REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
Wednesday, March 20, 2019 - 6:00 p.m.
CCRPC Offices; 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202
Winooski, VT 05404

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 February 20, 2019 Meeting * (Action; 1 minute)
5. GMT – proposed transit system changes, Jon Moore, Dir. of Transportation (Discussion; 40 minutes)
6. Capital Program Prioritization (MPO Business) * (Action; 20 minutes)
7. Shelburne Town Plan Approval, Confirmation of Planning Process, and Determination of Energy Compliance * (Action; 10 minutes)
8. Act 250 Recommendations * (Action; 20 minutes)
9. Chair/Executive Director Report (Discussion; 15 minutes)
   a. FY20 UPWP Update
   b. Legislative Update
10. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports (Information, 2 minutes)
    a. Executive Committee (meeting delayed to March 20th)
       i. Act 250 Sec 248 letters*
    b. Transportation Advisory Committee – draft minutes March 6, 2019*
    c. Clean Water Advisory Committee – draft minutes March 6, 2019*
    d. MS4 Subcommittee – draft minutes March 6, 2019*
    e. UPWP Committee - draft minutes – February 21, 2019*
    f. Brownfields Committee – draft minutes February 11, 2019*
    g. Act 250 Ad Hoc Committee – draft minutes March 13, 2019*
11. Members’ Items, Other Business (Information, 5 minutes)
12. Adjourn

The March 20th Chittenden County RPC streams LIVE on YouTube at https://www.youtube.com/Channel17TownMeetingTV 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:

- Executive Committee – Wednesday, March 20, 2019; 5:30 p.m.
- FY20 UPWP Committee Meeting, Thursday, March 21, 2019, 5:30 p.m.
- Transportation Advisory Committee - Tuesday, April 2, 2019; 9:00 a.m.
- Clean Water Advisory Committee - Tuesday, April 2, 2019; 11:00 a.m.
- CWAC MS4 Subcommittee – Tuesday, April 2, 2019; 12:15 p.m.
- Executive Committee – Wednesday, April 3, 2019; 5:45 p.m.
- Planning Advisory Committee - Wednesday, April 10, 2019; 2:30 p.m.
- CCRPC Board Meeting - Wednesday, April 17, 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>April 17, 2019</td>
<td>Warn Public Hearing for FY20 UPWP Airport?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 15, 2019</td>
<td>FY20 UPWP and Budget Public Hearing Report from Board Development Committee on FY20 Nominations VTrans Rail?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| June 19, 2019   | Annual Meeting
                 | Election of Officers
                 | Warn FY20-23 TIP Public Hearing                                           |
| July 17, 2019   | FY20-23 TIP Public Hearing
                 | UVM-Medical Center Population Health?                                     |
| August          | NO MEETING                                                                 |
| September 18, 2019 | Essex Junction Village Plan                                              |
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
March 20, 2019
Agenda Item C1a: Consent Item

**FY2019 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendments**

**Issues**

Make the following amendments to the FY19-22 TIP.

The projects listed below are grant funded projects (Municipal Highway and Stormwater Mitigation Program awards, Transportation Alternative awards, and Bike & Ped program awards) that had funds in FY18 (last year) that were not obligated. Advance funds from FY18 to FY19 (current year).

- **Phosphorus Control Plan, Colchester** (Project OT033, Amendment FY19-10) (STP MM18(1)) - Advance $40,000 in Municipal Highway and Stormwater Mitigation Program award funds from FY18 to FY19.

- **Phosphorus Control Plan, Essex Junction** (Project OT034, Amendment FY19-11) (STP MM18(2)) - Advance $18,784 in Municipal Highway and Stormwater Mitigation Program funds from FY18 to FY19. $40,000 was in the TIP in FY18 and $21,216 was obligated.

- **Town Hall/Parade US7 Crosswalk Upgrade, Shelburne** (Project BP104, Amendment FY19-12) - Advance $3,850 in 2017 Bike & Ped award funds from FY18 to FY19.

- **Kimball/Marshall Avenue Culvert, South Burlington-Williston** (Project BR058, Amendment FY19-13) (STP MM18(3)) - Advance $29,607 in Municipal Highway and Stormwater Mitigation Program funds from FY18 to FY19. $66,240 was in the TIP in FY18 and $36,633 was obligated.

- **Allen Brook Watershed Culvert Scoping, Williston** (Project OT045, Amendment FY19-14) (TAP TA18(8)) - Advance $15,000 in 2018 Transportation Alternatives funds from FY18 to FY19.

- **Williston Road Cycle Track and Pedestrian Improvements, South Burlington** (Project BP102, Amendment FY19-15) (STP BP 17(9)) - Advance $145,007 in 2017 Bike & Ped award funds from FY18 to FY19. $203,115 was in the TIP in FY18 and $58,108 was obligated.

- **Stormwater Detention Pond Design and Construction at LDS Church, Essex** (Project OT036, Amendment FY19-16) (STP MM18(9)) - Advance $61,268 in Municipal Highway and Stormwater Mitigation program funds from FY18 to FY19. $86,765 was in the TIP in FY18 and $25,497 was obligated.

- **Picard Circle Stormwater Improvements, South Burlington** (Project OT029, Amendment FY19-17) (TAP TA17(6)) - Advance $1,600 for right-of-way from FY18 to FY19 and move $233,547 for construction from FY21 to FY19.
The following CIRC Alternative projects had funds in FY18 (last year) that were not obligated. Advance the funds from FY18 to FY19 (current year).

- **VT15/Sand Hill Road, Essex** (Project HP082, Amendment FY19-18) (STPG 030-1(22)) - Advance $75,000 in right-of-way funds from FY18 to FY19.

- **VT2A/James Brown Drive, Williston** (Project HP090, Amendment FY19-19) (STP HES 5500(12)) - Advance $350,000 in construction funds from FY18 to FY19. $1,200,000 was in the TIP in FY18 and $850,000 was obligated.

- **Crescent Connector, Essex Junction** (Project HC014, Amendment FY19-20) – Advance $900,000 from FY18 to FY19 and allocate to right-of-way.

**TAC Recommendation:**
Recommend that the Board approved the proposed TIP amendments.

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

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

Issues

Make the following changes to the FY2019-2022 TIP.

**Champlain Parkway, Burlington** (Project HC001, Amendment FY19-20).

- **TIP Change**: Update the TIP construction funding amounts for Champlain Parkway as follows – FY20 - $13,222,501 (federal); FY21 - $10,386,361 (federal), FY22 - $4,885,102 (federal). Total federal funds - $28,475,964.

- **Reason for Change**: The adopted FY2019-2022 TIP programs $28,923,763 in federal funds for construction of Champlain Parkway. However, the schedule does not match the current construction schedule. Burlington is working towards advertising the project in the spring of 2019 and the TIP must reflect the revised funding schedule.

  The TIP is a fiscally constrained document so funds must be made available from other projects to accommodate this TIP amendment. Therefore, the following changes are also proposed.

**Shelburne Street Roundabout, Burlington** (Project HP085, Amendment FY19-21)

- **TIP Change**: Move $4,959,284 in construction funds from FY21 to FY22. $982,000 remains in FY21.

- **Reason for Change**: This change matches the current construction schedule for this project which is for two construction seasons in 2021 and 2022.

**Exit 17, Colchester** (Project BR050, Amendment FY19-22)

- **TIP Change**: Move $9,844,386 from FY22 to FY23. $924,520 remains in FY22.

- **Reason for Change**: The current schedule for this project has construction taking place in 2022, 2023 and 2024.

**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
DATE: Wednesday, February 20, 2019
TIME: 6:00 p.m.
PLACE: CCRPC offices; 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404

PRESENT:
Bolton: Sharon Murray  Buel’s: Absent
Burlington: Andy Montroll  Charlotte: Jim Donovan
Colchester: Jeff Bartley  Essex: Jeff Carr
Essex Junction: Dan Kerin  Hinesburg: Andrea Morgante
Huntington: Barbara Elliott  Jericho: Catherine McMains
Milton: Tony Micklus (6:02)  Richmond: Bard Hill (6:10)
St. George: Absent  Shelburne: John Zicconi (6:05)
South Burl: Justin Rabidoux (6:34)  Underhill: Brian Bigelow
Westford: Dave Tilton  Williston: Absent
Winooski: Mike O’Brien  VTrans: Amy Bell
Socio/Econ/Housing: Justin Dextradeur  Business/Industry: Tim Baechle
Agriculture: Absent  Cons/Env: Absent
Others: Matthew Langham, VTrans  Scott Moody, CCTV
Norm Baldwin, Burlington City DPW  Susan Molzon, Burlington DPW
Mike Bissonette, Hinesburg Alternate
Staff: Charlie Baker, Executive Director  Jason Charest, Sr. Trans. Eng.
Amy Irvin Witham, Business office Assoc.
Regina Mahony, Planning Prog. Mgr.

1. **Call to order; changes to the agenda.** The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by the Vice-Chair, Mike O’Brien. It was requested that we move item 6. Champlain Parkway update before item 5. Act 250 recommendations. **JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JIM DONOVAN TO AMEND THE AGENDA AS NOTED. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

2. **Public Comment Period on items NOT on the agenda.** There were none.

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

4. **Approve Minutes of January 16, 2019 board meeting.** **JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CATHERINE MCMAINS, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES WITH EDITS, IF ANY. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS WRITTEN.**

5. **Champlain Parkway Update.** Norm Baldwin, Burlington City Engineer, and Susan Molzon, Champlain Parkway Project Manager, attended to update us on the status of the Champlain Parkway project and other transportation projects in Burlington (presentation attached). Chapin Spencer had another meeting to attend. Susan showed a map of the route the parkway will take. Section C-1 will start at I-189 and go to Home Avenue. Segment C-2 will go from Home Avenue to Lakeside Avenue. Segment C-6 will go from Lakeside Avenue on the existing street and continue along Pine Street to Main Street. She
noted where bikepath and bikeshare lanes would be located and where raised intersections would be installed for pedestrian safety. Segments C1 and C2 would have limited access at major intersections and smaller neighborhood streets would dead end at the Parkway with only pedestrian access to walk/bike lanes. Norm then reviewed the schedule: they are completing final design and will request construction bids in spring 2019. They are finishing ROW acquisition with only two properties to go. They expect to begin construction in fall 2019 and complete construction in two years-2021. They will complete C-6 first and C-1 and 2 in the second year. Christine Forde noted that the TAC and board will be asked to approve a TIP amendment in March to adjust the construction schedule. It will not affect other projects in the TIP. Norm noted that there is a project website to keep up to date (http://champlainparkway.com/).

Norm then talked about other initiatives in Burlington that include Great Streets, which will improve the quality of the streets with pedestrian, bike, streetscape and landscape improvements. They have begun with St. Paul Street between Main Street and Maple Street. Other locations will include Main Street between Pine Street and Church Street and design around Burlington City Place. Because there are so many projects going on the City has set up a Construction Portal to help get information to the public as well as city departments. Members thanked them for the update.

5. Act 250 Recommendations. Regina Mahony reviewed the 8 overarching recommendations from the Ad Hoc Act 250 Committee, with changes from the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC). After a very lengthy discussion and some suggestions for changes, JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JIM DONOVAN, TO ACCEPT THE RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE AD HOC ACT 250 COMMITTEE WITH STAFF MAKING WORDING CHANGES IN RECOMMENDATIONS 1, 3 AND 4 WITH THE SUGGESTED CHANGES CONSISTENT WITH THE BOARD’S DISCUSSION. MOTION CARRIED WITH SHARON MURRAY ABSTAINING AS SHE REPRESENTS ANOTHER ORGANIZATION. (The recommendations are included below – red highlights indicate changes discussed and agreed to.)

**Recommendations for Improving Vermont’s Act 250 Permitting System**

*February 20, 2019*

Act 47 (in 2017) created a commission of six legislators to “review the vision for Act 250 adopted in the 1970s and its implementation with the objective of ensuring that, over the next 50 years, Act 250 supports Vermont’s economic, environmental, and land use planning goals.” CCRPC has reviewed the work of this Commission and offers the following general positions intended to make Act 250 more effective and efficient.

