corridor in Chittenden County to be sure we make the right investments. Eleni then reviewed the Roadway Capacity map that shows congestion area on I-89 between Exits 14 & 15 and that after adding a 3rd lane congestion just moves further north on the interstate. The I-89 2050 Study goals include:

- Assess current conditions of I-89 corridor in Chittenden County including capacity of interstate and existing interchanges; safety and resiliency; asset condition; land use; and, environmental and cultural resources.
- Assess future needs, develop and evaluate alternatives including: Multi-modal, capital and operational improvements; transportation and land use; climate change (air quality, energy consumption, etc.); Asset management/maintenance needs.
- Develop an implementation plan for I-89 and interchange investments – short, medium and long-term.

CCRPC will manage the project. The Technical committee will include: VTrans, FHWA, CCRPC and municipal staff. The Advisory Committee will include: Municipalities, VTrans, CLF (Conservation Law Foundation) & VNRC (Vermont Natural Resource Council), ANR (Agency of Natural Resources) and ACCD (Agency of Commerce and Community Development), Green Mountain Transit, Local Motion, GBIC, Lake Champlain Regional Chamber of Commerce, BTV (airport), Northwest RPC, and Central Vermont RPC. Focus groups will be held with: Vermont State Police, DMV (Department of Motor Vehicles), State Senators and Representatives, rail (Vermont Rail System & New England Central); UVM/Colleges, UVM Medical Center. And, there will extensive engagement with the public.

We had a two-step procurement process. Step 1 – letter of intent/statement of qualifications which was advertised widely in September 2018. A selection committee reviewed the letters in October and four consulting firms/teams were selected to respond to a Request for Proposals – VHB, Stantec, WSP and CHA. Step 2: The proposals are due Dec. 7th, the selection committee will review between December and January, and we hope to have a contract awarded in February 2019. Charlie noted this is the largest project in our work program and will be for the next two years as well, so it may reduce the amount of funding available for municipal projects. VTrans has committed to be a partner in this study which allowed us to expand the scope to be more holistic. Charlie said we also need to look into whether another interchange is needed and where it might be. Amy Bell said it is most important to realize how long this will take and that we’re not talking about improvements in the near-term. It will be very long-term before we can do anything. Chris Roy asked what interface does this study have with other studies on the interstate – Exits 14, 12 and 16? Charlie said we’re starting with the assumption that the projects in the pipeline will not be affected. Chris Roy noted that there
is a bike lane project under the bridge at Exit 12, as well as a park and ride lot on the southwest side of Exit 12.

8. Executive Director’s Update.
   a. **Business Office Associate.** Charlie noted that our Finance Assistant resigned in October and with Bernie’s pending retirement we’ve advertised for a full-time position. We hope to have someone on board by your January meeting.
   b. **Housing Convening.** Regina Mahony noted that we’ve been doing periodic workshops with members of municipal housing committee members. At the end of October, they talked about housing trust funds. We had about 26 people from 8 communities attend. The next convening will be at the end of January to discuss inclusionary zoning.
   c. **UPWP Process Update.** Charlie noted that applications were sent to municipalities for FY20 UPWP projects. Our staff is meeting with various communities and talking about applications to see what requests might be coming our way, as well as assisting them in developing their applications.
   d. **Legislative Breakfast Topics.** The Legislative Breakfast will take place on Tuesday, December 11th from 7:30-9:00 a.m. at Trader Duke’s hotel in South Burlington. Charlie reviewed the topics we are likely to discuss: ECOS Plan, Smart Growth, Housing, Vermont economy and how it’s affected by Chittenden County – taxes, employment, etc. Jeff Carr feels it’s too much data. Charlie said last year we had a separate handout that included the data. It was suggested to keep it to 3-5 facts in the presentation. We also need to let the legislators know that we’re here to help them, help us. Andrea Morgante suggested we give some information on the recent Transportation Survey results. We’ll probably include water quality funding and Act 250 and permitting changes. It was suggested to alert the legislators as to funding of RPCs to cover extra work we are being asked to do; as well as discuss increasing the share of the Property Transfer Tax slated for RPCs and Vermont Housing Conservation Board. The funding share has not been consistent with the statutory formula and the percentage has been declining over the years. Mike O’Brien suggested separating transportation and non-transportation – like RPC, MPO and combined RPC/MPO. Charlie will pare the presentation down to 15 minutes to leave adequate time for discussion.

9. Committee/Liaison Activities and Reports. Minutes of various committees are included in the packet.

10. Members’ Items/Other business. There was no other business.

11. Adjourn. **JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY AMY BELL, TO ADJOURN AT 7:35 P.M.**

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc
FY2019 Mid-Year UPWP and Budget Adjustment

**Background:**
Each year CCRPC reviews the approved work program and budget at mid-year and makes changes where needed. Some consultant projects don’t begin until mid-year so funds are adjusted to reflect how much we believe will be spent by June 30th. Some may require additional funds to complete, and some of those will carryforward into FY20. Staff also makes adjustments to the number of hours they anticipate spending on each UPWP task.

The Mid-Year Adjustment annual work plan document is posted separately from the packet. The Mid-Year Adjustment to the FY19 Budget is also attached as a separate document in 11x17 format.

A color key is included to indicate what changes were made either in task description or consultant dollars; as well as new or deleted tasks.

**Executive Committee Recommendation:**
CCRPC staff and the Executive Committee recommend approval of the FY19 Mid-Year UPWP and Budget Adjustment by the CCRPC Board.

**For more information contact:**
Charlie Baker, Executive Director at cbaker@ccrpcvt.org or at 846-4490 ext. *23
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
January 16, 2019

Agenda Item 6: Richmond Town Plan Approval, Confirmation of Planning Process, and Determination of Energy Compliance

Issues: This review of the 2018 Richmond Town Plan is the first instance of CCRPC granting a determination of energy compliance to a municipality. Because of this, you will see additional information included in the resolution and below.

The Town of Richmond has requested that the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (1) approve its 2018 Town Plan, (2) confirm its planning process and (3) grant a determination of energy compliance to its 2018 Town Plan. The Plan was adopted by the Voters of the Town of Richmond on November 6, 2018.