1. CCRPC encourages the Legislature to ensure a **predictable and coordinated review process** that minimizes inconsistency and duplication at all levels of review and puts those reviews in the most appropriate hands so environmental protection is not compromised, and housing, transportation and economic development is not unnecessarily time-consuming and expensive.

2. In general, the state permit process should encourage development in appropriately planned places and discourage development outside of those areas. Therefore, CCRPC strongly supports the concept that Act 250 should not have jurisdiction in areas planned for growth to encourage affordable housing and economic investment in our smart growth areas: walkable, transit-friendly, water and sewer-serviced areas. However, the **enhanced designation concept** as proposed is unworkable for the following reasons:

   a. It builds on an overly complex designation system that puts existing growth into a variety of unnecessary silos and does not adequately capture planned future growth
areas. The existing designation system, of which there are five designations, should be
overhauled into a comprehensive growth strategy rather than continue to build upon it
with a sixth designation. Improving and possibly expanding existing designations is
better than creating new designations.

b. It is not a true Act 250 release; it merely shifts the burden of all the Act 250 criteria to
the municipal level. Instead, we should support existing local planning and Downtown
Board efforts to designate these areas as places for housing and economic
development, acknowledge the greater environmental benefit of clustering growth into
areas with existing infrastructure, and not enforce Act 250 criteria that were originally
intended to minimize and mitigate indirect and cumulative impacts of major
development.

c. The current geographic boundaries of the designation programs are unnecessarily
limited. As an example, the Village and Downtown designations are narrowly focused on
commercial and civic uses and exclude redevelopment and infill in existing
neighborhoods surrounding Villages and Downtowns. The Downtown Board should
analyze each individual area on its merits as a smart growth area, and there should be
incentives to improve existing sprawl areas.

d. The Growth Center and Neighborhood Development Area designations come with an
affordable housing requirement, and this should not be lost under a new structure.

e. It adds an appeal process that the current designation programs don’t have. If an appeal
process is a necessary component, add that to the current designations rather than
creating a new one.

f. The proposed bill will be a significant expansion of Act 250 jurisdiction, including
expansion into areas where development is appropriate, such as existing neighborhoods
surrounding centers; and the enhanced designation concept will not solve that problem.

3. CCRPC supports the comprehensive nature concept of resource area protections and the
acknowledgement that Act 250 jurisdiction should be triggered by location in areas of statewide
interest, regardless of project size (even single-family home developments); however, there
needs to be more work done to identify and define these resources. There may also be
resources that would be better regulated through a separate permit.

4. Act 250 permitting should rely more on conceptual/sketch plans and capacity analysis as
opposed to engineer-sealed plans with more detail. Master Plan Permit approval Land Use
Permits should include conditions of obtaining the other more detailed permits (stormwater,
wastewater, etc.). This would ensure a more resident-friendly, efficient and less costly state
permitting process, helping to reach affordable housing, transportation and economic
development goals. In addition, CCRPC supports the master planning process for phased
developments.

5. CCRPC finds requests that any mapping established to define jurisdiction, and particularly
growth areas, in Act 250 should be based not only on state-level maps, but also on mapping in
local and regional plans due to the extensive public participation involved in their development.
There may also be resources that should be considered by Act 250 that are not identified on
state-level maps.

6. CCRPC asks that the Legislature either work out further details before adopting new concepts or
hold until further details are worked out (e.g. greenhouse gas mitigation fee). The development
costs of some of these concepts could be substantial and would exacerbate existing inflated
housing costs for Vermonters. New concepts should be more thoroughly considered before
adoption. Further, all the fees should be comprehensively reviewed to understand the impact
on development costs, particularly considering the goal of smart growth development.
7. CCRPC encourages the Legislature to consider a **phased approach** to implementing the new jurisdiction paradigm. If it moves forward, it will greatly expand the reach of Act 250, and could greatly disrupt the market. It would be best to first allow municipalities to apply for and obtain the enhanced designation before the greater rural development restrictions are implemented.

8. CCRPC supports an **appeals** process that allows coordination or consolidation of appeals of various municipal and state permits to one entity to ensure consistency in decision-making and prevent unaligned requirements between Environmental Court and the proposed re-invigorated Environmental Resource Board decisions.

---

7. **Chair/Executive Director Updates:**
   
a. **FY20 UPWP Update.** The UPWP committee will hold its second meeting tomorrow to review the list of projects that staff is recommending. We have aligned the budget with available PL funds.

   b. **ECOS Annual Report.** Staff distributed the 2018 Annual report.

   c. **Legislative Updates.** Charlie is watching another bill that would give RPCs a larger role helping ANR to distribute water quality funds to municipalities by watershed. Andrea suggested that the application process for state dollars needs to be consistent.

8. **Committee/Liaison Activities and Reports.** Mike noted that minutes of various committee meetings were included in the meeting packet.

9. **Members’ Items, Other business.** There were none.

10. **Adjourn.** JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JOHN ZICCONI, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:05 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
March 20, 2019
Agenda Item 6: Action Item

2021 Transportation Project Prioritization and Town Highway Bridge Pre-Candidate Prioritization

TAC/Staff Recommendation:

Approve the 2021 Regional Project Scores and Town Highway Bridge Pre-Candidate Regional Project Scores, with changes if any, and forward to VTrans.

Issues:

Each year the Vermont Legislature requires that projects in the Transportation Capital Program be prioritized. Specifically, they directed VTrans to develop a numerical grading system to assign a priority ranking to all paving, roadway, safety and traffic operations, state bridge, interstate bridge, and town highway bridge projects. The rating system was to consist of two separate, additive components as follows:

1. One component shall be an asset management-based factor which is objective and quantifiable and shall consider, without limitation, the following:
   - the existing safety conditions in the project area and the impact of the project on improving safety conditions;
   - the average, seasonal, peak, and nonpeak volume of traffic in the project area, including the proportion of traffic volume relative to total volume in the region, and the impact of the project on congestion and mobility conditions in the region;
   - the availability, accessibility, and usability of alternative routes;
   - the impact of the project on future maintenance and reconstruction costs.

2. The second component of the priority rating system was to consider the following factors:
   - the functional importance of the highway or bridge as a link in the local, regional, or state economy; and
   - the functional importance of the highway or bridge in the social and cultural life of the surrounding communities.

A prioritization methodology was developed as a collaborative effort between VTrans and the regional planning commissions (RPCs). VTrans provides technical input on projects to determine the first part of the project score and the RPCs provide input on the second part of the score.

VTrans Methodology Overview

Prioritization methodologies were developed for each program category listed in the Transportation Capital Program. The methodologies are summarized below.

Paving

- Pavement Condition Index – 20 points (more points are given for higher levels of pavement deterioration)
Benefit/Cost – 60 points (output comes from a Pavement Management System software which considers the type of pavement treatment, traffic volumes and percentage of trucks)

Regional Priority – 20 points

Bridge

Bridge Condition – 30 points (considers the condition of components of the bridge such as the deck, superstructure and substructure)

Remaining Life – 10 points (considers the rate at which the bridge is deteriorating)

Functionality – 5 points (adequacy of the alignment and the width)

Load Capacity and Use – 15 points (considers if there is a weight restriction and the traffic volumes)

Waterway Adequacy and Scour Susceptibility – 10 points (characteristics of the waterway the bridge crosses, if applicable)

Project Momentum – 5 points (considers right-of-way and permit issues)

Benefit Cost Factor – 10 points (considers the benefit to the traveling public of keeping the bridge open)

Regional Priority – 15 points

Roadway

Highway System – 40 points (looks at highway sufficiency rating and network designation)

Cost per vehicle mile – 20 points

Project Momentum – 20 points (considers right-of-way and permitting issues)

Designated Downtown project – 10 bonus points

Regional Priority – 20 points

Traffic Operations

Intersection Capacity – 40 points (based on level of service)

Accident Rate – 20 points

Cost per Intersection Volume – 20 points

Project Momentum – 10 points (considers right-of-way and permitting issues)

Regional Input – 20 points

CCRPC Priority Methodology

CCRPC developed a methodology for regional priority scores in 2005. The methodology is based on planning factors MPOs are required to consider in their planning process, as stated in ISTEA and reiterated in subsequent Federal legislation. The methodology scores projects in each of the following categories: Economic Vitality; Safety and Security; Accessibility, Mobility and Connectivity; Environment, Energy and Quality of Life; Preservation of Existing System; and, Efficient System Management.

The methodology uses a project scoring sheet that identifies project characteristics that result in a score of High, Medium-High, Medium, Low or No Impact for each of the six scoring criteria. Each project receives one score for each planning factor. The score is determined by finding the highest scoring project characteristic that applies
to each project. Necessary information for scoring projects is derived from existing studies and data collected/processed by CCRPC, VTrans, consultants or towns. Only one score is applied to the project for each planning factor even though multiple characteristics may apply to the project.

In addition to the six scoring categories, projects receive points if the project is in the current TIP according to the following schedule:

- 10 points for construction funds in the TIP
- 8 points for right-of-way in the TIP
- 6 points for engineering in the TIP

Projects receive only one score for the TIP Status item corresponding to the highest scoring project phase even if there are multiple phases listed in the TIP for the project.

The list of projects to be scored comes from the annual Transportation Capital Program and is supplied by VTrans. The list includes all projects in the Capital Program except rail projects, aviation projects, interstate projects, bridge maintenance projects, projects funded with federal safety funds, bike/ped and Transportation Alternatives awards and projects expected to be under construction in the near future.

Preliminary project scoring sheets were sent to TAC members having projects in their towns for review and comment.

The attached table lists projects in rank order by program category, from high score to low score. Ties between projects are broken in the following way: higher functional classes are placed before lower functional classes. Functional class order is: Interstate, Principal Arterial, Minor Arterial, Major Collector. If ties still remain higher traffic volumes are placed before lower traffic volumes.

**2021 Town Highway Bridge Pre-Candidate Prioritization**

VTrans also requests that all Regional Planning Commissions prioritize up to 10 town highway bridges as pre-candidate projects. This list queues projects to be added to the VTrans Town Highway Bridge Program in the future.

CCRPC scored town highway bridges using our Project Prioritization methodology described above. The prioritization methodology was applied to the 20 worst-condition town highway bridges, as ranked by VTrans, in the county. The prioritized list is attached.

**Additional Information**

All transportation projects funded by VTrans, with state or federal funds, must be included in the Transportation Capital Program. This program is developed by VTrans and approved by the Vermont Legislature.

Chittenden County projects funded with Federal transportation funds must also be included in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). However, inclusion in the TIP does not replace inclusion in the Capital Program – Chittenden County projects funded with federal transportation funds must be included in the Capital Program and the TIP.
The Capital Program includes three categories of projects, Candidate projects, Development & Evaluation project and Front of the Book Projects. These project types are defined below.

- **Candidate** - A project gets on the Candidate list after it has completed the planning process. Candidate projects are not anticipated to have significant expenditures for preliminary engineering and/or right-of-way during the budget year, and funding for construction is not anticipated within a predictable time-frame.

- **Development & Evaluation** - A project moves from the Candidate list to the Development and Evaluation list when the Project manager anticipates the project will proceed to preliminary plans within 12 to 24 months. Development and Evaluation projects are anticipated to have preliminary engineering and/or right-of-way expenditures during the budget year.

- **Front of the Book** - A project moves from the Development and Evaluation list to the front of the book when it has completed preliminary plan development. Front of the book projects are anticipated to have construction expenditures during the budget year and/or the following three years.

**TAC Recommendation:**
Approve the 2021 Regional Project Scores and Town Highway Bridge Pre-Candidate Regional Project Scores, with changes if any, and forward to VTrans

**Staff Recommendation:**
Approve the 2021 Regional Project Scores and Town Highway Bridge Pre-Candidate Regional Project Scores, with changes if any, and forward to CCRPC Commission

**For more information contact:**
Christine Forde
cforde@ccrpcvt.org or 846-4490 ext. *13

**Attachments:**
- CCRPC Prioritized Project Lists – 2021
- CCRPC Project Scoring Sheet
- Supplemental Project Information
CCRPC 2021 Prioritized Project Lists
## 2021 CCRPC Prioritized Project List - Project Ranks

### Roadway

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>CCRPC Score</th>
<th>Economic Vitality</th>
<th>Safety and Security</th>
<th>Accessibility, Mobility and Connectivity</th>
<th>Environment, Energy and Quality of Life</th>
<th>Preservation of Existing System</th>
<th>Efficient System Management</th>
<th>TIP Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US2/Industrial Avenue, Williston</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>CON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susie Wilson Road Improvements, Essex -- CIRC ALT PHASE III</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Scoping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit 12 Stage 1, Williston - Shared Use Path Under I-89 and New VT2A Lane from Marshall to I-89 Ramp -- CIRC ALT PHASE III</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>CON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prim/West Lakeshore Drive Intersection, Colchester - CIRC ALT PHASE III</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>CON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit 12 Stage 3, Williston - Diverging Diamond Interchange -- CIRC ALT PHASE III</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>No funds programmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit 12 Stage 2, Williston - New Grid Streets and at grade intersection -- CIRC ALT PHASE III</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>No funds programmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT2A Reconstruction, Colchester - CIRC ALT PHASE III</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>No funds programmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT2A Culvert Rehab</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>CON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit 12 Stage 4, Williston - VT2A Boulevard from grid street to US2 -- CIRC ALT PHASE III</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>No funds programmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT117/North Williston Road Hazard Mitigation, Essex - CIRC ALT PHASE III</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>No funds programmed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>CCRPC Score</th>
<th>Economic Vitality</th>
<th>Safety and Security</th>
<th>Accessibility, Mobility and Connectivity</th>
<th>Environment, Energy and Quality of Life</th>
<th>Preservation of Existing System</th>
<th>Efficient System Management</th>
<th>TIP Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crescent Connector</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>CON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champlain Parkway, Burlington</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>CON</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Traffic Operations & Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>CCRPC Score</th>
<th>Economic Vitality</th>
<th>Safety and Security</th>
<th>Accessibility, Mobility and Connectivity</th>
<th>Environment, Energy and Quality of Life</th>
<th>Preservation of Existing System</th>
<th>Efficient System Management</th>
<th>TIP Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic Operations &amp; Safety</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit 16 Improvements, Colchester - CIRC ALT PHASE I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severance Corners, Colchester - CIRC ALT PHASE II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT116/CVU Road, Hinesburg</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelburne Road Roundabout, Burlington</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US7/Middle Road/Railroad Street, Milton</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US2/Trader Lane, Williston</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT2A/Industrial Avenue, Williston - CIRC ALT PHASE III</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US7/Ferry Road, Charlotte</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT15/Sand Hill, Essex - CIRC ALT PHASE II</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT117/North Williston Road, Essex - CIRC ALT PHASE III</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US7/Harbor Road/Falls Road, Shelburne</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blakely Road/Laker Lane, Colchester - CIRC ALT PHASE III</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US7 Signal Upgrades, Shelburne-South Burlington</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayside Intersection Roundabout, Colchester</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT116/VT2A Intersection Improvements, St. George</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* US7/Harbor Road/Falls Road has recently completed scoping and CCRPC seeks to have this project added to the Capital Program. The project has been scored, but not ranked because it is not currently part of the transportation program.
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### Paving and Town Highway Bridge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>CCRPC Score</th>
<th>Economic Vitality</th>
<th>Safety and Security</th>
<th>Accessibility, Mobility and Connectivity</th>
<th>Environment, Energy and Quality of Life</th>
<th>Preservation of Existing System</th>
<th>Efficient System Management</th>
<th>TIP Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paving</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT15, Essex-Underhill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT15, Underhill-Cambridge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US2, Richmond-Bolton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Town Highway Bridge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Bridge 32 on Camels Hump Road (TH22) - west of Fielder Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Bridge 10 on Main Road - south of Beane Road</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underhill Bridge 7 on Pleasant Valley Road - near Deane Road</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jericho Bridge 15 on Brown's Trace - near Fitzsimonds Road</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Bridge 31 on Dorset Street - south of Carpenter Road</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# CCRPC Project Prioritization
## Scoring Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Factors</th>
<th>Economic Vitality</th>
<th>Safety and Security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Characteristics</strong></td>
<td><strong>Support the economic vitality especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency</strong></td>
<td><strong>Increase the safety and security of the transportation system for motorized and nonmotorized users</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Impact (10 points)</strong></td>
<td>□ Project provides new or improved access, including transit and pedestrian/bike access, to or within a Vermont designated Growth Center, Downtown, New Town Center or Village Center or a CCRPC designated Enterprise Planning Area</td>
<td>□ Safety improvement in a VTrans identified High Crash Location – intersection or section of roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Project on an interstate or principal arterial that improves access for freight</td>
<td>□ Bridge improvement for a bridge with critical safety deficiencies (sufficiency rating up to 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Project improves airport access</td>
<td>□ Dedicated pedestrian/bike facility making intermodal linkages or regional connections in a location with a documented existing safety problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Project improves access, including transit and pedestrian/bike access, to tourism facility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Project that improves access to the rail network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium-High Impact (7 points)</strong></td>
<td>□ Project provides new or improved access, including transit and pedestrian/bike access, to or within a CCRPC designated Center, Metro or Village Planning area, or a municipal designated growth area</td>
<td>□ Bridge improvement for a bridge with serious safety issues (sufficiency rating of 25.1 to 50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Project on a minor arterial or major collector that improves access for freight</td>
<td>□ New median barriers, guardrails or shoulders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Project addresses environmental issues that could impact economic development (stormwater, flood resiliency)</td>
<td>□ Intersection/roadway safety improvement in a location with a documented safety problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ New/expanded Park and Ride Lot</td>
<td>□ Rail grade crossing improvement or warning signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Dedicated pedestrian/bike facility with a documented safety problem on a Principal or Minor Arterial roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Impact (5 points)</strong></td>
<td>□ Project that provides new or improved access, including transit and pedestrian/bike access, to or within a future activity area identified in a municipal plan or study</td>
<td>□ Bridge safety improvement for a bridge with a sufficiency rating from 50.1–80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Bus station/stop amenities and shelters</td>
<td>□ Repave interstate or principal arterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Project maintains or improves an access facility important to rural community including town highw ay bridges</td>
<td>□ Dedicated pedestrian/bike facility in a location with a documented safety problem on a Major Collector roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Repave interstate or principal arterial</td>
<td>□ Safety related transportation project identified in a study/report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Impact (3 points)</strong></td>
<td>□ Other transportation improvement that supports economic development</td>
<td>□ Repave a minor arterial or major collector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Repave a minor arterial or major collector</td>
<td>□ Dedicated pedestrian/bike facility in a location with a documented safety problem on a local road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Other safety related improvement identified in a study/report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Impact (0 Points)</strong></td>
<td>□ No discernible benefit</td>
<td>□ No discernible benefits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Improved access is defined as increase in capacity or reduced delay
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Characteristics</th>
<th>Planning Factors</th>
<th>Environment, Energy and Quality of Life</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                         | **Accessibility, Mobility and Connectivity** | *
|                         | **Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight** | *
<p>| High Impact (10 points) | Bicycle/pedestrian facility making intermodal linkages or regional connections to or within a Vermont designated Growth Center, Downtown, New Town Center or Village Center | Pedestrian/bike facility making intermodal linkages or regional connections resulting in the potential for reducing VMT |
|                         | Project that facilitates movement of goods or improves intermodal connectivity to or within a Vermont designated Growth Center, Downtown, New Town Center or Village Center | Clean fuel buses/vehicles and alternative fuel infrastructure |
|                         | Project that benefits areas where 10% or more of the households are below the poverty level | VMT reduction program including transportation demand management and park and ride lots |
|                         | Bridge or other project that maintains connectivity or reduces flood vulnerability in a location with no alternative route for residents or businesses | Transportation project that encourages compact land use or transit oriented development |
| Medium-High Impact (7 points) | Bicycle/pedestrian facility making intermodal linkages or regional connections to or within a CCRPC designated Center, Metro, Enterprise or Village Planning area or municipal designated growth area | Transportation project that reduces stormwater runoff or improves water quality or other stream ecological conditions for impaired waterways |
|                         | Project that facilitates movement of goods or intermodal connectivity to or within a CCRPC designated Center, Metro, Enterprise or Village Planning area or municipal designated growth area | Transportation project that reduces delay at an existing high volume intersection or group of intersections within a Vermont designated Growth Center, Downtown, New Town Center, Village Center, CCRPC designated Center, Metro, Enterprise or Village Planning area or municipal designated growth area |
|                         | Project maintains or improve connectivity on interstate or principal arterial | Transportation project that reduces delay at an existing high volume intersection or group of intersections |
|                         | Bridge or other project that maintains connectivity or reduces flood vulnerability in a location with limited alternative routes for residents or businesses (detour greater than 10 miles) | Necessary bridge or roadway improvements within a Vermont designated Growth Center, Downtown, New Town Center, Village Center, CCRPC designated Center, Metro, Enterprise or Village Planning area or municipal designated growth area |
| Medium Impact (5 points) | Bicycle/pedestrian facility making intermodal linkages or regional connections to or within a locally important activity center | Transportation project that reduces delay at an existing high volume intersection or group of intersections |
|                         | Project that facilitates freight movement or intermodal connectivity to or within a locally important activity center | Necessary bridge or roadway improvements within a Vermont designated Growth Center, Downtown, New Town Center, Village Center, CCRPC designated Center, Metro, Enterprise or Village Planning area or municipal designated growth area |
|                         | Project maintains or improves connectivity on minor arterial or major collector | Necessary bridge or roadway improvements on interstate or principal arterial |
|                         | Project that maintains connectivity and mobility for a rural community including town highway bridges | |
| Low Impact (3 points)   | Project that maintain or improve connectivity on minor arterials or major collectors | Necessary bridge or roadway improvements on minor arterial or major collector |
|                         | | Other project that has a positive effect on the environment, energy use or quality of life in the region |
|                         | | Other bridge improvements |
| No Impact (0 Points)    | No discernible benefits | No discernible benefits |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Characteristics</th>
<th>Planning Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Preservation of Existing System</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| High Impact (10 points) | - Reconstruction, resurfacing or intersection improvement for a project with a documented critical need  
- Bridge structural improvement for a bridge documented to be in danger of being closed or weight restricted (sufficiency rating of less than 25)  
- Reconstruction or resurfacing of an existing pedestrian/bike facility making intermodal linkages or regional connections with a documented significance need | - TDM strategies, programs and incentives including new or expanded park and ride lot that would reduce VMT  
- Traffic signal interconnect or other ITS improvement to reduce congestion  
- Improvement that reduces congestion to roadway, corridors or intersection with significant congestion (V/C over 1.5)  
- Pedestrian/bike facility making intermodal linkages or regional connections resulting in the potential to reduce congestions |
| Medium-High Impact (7 points) | - Reconstruction, resurfacing or intersection improvement for a project with a documented significant need  
- Bridge structural improvement for a bridge with documented significant structural deficiencies (sufficiency rating of 25 – 50)  
- Reconstruction or resurfacing of an existing pedestrian/bike facility with a documented significant need  
- Necessary improvement to an existing park and ride lot | - Improvements that reduces congestion to roadway, corridor or intersection (V/C over 1)  
- New interchange on limited access highway, in a location with significant congestion, to relieve congestion  
- New signals or roundabout where warranted  
- New connections between existing streets to facilitate the use of alternative routes and reduce congestion  
- Necessary improvements to operate existing bridges and roadways on interstate or principal arterial |
| Medium Impact (5 points) | - Reconstruction, resurfacing or intersection improvement for a project with a documented moderate need  
- Bridge structural improvement for a bridge with documented moderate structural deficiencies (sufficiency rating of 50.1-75)  
- Reconstruction or resurfacing of an existing pedestrian/bike facility | - Improvement that reduces congestion to roadway, corridor or intersection (V/C less than 1)  
- Median treatment or access management  
- Bicycle/pedestrian facility making locally important connections resulting in the potential for reducing congestion  
- Improvements that reduce travel time  
- Necessary improvements to operate existing bridges and roadways on minor arterial or major collector |
| Low Impact (3 points) | - Other improvement to the existing transportation system  
- Transportation improvement that has an indirect benefit to the existing transportation system | - Necessary improvements to operate town highway bridges on minor collectors and local roads  
- Other improvements that benefit the transportation system. |
| No Impact (0 Points) | - No discernible benefits | - No discernible benefits |
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## Supplemental Project Information