As described in the attached proposed resolution, the PAC has held the required hearings, reviewed the Plan in light of these requests, and recommends Board approval at this time. Also, for your information, attached are two staff reports to the Planning Advisory Committee, one regarding approval and confirmation of the plan (dated June 5, 2018) and one regarding the determination of energy compliance (dated November 30, 2018).

If interested, VAPDA is keeping track of municipalities that receive a determination of energy compliance at this website: vapda.org/vermont-enhanced-town-energy-plans/

Please note that municipal planning process confirmation, plan approval and determination of energy compliance decisions shall be made by majority vote of the commissioners representing municipalities, in accordance with the bylaws of the CCRPC and Title 24 V.S.A.§ 4350(f).

Planning Advisory Committee Recommendation: The Planning Advisory Committee recommends that the CCRPC Board approve the 2018 Richmond Town Plan, confirm Richmond’s planning process, and grant an affirmative determination of energy compliance to the 2018 Richmond Town Plan.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the CCRPC Board approve the 2018 Richmond Town Plan, confirm Richmond’s planning process, and grant an affirmative determination of energy compliance for the 2018 Richmond Town Plan.

Staff Contact: Contact Emily Nosse-Leirer and Regina Mahony with any questions: enosse-leirer@ccrpcvt.org or rmahony@ccrpcvt.org, 846-4490 ext. *15 or *28.
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC)
Resolution
Richmond’s 2018 Comprehensive Plan, Planning Process and Enhanced Energy Plan

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, Title 24, V.S.A. §4352 in part states that a municipality that wishes to seek a Determination of Energy Compliance may submit its plan to the Regional Planning Commission, if the regional plan has an affirmative determination of energy compliance; that each review shall include a public hearing; and that the Commission shall issue an affirmative determination of energy compliance if the plan:

1. is consistent with the regional plan;
2. includes an energy element;
3. is consistent with Vermont’s energy goals and policies; and
4. meets the standards for issuing a determination of energy compliance included in the State energy plans, as described by the Vermont Department of Public Service in their Energy Planning Standards for Municipal Plans;

WHEREAS, the CCRPC’s 2018 Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the ECOS Plan, adopted June 20, 2018, received an affirmative determination of energy compliance on August 2, 2018;

WHEREAS, the CCRPC at its September 19, 2018 meeting approved the CCRPC Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes, Approval of Municipal Plans and Granting Determination of Energy Compliance dealing with local plans and CCRPC action;

WHEREAS, The Town of Richmond, Vermont is a member municipality of this Commission;

WHEREAS, The Town of Richmond formally requested CCRPC to approve its 2018 Town Plan and confirm its planning process on May 21, 2018 and formally requested CCRPC to grant a determination of energy compliance on November 19, 2018;

WHEREAS, the Planning Advisory Committee warned a public hearing on November 15, 2017 and held a public hearing on December 6, 2017 to review the 2018 Town Plan for approval and confirmation of the planning process; and the Planning Advisory Committee warned a public hearing on November 26, 2018 and held a public hearing on December 12, 2018 for granting a determination of energy compliance, at the CCRPC offices, located at 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, Vermont;

WHEREAS, the Planning Advisory Committee reviewed the records and recommended that the Commission approve Richmond’s 2018 Town Plan as meeting the requirements of 24 V.S.A.§ 4350 and the Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes, Approval of Municipal Plans and Granting Determinations of Energy Compliance and confirm the community’s planning process as consistent with Title 24, Chapter 117, as described in CCRPC’s staff review, dated June 5, 2018 and the minutes of the Planning Advisory Committee from June 13, 2018;

WHEREAS, the Planning Advisory Committee reviewed the records and recommended that the Commission grant an affirmative determination of energy compliance to Richmond’s 2018 Town Plan as meeting the requirements of Title 24, V.S.A. §4352 and the Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes, Approval of Municipal Plans and Granting Determinations of Energy Compliance, as described in CCRPC’s staff review, dated November 30, 2018 and the minutes of the Planning Advisory Committee from December 12, 2018; and

WHEREAS, the voters of the Town of Richmond adopted the 2018 Richmond Town Plan on Election Day, November 6, 2018.

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, Approval of Municipal Plans and Granting Determinations of Energy Compliance, CCRPC approves the 2018 Richmond Comprehensive 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 Richmond’s municipal planning process.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION, that, in compliance with Title 24, V.S.A. §4352 and the Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes, Approval of Municipal Plans and Granting Determinations of Energy Compliance, CCRPC grants an affirmative determination of energy compliance to the 2018 Richmond Town Plan.

Dated at Winooski, this 16th day of January, 2019.

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

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

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

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

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

Staff Review Findings and Comments

1. The 2018 Richmond Town Plan is consistent with the general goals of §4302. See the attached Appendix A submittal that describes how the Plan is consistent with these goals.

2. The 2018 Richmond Town Plan is consistent with the specific goals of §4302. See the attached Appendix A submittal that describes how the Plan is consistent with these goals.

3. The 2018 Richmond Town Plan contains the required elements of §4382. See the attached Appendix A submittal that describes how the Plan is consistent with these goals.

4. The 2018 Richmond Town Plan is generally compatible with the planning areas, goals and strategies of the 2013 Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan.

5. The 2018 Richmond Town Plan appears compatible with the municipal plans for Williston, Hinesburg, Huntington, Bolton, and Jericho, but more detail on this is necessary (see comment below). – Fully addressed in final draft
6. Richmond has a **planning process** in place that is sufficient for an approved plan. In addition, Richmond has provided information about their planning budget and CCRPC finds that Richmond is maintaining its efforts to provide local funds for municipal and regional planning.

**Additional Comments/Questions:**

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

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

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

**Energy Planning Comments**
- My understanding is that Richmond intends to seek a Determination of Energy Compliance after the planned adoption of the plan in November 2018. Although CCRPC cannot formally review the plan until after it is adopted and after the 2018 ECOS Plan receives its own Determination of Energy Compliance, I reviewed this draft against the Department of Public Service’s Energy Planning Standards for Municipal Plans and suggest only one change necessary to meet the standards.
The energy data section includes references to “maps in this section,” but the maps are not included in the text. Please change it to refer to the map names/map numbers in the plan, and indicate page numbers or links.