### Roadway, Traffic Operations & Safety, Paving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>V Trans Priority</th>
<th>Capital Program Status</th>
<th>Planning Designation</th>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>High Crash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US2/Industrial Avenue, Williston</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>Front of Book</td>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>Principal Arterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susie Wilson Road Improvements, Essex -- CIRC ALT PHASE III</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Scoping</td>
<td>Development &amp; Evaluation</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>Major Collector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit 12 Stage 1, Williston - Shared Use Path Under I-89 and New VT2A Lane from Marshall to I-89 Ramp -- CIRC ALT PHASE III</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>Development &amp; Evaluation</td>
<td>State Growth Center</td>
<td>Interstate/ Principal Arterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prim/West Lakeshore Drive Intersection, Colchester - CIRC ALT PHASE III</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>Front of Book</td>
<td>CCRPC Village</td>
<td>Minor Arterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit 12 Stage 3, Williston - Diverging Diamond Interchange -- CIRC ALT PHASE III</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>No funds programmed</td>
<td>Development &amp; Evaluation</td>
<td>State Growth Center</td>
<td>Interstate/ Principal Arterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit 12 Stage 2, Williston - New Grid Streets and at grade intersection -- CIRC ALT PHASE III</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>No funds programmed</td>
<td>Development &amp; Evaluation</td>
<td>State Growth Center</td>
<td>Interstate/ Principal Arterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT2A Improvements, Colchester - CIRC ALT PHASE III</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>No funds programmed</td>
<td>Development &amp; Evaluation</td>
<td>CCRPC Village</td>
<td>Minor Arterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT2A Culvert Rehab, Williston</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>Front of Book</td>
<td>State Growth Center</td>
<td>Principal Arterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit 12 Stage 4, Williston - VT2A Boulevard from grid street to US2 -- CIRC ALT PHASE III</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>No funds programmed</td>
<td>Development &amp; Evaluation</td>
<td>State Growth Center</td>
<td>Principal Arterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT117/North Williston Road Hazard Mitigation, Essex - CIRC ALT PHASE III</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>No funds programmed</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Major Collector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New Capacity

| Crescent Connector                                                    | 1    | 4                | CON                    | Front of Book        | State Village     | Major Collector | Yes |
| Champlain Parkway, Burlington                                         | 2    | 2                | CON                    | Front of Book        | Enterprise/ Metro | Principal Arterial | No |

### Traffic Operations & Safety

| Exit 16, Colchester - CIRC ALT PHASE I                                | 1    | 1                | CON                    | Front of Book        | Enterprise/ Metro | Principal Arterial | Yes |
| Severance Corners, Colchester - CIRC ALT PHASE II                     | 2    | 9                | CON                    | Front of Book        | State Growth Center | Principal Arterial | Yes |
| VT116/CVU Road, Hinesburg                                             | 3    | Safety - Not ranked | CON                    | Front of Book        | CCRPC Village     | Minor Arterial | Yes |
| Shelburne Road Roundabout, Burlington                                 | 4    | Safety - Not ranked | CON                    | Front of Book        | Metro             | Principal Arterial | Yes |
| US7/Middle Road/Railroad Street, Milton                               | 5    | 7                | CON                    | Front of Book        | Center            | Principal Arterial | Yes |
| US2/Trader Lane, Williston                                            | 6    | 10               | CON                    | Front of Book        | State Growth Center | Principal Arterial | No |
| VT2A/Industrial Avenue, Williston - CIRC ALT PHASE III                | 7    | 5                | CON                    | Front of Book        | Suburban          | Principal Arterial | Yes |
| US7/Ferry Road, Charlotte                                             | 8    | 11               | CON                    | Front of Book        | CCRPC Village     | Principal Arterial | Yes |
| VT15/Sand Hill, CIRC ALT PHASE II                                     | 9    | 13               | CON                    | Front of Book        | Suburban          | Principal Arterial | No |
| VT117/North Williston Road, Essex - CIRC ALT PHASE III                | 10   | 14               | CON                    | Front of Book        | Rural             | Principal Arterial | No |
## Supplemental Project Information
### Roadway, Traffic Operations & Safety, Paving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>V Trans Priority Rank</th>
<th>TIP Status</th>
<th>Capital Program Status</th>
<th>Planning Designation</th>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>High Crash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US7/Harbor Road/Falls Road, Shelburne</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Illustrative</td>
<td>Illustrative</td>
<td>State Village</td>
<td>Principal Arterial</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blakely Road/Laker Lane, Colchester - CIRC ALT PHASE III</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>Front of Book</td>
<td>CCRPC Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US7 Signal Upgrades, Shelburne-South Burlington</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Scoping</td>
<td>Front of Book</td>
<td>Center/Suburban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayside Intersection Roundabout, Colchester</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>New - not yet ranked</td>
<td>New Candidate</td>
<td>CCRPC Village</td>
<td>Minor Arterial/Major</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT116/VT2A Intersection, St. George</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>New - not yet ranked</td>
<td>Scoping</td>
<td>Front of Book</td>
<td>CCRPC Village</td>
<td>Principal Arterial/Major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Paving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>V Trans Priority Rank</th>
<th>TIP Status</th>
<th>Capital Program Status</th>
<th>Planning Designation</th>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>High Crash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VT15, Essex-Underhill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>Front of Book</td>
<td>Metro/Suburban/ Rural</td>
<td>Principal/ Minor Arterial</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT15, Underhill-Cambridge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>Front of Book</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Minor Arterial</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US2, Richmond-Bolton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Front of Book</td>
<td>Village/ Rural</td>
<td>Minor Arterial</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CCRPC 2021 Project Prioritization
Town Highway Bridge Pre-Candidate List
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Bridge Details</th>
<th>CCRPC Rank</th>
<th>CCRPC Score</th>
<th>Economic Vitality</th>
<th>Safety and Security</th>
<th>Accessibility, Mobility and Connectivity</th>
<th>Environment, Energy and Quality of Life</th>
<th>Preservation of Existing System</th>
<th>Efficient System Management</th>
<th>VTrans Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHELBURNE</td>
<td>BR7 on Bay Road over the LaPlatte River</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNTINGTON</td>
<td>BR9H on Main Road over Texas Hill Brook north of Texas Hill Road</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNTINGTON</td>
<td>B14 on Main Road over Huntington River</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINESBURG</td>
<td>BR6 on Charlotte Road over the LaPlatte River</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINESBURG</td>
<td>BR9 on Hollow Road over Hollow Brook - south of Hinesburg Hollow Road</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERHILL</td>
<td>BR31 on Green Street</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINESBURG</td>
<td>BR26 on Leavensworth Road over the LaPlatte River</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURLINGTON</td>
<td>BR2 on Queen City Park Road</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHMOND</td>
<td>BR9R on Huntington Road over the Huntington River - north of Mayo Road</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINESBURG</td>
<td>BR11 on Silver Street over Lewis Creek - near Monkton Town Line</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERHILL</td>
<td>BR8 on Pleasant Valley Road over Browns River - north of Beartown Road</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JERICHO</td>
<td>BR13 on Nashville Road over Mill Brook - near Bentley Lane</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOLTON</td>
<td>BR8 on Duxbury Road over Preston Brook</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLCHESTER</td>
<td>BR14 on Colchester Pond Road</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOLTON</td>
<td>BR7 on Cemetery Road over Mill Brook</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNTINGTON</td>
<td>B7H on Main Road over Cobb Brook - south of Charlie Smith Road</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JERICHO</td>
<td>BR 17 on Browns Trace over Lee River - north of Lee River Road</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOLTON</td>
<td>BR15 on Joiner Lane over Joiner Brook</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JERICHO</td>
<td>BR38 on Maconber Place over Lee River</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNTINGTON</td>
<td>BR29 on Charlie Smith Road over Cobb Brook</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Bridge Description</td>
<td>CCRPC Rank</td>
<td>CCRPC Planning Designation</td>
<td>Roadway Functional Class</td>
<td>Condition - Deck/ Superstructure/ Substructure (out of 10)</td>
<td>Detour Length (Miles)</td>
<td>Average Daily Traffic</td>
<td>Federal Sufficiency Rating (out of 100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHELBURNE</td>
<td>BR7 on Bay Road over the LaPlatte River</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Major Collector</td>
<td>5/6/5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNTINGTON</td>
<td>BR9H on Main Road over Texas Hill Brook north of Texas Hill Road</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CCRPC Village</td>
<td>Major Collector</td>
<td>6/6/7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2140</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNTINGTON</td>
<td>B14 on Main Road over Huntington River</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Major Collector</td>
<td>8/6/6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINESBURG</td>
<td>BR6 on Charlotte Road over the LaPlatte River</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CCRPC Village</td>
<td>Major Collector</td>
<td>Culvert - 5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINESBURG</td>
<td>BR9 on Hollow Road over Hollow Brook - south of Hinesburg Hollow Road</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>Major Collector</td>
<td>6/6/6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERHILL</td>
<td>BR31 on Green Street</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>CCRPC Village</td>
<td>Town Road</td>
<td>6/6/7</td>
<td>No alt route</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINESBURG</td>
<td>BR26 on Leavensworth Road over the LaPlatte River</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Town Road</td>
<td>6/5/8</td>
<td>No alt route</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURLINGTON</td>
<td>BR2 on Queen City Park Road</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>Town Road</td>
<td>5/7/7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHMOND</td>
<td>BR9R on Huntington Road over the Huntington River - north of Mayo Road</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Major Collector</td>
<td>7/7/5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2170</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINESBURG</td>
<td>BR11 on Silver Street over Lewis Creek - near Monkton Town Line</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Major Collector</td>
<td>7/7/7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3330</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERHILL</td>
<td>BR8 on Pleasant Valley Road over Browns River - north of Beartown Road</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>CCRPC Village</td>
<td>Major Collector</td>
<td>6/7/7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JERICHO</td>
<td>BR13 on Nashville Road over Mill Brook - near Bentley Lane</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Rural Minor Collector</td>
<td>6/7/6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOLTON</td>
<td>BR8 on Duxbury Road over Preston Brook</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Rural Minor Collector</td>
<td>6/7/7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLCHESTER</td>
<td>BR14 on Colchester Pond Road</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Town Road</td>
<td>7/8/5</td>
<td>No alt route</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOLTON</td>
<td>BR7 on Cemetery Road over Mill Brook</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Town Road</td>
<td>7/5/7</td>
<td>No alt route</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNTINGTON</td>
<td>B7H on Main Road over Cobb Brook - south of Charlie Smith Road</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Major Collector</td>
<td>8/8/7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JERICHO</td>
<td>BR 17 on Browns Trace over Lee River - north of Lee River Road</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Major Collector</td>
<td>6/7/6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2820</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOLTON</td>
<td>BR15 on Joiner Lane over Joiner Brook</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Town Road</td>
<td>5/6/7</td>
<td>No alt route</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JERICHO</td>
<td>BR38 on Macomber Place over Lee River</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Town Road</td>
<td>7/6/5</td>
<td>No alt route</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNTINGTON</td>
<td>BR29 on Charlie Smith Road over Cobb Brook</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Town Road</td>
<td>6/7/7</td>
<td>No alt route</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
March 20, 2019

Agenda Item 7: 2019 Shelburne Comprehensive Plan Approval, Confirmation of Planning Process, and Determination of Energy Compliance

Issues: The Town of Shelburne has requested that the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (1) approve the 2019 Shelburne Comprehensive Plan, (2) confirm its planning process and (3) grant a determination of energy compliance to the 2019 Shelburne Comprehensive Plan. The Plan was adopted by the Selectboard of the Town of Shelburne on February 12, 2019.

As described in the attached proposed resolution, the PAC has held the required hearing, reviewed the Plan in light of these requests, and recommends Board approval at this time. For your information, the staff report to the Planning Advisory Committee regarding approval and confirmation of the plan and the determination of energy compliance is attached. 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 2019 Shelburne Comprehensive Plan, confirm Shelburne’s planning process, and grant an affirmative determination of energy compliance to the 2019 Shelburne Comprehensive Plan.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the CCRPC Board approve the 2019 Shelburne Comprehensive Plan, confirm Shelburne’s planning process, and grant an affirmative determination of energy compliance for the 2019 Shelburne Comprehensive Plan.

Staff Contact: Contact Emily Nosse-Leirer or 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

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 Shelburne, Vermont is a member municipality of this Commission;

WHEREAS, The Town of Shelburne formally requested CCRPC to approve its 2019 Shelburne Comprehensive Plan and confirm its planning process and grant a determination of energy compliance on October 25, 2018;

WHEREAS, the Planning Advisory Committee warned a public hearing on October 22, 2018 and held a public hearing on November 7, 2018 to review the 2019 Shelburne Comprehensive Plan for approval and confirmation of the planning process and 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 the 2019 Shelburne Comprehensive 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 and the minutes of the Planning Advisory Committee, dated November 7, 2018;

WHEREAS, the Planning Advisory Committee reviewed the records and recommended that the Commission grant an affirmative determination of energy compliance to the 2019 Shelburne Comprehensive 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 and the minutes of the Planning Advisory Committee, dated November 7, 2018; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Shelburne Selectboard adopted the 2019 Shelburne Comprehensive Plan on February 12, 2019;

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 2019 Shelburne 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 Shelburne’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 2019 Shelburne Comprehensive Plan.

Dated at Winooski, this 20th day of March, 2019.

CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

______________________________________________
Christopher D. Roy, Chair
The Town of Shelburne has requested, per 24 V.S.A §4350, that the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (1) approve its 2019 Shelburne Comprehensive Plan; and (2) confirm its planning process.

Additionally, the Town of Shelburne has requested that the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission issue a determination of compliance with the enhanced energy planning standards set forth in 24 V.S.A. §4352 for the 2019 Shelburne Vermont Comprehensive Plan.

This draft 2019 Shelburne Comprehensive Plan is an update and re-adoption of the 2014 Shelburne Comprehensive Plan, as amended in 2016. In accordance with statute, re-adoption means that this is a fully compliant plan that will expire eight years after adoption by the Selectboard. CCRPC reviewed the 2014 plan and met with Shelburne staff to discuss it in March 2017 as part of an informal review and consultation process. The 2019 Shelburne Comprehensive Plan addresses several new required elements, provides updated data, addresses recent changes to the community and includes an enhanced energy plan. Staff have completed this formal review of the plan and review of the plan against the Vermont Department of Public Service’s Energy Planning Standards for Municipal Plans in advance of the Planning Commission’s November 15, 2018 hearing on the plan.

**Confirming and Approving the Municipal Plan**

Following the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission’s (CCRPC’s) *Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans* (2018) and the statutory requirements of 24 V.S.A. Chapter 117, I have reviewed the draft 2019 Shelburne Comprehensive 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 2018 Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the *2018 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 2019 Shelburne Comprehensive 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 2019 Shelburne Comprehensive Plan is consistent with the specific goals of §4302 with the exception of Goal 6B (see comment below). See the attached Appendix A submittal that describes how the Plan is consistent with these goals. **Addressed**
3. The 2019 Shelburne Comprehensive 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 2019 Shelburne Comprehensive Plan is generally compatible with the planning areas, goals and strategies of the 2018 Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan.

5. The 2019 Shelburne Comprehensive Plan is compatible with the municipal plans for Charlotte, Hinesburg, St. George, Williston and South Burlington.

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

Changes Needed to Meet Statutory Requirements
7. Act 64 became effective in 2015 and added the following to the state planning goals:
   (6) (B) Vermont’s water quality should be maintained and improved according to the policies and actions developed in the basin plans established by the Secretary of Natural Resources under 10 V.S.A. § 1253.

   Shelburne is in both the Northern Lake Champlain Basin and the Winooski Basin, so a reference to both of those Tactical Basin Plans is needed. This could be as simple as adding a reference to the plans in one of your actions, such as Action 2.5, which discusses water quality more broadly.

   The reference was added in the final draft of the plan.

Additional Comments/Questions:

The format of this plan is unique, with very little text narrative about each topic. However, there is a large amount of data provided in the appendices, as well as dozens of maps showing current conditions. The plan is very focused on implementation items, which often include explanations or relevant context for the related actions. There are multiple places where plans are incorporated by reference to provide additional context and support. In a future draft, it would be useful to have links to these plans in the PDF.

Enhanced Energy Plan Review
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 draft Comprehensive Plan to determine whether:

8. The Comprehensive 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.

9. The Comprehensive 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.

10. The Comprehensive 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</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Plan duly adopted and approved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Necessary for final determination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Submit a copy of the adopted plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Necessary for final determination</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>Addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.b. Report 2025, 2035 and 2050 targets for energy use</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Addressed</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>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Municipal enhanced energy plans are required to estimate current energy use across transportation, heating and electric sectors (Standard 5A). The plan as drafted does not contain estimates of current energy use. However, the energy data guide provided by CCRPC in February 2018 does contain 2015 estimates (Table A1-A5). Including these data will meet this requirement.

*Added in the final draft of the plan.*

13. Municipal energy plans are required to report targets for renewable electricity generation (Standard 5B). Meeting this standard requires stating the renewable energy generation target for Shelburne. CCRPC set high and low targets for the county and for each municipality. Shelburne’s targets can be found in the energy data guide provided by CCRPC in February 2018 (Table C3). Based on that analysis Shelburne does have sufficient land for renewable energy development. Current generation is 4,648 MWh annually. The high target for future generation is an additional 42,934 MWh annually by 2050. With just areas defined as “prime solar,” Shelburne could produce an additional 66,835 MWh annually. This area excludes “local constraints” that are included in the ECOS Plan at the Town’s request: significant view areas, archaeologically sensitive areas and the lakeshore buffer. Including this information will meet this requirement.

*Added in the final draft of the plan.*

14. Municipal enhanced energy plans are required to evaluate generation from existing renewable energy generation in the municipality (Standard 9A). The plan as drafted does not contain an estimate of existing renewable energy generation. However, the energy data guide provided by CCRPC in February 2018 do contain information on existing generation (Table A6). Including these data will meet this requirement.

*Added in the final draft of the plan.*

**Additional Comments/Questions:**

The changes discussed above are the only changes necessary for the comprehensive plan to be granted an affirmative determination of energy compliance. However, the changes discussed below would improve the plan’s efficacy.

15. Certified municipal enhanced energy plans gain substantial deference for their land use policies. According to 30 VSA §248, “‘substantial deference’ means that a land conservation measure or specific policy shall be applied in accordance with its terms unless there is a clear and convincing demonstration that other factors affecting the general good of the State outweigh the application of the measure or policy.” This plan includes siting policies regarding proactively weighing in on applications on formerly developed sites that the town supports. Enhanced energy plans are required to have siting policies, and this policy meets that requirement. **However, if the town’s intent is to also identify resource areas where development (including renewable energy generation) should NOT go, CCRPC anticipates the current policy language will not be sufficient.**
a. There are a number of places in the plan where more clarity would be useful in PUC proceedings. For example, Future Land Use Objective 2 (page 21) is “Identify and exclude from development locations with significant constraints or hazards, including wet or unstable soils, flood hazard areas, and steep slopes. Conserve those resources identified on maps specifically identified in the Natural and Scenic Resources section of this Plan.” This policy would probably be stronger if it defined what wet or unstable soils are/which mapped elements they correspond to, whether the 1% and/or the 0.2% annual chance floodplain are affected, and what percentage of slope is considered a steep slope (all slopes are mapped).

b. There are a number of places where policies protecting resources are written in a way that specifically excludes the PUC process. For example, Natural and Scenic Resources and Land Conservation Action 1.4 states “…Require that any subdivision or development of property subject to Act 250 review and containing prime agricultural soils or soils of statewide significance in the Rural District protect, minimize or mitigate the disturbance to those productive soils.” Limiting this to Act 250 development seems to exclude this policy from applying to projects before the PUC, which is fine if that is the intent. CCRPC staff can provide additional assistance with these policies if desired.

Not addressed, but not required for a determination of energy compliance.

16. Municipal enhanced energy plans are required to demonstrate the municipality’s leadership by example with respect to the efficiency of municipal transportation (Standard 7E). The plan meets this requirement by including a discussion of installing electric vehicle charging infrastructure in municipal parking lots. However, consider strengthening this requirement by discussing possible efficiency upgrades for town-owned vehicles.

Not addressed, but not required for a determination of energy compliance.

Proposed Motion & Next Steps:

PROPOSED MOTION: The PAC finds that the draft 2019 Shelburne Comprehensive Plan, with the addition of a reference to the Northern Lake Champlain Tactical Basin Plan and the Winooski Tactical Basin Plan, meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC approval, and that the municipality’s planning process meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC confirmation. Addressed

The PAC also finds that the draft 2019 Shelburne Comprehensive Plan will meet the requirements of the enhanced energy planning standards (“determination”) set forth in 24 V.S.A. §4352 with the addition of the data described in #10-12 above. Addressed

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. If staff determines that the required data and reference have not been added, or that substantive changes have been made, the materials 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, confirmation, and an affirmative determination of energy compliance.
CCRPC Board – March 20, 2019

Agenda Item 8: Act 250 Recommendations

Additional Act 250 Position Statements

At present, we have two additional positions we’d like to discuss. The large Act 250 Commission bill (Committee Bill 19-0040, Draft 5.2, 1/23/2019) includes a provision requiring that, in order to be used in Act 250, local and regional plans must be approved as consistent with the statutory planning goals. Vermont Planners Association (VPA) sums up the proposed provision as follows:

- This is a positive change. Most local plans do get approved by the regional planning commission to this same standard in order to ensure municipal eligibility for certain State grants. However, this change will provide further incentive for municipalities to seek plan review and approval.

- Since regional plans have no existing approval process, the bill needs to establish the right review/approval entity. The bill proposes that the new Environmental Board serve this function, but we recommend an alternative model. Just as importantly, the bill needs to address how regional plans will be factored into Act 250 review in the interim – i.e., prior to approval of all the regional plans.

- The bill also needs to flesh out an appeal process for these approvals. Existing statute (Title 24, Chapter 117, Section 4476) provides an appeal process for decisions by regional planning commissions (i.e., approval of local plans). Unfortunately, this section of statute needs to be updated because it references an appellate body (the “regional review panel”) that is defined in another section of statute (section 4305) that was repealed.

For your information, under current statute, when Regional Plans are amended or re-written, RPC’s are already required to provide 30 day notice of the public hearing to the Agency of Commerce and Community Development, Agency of Natural Resources, and the Agency of Agriculture.

Therefore, Staff suggests two additional position statements, which are in line with VPA’s recommendations. The ad hoc Act 250 Committee reviewed these at their March 13th meeting, and provided edits that have been incorporated. The Executive Committee will also review these statements immediately before the March 20th Board meeting. The existing position paper with these modified additions are attached.