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

**Proposed Motion & Next Steps:**

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

Upon notification that the Plan has been adopted by the municipality, CCRPC staff will review the plan, and any information relevant to the confirmation process, for changes. If staff determines that changes are substantive, those changes will be forwarded to the PAC for review. Otherwise the PAC recommends that the Plan, and the municipal planning process, should be forwarded to the CCRPC Board for approval.
Staff Review of the 2018 Richmond Town Plan (Enhanced Energy Plan Review)  
Emily Nosse-Leirer, Senior Planner  
November 30, 2018

The Town of Richmond has requested that the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC) issue a determination of energy compliance with the enhanced energy planning standards set forth in 24 V.S.A. §4352 for the 2018 Richmond Town Plan. The 2018 Richmond Town Plan was adopted on November 6, 2018. The Planning Advisory Committee reviewed the draft plan on June 13, 2018 and recommended it to the CCRPC board for confirmation and approval. The Planning Advisory Committee did not review the plan against the enhanced energy planning standards at that time. This review does not affect the PAC motion from June 13, 2018.

Following the statutory requirements of 24 V.S.A. §4352 and Vermont Department of Public Service’s Energy Planning Standards for Municipal Plans, I have reviewed the 2018 plan to determine whether:

1. The Plan includes an energy element that has the same components as described in 24 V.S.A. §4348a(a)(3) for a regional plan and is confirmed under the requirements of 24 V.S.A. §4350.

2. The Plan is consistent with following State goals:
   a. Vermont’s greenhouse gas reduction goals under 10 V.S.A. § 578(a);
   b. Vermont’s 25 by 25 goal for renewable energy under 10 V.S.A. § 580;
   c. Vermont’s building efficiency goals under 10 V.S.A. § 581;
   d. State energy policy under 30 V.S.A. § 202a and the recommendations for regional and municipal energy planning pertaining to the efficient use of energy and the siting and development of renewable energy resources contained in the State energy plans adopted pursuant to 30 V.S.A. §§ 202 and 202b (State energy plans); and
   e. The distributed renewable generation and energy transformation categories of resources to meet the requirements of the Renewable Energy Standard under 30 V.S.A. §§ 8004 and 8005.

3. The Plan meets the standards for issuing a determination of energy compliance included in the State energy plans as developed by the Vermont Department of Public Service.

Staff Review Findings and Comments

Consistency with the requirements above is evaluated through the Vermont Department of Public Service’s Vermont Department of Public Service’s Energy Planning Standards for Municipal Plans, which is attached to this document and briefly summarized below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
<th>N/A Yet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Plan duly adopted and approved</td>
<td>X – CCRPC approval and confirmation planned in January</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Proposed Motion & Next Steps:

**PROPOSED MOTION:** The PAC finds that the 2018 Richmond Town Plan meets the requirements of the enhanced energy planning standards set forth in 24 V.S.A. §4352.

Upon notification that the Plan has been adopted by the municipality, CCRPC staff will review the plan amendment. If staff determines that substantive changes have been made, the materials will be forwarded to the PAC for review. Otherwise the PAC recommends that the Plan should be forwarded to the CCRPC Board for an affirmative determination of energy compliance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
<th>N/A Yet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Submit a copy of the adopted plan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Plan contains an energy element</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Analysis of resources, needs, scarcities, costs and problems in the municipality across all energy sectors</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.a. Report Current energy use for heating, electricity, and transportation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.b. Report 2025, 2035 and 2050 targets for energy use</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.c. Evaluation of thermal-sector energy use changes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.d. Evaluation of transportation-sector energy use changes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.e. Evaluation of electric-sector energy use changes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.a. Encourage conservation by individuals and organizations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.b. Promote efficient buildings</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.c. Promote decreased use of fossil fuels for heat</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.a. Encourage increased public transit use</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.b. Promote shift away from single-occupancy vehicle trips</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.d. Promote shift from gas/diesel to non-fossil fuel vehicles?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.e. Demonstrate municipal leadership re: efficiency of municipal transportation?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.a. Promote Smart growth land use policies</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.b. Strongly prioritize development in compact, mixed use centers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.a. Report existing renewable energy generation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.B. Analyze generation potential</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.c. Identify sufficient land to meet the 2050 generation targets</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.d. Ensure that local constraints do not prevent the generation targets from being met</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.e. Include policy statements on siting energy generation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.f. Maximize potential for generation on preferred sites</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.g. Demonstrate municipal leadership re: deploying renewable energy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.-13. Include maps provided by CCRPC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission  
January 16, 2019  
Agenda Item 7: Clean Water Advisory Committee (CWAC) Membership Guidelines

**Issue:** The CCRPC bylaws provide for the CWAC membership as follows:

“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.”

At its September 2018 meeting, the Board also voted to ask the CWAC to develop guidelines to guide future CWAC recommendations for new CWAC members which would be approved by the Board. The CWAC debated proposed guidelines at its November 6, 2018 and January 8, 2019 meetings.

**CWAC Recommendation:** At its January 8, 2019 meeting on a vote of 15 to 2 plus 2 abstaining the CWAC voted to recommend the following guidelines for non-municipal members of the CWAC:

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.

**Staff Recommendation:** Approve the guidelines as recommended by the CWAC

**Staff Contact:** Contact Charlie Baker with any questions: cbaker@ccrpcvt.org, 846-4490 ext. *23.
DATE: Wednesday, December 5, 2018
TIME: 5:45 p.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices; 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404
PRESENT: Chris Roy, Chair
Mike O’Brien, Vice-Chair
Catherine McMains, At-Large
Barbara Elliott, At-Large via phone
John Zicconi, Secretary-Treasurer (5:55)
Staff: Charlie Baker, Executive Director
Regina Mahony, Planning Program Mgr.
Forest Cohen, Sr. Business Manager

The meeting was called to order at 5:45 p.m. by the chair, Chris Roy. Barbara Elliott joined the meeting by telephone.