For questions, contact Charlie Baker, 846-4490 ext. *23 or cbaker@ccrpcvt.org
Recommendations for Improving Vermont’s Act 250 Permitting System
Approved by CCRPC Board on February 20, 2019

Act 47 (in 2017) created a commission of six legislators to “review the vision for Act 250 adopted in the 1970s and its implementation with the objective of ensuring that, over the next 50 years, Act 250 supports Vermont’s economic, environmental, and land use planning goals.” CCRPC has reviewed the work of this Commission and offers the following general positions intended to make Act 250 more effective and efficient.

1. CCRPC encourages the Legislature to ensure a **predictable and coordinated review process** that minimizes inconsistency and duplication at all levels of review and puts those reviews in the most appropriate hands so environmental protection is not compromised, and housing, transportation and economic development is not unnecessarily time-consuming and expensive.

2. In general, the state permit process should **encourage development in appropriately planned places** and discourage development outside of those areas. Therefore, CCRPC strongly supports the concept that Act 250 should not have jurisdiction in areas planned for growth to encourage affordable housing and economic investment in our smart growth areas: walkable, transit-friendly, water and sewer-serviced areas. However, the **enhanced designation concept** as proposed is unworkable for the following reasons:

   a. It builds on an overly complex designation system that puts existing growth into a variety of unnecessary silos and does not adequately capture planned future growth areas. The existing designation system, of which there are five designations, should be overhauled into a comprehensive growth strategy rather than continue to build upon it with a sixth designation. Improving and possibly expanding existing designations is better than creating new designations.

   b. It is not a true Act 250 release; it merely shifts the burden of all the Act 250 criteria to the municipal level. Instead, we should support existing local planning and Downtown Board efforts to designate these areas as places for housing and economic development, acknowledge the greater environmental benefit of clustering growth into areas with existing infrastructure, and **not** enforce Act 250 criteria that were originally intended to minimize and mitigate indirect and cumulative impacts of major development.

   c. The current geographic boundaries of the designation programs are unnecessarily limited. As an example, the Village and Downtown designations are narrowly focused on commercial and civic uses and exclude redevelopment and infill in existing neighborhoods surrounding Villages and Downtowns. The Downtown Board should analyze each individual area on its merits as a smart growth area, and there should be incentives to improve existing sprawl areas.

   d. The Growth Center and Neighborhood Development Area designations come with an affordable housing requirement, and this should not be lost under a new structure.

   e. It adds an appeal process that the current designation programs don’t have. If an appeal process is a necessary component, add that to the current designations rather than creating a new one.

   f. The proposed bill will be a significant expansion of Act 250 jurisdiction, including expansion into areas where development is appropriate, such as existing neighborhoods surrounding centers; and the enhanced designation concept will not solve that problem.
3. CCRPC supports the concept of **resource area protections** and the acknowledgement that Act 250 jurisdiction should be triggered by location in areas of statewide interest, regardless of project size (even single-family home developments); however, there needs to be more work done to identify and define these resources. There may also be resources that would be better regulated through a separate permit.

4. Act 250 permitting should rely more on **conceptual/sketch plans** and capacity analysis as opposed to engineer-sealed plans with more detail. Land Use Permits should include conditions of obtaining the other more detailed permits (stormwater, wastewater, etc.). This would ensure a more resident-friendly, efficient and less costly state permitting process, helping to reach affordable housing, transportation and economic development goals. In addition, CCRPC supports the master planning process for phased developments.

5. CCRPC believes that any mapping established to define jurisdiction, and particularly growth areas, in Act 250 should be based not only on state-level maps, but also on **mapping in local and regional plans** due to the extensive public participation involved in their development. There may also be resources that should be considered by Act 250 that are not identified on state-level maps.

6. CCRPC asks that the Legislature either work out **further details** before adopting new concepts or hold until further details are worked out (e.g. greenhouse gas mitigation fee). The development costs of some of these concepts could be substantial and would exacerbate existing inflated housing costs for Vermonters. New concepts should be more thoroughly considered before adoption. Further, all the fees should be comprehensively reviewed to understand the impact on development costs, particularly considering the goal of smart growth development.

7. CCRPC encourages the Legislature to consider a **phased approach** to implementing the new jurisdiction paradigm. If it moves forward, it will greatly expand the reach of Act 250, and could greatly disrupt the market. It would be best to first allow municipalities to apply for and obtain the enhanced designation before the greater rural development restrictions are implemented.

8. CCRPC supports an **appeals** process that allows coordination or consolidation of appeals of various municipal and state permits to one entity to ensure consistency in decision-making and prevent unaligned requirements between Environmental Court and the proposed re-invigorated Environmental Resource Board decisions.

9. CCRPC supports the position of the Vermont Planners Association regarding **regional plan approvals** which is to modify the bill language so that regional plans are reviewed and approved by a Development Cabinet¹, or some similar instrument of the State, that is expanded for this function to include representatives with planning expertise – e.g., directors of two adjacent regional planning commissions, a representative from the VT Planners Association, and a representative from the VT Association of Planning and Development Agencies.

10. Clarify and add to existing statute (Title 24, Chapter 117, Section 4476) to make the existing Environmental Court hear **appeals for regional plan approvals and for regional approval and/or confirmation of local plans** and the local planning process.

---

¹ While not active, the Development Cabinet is in statute (3 V.S.A. § 2293) for the purpose of collaboration and consultation among State agencies and departments. As described in statute it consists of the Secretaries of the Agencies of Administration, of Agriculture, Food and Markets, of Commerce and Community Development, of Education, of Natural Resources, and of Transportation. The Governor or the Governor’s designee shall chair the Development Cabinet.
March 8, 2019

Stephanie H. Monaghan
District #4 Coordinator
111 West Street
Essex Junction, VT 05495

RE: JJJ South Burlington, LLC (Cider Mill II); South Burlington; Application #4C1128-5

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 an amendment to the development known at Cider Mill II. This amendment involves increasing the amount of residential units from 109 to 142. The additional 33 units will be added to the previously proposed Phase IV area designated for “Future Development.” The amendment received approval from the City of South Burlington’s Development Review Board on November 26, 2018. **We offer the following comments:**

The project is located within the Suburban 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 Suburban 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 proposed to be served by municipal water and sewer service, and is located within 0.25 miles of a GMT transit route on Hinesburg Road (though it is approximately 1.0 mile from an existing bus stop).
3. The density and uses are consistent with the local regulations.

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

We also find that this project meets the requirements of Criterion 9(L). We find that this area does not meet the exact definition of “existing settlement” . Therefore, under Criterion 9(L), the applicant must show that any project outside an existing settlement:

i. Makes efficient use of land, energy, roads, utilities and other infrastructure, and either:
   ii. Will not contribute to strip development, or
   iii. If the project is “confined to” existing strip development, it incorporates infill and minimizes the characteristics of strip development.

Because this project is located within the municipal water and sewer service area, is clustered close to Cider Mill I and the previously approved dwelling units of Cider Mill II, and is compact in design, we find that this proposed project is making efficient use of land, energy, roads, utilities and other infrastructure. Second, we find that this proposed project is residential and therefore not contributing to strip development.

The Traffic Impact Assessment Addendum revised 12/4/2017 conducted by Lamoureux & Dickinson Consulting Engineers, Inc was reviewed. We concur with its findings and support the monitoring conditions set forth.
concerning the VT-116 intersections of Cheesefactory Road and Nadeaucrest Drive.

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
March 11, 2019

Sarah Shaw
SunCommon Commercial Project Assistant
442 US Route 2
Waterbury, VT 05676

RE: Petition for SunCommon/Green Mountain Power Corporation’s Proposed 150kW Solar Canopy at 163 Acorn Lane, Colchester, VT (#19-0385-AN)

Dear Ms. Shaw,

Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission has received the advance notice of a Section 248 Petition to be filed with the Vermont Public Utility Commission for a 150kW solar canopy at 163 Acorn Lane in Colchester, 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.

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

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

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

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

The 2018 ECOS Plan strongly supports the building of renewable energy facilities on areas that are already impacted, including rooftops and parking lots. Therefore, the location of this project meets the suitability policies of the 2018 ECOS Plan.

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

This project will be located on an existing parking lot. Therefore, CCRPC finds that this project complies with the siting constraint policies in the ECOS Plan.

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

Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Charlie Baker
Executive Director

cc: CCRPC Board
    Sarah Hadd, Colchester Director of Planning and Zoning
March 11, 2019

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

RE: Petition for Aegis Renewable Energy/Buttermilk LLC’s Proposed 128kW Combined Rooftop and Solar Carport Facility Project at 74 Jolina Court in Richmond, VT (Case #19-0452-NM)

Dear Mr. Behn:

Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission has received the notice of a Section 248 Petition filed with the Vermont Public Utility Commission for a 128kW solar project at 74 Jolina Court in Richmond, Vermont. We understand that this case is a refiling that combines two separately filed projects on the same site. CCRPC previously submitted supportive comments on the solar carport portion of this application (#18-1391-AN). 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.

**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 advances the following suitability policies:

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

The 2018 ECOS Plan strongly supports the building of renewable energy facilities on areas that are already impacted, including rooftops and parking lots. Therefore, the location of this project meets the suitability policies of the 2018 ECOS Plan.

**Constraints**

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

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

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

Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Charlie Baker
Executive Director

cc: CCRPC Board
    Jessica E. Draper, Richmond Town Planner
DATE: Wednesday, March 6, 2019
TIME: 9:00 a.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal St. Winooski, VT

Members Present
Lisa Schaeffler, Williston
Brian Bigelow, Underhill
Jon Rauscher, Winooski
Amy Bell, VTrans
Nicole Losch, Burlington
Allegra Williams, Local Motion
Richard Watts, Hinesburg
Matt Langham, VTrans
Chris Jolly, FHWA
David Allerton, Milton
Dennis Lutz, Essex
Mary Anne Michaels, Rail
Larry Lackey, Burlington Airport
Dean Bloch, Charlotte
Josh Arneson, Richmond

1. Consent Agenda
DEAN BLOCH MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY RICHARD WATTS, TO REMOVE THE
CHAMPLAIN PARKWAY TIP AMENDMENT FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA AND TO TAKE
ACTION ON THAT AFTER HEARING BURLINGTON’S PRESENTATION ON THAT PROJECT.
THE MOTION PASSED.

AMY BELL MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BRIAN BIGELOW, TO APPROVE THE TIP
AMENDMENT ITEMS DESCRIBED IN AGENDA MEMO 1A. THE MOTION PASSED.

2. Approval of Minutes
NICOLE LOSCH MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY RICHARD WATTS, TO APPROVE THE
MINUTES OF JANUARY 8, 2019. THE MOTION PASSED.

3. Public Comments
None.

4. Champlain Parkway and Other Burlington Projects
Susan Molzon of Burlington Public Works briefed the TAC on the status of this long-planned project.
She identified the DPW project team, illustrated the compete layout from I-189 west, then north to
Lakeside, then to Pine north to Main Street. She next provided cross section views from eight sections
along the corridor. Currently final design plans are being prepared and all necessary permits are in
hand or applications are under review. The current schedule sees construction going out to bid this
coming spring and construction starting this fall. The project is expected to be complete in fall 2021.
Susan concluded with a screenshot of the project website identifying the various information resource
links. Topics of discussion that followed included, parking impacts, truck routes, project cost, signals,
court appeals status and right-of-way acquisition status. Nicole Losch then presented the TAC with other
Burlington projects and initiatives, including Great Streets, bikeshare expansion, parklet pilot program, quick build and others.

Returning to the topic of TIP amendment for the Champlain Parkway project, DEAN BLOCH MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE TIP AMENDMENT AS RECOMMENDED IN MEMO 1B. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY RICHARD WATTS AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

5. Water Quality Update
Chris Dubin provided updates on the CCRPCs efforts in assisting Municipalities meet Municipal Roads General Permit (MRGP) goals through inventory work, reporting, and various grant programs. In particular, items discussed were:
- Outlet mapping, criticality for correct methodology, and impacts to MRGP compliance
- Grants in Aid Program plan for outstanding FY19 work in Chittenden County
- DEC MRGP reporting form and inventory completion dates.
- Upcoming field season game plan for CCRPC field technicians.