1. Changes to the Agenda; Members’ items: Charlie noted an additional proposed change to the Personnel Policy under Item 5.

2. Approval of November 7, 2018 Executive Committee Minutes. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CATHERINE McMAINS, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES WITH CHANGES, IF ANY. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS WRITTEN.

3. Act 250 & Section 248 Applications.
   a. Underhill Green Lantern Group Solar, preferred site request. This is a request to designate a site on Beartown Road in Underhill as a “preferred site” to enable them to develop a 150kW solar array on a parcel owned by the Town of Underhill and is certified as a categorical disposal facility. CCRPC will review the final site plan when it is available to ensure that it continues to avoid known constraints and minimize impacts to possible constraints. CCRPC supports the identification of this site as a preferred site for net metering. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O’BRIEN, TO APPROVE THE LETTER TO THE VERMONT PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
   b. Bullrock Solar, 150kW solar array at 650 Spear Street, So. Burlington, #18-325-AN. This is the 45-day notice of a Section 248 petition to be filed with Vermont PUC for a 150kW solar project at 650 Spear Street in South Burlington. Regina asked members to hold action on this project until we hear from South Burlington about how they feel about it. There is a question about the city requiring vegetation underneath. Emily informed the City that there is a concrete pad underneath that had been a composting area. We can hold action until the end of December as we’re still waiting for South Burlington on this. Mike O’Brien wondered if we need to wait since we don’t normally comment on those more detailed types of issues. Do we care about the concrete pad? He suggested that we address language on South Burlington’s requirement. Regina said we can certainly make it clear that the City is looking at it because there is a concrete pad in place, so no vegetation can grow; and that we reserve the right to address this. John Zicconi said since we don’t normally deal with ag or wetlands, why don’t we just say ANR will deal with it. Brief discussion. It was agreed to add a sentence noting that South Burlington may have comments about the concrete pad. We reserve the right to provide further comments after the City has commented. Chris Roy noted it’s just a way to flag things. This is a
pre-filing letter anyway so they can address a solution in the application. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A
MOTION, SECONDED BY CATHERINE MCMAINS, TO APPROVE THE LETTER TO WILSCHEK
IARRAPINO LAW OFFICE AS REVISED. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

c. Bullrock Solar, 80kW Solar at 705 Spear Street, South Burlington #18-3927-AN. Regina noted
that this is the 45-day notice of a Section 248 petition to be filed with the Vermont PUC for an
80kW solar project at 705 Spear Street in South Burlington. The So. Burlington Planning
Commission is ok with this one. They do not object to the location, but may provide comments
on the design to put pollinating plants under the solar panels. There are some ag soils here and
the state will address that. We are not requesting further information or action related to ag
soils or wetlands. JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O’BRIEN, TO APPROVE
THE LETTER TO WILSCHEK IARRAPION LAW OFFICES. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. Vermont Climate Pledge. Charlie noted that the Energy Sub-committee reviewed this in the spring
and recommends CCRPC joining as an organizational entity rather than on behalf of all of our member
municipalities. Members reviewed what we’re already doing and potential action for consideration.
Charlie said to become a member of the coalition, CCRPC needs to make a motion to join to be noted in
the official minutes of the board, register an account on the Community Energy Dashboard, and fill out a
form indicating name, address, number of employees, and identify actions to complete or have
completed. It was noted that this pledge is consistent with actions we already are taking or will take in
our office space as an employer.

BARBARA ELLIOT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CATHERINE MCMAINS, THAT SINCE THE CLIMATE
PLEDGE RECOMMENDED BY THE ENERGY SUBCOMMITTEE IS JUST REFLECTING
OPERATIONAL/EMPLOYER ACTIONS AND DOES NOT INVOLVE ANY POLICY POSITION, CCRPC JOIN THE
VERMONT CLIMATE PLEDGE COALITION TO DEMONSTRATE ITS COMMITMENT TO THE PARIS CLIMATE
AGREEMENT AND VERMONT’S GOAL OF 90% RENEWABLE ENERGY BY 2050 THROUGH ACTIONS
UNDERTAKEN BY CCRPC AS AN ORGANIZATIONAL ENTITY TO REDUCE ENERGY AND GREENHOUSE GAS
EMISSIONS AND NOTE THAT THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE HAS THE AUTHORITY TO APPROVE THIS ON
BEHALF OF THE BOARD AS IT ONLY PERTAINS TO CCRPC’S INTERNAL OPERATING PROCEDURES.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. Personnel Policy Updates.
   a. Health Savings Account Contribution Change. Charlie noted that we had been grandfathered
      into an MVP high-deductible health insurance plan and now they have discontinued that plan.
      We shopped around and found a similar plan that has a slightly higher deductible, so we are
      proposing to add $200 for individual plans and $400 for two-person or family plans to the health
      savings account (HSA) benefit. The total annual expense would increase by about $4,200 and
      this is under our budget. JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O’BRIEN, TO
      APPROVE THE INCREASE IN HSA CONTRIBUTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
   b. PTO Carry Over and Family Leave Policy Updates. Charlie noted that CCRPC currently has a
      policy that allows employees who have been with us for 10 years or less to carry over 15 days of
      accrued paid time off (PTO) into the next calendar year. Employees with 11 years or more of
      service may carry over 20 days of accrued PTO. The reason is designed to reduce liability as well
      as to incentivize staff to take regular vacation. We recently received a request from an
      employee to take family leave for 8 weeks next summer. The first part of the proposed change
      is to provide the Executive Director discretion to allow an extra week off for planned family
      leave. With that change it made us look at the Family Leave Policy as well. Our policy had read
      not to exceed 6 weeks. We contacted VLCT. This restriction is not consistent with Vermont law.
We are proposing to eliminate that phrase from the policy so that employees may use earned PTO. JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CATHERINE MCMAINS, TO APPROVE THE PTO CARRY OVER AND FAMILY LEAVE POLICY UPDATES. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

6. Legislative Breakfast presentation review. Members reviewed the powerpoint slides and made suggestions for changes. Barbara Elliott suggested that we add an explanation of what acronyms mean. Discussion continued. Charlie reviewed the investment in RPCs ACCD funding which has not changed in 5 years. Charlie asked members to let him know of any other ideas they have, prior to the breakfast.