6. Project Prioritization
Christine Forde presented the latest version of this process that has been on-going for over 10 years. She first provided background information contrasting the VTrans Capital Program with CCRPC’s Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and noting the different program categories in the Capital Program. Each year the Vermont Legislature requires that projects in the State’s Transportation Capital Program be prioritized. The numerical grading system assigns a priority rating to all paving, roadway, safety and traffic operations, state bridge, interstate bridge, and town highway bridge projects. The rating system consists of two separate components:

1. An asset management-based factor which is objective and quantifiable with data provided by VTrans.
2. A priority rating system focusing on functional importance taking into consideration several factors and established by Regional Planning Commissions.

Christine provided the details that go into each of the components, identifying categories and point assignments. Also taken into consideration is where the project falls in the TIP. Typically, projects that score well are those that:
- access designated growth areas, airport, tourism facilities
- improve safety in a location with a document safety problem
- are bicycle/pedestrian facilities making intermodal, regional connection or accessing designated growth areas
- Are reconstruction projects with critical need
- Improve corridors with significant congestion

Dennis Lutz would like to see a plan for projects to “move up the food chain” from scoping onto the TIP. Currently, scoped projects can languish before moving on to an implementation phase with no clear guidance on how to move forward. He suggested Towns should formalize a process, sending a letter post-scoping requesting the RPC add the project to the TIP. Following this step, those scoped projects should also be prioritized. Christine responded noting that the CCRPC will report on all scoped projects and their current status.

Following discussion, DENNIS LUTZ MADE A MOTION THE TAC APPROVE THE 2021 PRIORITIZATION AND FORWARD TO THE CCRPC BOARD. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY DEAN BLOCH AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
7. Future TAC Agenda Items
Peter reported that staff had recently started to find it a challenge to fill the agendas for the monthly meetings and felt that soliciting TAC members could produce some timely and informative topics to consider for future meetings. Suggested topics from members both present and via email included:
- VTrans On-Road Bike Plan updates
- New paving techniques
- I-89 Corridor study land use modeling
- Congressional action on transportation related bills
- Recent data gathering technology and its analytical uses

For the next two TAC meetings we will also have the FY2020 draft UPWP up for discussion and action.

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

9. CCRPC January and February Board Meetings Report
Peter noted that the Board approved the mid-year adjustment to the FY19 UPWP in January and in February heard the presentation on Burlington projects.

10. Chairman’s/Members’ Items
Amy Bell noted that VTrans is in the process of synchronizing road standards and that there had been a spirited discussion on this topic with regional planners last month. There will be a draft of new standards shortly with a deadline for comments of April 26th.

AMY BELL MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY NICOLE LOSCH, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. THE MOTION PASSED.

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 AM.

Respectfully submitted, Peter Keating
1. **Call to Order.** The meeting was called to order by Annie Costandi at 11:00 a.m.

2. **Changes to the Agenda** No changes were made. Dan distributed a “get well soon” card for signature to be delivered to Jim Pease.

3. **Review and action on draft minutes of February 5, 2019**

   After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, James Sherrard made a motion, seconded by Jenna Olson to approve the minutes as drafted. MOTION PASSED with abstention by Jessica Draper.

4. **Water Quality Legislative Update: S.96**

   Charlie Baker briefed the committee. S.96 seeks to set up a mechanism for regional decision-making on selection, funding and implementation of projects to address phosphorus-reduction efforts outside of that required by permits/regulations. Estimates are that this represents 10-20 percent of overall needed reduction to meet the Lake Champlain TMDL that would come from voluntary, non-regulatory efforts. This bill does not address how to raise the needed funds which would be managed/distributed on a watershed basis with RPCs acting as administrators in consultation with a watershed council. Both he and James Sherrard testified to Senate Natural Resources Committee on the bill.

   Concerns include: the lack of funds for Operation & Maintenance; no reference to existing stormwater utilities, the implied legal penalties on RPCs should pollution reduction goals fail to be met, doesn’t address funding for almost all projects within an MS-4 community as they fall under a regulatory requirement (MS4, FRP, PCP, MRGP, 3-acre, etc.), doesn’t address most agricultural projects either, how would RPCs make sure work is getting done and being operated and maintained properly if they don’t have regulatory authority.

   On the positive side, there is recognition that funding needs to get on the ground and that the role of partners such as RPCs can be enhanced. Dan noted that the bill recognizes the role of RPCs as facilitators, administrators and grant managers.

   James Sherrard noted that legislators want to hear from people with “on-the-ground” knowledge. If you call up the staff of the various committees and ask to testify there’s a good chance you can. Charlie indicated that the House Natural Resources Committee will be starting from scratch. Cross-over is March
22nd and more information will be known by then on how this bill will fare as well as separate efforts to raise funds for water quality projects.

5. **Updates.**
   a. **MRGP Planning Report and Grants-in-Aid**
      Dan and Eleni noted that all municipalities can report that their Road Erosion Inventory as completed. Check in with Chris Dubin at CCRPC if you need to know the year of completion. No word yet on new grants in aid funds for next fiscal year.
   b. **Jim Pease, medical update**
      Dan reported that he spoke with Jim Pease yesterday and he sounded good. Jim called because he saw his name on the agenda! Jim said he is recovering well but he is at least a month away from returning to work. Dan plans to visit Jim this afternoon at Fanny Allen and deliver the card to him.

6. **Items for April 2nd meeting agenda.**
   - Jim Ryan will present on how MRGP standards may be addressed within the planned update to VTRAN’s “Town Road and Bridge Standards.”
   - Legislative update

7. **Adjournment.** The meeting adjourned at 12:07 p.m.

   Respectfully submitted, Dan Albrecht
CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
MS4 SUBCOMMITTEE
OF CLEAN WATER ADVISORY COMMITTEE – DRAFT MINUTES

DATE: Wednesday, March 6, 2019
SCHEDULED TIME: 12:15 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT
DOCUMENTS: Minutes, documents, and presentations discussed accessible at:
http://www.ccrpcvt.org/meetings/clean-water-advisory-committee/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Members in Attendance</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burlington: Jenna Olson</td>
<td>Burlington Airport: Larry Lackey, Doug Campbell (Stantec)</td>
<td>Williston: James Sherrard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester: Karen Adams, Andrew Douglas</td>
<td>Milton: Dave Allerton</td>
<td>Winooski: Tim Grover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex: Annie Costandi, Co-Chair</td>
<td>Shelburne: Chris Robinson</td>
<td>VAOT: Tyler Hanson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Junction:</td>
<td>South Burlington: Tom DiPietro</td>
<td>Univ. of VT: Claire Forbes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC: Christy Witters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Attendees: WNRCD: Kristen Balschunat;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCRPC Staff: Dan Albrecht</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Call to Order and Changes to the Agenda**: Annie Costandi called the meeting to order at 12:27 p.m. Kristen will provide a Stream Team status update.

2. **Review and action on draft minutes of February 6, 2019**
   - After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, Chris Robinson made a motion, seconded by James Sherrard to approve the minutes as drafted. **MOTION PASSED with no abstentions.**

3. **2018 Annual Report materials**
   - a. **Review & approve final MCM#1 2018 Calendar Year report**
     - Dan provided a brief recap. Karen Adams made a motion, seconded by Chris Robinson to approve the report as presented. **MOTION PASSED.**
   - b. **Update: Stream Team 2018 Water Quality Sampling report**
     - Kristen noted that as her boss, Gianna, has a good background in statistics that she is adding in an additional analysis to the report. Annie indicated that a draft will be circulated by March 15th and members will have 1 week to provide any comments. Once that is done, Dan will circulate the WQ report as well PDFs of the MCM#1 and MCM#2 reports to member for use in their Annual Reports.

4. **DEC 2018 MS4 Annual Report Form**
   - Christy Witters recapped the various elements of the form. Several members praised her efforts.

5. **Elements of a First Annual PCP report**
   - Christy indicated as long as MS4 permittees check the box regarding Road Erosion Inventory on their 2018 MS4 Annual Report form, this will meet their obligation to file their first Annual PCP report.

6. **Updates**
   - a. **Stream Team**: Kristen indicated that February was quiet. She is working with Dave Barron of Pluck on website update and handouts which will roll out in April. Drafts of the rack card and flyers look good. The rack card containing simple messaging while, if a person wants more detailed information, they will get that from the flyer. She and Dave are also working on a “seed card” to distribute.

7. **Items for Tuesday, April 2nd meeting**
   - Final MCM#1 report, Final RRST WQ Summary Report; DEC template for MS4 reporting

8. **Adjournment**
   - The meeting adjourned at 12:48 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Dan Albrecht
FY2020 UPWP Committee Meeting 2  
February 21, 2019  
Location: O’Brien Community Center, Winooski

Attendees:  
Mike O’Brien, Committee Chair  
Amy Bell, VTrans  
Chris Jolly, FHWA  
John Zicconi, Board  
Michael Bissonnette, Board  
Jeff Bartley, Board  
Barbara Elliot, TAC  
Jessica Draper, PAC  
Charlie Baker, CCRPC  
Eleni Churchill, CCRPC  
Regina Mahony, CCRPC  
Forest Cohen, CCRPC  
Marshall Distel, CCRPC

- Committee Chair Mike O’Brien opened the meeting at 5:37 p.m.  
- Introductions were made.  
- The minutes from the first UPWP Committee meeting were reviewed and approved with no changes. John Zicconi made the motion and Jeff Bartley seconded.  
- Eleni Churchill introduced the second draft of the UPWP project spreadsheet to the Committee. Projects highlighted in red signify a recommended deletion by CCRPC staff; blue signifies a change from the previous spreadsheet; yellow signifies an outstanding question.  
- The budget for the Chittenden County Freight Plan was reduced to $40,000 after Eleni coordinated with VTrans.  
- The Prioritization of Regional Bike/Ped Connections, Model Parking Guidelines and the Regional Park and Ride Plan were recommended to be removed by CCRPC staff because of budget constraints. These will be reevaluated at mid-year.  
- The Water Quality Transportation task was reduced from $100,000 to $40,000 because sufficient funding for water quality projects is being directed to the municipalities through individual project requests as part of the UPWP process.  
- Chris Jolly asked about the status of current park and ride projects. The Exit 16 park and ride was completed, and coordination is taking place to evaluate options around Exit 17. Amy Bell suggested that since there aren’t many park and ride projects in the pipeline, this task should see a higher level of prioritization. Eleni said that a consensus was made by staff to wait until GMT updates their new transit routes prior to moving forward with an update to the Park and Ride Plan.  
- The Regional Energy Assistance task was changed to staff time only.  
- The E&D budget was reduced further because this task is just a placeholder for now. John Zicconi asked about how this task relates to the current United Way project. Charlie Baker mentioned that this is intended to be a follow up to that work.  
- The 150,000 budget is still the best estimate that CCRPC staff have for the FY20 phase of the I-89 Project. There will be better information for the next meeting.  
- Way to Go! is a new addition that was not included on the original spreadsheet.  
- Marshall Distel brought up Dean Pierce’s comment about whether the Multiuse Path Connecting Williston to South Burlington should be a regional project. Amy Bell said that this link was identified as a regional priority within the Active Transportation Plan.  
- The Winooski Ave task was removed because no new funds are being requested for FY20.
• Eleni described the ongoing conversation with Burlington about the ROW inventory request. At the request of CCRPC staff, Burlington provided three new cost proposals with assessment areas every 500 feet versus every 200 feet. The UPWP Committee would like CCRPC staff to clarify the difference in cost between doing two wards and one ward within a single fiscal year.
• Burlington’s Lake Street request was changed to a feasibility study rather than a scoping study.
• The budget for the Colchester Avenue project was reduced to $60,000 from $85,000 after discussions with Burlington. If safety funding becomes available from VTrans, this project would become a higher priority for Burlington.
• The cost proposals for the Essex and Essex Junction stormwater inventory projects were lowered to $45,000 each because the cleaning of the pipes was removed from the proposal.
• The description of the Tanglewood Drive Project was updated to reflect the need to complete scoping.
• CCRPC staff clarified the scope of the Stormwater Project Conceptual Design task with Richmond, VTrans and FHWA.
• The UPWP Committee discussed the procurement issues with UVM’s Chittenden County Bus Commuter Ridership Pilot Project. After discussions with VTrans and UVM, there may be a way forward through the use of a cooperative agreement. Questions were raised about how this new request would relate to the Route 116 request from FY19. Marshall Distel conveyed that UVM held a meeting with GMT and CATMA to discuss the development of this project. Both GMT and CATMA expressed support for the project and recognized the regional benefits. John Zicconi expressed concerns about the project and the process. Michael Bissonnette informed the Committee that he has not seen final results from the first study. Amy Bell suggested that if UPWP funds were granted to UVM, then that might open the door to numerous other entities, other than the traditional TDM partners, requesting UPWP funds. Mike O’Brien asked if there was a consensus to remove this task from the UPWP. The Committee agreed to remove this request from the draft UPWP and to reconsider at mid-year after the final results are made available from the Route 116 project.
• The VEIC budget was cut down to $30,000.
• Charlie Baker outlined the next steps. At the third UPWP Committee meeting on 3/21, CCRPC staff will present a full draft of the FY20 UPWP.
• Marshall Distel provided the Committee with a funding overview of the FY18-FY20 UPWP requests. Water quality requests have been increasing, while traditional transportation-related studies have been decreasing. Marshall Distel also mentioned that Bryan Davis had prepared an overview spreadsheet of partner requests and deliverables. A link will be sent by email to the Committee members.
• John Zicconi made a motion to adjourn the meeting, with a second from Michael Bissonnette. The meeting adjourned at 6:37.