(Forest left the meeting.)

7. Chair/Executive Director Report.
   a. Business Office Associate Update. We have held second interviews with three candidates and have narrowed it down to one, so we should have someone on board by the next meeting.
   b. Staff change. Charlie noted that Lee Krohn has accepted a job offer to become Shelburne’s Town Manager. We’re working with staff to shift some responsibilities. Marshall has been doing LEPC for six months and doesn’t want to continue, but Christine is interested.

8. Other Business. It was noted that Barbara will not be available to attend the January 2nd Executive Committee meeting and wondered if we could change the date. All other members are available on January 2nd, so the meeting will not change.

9. Executive Session. There was none needed.

10. Adjournment. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JOHN ZICCONI, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 6:40 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

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

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

2. Approval of December 5, 2018 Executive Committee Minutes. JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O’BRIEN, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 5, 2018 AS WRITTEN. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. Act 250 & Sec. 248 Applications. Chris Roy recused himself from discussion/action on all three applications, so Mike O’Brien took over as chair for this item.
   a. Act 250 Hearing for Lakeview LLC, Burlington; #4C1303-1. Regina noted that this is for a project on North Avenue at the top of Depot Street and they are proposing addition of balconies to the southwestern facade of a previously approved residential building; as well as substitution of corrugated metal for permitted cedar shingle cladding on stair towers of the northwestern facade, and we don’t have any comments. JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO APPROVE THE LETTER TO ACT 250 COORDINATOR. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
   b. Final CPG Application for VESI VEC LLC; Hinesburg; #18-3088-PET. This project is off of Pond Lake Road in Hinesburg for a 1.8MW battery storage facility. It is adjacent to an existing VELCO substation. The constraints identified in the 45 day notice letter are not an issue; and therefore this is in conformance with the ECOS Plan. JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO APPROVE THE LETTER TO DOWNS RACHLIN MARTIN REGARDING THIS PROJECT. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
   c. Act 250 Application for Costco; Colchester; #4C0288-19F. Regina noted that we have discussed this project many times before. Now Costco is requesting an amendment to condition #29 of the Land Use permit in order to operate the Costco gas pumps during off-peak traffic hours (M-F 6 am-2 pm; 6pm-10pm; Sat 6am-10am; 2 pm-10pm & Sun 6am-10pm), prior to the construction of the Diverging Diamond Intersection improvement project. Regina noted that we generally coordinate comments with VTrans. However, VTrans will be reviewing this tomorrow morning. Since the hearing isn’t until January 10th, we have time to respond. It should be noted that the gas pumps have already been installed under a prior Town approval and the Town has no comments on this amendment at this time. Members questioned the “off peak” hours in the a.m. Eleni noted that these off-peak hours were selected based on LOS/delays for the entire Mountain View intersection (not specific approaches) and the I-89 ramps. Overall traffic volumes and delays are higher during the p.m. peak hours. ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION,
SECONDED BY JOHN ZICCONI, TO APPROVE THE LETTER AS DRAFTED. HOWEVER, IF VTRANS REVIEW CHANGES ANYTHING, THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE WANTS TO REVIEW THE LETTER BEFORE IT IS SENT. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. FY19 Mid-Year Adjustment to UPWP and Budget. Charlie reviewed the UPWP document to show tasks that will be deleted, added and changes to deliverables or dollars. Members then reviewed the income/expense sheet. MIKE O'BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO RECOMMEND THE BOARD APPROVE THE PROPOSED FY19 MID-YEAR ADJUSTMENT. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. Proposed banking change. Charlie noted that we are considering a change in our bank to align more with our ECOS Plan and get more local. He is the chair of the board of the Opportunities Credit Union, which is a low-income credit union in Burlington and Winooski. They operate under special federal banking regulations and cater to low-income residents. Charlie indicated that he got on the Board of Opportunities Credit Union as a means to help address ECOS Strategy 8 – ensuring equity in the community. He is suggesting that perhaps CCRPC would move our funds to this local institution and support their mission as long as there is no negative financial implication. There may be the potential to earn more interest income. After input from Exec. Comm., Forest and Charlie will be getting more information from the Credit Union and should be able to make a recommendation by the next Executive Committee Meeting.

6. Legislative Breakfast Debrief. Charlie asked members for feedback on last month’s legislative breakfast. Members generally felt it went well and that folks appeared interested all the way through. They felt having municipal staff talk about some of the items was helpful. Members discussed whether this should be an annual or biannual event. Most members felt an annual event was useful to remind legislators of the range of issues CCRPC deals with.

7. Chair/Executive Director’s Report.
   a. Staffing update. Charlie noted that since our last meeting, Lee Krohn has officially accepted the Shelburne Town Manager position and will not be returning. For the next six months Christine Forde will be helping out with emergency management program to see if she likes it. Our new Business Office Associate, Amy Irvin Witham, will be starting on January 7th.
   b. ECOS Annual Report Update. Charlie noted that we and our partners are working on the annual report and we should have something for the February meeting.
   c. I-89 Study. We have worked with VTrans, Burlington and South Burlington on a consultant selection committee for the I-89 2050 study and they unanimously agreed to hire VHB and its team for that study. We are asking TAC approval next week.
   d. Legislative issues this year. Charlie noted he met with ANR Secretary Julie Moore who is looking at proposing legislation for Water Quality Utilities that towns would have to join. The idea is to focus more on non-regulatory projects to achieve our clean water goals. There are quite a few issues with this concept that Charlie communicated to the Secretary. Another big item that we’ll watch in this year’s session is the recommendations from the Act 250 Commission. Regina sent out an email earlier today to CCRPC’s ad hoc committee to begin reviewing the recommendations.

8. Review Agenda for January 16, 2019 CCRPC Board Meeting. Members reviewed and made changes to the proposed agenda.
9. Other Business. Chris Roy suggested we begin looking at dates and venues for our Annual Meeting in June. It was suggested that it be CCRPC’s annual meeting rather than a joint meeting with GBIC. Members agreed.

11. Adjournment. ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JOHN ZICDONI, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 6:35 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc
December 7, 2018

Joslyn Wilschek
Wilschek Iarrapino Law Office, PLLC
3 Elm Street, Suite 200
Montpelier VT 05602

RE: Advance Notice of Petition for Bullrock Solar, LLC’s Proposed 150 kW Project in South Burlington, VT – 650 Spear Street (Case #18-3925-AN)

Dear Ms. Wilschek:

Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission has received the 45-day notice of a Section 248 Petition to be filed with the Vermont Public Utility Commission for a 150kW solar project at 650 Spear Street in South Burlington, VT. We have reviewed this project in light of CCRPC’s 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan, which gained a Determination of Energy Compliance from the Vermont Department of Public Service on August 9, 2018. Please be advised that the City of South Burlington is still reviewing this application.

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

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

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

- The project is located in an area proximate to existing distribution and transmission infrastructure with adequate grid capacity.
- The project is located on a previously developed site (a concrete pad formerly used for composting), and is therefore a preferred site as defined in the Vermont Public Utility Commission’s Net Metering Rule (Rule 5.100).
- The project is located in one of Chittenden County’s areas planned for growth (Metro Planning Area).
- The project is outside of any state designated centers or historic districts.

CCRPC finds that the location of this project meets the suitability policies of the 2018 ECOS Plan.
Constraints
The 2018 ECOS Plan states that development should be located to avoid state and local known constraints that have been field verified, and to minimize impacts to state and local possible constraints that have been field verified (Strategy 3, Action 1.f and Strategy 4, Action 1.f and Action 2.e).

Based on the site plan included in the advance notice, CCRPC has reviewed the constraints that exist on the site of the proposed project. While there are primary agricultural soils, wetland and associated buffers, areas of riparian connectivity and slopes over 20% on this site

Based on our review of this project’s location using the ANR Natural Resources Atlas and ANR BioFinder, it appears that there are primary agricultural soils, wetland and associated buffers, areas of riparian connectivity and slopes over 20% on this site. However, this project will be completely located on an existing concrete pad and will not have an additional impact on any resources. Therefore, CCRPC has determined that this project avoids known constraints and minimizes impact to possible constraints and is not requesting further information or action related to these constraints at this time.

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

Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Charlie Baker
Executive Director

cc: CCRPC Board
Paul Conner, Director of Planning & Zoning, City of South Burlington
December 7, 2018

Joslyn Wilschek
Wilschek Iarrapino Law Office, PLLC
3 Elm Street, Suite 200
Montpelier VT 05602

RE: Advance Notice of Petition for Bullrock Solar, LLC’s Proposed 80 kW Project in South Burlington, VT – 705 Spear Street (Case #18-3927-AN)

Dear Ms. Wilschek:

Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission has received the 45-day notice of a Section 248 Petition to be filed with the Vermont Public Utility Commission for a 80kW solar project at 705 Spear Street in South Burlington, VT. We have reviewed this project in light of CCRPC’s 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan, which gained a Determination of Energy Compliance from the Vermont Department of Public Service on August 9, 2018. The City of South Burlington Planning Commission does not object to the location of the project, but may request modifications to the design.

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

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

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

- The project is located in an area proximate to existing distribution and transmission infrastructure with adequate grid capacity.
- The project is located directly adjacent to an existing structure and an existing solar array and will provide more than 50% of energy produced to the structure. It is therefore a preferred site as defined in the Vermont Public Utility Commission’s Net Metering Rule (Rule 5.100).
- The project is located in one of Chittenden County’s areas planned for growth (Metro Planning Area).
- The project is outside of any state designated centers or historic districts.

CCRPC finds that the location of this project meets the suitability policies of the 2018 ECOS Plan.
Constraints
The 2018 ECOS Plan states that development should be located to avoid state and local known constraints that have been field verified, and to minimize impacts to state and local possible constraints that have been field verified (Strategy 3, Action 1.f and Strategy 4, Action 1.f and Action 2.e).

Based on our review of this project’s location using the ANR Natural Resources Atlas and ANR BioFinder, it appears that there are wetlands and associated buffers on the parcel, but not impacted by this project. We mention the presence of these nearby constraints simply for your information, given that our review is based on data that have not been verified by on-the-ground studies. CCRPC is not requesting further information or action related to these constraints.

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

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

Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Charlie Baker
Executive Director

cc: CCRPC Board
Paul Conner, Director of Planning & Zoning, City of South Burlington
January 3, 2018

Joshua D. Leckey
Downs Rachlin Martin PLLS
199 Main Street, PO Box 190
Burlington, VT 05401

RE: Petition for a Certificate of Public Good for VESIVEC, LLC for a 1.8MW Battery Storage Project on Pond Brook Road in Hinesburg, VT (Case #18-3088-PET, previously #18-2743-AN)

Dear Mr. Leckey:

Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission has received the Petition for a Certificate of Public Good filed with the Vermont Public Utility Commission for a 1.8MW battery storage project on Pond Brook Road in Hinesburg, VT. The project is adjacent to an existing Vermont Electric Cooperative substation. We have reviewed this project in light of CCRPC’s 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan, which gained a Determination of Energy Compliance from the Vermont Department of Public Service on August 9, 2018.

The project is located within the Rural Planning Area as defined in 2018 ECOS Plan. The plan states that “the Rural Planning Area...provides for low density commercial, industrial, and residential development...that is compatible with working lands and natural areas.” The Plan is not intended to prescribe uses and we find that this project, which is efficiently located next to existing transmission infrastructure on a developed parcel, is not inconsistent with this planning area. Therefore, we find this project to be generally in conformance with the Planning Areas of the 2018 Chittenden County Regional Plan.

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

Strategy 2, Action 4b of the ECOS Plan states “CCRPC supports the generation of new renewable energy in the County to meet the Vermont Comprehensive Energy Plan’s goals of using 90% renewable energy by 2050, in a manner that is cost effective and respects the natural environment.” Development of this battery storage project will increase the resilience and capacity of existing grid infrastructure.