Respectfully submitted,

Marshall Distel
Brownfields Advisory Committee Minutes
Monday, February 11, 2019, 3:00pm – 4:00pm

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

Committee Members:
Curt Carter, GBIC (Chair)
Matt Vaughan, Lake Champlain Basin Program

CCRPC Staff
Dan Albrecht, Senior Planner
Jason Charest, Senior Transportation Planner
Emily Nosse-Leirer, Senior Planner

Other Attendees:
Steve Shaw, Weston and Sampson
Lori Hayes, Property Owner at Champlain Chiropractic
Kathi O'Reilly, Town of Colchester, Director of Economic Development
Dave Allerton, Town of Milton, Public Works Director
Kurt Mueller, Johnson Co.
Miles Waite, Waite-Heindel (via phone)
Robin Pierce, Village of Essex Junction, Community Development Director
Lee Rosberg, Stone Environmental

1. **Call to Order, Introductions and Changes to the Agenda**
   The meeting was called to order at 3:00pm.

2. **Public comments on items not on the Agenda**
   Lori asked staff to look into mistakes in the recurring calendar appointment on the CCRPC website.

3. **Review and action on 10/1, 11/2, 6 12/19 and 1/22 meeting summaries**
   An email was sent by Dan to members the week prior to this meeting asking them to review and if needed, suggest edits/corrections prior to today. None were received. *The summaries were approved by consensus.*

4. **Action on Site Nominations/Assistance Requests**
   **Essex Junction: Road ResQ, amendment to Site Participation Agreement**
   Dan reported that VT DEC has advised CCRPC to try to use hazardous funds to pay for the Phase I ESA, rather than petroleum funds given uncertainty about the financial viability of the prior owner (Bushey). VT DEC indicated they would be receptive to authorizing the use of CCRPC’s Petroleum funds for work beyond the Phase I if needed. Miles Waite wondered if the purchase agreement between Handy and Bushey would have included a clause indemnifying him of future liability, but no one knew the answer. CCRPC has submitted a request to the EPA to use hazardous materials funding and has not heard back yet.
Dan gave an overview of proposed changes to the participation agreement and reported that Pablo Bose had indicated his support as well. The committee members agreed with the minor edits.

**Colchester: Champlain Chiro (Weston & Sampson: HAZ, Phase II-ESA, non-PCF eligible costs)**

Upon review with DEC and PCF staff, the work plan for the property has been revised to only include hazardous materials, which decreased the cost substantially. The deductible will be fully met with work that will be funded by previously approved CCRPC funds, allowing the Hayes’s to access PCF monies for future work on petroleum contamination. The PCF will also fund the creation of the work plan. Dan recommended that half of the remaining cost be covered by the CCRPC brownfields ($2,625 of the $5,250 for the last part of the hazardous work).

Curt asked for clarity on how much has been spent on this project, and Dan clarified that the cost is $54,500 ($53,500 in Petro, $1,000 in Haz). Lori asked if future funds might be available if more hazardous materials are found. Emily clarified that all CCRPC funds can only be used for assessment and not for any cleanup.

Matt asked to see the evaluation scorecard for the project. Dan explained that it had scored pretty highly because of a possible housing component in future development.

The committee concurred with the staff recommendation.

**Burlington: Blodgett Oven: (Stone Enviro: HAZ, Corrective Action Plan & Construction Soil Monitoring)**

Lee Rosberg gave an overview of the Blodgett project and the proposal for the corrective action plan and the soils management. Dan gave his recommendation that the project be funded at 80% of the cost proposal for a total of $28,963. Curt asked if there are future costs that might be needed. Lee stated that future costs will be related to cleanup and not assessment. Dan noted that Soil Management Costs were more fluid than preparation of the CAP (and could come in lower). For clarity, Dan offered a change to his original recommendation, proposing that CCRPC funds used be used first to pay for the CAP in full rather than 80% of each of the two segments. The committee concurred with the recommendation. [Editor’s Note: After the meeting and with the concurrence with of Committee Chair $20,407 for the Corrective Action Plan, and up to $8,286 for Soil Management Oversight. ]

5. **Updates**

**West Allen Street project (former Key Bank building), Winooski**

The proposed redevelopment (which would have demolished the building) from 2016 has not gone forward and so the unspent funds will be returned to our allocable hazardous funds from FY2016.

**US Route 7 properties, “hourglass” road project, Milton (Johnson Company & Town staff)**

Kurt gave an overview of the possible issues found on both properties (see PowerPoint in meeting materials link). Dan asked for clarification about whether the work is complete or not. Kurt indicated that hazardous building material assessments are not done at the Parent property. Kurt suggested that the Town of Milton consider paying for GPR to determine whether the tanks are really there or not. Dan stated that CCRPC can pay for it as part of the existing contract with Johnson Co. if there is no QAPP needed. Dave Allerton indicated that there is already an option to purchase on the Parent property and there have been no stumbling blocks on the Paseraphim property. Dave indicated that the southern side of the hourglass will be paid for by the town and the northern side will be paid for by VTrans. Jason Charest noted that the project is funded for State Fiscal Year FY21 in the Transportation Improvement Program, aka “the TIP.”
Lot 7D, Winooski (City staff and Weston & Sampson staff)
Steve Shaw recommended that a full Phase II be completed on the site, given the past presence of a nearby dry cleaner. Dan indicated that CCRPC will entertain a future proposal for more funding.

6. **Adjourn**
The meeting was adjourned at 4:05pm.
**ad hoc Commission on Act 250 Committee**

**Minutes**

**Date:** Wednesday, March 13, 2019, 5:30pm to 7:00pm  
**Location:** CCRPC Small Conference Room, 110 West Canal Street, Winooski  
**Attendees:** Chris Roy, Tony Micklus, Justin Dextradeur, Curt Carter (GBIC), Charlie Baker and Regina Mahony

I. **Welcome, Changes to the Agenda, Members’ Items.** Chris Roy welcomed everyone.

II. **Review Minutes from January 30, 2019.** Tony Micklus made a motion, seconded by Justin Dextradeur, to approve the minutes of January 30, 2019. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.

III. **Review of additions to CCRPC Position Statements**

Charlie Baker provided an overview of his testimony that he provided to the House Natural Resources Committee on February 21st. He testified after Kate McCarthy (VNRC) and Alex Weinragen (Vermont Planners Association) and only had about 9 minutes. He was able to move quickly through CCRPC’s positions that were similar to or supported VNRC and VPA’s statements. Charlie also provided them with a map of Chittenden County’s state designations versus areas that already have water and sewer infrastructure to reiterate how small the state designations are in comparison to our areas planned for growth. The House Natural Resources Committee is still not marking up their bill, so it is hard to tell if they are approving or disagreeing with any testimony received so far. Chris Roy added that he testified this morning as well. It seems clear that they aren’t going to move this forward this session, with the crossover deadline this Friday (3/15/19).

Regina Mahony described the two additional position statements regarding the Regional Plan approvals, and appeals of those approvals. The language is what VPA recommended in their testimony, and CCRPC Staff are okay with being accountable to the statutory requirements. Discussion ensued on the idea of regional plan approvals and who should approve the plans. There was a suggestion that we are already committed to ACCD through funding, so why not have them do it? Charlie indicated that some of his peers would be more comfortable if it wasn’t just one state agency that had the authority; and our Plans cover many topics that are relevant to a variety of state agencies. The ad hoc Committee decided to make it clear that we are supporting this VPA position so if they modify the position down the road we can stay aligned with them; and to add some flexibility to the Development Cabinet with “or some instrument of the state” to be clear that the authority of approval shouldn’t just be with the RPCs, or the Natural Resources Board/Environmental Review Board. Regarding which body should hear appeals of the plan approval, staff isn’t sure about VPA’s recommendation of the Natural Resources Board/Environmental Review Board because those Boards would be using the Plans in their regulatory process. The ad hoc Committee decided to recommend the Environmental Court as the appropriate body to hear both regional and local plan approval appeals. Staff will make these edits and forward them on to both the Executive Committee and full Board for their March 20th meetings.

IV. **Review of VNRC Jurisdictional Tiers Proposal**

Charlie Baker explained that Brian Shupe of VNRC is looking for feedback on their ideas to bring more clarity to the various geographic areas and associated jurisdiction. Regina Mahony explained their proposal as described in four tiers:

- Critical Resource Areas (river corridor, a significant wetland, land at or above 2,000 feet, and land characterized by slopes greater than 15% and shallow depth to bedrock) – as proposed in the bill this
would trigger Act 250. VNRC is suggesting just state permitting for wetlands and river corridors rather than Act 250 jurisdictional trigger. The ad hoc Committee had some questions about why VNRC is taking this position.

- Enhanced designation areas – as proposed in the bill these areas would not be subject to Act 250, and VNRC is not proposing any expansion of this concept. The ad hoc Committee indicated that these areas need to be expanded.

- Areas Currently Defined as Rural and Working Lands – as proposed in the bill this would include everything that isn’t currently under the first two bullets.
  - Regionally Designated Areas – VNRC is suggesting that regions can define these growth areas. This is good idea, however they are only proposing to change the jurisdictional threshold from 10 or more lots/units to 20 or more lots/units; 10 acre commercial stays the same. The ad hoc Committee recommended that these areas should be given the same Act 250 relief as the enhanced designation areas.
  - Resource areas – VNRC is suggesting that land that is neither an enhanced designation or a regionally designated area would fall within this category for the purposes of addressing incremental loss of resources areas, including farm, forest land and natural areas. The jurisdictional threshold would be subdivisions of three lots or more, commercial or industrial development on one acre or more, and/or roads and driveways segments that total more than 1,200 feet are subject to Act 250. The ad hoc Committee commented that it is imperative that this not happen unless full Act 250 relief happens in an expanded geographic area; and this expansion in resource areas should not happen before Act 250 is released in appropriate areas. This is reflected in CCRPC’s position statement #7.

Charlie will provide this feedback to Brian Shupe.

V. Next Meeting. The ad hoc Committee decided to not set another meeting until there is a marked-up bill to respond to.

VI. Adjourned at 6:22pm.