Constraints
The 2018 ECOS Plan states that development should be located to avoid state and local known constraints that have been field verified, and to minimize impacts to state and local possible constraints that have been field verified (Strategy 3, Action 1.f and Strategy 4, Action 1.f and Action 2.e).

Based on the site plan included in the advance notice, CCRPC has reviewed the constraints that exist on the site of the proposed project. During our review of the advance notice for this project, CCRPC noted that this project had the potential to impact deer wintering areas and slopes between 15-25%. The additional information provided with CPG application indicates that this project avoids impacts to...
known constraints and mitigates impacts to possible constraints.

- **Deer Wintering Areas:** Based on the prefiled testimony and natural resources assessment submitted by VHB’s Senior Ecologist, Adam Crary, the project avoids impacts to deer wintering areas, a state possible constraint.

- **Slopes between 15-25%:** While this project does affect slopes over 15%, the developer has proposed mitigation measures that include limited tree clearing and riprap for slope stabilization. CCRPC understands that the Hinesburg Planning Commission has no further concerns about the effect on steep slopes.

These comments are based on information currently available; we may have additional comments as the process continues.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Charlie Baker
Executive Director

cc: CCRPC Board
    Alex Weinhagen, Director of Planning & Zoning, Town of Hinesburg
December 6, 2018

Judith Whitney, Clerk of the Commission
Vermont Public Utility Commission
112 State Street
Montpelier, VT 05620-2701

Re: Underhill GLC Solar, LLC Preferred Site Letter of Support - Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission

Dear Ms. Whitney,

The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (“CCRPC”) is in receipt of a plan by the Green Lantern Group to develop a 150kW solar array to be located at 97 Beartown Road in Underhill, VT. This parcel is owned by the Town of Underhill and is certified as a categorical disposal facility. The developer and Town wish to designate this site as a “preferred site,” as described in PUC Rule 5.100.

The 2018 ECOS Plan and CCRPC’s “Guidelines and Standards for Reviewing Act 250 and Section 248 Applications” provide guidance for the siting of renewable energy facilities and the designation of preferred sites. Based on the draft site plan, CCRPC has identified no specific issues or concerns on this site. Slopes of over 20% (a local constraint) are present on part of the site, but the draft site plan indicates that these slopes will be avoided. CCRPC will review the final site plan when it is available to ensure that it continues to avoid known constraints and minimize impacts to possible constraints.

Additionally, the site meets several of the 2018 ECOS Plan’s suitability standards, which define characteristics of sites where CCRPC encourages renewable energy generation facilities. The suitability standards met by this project are:

1. Locate renewable energy generation in areas designated by a municipality: The Underhill Selectboard and Planning Commission have both signed on to a letter designated this site as a preferred site.
2. Locate solar generation (including but not limited to net metering) on previously impacted areas: The project is proposed on a categorical disposal facility certified by the State of Vermont.
3. Locate ground-mounted solar larger than 15 kW...outside of state designated village centers: The project is located outside of both of Underhill’s designated village centers.

Finally, this project advances the 2018 ECOS Plan’s goal of increasing renewable energy generation in Chittenden County. The CCRPC supports the identification of this site as a preferred site for net metering.

This review is based on a draft site plan. CCRPC will review and comment on materials submitted during the CPG review process as they become available.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

Charlie Baker
Executive Director

CC: CCRPC Board
Andrew Strniste, Underhill Planning Director
January 9, 2019

Stephanie H. Monaghan
Act 250 Coordinator
111 West Street
Essex Junction, VT 05452

RE: Lakeview LLC; Burlington; Application #4C1303-1

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 the addition of balconies on the southwestern façade of previously-approved residential building. The Project also includes the substitution of corrugated metal for permitted cedar shingle cladding on stair towers of the northwestern facade. The Project is located at 85 North Avenue in Burlington, Vermont. We understand that the District Commission intends to narrow the scope of this hearing to Criterion 8, specifically aesthetics, lights and noise. The changes to cladding and the addition of balconies was approved by the City of Burlington on August 27, 2018. We offer the following comments:

This project received an Act 250 permit on November 14, 2017. CCRPC did not comment on the project at that time, as there was no hearing. The project is located in the 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan’s Metro Planning Area. The ECOS Plan defines Metro Planning Areas as “areas where local zoning authorizes places to accommodate jobs and housing in a compact development pattern that supports transit service and encourages pedestrian activity...within the sewer service area.” This project is in conformance with the ECOS Plan, and conformance is not affected by the proposed aesthetic changes.

We have no comments on impacts to traffic at this time.

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
1. Welcome and Introductions
Joss Besse called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

2. Approval of November 7, 2018 Minutes
Everett Marshall made a motion, seconded by Darren Schibler, to approve the November 7, 2018 minutes. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.

3. Neighborhood Development Area
John Adams provided the PAC with an update on the State’s project to create and regularly update parcel data to meet state standards. Project information can be found here: [http://vcgi.vermont.gov/parcels](http://vcgi.vermont.gov/parcels). Parcel data is the most searched for data set on the VCGI website. Most of Chittenden County is in a good place with this program. All but Colchester and South Burlington have and will be done in Phase 1 and 2. The data is on the Interactive Map Viewer where you can see the parcel data linked to the grandlist (maps.vermont.gov/vcgi). With parcel data, the State (and others) can do more value added products, including the 3D value by parcel maps (https://vcgi.github.io/value-per-acre).

There was a discussion regarding maintenance going forward. Surveyors are on board with the concept of a single statewide survey library for digital copies of surveys. It would allow surveyors to upload new surveys and it would provide an option for municipalities to confirm the approval of an actual new subdivision and add information like the deed reference. The idea of verification at the municipal level for subdivisions and lot line changes after the surveyor submits seemed to have merit for some PAC members, because there are scenarios when the surveyor doesn’t know the status of the plat after they’ve completed it and sometimes the landowner decides to not record it. There are also many surveys that don’t need approval from the Town; and the surveyors or landowners for those don’t necessarily want to make them public. The survey library will help to keep the digital information in a useful place; however the actual parcel updates still need to be done.

There was a suggestion that CCRPC and/or Planners advocate for continued funding for this program going forward.

4. 2018 Richmond Town Plan – Energy Review
Joss Besse opened the public hearing at 3:14pm; hearing none, the public comment period was closed.

Emily Nosse-Leirer provided an overview of the staff report for Richmond’s enhanced energy plan. The PAC has reviewed this Plan a few times; and the Plan was adopted on November 6. Post-adoption, the town is seeking a Determination of Energy Compliance. Emily recommended that the PAC approve the motion and this will be added to the full Plan motion and forwarded to the Board as a recommendation to approve both.
Thoughts/comments from the PAC:
- There was a discussion about the energy plans in general, not just in relation to Richmond’s Plan. The discussion was about whether the Plans are going far enough to ensure that real changes will happen to meet the State’s energy goals. Particularly because this is an incentive based program where a municipality is given the ability to say no to a renewable energy project at the Public Utility Commission, but only because they’ve committed to meeting the State’s goals like energy use reduction. The PAC discussed that there are only so many things that a municipality can influence in this realm. Land use density is within a municipalities control. There was a discussion about checking in on implementation of the Plans, and that this is the first round of energy plans and we’ll know a lot more over the coming years as we implement the Plans and as we re-write them in the next round. For Winooski they don’t need to switch direction; but for a rural town they really need to go in a different direction to put a park and ride in, or densify, etc.

Specific comments on Richmond:
- Great that the information from CCRPC has been incorporated.
- Concern that there is no way to actually measure and evaluate success. There are a number of good actions, but no way to know whether it will actually meet the goals or not. If transportation energy is the real problem, tightening up land use might be the real solution. Like for a park and ride is there a target portion of the Richmond residents that will use the park and ride? There is only so much that a municipality has control over and the causality is challenging to match up. It is more than likely that gas prices will impact use of the park and ride. The hope is that a municipality is not preventing desired effects, and they’ve done what they can.

There was an ask to discuss the implementation/accountability topic on another PAC meeting agenda outside of a specific Plan review, including whether CCRPC should review the Plans earlier than 24 months before they expire.

Darren Schibler made a motion, seconded by Ravi Venkataraman, that the PAC finds that the 2018 Richmond Town Plan with the draft energy amendments, as submitted, does meet the requirements of the enhanced energy planning standards set forth in 24 V.S.A. §4352. The PAC recommends that the Plan should be forwarded to the CCRPC Board for an affirmative determination of energy compliance. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.

5. 2019 Winooski Master Plan & Enhanced Energy Review
Joss Besse opened the public hearing at 3:44pm; hearing none, the public comment period was closed.

Emily Nosse-Leirer provided an overview of the staff report for the Winooski Plan. The Plan was reviewed for both the municipal plan approval and confirmation, as well as the enhanced energy component. Emily indicated that the format of the Plan was very good. The Plan only needs to address resource extraction for Plan confirmation, though there are a few other suggested recommendations as well.

Eric Vorwald thanked CCRPC for their work on the Plan. Eric explained that the last Plan was really done in 2004, so this is a major re-write based on the City’s vision. The City has been working on a number of more specific studies over the last few years, so this Plan is a summary, overarching document and many of the actions live in the more specific plans. The implementation component of the Plan is purposefully at a pretty high level, so the City can pivot as necessary going forward.

There was quite a bit of discussion regarding the Enhanced Energy Plan. The City isn’t certain they are going to officially request the determination because there is a concern that the State’s constraint maps include resources that the City doesn’t view as a development constraint (namely agricultural soils). Generally speaking the PAC felt that Winooski is a leader in energy efficiency based on its land use density and multimodal transportation options and that should be the focus of the energy plan; rather than a lack of land area for renewable energy generation.

Other questions/comments from the PAC:
Like the format and the identity of what Winooski is and what it’s becoming. The City has been able to define that better than other municipalities.

Maps don’t have a legend and so it is difficult to understand. Talked about having a separate appendix so these can be full size with a legend.

There was a discussion regarding the future land use map and the areas identified as “city park zoned commercial or industrial”. There are three areas in the City that are owned by the City and currently used as parks but zoned as commercial and industrial. There was a recommendation that the Land Use map disconnect from the actual zoning, and make the future use of these areas more clear in the map if the City has clarity on what they want to do with them.

Recommendation to be more clear in the intent of the Implementation Section, such as: The way in which we are implementing this Plan is by making commitments in these specific plans and we are taking our actions from those.

There are a number of grammar/typos.

Recommendation to think about requiring EV charging in the City’s building code (essentially ensuring the conduits are in place to allow for future charging stations) and consider requiring the stretch energy code.

There was a discussion about whether the PAC was ready to make a motion to recommend approval with conditions (to include addition of resource extraction, clarify future land use map, be more intentional in the implementation section, and clarify if the City is seeking enhanced energy planning or not), or whether there was time to see the Plan again before making a motion. There is time for the PAC to review another version of the Plan, however there wouldn’t be enough time for another round of PAC comments to be addressed by the City.

Alex Weinhegen made a motion, seconded by Darren Schibler, to table this to another meeting. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED. Eric Vorwald abstained.

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

Essex: none
Shelburne: none
Huntington: none
Williston: none
Bolton: none
South Burlington: New hotel in City Center. Preliminary Plat for 160 housing units application. 2 little PUCs projects on UVM. Fed Ex in review for 140,000 sq.ft. building by the whale’s tails.
Hinesburg: Nothing
Richmond: Nothing new. Creamery re-development is moving slower than originally planned.
Winooski: 24 unit multifamily going to Act 250 for an amendment.

7. Other Business

a. Williston 2018 Amendment to 2016 Comprehensive Plan – the packet included a letter from CCRPC indicating that previous approval and confirmation are not affected by Williston’s adopted Plan amendments.

b. Regina indicated that there may not be a need for a January PAC Meeting – Wednesday, January 9th

c. CCRPC Board member communication – Regina indicated that Staff will be cc’ing our Board Representatives when doing municipal projects in the respective municipalities; particularly when going to a PC or SLB meeting so that the Board members can be kept abreast of our work and participate if they’d like.

8. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony