REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
Wednesday, April 17, 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 March 20, 2019 Meeting * (Action; 1 minute)
5. Warn Public Hearing for the FY 20 UPWP and Budget* (Action; 15 minutes)
6. Road Erosion Inventory Status presentation (Information; 20 minutes)
7. Charge to Board Development Committee to Develop slate of officers for FY20 (Chair Action; 1 minute)
8. Winooski Master Plan Approval, Confirmation of Planning Process, and Determination of Energy Compliance * (Action; 10 minutes)
10. S.96 Recommendations * (Action; 30 minutes)
11. Chair/Executive Director Report (Discussion; 15 minutes)
a. Legislative Update
12. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports (Information, 2 minutes)
a. Executive Committee (meeting minutes: March 20, 2019 & April 3, 2019)*
   i. Act 250 Sec 248 letters*
b. Transportation Advisory Committee – draft minutes April 2, 2019*
c. Clean Water Advisory Committee – draft minutes April 2, 2019*
d. MS4 Subcommittee – draft minutes April 2, 2019*
e. UPWP Committee - draft minutes – March 21, 2019*
f. Finance Committee – draft minutes – March 27, 2019
13. Members’ Items, Other Business (Information, 5 minutes)
14. 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, May 1, 2019; 5:45 p.m.
- Transportation Advisory Committee - Tuesday, May 7, 2019; 9:00 a.m.
- Clean Water Advisory Committee - Tuesday, May 7, 2019; 11:00 a.m.
- CWAC MS4 Subcommittee – Tuesday, May 7, 2019; 12:15 p.m.
- Planning Advisory Committee - Wednesday, May 8, 2019; 2:30 p.m.
- CCRPC Board Meeting - Wednesday, May 15, 2019; 6:00 p.m.

Tentative future Board agenda items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Agenda Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 15, 2019</td>
<td>FY20 UPWP and Budget Public Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report from Board Development Committee on FY20 Nominations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burlington City Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 19, 2019</td>
<td>Annual Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Election of Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Calendar of Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warn FY20-23 TIP Public Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 17, 2019</td>
<td>FY20-23 TIP Public Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>NO MEETING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 18, 2019</td>
<td>Essex Junction Village Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Potential Topics/Speakers:
- VTrans Rail?
- UVM-Medical Center Population Health?
- South Burlington City Center?
- E-assist Bikeshare and E-scooters?

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.
1. Call to order; changes to the agenda. The meeting was called to order at 6:05 p.m. by the Chair, Chris Roy. There are no changes to the agenda.

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

3. Action on Consent Agenda (MPO Business). There were two amendments to the FY19-22 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The first to add 8 grant-funded projects (Municipal Highway and Stormwater Mitigation awards, Transportation Alternative awards and Bike & Ped awards); and three Circ. Alternative projects. The second amendment updated TIP construction funding amounts for Champlain Parkway to meet the new construction schedule; move construction funds for Shelburne Street Roundabout from FY21 to FY22; and, move construction funds for Exit 17 in Colchester from FY22 to FY23. JIM DONOVAN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY DAN KERIN, TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. (Only municipal representatives and VTrans voted on this MPO action item.)

4. Approve Minutes of February 20, 2019 Meeting. ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY SHARON MURRAY, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS PRESENTED. MOTION CARRIED, WITH ABSTENTIONS FROM CHRIS ROY, IRENE WRENNER AND DON MEALS.
5. **GMT (Green Mountain Transit) proposed transit system changes.** Jon Moore, Director of Maintenance and Planning at GMT, gave a presentation on the NextGen planning study they are finishing. They hired Nelson-Nygaaard to review all the current routes and make recommendations for service improvements. The ultimate goal is to increase ridership and improve service. In the service improvement plan, Phase one, they plan to use GMT resources more effectively. Phase One is cost neutral. They propose changes for nearly every route to: improve service for large majority of existing riders; attract new riders; and better balance services with demand. They are in the public comment period of the plan approval process and hope to adopt the plan at their board meeting in April 2019. New scheduling summary includes:

- 20-minute headways from 6 am to 6 pm on the 4 major routes – Williston, Essex Junction, Shelburne Road and North Avenue; and, eliminate peak hour 15-minute service.
- 30-minute headways from 6 am to 6 pm on most other routes.
- Late night service Monday through Saturday until 11 pm or later on major routes and Riverside/Winooski and new Waterfront/Airport route.
- Dedicated Sunday service on Williston, Essex Jct., Pine Street, North Avenue, Waterfront/Airport and City Loop.
- Adjusted Commuter times.
- Improved On-Time performance.

On routing they will have increased interlining to reduce transfers; have direct service from Downtown and the hospital to the airport with the new Waterfront/Airport route. Interlining combines two routes into one, which reduces the number of passenger transfers required; makes wayfinding more simplistic and allows color-coded route naming system:

- **Red Line** – Williston and North Avenue routes
- **Blue Line** – Essex Junction and Shelburne routes
- **Green Line** – Pine Street and Riverside/Winooski routes
- **Purple Line** – College Street & UMall/Airport routes
- **Orange Line** – Essex Center and Essex/Williston routes
- **Silver Line** – City Loop

Mr. Moore showed examples of the new schedule and color-coded service diagrams. He then reviewed the Assessment impacts and proposed fare increase. According to their charter, a change (increase or decrease) of ten or more weekly driver pay hours in a municipality would result in assessment impacts. The NextGen service changes maximize driver scheduling (and cost) efficiencies. The driver pay hours are projected to decrease by 48 weekly hours but the revenue hours will increase by 110 weekly hours. The GMT board is considering freezing the FY20 assessments at the current levels and “re-balancing” as necessary for FY21. Right now the College Street shuttle is a free service paid for by the City of Burlington ($125,000). With the extension of the route to the airport they’ll need to determine the fare structure for the route. They haven’t had a fare increase since 2005 and are proposing a fare increase from $1.25 to $1.50 and decreasing the monthly unlimited pass from $50 to $40.

Mr. Moore then reviewed the new technology passengers will be able to use for bus locations and even purchasing all ticket types via their smart phones. They will continue to take cash for those without smart phones. The next steps include completing the public hearings late March to mid-April with GMT Board approval on April 16th and service and fare change implementation on June 17th. Jon answered questions for board members.
6. **Capital Program Prioritization – (MPO Business).** Christine Forde noted that each year the Vermont legislature requires the projects in the Transportation Capital Program be prioritized by VTrans and the RPCs and 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. Each project is rated by methodologies developed for each program category. VTrans uses one set of criteria and each region uses a set of criteria developed for their region, which Christine described. We send our scoring to VTrans and they add our scores to theirs to develop the priorities. She noted that the Capital Program and the TIP/STIP are similar but different. The Capital Program is the actual budget for a given year. The TIP/STIP are planning documents. When Andrea asked if we consider stormwater, Christine said stormwater is considered in the resiliency factor. The scoring sheets are sent to the TAC members to review the projects in their municipality and then the TAC revises/recommends the prioritization. Tim Baechle asked about bike/ped projects from the Circ alternatives list. Christine said bike/ped projects are grants and are prioritized through those grant programs. Matthew Langham said Phase 1 Circ Alternative projects moved forward without prioritization. Charlie noted that this is our input into the FY21 Capital Program, which will be sent to the legislature in January 2020. Christine noted that we also do a scoring of town highway bridge candidate projects so we can see if a project potentially can move to the program list. When asked how to get on that list, Amy Bell said all town highway bridges are on this list. There are 1700 town highway bridges statewide and they are ranked every two years. Brief discussion ensued. Matthew Langham clarified that this list includes all structures over 20’ span – including box culverts.

Christine then distributed a chart showing Chittenden County projects in the FY20 Capital Program that begins July 1, 2019. The projects highlighted in yellow are newly added. Amy noted that this list is what is in the Governor’s budget, and the legislature will determine the final outcome.

DAN KERIN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JIM DONOVAN, TO APPROVE THE 2021 REGIONAL PROJECT SCORES AND TOWN HIGHWAY BRIDGE PRE-CANDIDATE REGIONAL PROJECT SCORES AND FORWARD IT TO VTRANS. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. (Only municipal representatives and VTrans voted on this item.)

7. **Shelburne Town Plan Approval, Confirmation of Planning Process and Determination of Energy Compliance.** 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 proposed resolution, the PAC has held the required hearing, reviewed the Plan in light of these requests, and recommends Board approval at this time. 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). SHARON MURRAY MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JIM DONOVAN, TO 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. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. (Only municipal representatives voted on this item.)

8. **Act 250 Recommendations.** Regina noted that last month members approved eight recommendations regarding the proposed Act 250 legislation. At this time, we have two additional
positions we’d like to discuss. The large Act 250 Commission bill (Committee bill 19-0040, Draft 5.2, 1/23/19) includes a position requiring that, in order to be used in Act 250, local and regional plans must be approved as consistent with statutory planning goals. VPA feels that since regional plans are used in the Act 250 regulatory process under Criterion 10, the Environmental Board should not be reviewing and approving regional plans. The second recommendation deals with appeals for regional plan approvals. Suggested language is:

#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 Cabinet; 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.”Earlier, after a brief discussion, Executive Committee members agreed to amend the second line to read “…plans are reviewed for compliance with statutory planning goals and approved by a Development Cabinet…” Regina noted that the Development Cabinet, though not active, is in statute (3 V.S.A. §2293) for the purpose of collaboration and consultation among State agencies and departments. After board discussion it was agreed to change “compliance” to “consistency.”

#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.”

After a lengthy discussion, JIM DONOVAN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY IRENE WRENNER, TO APPROVE THE ADDITION OF THOSE TWO RECOMMENDATIONS, AS AMENDED. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. SHARON MURRAY ABSTAINED.

9. Chair/Executive Director’s Update:
   a. FY20 UPWP Update. Charlie noted that the UPWP committee will hold its last meeting tomorrow evening. We have a pretty good draft right now. We will present the draft UPWP to the Executive Committee and the Board at your April meetings.
   b. Legislative update. Charlie noted that the House Natural Resources Committee has not yet turned the Act 250 document into a bill. We are working on this language to be prepared. He feels there will be a bill formally introduced in the spring to be taken up again in January.
   c. He is following another bill S.96 that deals with water quality that has the potential to do two things: raise revenue for water quality and change how those funds are distributed. It proposes to distribute water quality funds to a clean water service provider in each watershed basin which would default to the RPCs. There are a couple of issues in there. It would require us to be responsible for the operation and maintenance for any project getting funding. It also would open up the clean water service provider to enforcement action. Charlie noted that the initial idea was to help get funding distributed. All of the RPCs are concerned about these other requirements. There will have to be more conversation on this. He feels the Senate will vote it out to the House. The second part of the bill is to raise revenue to fund it. They’ll have the House work on that.

10. Committee/Liaison Activities and Reports. The chair noted that minutes of various committee meetings were included in the board packet.
11. **Members’ Items; Other Business.** There was no other business.

12. **Adjourn.** IRENE WRENNER MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JIM DONOVAN, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:32 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
April 17, 2019
Agenda Item 5: Action Item

FY 2020 Unified Planning Work Program & Budget Public Hearing

Background: Each year the CCRPC undertakes the development and implementation of a Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). The UPWP serves as the annual work plan for local and regional transportation projects and other planning activities in Chittenden County. The Board of Directors of the CCRPC has established a Committee process for the development of the UPWP. The Committee members appointed by the Chair consists of the following members:

- **Board**: Michael O’Brien, Winooski (Chair); John Zicconi, Shelburne; Mike Bissonette, Hinesburg; Jeff Bartley, Colchester; Sharon Murray, Bolton
- **PAC**: Jessica Draper, Richmond; Dean Pierce, Shelburne
- **TAC**: Justin Rabidoux, South Burlington; Barbara Elliott, Huntington;
- **VTrans**: Amy Bell
- **FHWA**: Chris Jolly
- **GMT**: Rachel Kennedy

FY 20 UPWP Requests and Entire Program: Our 12-member UPWP Committee met in January, February and March to determine how best to allocate our funds to develop our FY 20 UPWP. The CCRPC received $1.7 million in project requests for FY20 and was able to fund about $1.4 million in new consultant and partner-funded transportation projects and initiatives. To meet the budget constraints, several staff-generated regional requests were cut, and some project budgets were reduced. However, no municipal or partner projects were removed entirely. Please see below for a table indicating the funding categories for the new FY20 UPWP projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY20 UPWP Funding Categories</th>
<th>(New Projects/Initiatives)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roadway/Misc.</td>
<td>$315,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>$265,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>$407,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit/GMT</td>
<td>$402,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDM</td>
<td>$239,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Tech assistance, Impact fees, and Freight Plan</td>
<td>$97,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,772,163</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table below indicates the overall FY20 UPWP funding (consultants and CCRPC staff) for specific task areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY20 UPWP Funding by Task Area (All Projects/Initiatives)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brownfields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism/Byways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy and Climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety/Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data &amp; GIS Programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional or Shared Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UPWP Committee Recommendation:** On March 21st, the UPWP Committee recommended to advance the FY 2020 UPWP to the Executive Committee and Board.

**Executive Committee Recommendation:** On April 3rd the Executive Committee recommended that the Board warn a public hearing for the draft FY20 UPWP and Budget at their May 15th meeting.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff is asking the Board to warn a public hearing on May 15th at 6:00 pm for the draft FY20 UPWP and Budget.

**For more Information contact:** Charlie Baker, cbaker@ccrpcvt.org or 861-0115 OR
Marshall Distel, mdistel@ccrpcvt.org or 861-0122
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Trans Cost</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chittenden County Freight Plan</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>The last comprehensive Chittenden County Freight Study was conducted in 2001. This study will be conducted in collaboration with VTrans as they embark on the development of a statewide freight study. The Chittenden County freight study will evaluate existing and emerging freight movement issues/needs of the region and develop recommendations for planned transportation system investments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watershed Resiliency Mapping</td>
<td>Munis TBD, VTrans</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>This project will follow a VTrans effort that helped identify road segments, bridges and culverts that are vulnerable to flood and erosion damages. Critical locations will be pinpointed and mitigation options on the transportation network will be identified. The deliverable will be a web-based application to display risk information. This is proposed to be conducted for one watershed (TBD) in Chittenden County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiuse Path Connecting Williston to South Burlington</td>
<td>South Burlington &amp; Williston</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>Conduct a detailed evaluation of the obstacles of the preferred alternative, identified in the 2006 &amp; 2010 Scoping Studies, for a multiuse path connecting Williston and South Burlington over Muddy Brook. This study will focus on the alignment along Marshall Ave and will include evaluation of impacts on wetlands, right-of-way and archaeological sensitive areas, and permitting, among others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen City Parkway Sidewalk Scoping</td>
<td>Burlington &amp; South Burlington</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>Queen City Park Road is split between South Burlington and Burlington and connects residential, recreation and commercial land uses. Presently, sidewalk exists on the south side of QCPR, but a large ~700 ft gap is missing from the Champlain Water District to Central Avenue. Central Avenue is home to South Burlington's Red Rocks Park and its Red Rocks residential neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance to Advance ECOS/MTP/TIP Implementation - Local, Regional &amp; State</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>Provide transportation technical assistance to Chittenden County municipalities for plans, projects and initiatives at the local level that help advance the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) as well as the ECOS Strategies. Municipal technical assistance includes but not limited to: complete streets evaluation, traffic calming measures, traffic control warrants, speed studies, autonomous vehicle feasibility studies, etc. Provide transportation technical assistance to advance the implementation of State &amp; Regional level ECOS/MTP and TIP projects and initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality Transportation</td>
<td>Seven Munis</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>Consultant assistance in developing conceptual plans and cost estimates for high priority Road Erosion Inventory (REI) sites for Municipal Roads General Permit (MRGP) compliance. Conceptual plans would contain geographic locations, extent, and detailed schematics or examples of various stormwater mitigation infrastructure techniques that will assist in meeting MRGP standards and mitigate roadway stormwater erosion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chittenden County E&amp;D Transportation</td>
<td>United Way, GMT, SSTA, VTrans</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>In FY19, CCRPC and United Way staff started to conduct an evaluation of E&amp;D transportation in Chittenden County. In FY20, CCRPC staff hope to work on additional initiatives to create a more equitable and efficient paratransit service for all Chittenden County residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chittenden County I-89 2050 Study</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>This is the second year of a multiyear study. The broad intent of this study is to assess the safety, capacity, resiliency and other needs of Interstate 89 in Chittenden County; identify existing and future multimodal needs; develop and evaluate improvements strategies; examine transportation and land use impacts of new or expanded interchanges; determine asset management/maintenance needs; and develop an implementation plan for making investments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chittenden County I-89 2050 Study (VTrans contribution)</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>VTrans contribution to I-89 Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Way to Go!</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>Way to Go! (WTG) encourages Vermonters to find and use more efficient transportation options to meet their mobility needs. Its purpose is to help lower emissions, conserve energy, and save transportation dollars through reduced single occupancy vehicle (SOV) use. This year, the program might continue to focus on schools to explore new mobility opportunities for students, parents, teachers, and administrators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Way to Go! (Statewide)</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>VTrans contribution to Way to Go!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Regional Project Totals:** $500,000
## CCRPC FY2020 UPWP Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Trans Cost</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bolton Valley Community Development Block Grant - Grant Administration</td>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>CCRPC staff time</td>
<td>Assist Bolton with administration of a Community Development Block Grant for community water and sewer system improvements (grant), and resort facility upgrades (loan) at Bolton Valley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Condition Inventory for Stormwater Retrofit Feasibility – Phase 1</td>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>This project would cover Phase 1 (Wards 5 &amp; 6) of a multi-year effort to create a comprehensive condition inventory of the City’s right-of-way, to determine the feasibility of implementing stormwater retrofits to treat and manage stormwater runoff from City streets. This inventory would allow Burlington’s Stormwater Program to coordinate, plan, and execute retrofits ahead of other City transportation and asset management projects. This data will further allow us to be nimble in implementing the City’s Integrated Plan. <strong>Note: Original request was $157,964. Cost reduced and asked Burlington to phase this effort.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Street Stormwater and Sidewalk Feasibility Study</td>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>Feasibility study for Lake Street to address stormwater issues and close the gaps in the sidewalk network on the street. These improvements will be incorporated into the City’s anticipated paving of the street in 2020 or 2021.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikeway Connectivity, Pedestrian Safety, and Stormwater Management in the Old North End</td>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>This project should evaluate options for low-stress bikeways that will connect the Battery Park shared use path, the Old North End Neighborhood Greenway, and the upcoming Lakeview Terrace and Depot Street Neighborhood Greenways. This may include options through Battery Park and on adjacent roadways, which could include but may not be limited to North Avenue, North Street, Front Street, Park Street, and Summer Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester Avenue Protected Bike Lanes and East Avenue Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>This is a scoping study to investigate safety issues at the Colchester Ave/East Ave intersection (High Crash Location) and develop alternatives to address these issues as well as investigate the feasibility of protected bike lanes along Colchester Avenue and other improvements to provide for safe travel of pedestrians and bicyclists at this intersection. <strong>Note: Reduced cost - original ask was $85,000.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Stormwater CCTV Inspection</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>The Town doesn’t have a complete assessment of the condition of old metal and aluminum pipes in the Town. The areas selected above were constructed between the 1960s and 1980s and consist of the pipes originally installed while the development was constructed. The areas selected are rated and based on known deficiencies and maintenance and repair records. It is imperative that the Town understand the condition of the pipes for future planning. The project consists of hiring a consultant to use a camera to televise the pipes in the project location and to generate a condition assessment report that the Town will then use to create a stormwater infrastructure replacement plan, to be used in both operational and capital infrastructure planning. <strong>Note: Original request was $50,000. Reduced cost by removing ineligible costs for pipe cleaning.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanglewood Drive Shared-Use Path and Stormwater Scoping Project</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$39,000</td>
<td>This study will include scoping for a multiuse path and stormwater improvements along Tanglewood Drive. The Tanglewood Drive neighborhood currently lacks adequate infrastructure for bicyclists and pedestrians. Moreover, the roadway’s 40-ft cross section contributes to significant stormwater runoff into a gully located at the end of Fern Hollow Road, which has caused significant erosion and has contributed to an increase in the sediment load to the Alder Brook watershed. This study will seek to identify alternatives to enhance safety for bicyclists and pedestrians, while also identifying opportunities to reduce the stormwater runoff from the transportation system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Jct Stormwater CCTV Inspection</td>
<td>Essex Jct</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>The Village has determined the need for an assessment of the condition of the stormwater pipes in our MS4 permitted area. The areas selected have not been televised, are known to have some developing deficiencies, recent problems or concerning repair records. The project would consist of hiring a consultant to televise the stormwater pipes in the selected areas and create a condition assessment report in PACP standards. The Village would then use the assessment to guide future stormwater improvement project planning including a schedule for replacement of deficient pipes as part of capital and operational planning. <strong>Note: Original request was $50,000. Reduced cost by removing ineligible costs for pipe cleaning.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Road Intersection Scoping</td>
<td>Hinesburg</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>Conceptual plans to modify the intersection of Richmond Road, North Road, and Texas Hill Road, and reclaim the curved roadway and associated parking area to serve as public space. Existing GMT transit stop to be retained. Possible public space opportunities could include a playground with benches and tree plantings for an underserved part of the community, and a terrific terminus for the future Richmond Road sidewalk (per 2016 CCRPC-funded feasibility study). Project elements: a local concerns meeting, design options by a landscape architect, a follow up public meeting to present options, a final report, and a cost estimate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRGP Improvement Plan</td>
<td>Jericho</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Develop a 10-yr plan to improve hydraulically connected road segments which do not currently meet MRGP standards. Ensure that the methodology is applicable for other rural municipalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Trans Cost</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paving Analysis for Raceway Road and Packard Road</td>
<td>Jericho</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Inventory existing conditions of Raceway and Packard Roads, including soil borings. Based on existing conditions, identify improvements necessary to support paving those two roads. Develop a phased paving plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Project Conceptual Design</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$4,523</td>
<td>The goal of this study is to update conceptual plans to address stormwater runoff from I-89 that is creating erosion issues in and around the Camels Hump Middle School property. This project was identified in the most recent Richmond Stormwater Master Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Overlay District / Traffic Impact Fees Update Phase II</td>
<td>South Burlington</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$37,500</td>
<td>The City and CCRPC are currently completing a project that overhauls the City’s Traffic Overlay District and Traffic Impact Fees into a coordinated transportation regulatory system. In this Phase II, the City and CCRPC will work to link the results of this work directly to implementation projects identified through other studies completed in recent years. This may include updates to elements of scoping or corridor studies for prioritized improvements, as well as developing a traffic-reduction assignment to specific improvements. As discussed with CCRPC staff, this proposal would evolve as the Phase I project concludes in the current fiscal year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Road/ Pleasant Valley Road Bicyclist Accommodation and Pavement Analysis</td>
<td>Underhill</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>The project will identify safety improvements for bicyclists and motorists who use River Road and Pleasant Valley Road, which tend to be high-traffic and high-speed roads, particularly during commute times. Inadequate, crumbling shoulders on these roadways create safety conflicts between bicyclists and motorists. Moreover, prior to 2018 resurfacing, the pavement was compromised with deep and persistent rutting creating an additional hazardous condition for bicyclists. The abbreviated lifespan of area resurfacing projects is taken to be an indication of a roadway subbase issue. The goals of this study would be to evaluate and recommend improvements for bicyclists and the roadway. Evaluation to include consideration of utilization of Irish Settlement Road (as opposed to Pleasant Valley Road) as the primary means for bicyclists reaching points north (Cambridge, Lamoille Rail Trail, etc.) of Underhill Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Signal Assessment</td>
<td>Williston</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>This study will evaluate signal equipment condition and communications capabilities at 4 signalized intersection along Marshall Avenue. Depending on results, a plan will be developed for signal upgrades at these intersections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Williston Phosphorus Control Plan</td>
<td>Williston</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>The Town of Williston is requesting funding to hire a consultant to prepare the initial (first phase) town-wide Phosphorus Control Plan (PCP). The main component of such a Plan will be to identify eligible opportunities for reductions in the amount of phosphorus discharging to Lake Champlain and her tributaries. At a minimum, the PCP shall be designed to achieve a level of phosphorus reduction equivalent to the reduction targets required for Williston’s developed lands as put forth in the Lake Champlain TMDL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Assignment Evaluation for Route 2A/Zephyr Road/Paul Street Intersection</td>
<td>Williston</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>CCRPC staff time</td>
<td>Evaluate lane assignment and signal phasing plan at the Zephyr Rd/Route 2A/Paul St intersection in Williston. Evaluate traffic data to develop a report determining if the lane redesignation at this intersection is needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Williston Road Traffic Calming Device Evaluation</td>
<td>Williston</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>CCRPC staff time</td>
<td>The North Williston Rd Scoping study was completed in 2017, with the preferred alternatives being implemented in stages as funding is available. Phase I of the traffic calming measures were installed in 2018. These included: four way stop signs at Mountain View/Gov. Cittenden/North Williston Road intersection, yellow flashing curve sign, radar speed feedback sign, chevrons, and rumble strips. Rectangular rapid flashing beacons will be installed in the spring of 2019. This study will evaluate the Phase I traffic calming measures before continuing to Phase II of the installation of additional measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection and Inventory of Existing Stormwater System</td>
<td>Winooski</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>The proposed work includes inspection, condition assessment and updating GIS layers for the City’s stormwater drainage system within the roadway network. The data will be used to better manage the City’s transportation capital planning program and support water quality improvement planning. The work should include visual inspection using zoom camera technology. Results would be analyzed to determine replacement, rehabilitation, or maintenance needs. Deliverables would also include updated GIS layers with physical asset details and condition data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Winooski Phosphorus Control Plan</td>
<td>Winooski</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
<td>MS4 communities within the Lake Champlain Basin are required to complete a Phosphorus Control Plan for developed lands within their municipality. We are proposing to perform a study focused on the transportation network stormwater runoff to support the full study. The goal would be to develop a plan for the City to achieve phosphorus reduction targets for the City’s impervious transportation network. The scope would include a report with mapping/modeling to identify existing transportation-related stormwater BMPs and good-housekeeping practices with modeled credits. The report would also include potential concept-level transportation BMP projects with corresponding phosphorus credit modeling.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Municipal Project Totals** | $615,023
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Trans Cost</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit Planning in Chittenden County</td>
<td>GMT</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$402,340</td>
<td>GMT staff will contact the following activities: 1) Service Planning: NextGen Implementation Assistance, Bus Stop Audit &amp; Numbering, Customer Service Survey, Ongoing Service Planning; 2) NTD reporting: FTA reporting; 3) Ridecheck: Annual survey of boardings/deboardings; and 4) Miscellaneous Planning Activities: Transit Asset Management (TAM) Plan, Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) planning, HASTUS Training, Facility Planning, Grant Writing, and others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old North End Park It Pledge</td>
<td>CarShare Vermont</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$24,500</td>
<td>In 2013, CarShare Vermont conducted a successful citywide outreach campaign called the Park It Pledge (PIP) to encourage residents to adopt more sustainable transportation practices for a sustained period of time. Outreach and communication strategies were derived from community-based market research, allowing us to speak directly to people’s concerns and motivators. Building upon that success, we would like to conduct a more targeted PIP focused in Burlington’s Old North End neighborhood. We aim to canvas 1,000 households to inform residents about the transportation options available in our community and offer generous incentives to encourage households to commit to reducing their vehicle dependence for a three-month period. Our goal is to recruit at least 25 households to participate in the pledge by committing to more efficient and sustainable transportation practices. Through incentives, exposure to new ways of getting around, and accountability, we expect that a significant portion of households will shed vehicles permanently, thereby continuing to reduce their VMT and emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homes for People, Not Cars</td>
<td>CarShare Vermont</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>CarShare Vermont seeks to deepen its potential to make residential living costs in Burlington more affordable by making more visible the various connections between transportation and housing costs. CarShare Vermont proposes to work with local non-profits and banking institutions to develop informational and outreach resources for people of low- to moderate incomes to help increase access to housing opportunities through sound management of personal transportation costs. Secondly, CarShare Vermont, with local housing partners, hopes to explore an innovative sharing model which incentivizes the creation of accessory dwelling units while minimizing private vehicle ownership, literally transforming space for cars to house people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimize CATMA as the Countywide Transportation Specialist &amp; Expand ETC Network</td>
<td>CATMA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$58,000</td>
<td>CATMA will plan and strengthen its expansion as a regional TMA, and provide comprehensive TDM planning assistance and support to businesses, developers, and municipalities. A consistent resource in the region on cooperative transportation and parking opportunities will ensure efficient, coordinated &amp; cost-effective TDM solutions. The continued growth and interest in CATMA’s Employee Transportation Coordinator (ETC) Network, consisting of over 60 diversified members, has provided a forum for members to engage in the TDM conversation and practices, while bolstering networking among regional TDM leaders and providing CATMA with information on TDM needs and opportunities in our region. In addition, CATMA will conduct online transportation surveys at three additional sites in FY20 in an effort to provide the organization with baseline commute data and inform our region about transportation barriers and opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chittenden County Bus Commuter Ridership Pilot Project</td>
<td>University of Vermont</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Increasing public transit use can reduce demand for single occupancy cars, contributing to lower emissions, improve transportation cost equity, and reduce congestion. Due to the real and perceived costs of using transit, demand for fixed route transit often increases when coupled with workplace parking restrictions (e.g., limits on permits, higher costs, remote parking requiring longer walks or other transfers). In this project we expand a targeted intervention connecting potential transit users with free transit offered by UVM and other Burlington entities with efficient bus service and parking facilities on five Link Express and Commuter Routes that serve Chittenden County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Motion Regional Walk-Bike Planning and Technical Assistance</td>
<td>Local Motion</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>WALK-BIKE PLANNING &amp; TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE: Work with municipalities across Chittenden County to incorporate bike and pedestrian design and policy as part of transportation and land use plans and projects, as well as take advantage of opportunities for short-term, on the ground improvements for walking and biking through the coordination of pop-up demos and the development of Walk-Bike Safety Community Action Plans. BIKE COMMUTER TRAINING &amp; SUPPORT: Provide bicycling training and consulting through a series of workshops, personalized demonstrations, and other assistance for people using bikes for transportation via workplaces and community centers, and helping employers identify strategies and programs for encouraging walking and biking to work. PUBLIC EDUCATION &amp; EVENTS TO PROMOTE WALKING AND BIKING: Raise the profile of walking and biking and emphasize the connections between active transportation and community/economic vitality through a coordinated event and public education series. CONTRACT ADMIN &amp; COORDINATION: Manage contract and coordinate with CCRPC and other partners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CCRPC FY2020 UPWP Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Trans Cost</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighbor Rides</td>
<td>United Way</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$47,000</td>
<td>The Neighbor Rides initiative is a multi-year effort working to align community resources, identify and prioritize gaps in the current system and develop creative solutions to support the mobility needs of older adults and adults with disabilities. This project will be the second and final stage of our initiative to develop a system for engaging end-users' of Chittenden County's E&amp;D program in providing feedback. The establishment of a high-quality feedback loop is essential to inform the E&amp;D program as well as support greater inclusion in transportation planning over time. This project also has support from the Fund for Shared Insight and SurveyMonkey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chittenden County Energy Planning and Transportation Electrification Support</td>
<td>VEIC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>This project will continue VEIC's support for local and regional energy planning and plug-in electric vehicle (EV) market transformation in Chittenden County. Significant advances have occurred in EV technology over the past six years VEIC has partnered with CCRPC to support energy efficiency, clean transportation and energy planning in the region. For FY2020 VEIC proposes the following activities in support of the ECOS plan's clean energy goals: Municipal energy planning assistance; Consumer engagement and marketing programs to support electric vehicle adoption; and Workplace and multifamily charging infrastructure resources and development. <strong>Note: Original request was $50,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Partner Totals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$657,140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,772,163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
April 17, 2019

Agenda Item 8: 2019 Winooski Master Plan Approval, Confirmation of Planning Process, and Determination of Energy Compliance

Issues:
The City of Winooski has requested that the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (1) approve the 2019 Winooski Master Plan, (2) confirm its planning process and (3) grant a determination of energy compliance to the 2019 Winooski Master Plan. The Plan was adopted by the City of Winooski City Council on March 18, 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 Winooski Master Plan, confirm Winooski’s planning process, and grant an affirmative determination of energy compliance to the 2019 Winooski Master Plan.

Staff Recommendation:
Staff recommends that the CCRPC Board approve the 2019 Winooski Master Plan, confirm Winooski’s planning process, and grant an affirmative determination of energy compliance for the 2019 Winooski Master 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.
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 9, 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 City of Winooski, Vermont is a member municipality of this Commission;

WHEREAS, The City of Winooski formally requested CCRPC to approve its 2019 Winooski Master Plan and confirm its planning process and grant a determination of energy compliance on November 27, 2018;

WHEREAS, the Planning Advisory Committee warned a public hearing on November 26, 2018 and held a public hearing on December 12, 2018 to review the 2019 Winooski Master 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 Winooski Master 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 December 12, 2018 and February 13, 2019.

WHEREAS, the Planning Advisory Committee reviewed the records and recommended that the Commission grant an affirmative determination of energy compliance to the 2019 Winooski Master 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 December 12, 2018 and February 13, 2019; and

WHEREAS, the City of Winooski City Council adopted the 2019 Winooski Master Plan on March 18, 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 Winooski Master 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 City of Winooski’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 Winooski Master Plan.

Dated at Winooski, this 17th day of April, 2019.

CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

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

Additionally, the City of Winooski 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 draft 2019 Winooski Master Plan.

The Planning Advisory Committee reviewed this plan at their December 12, 2018 meeting and requested that several changes be made to the plan to ensure compliance with statutory requirements. Additionally, the PAC’s motion indicated that they would review the plan again before deciding whether to recommend that the CCRPC board grant approval, confirmation and a determination of energy compliance to the plan. The comments from the December PAC meeting and the City of Winooski’s response to them are summarized in the attached memo (dated December 13, 2018 and annotated February 6, 2019).

I have completed this formal review of the plan against the statutory requirements of 24 V.S.A. Chapter 117 and the Vermont Department of Public Service’s Energy Planning Standards for Municipal Plans in advance of the first City Council hearing on the plan on February 19, 2019.

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 Winooski Master 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 draft 2019 Winooski Master 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 draft 2019 Winooski Master Plan is consistent with the specific goals of §4302. See the attached Appendix A submittal that describes how the Plan is consistent with these goals.
3. The draft 2019 Winooski Master 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 draft 2019 Winooski Master 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 draft 2019 Winooski Master Plan is compatible with the municipal plans for South Burlington, Colchester and Burlington (both existing plans and upcoming drafts).

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

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 2019 Winooski Master Plan to determine whether:

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

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

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

Staff Review Findings and Comments
Consistency with the requirements above is evaluated through the Vermont Department of Public Service’s 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>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Analysis of resources, needs, scarcities, costs and problems in the municipality across all energy sectors X
5.a. Report Current energy use for heating, electricity, and transportation X
5.b. Report 2025, 2035 and 2050 targets for energy use X
5.c. Evaluation of thermal-sector energy use changes X
5.d. Evaluation of transportation-sector energy use changes X
5.e. Evaluation of electric-sector energy use changes X
6.a. Encourage conservation by individuals and organizations X
6.b. Promote efficient buildings X
6.c. Promote decreased use of fossil fuels for heat X
6.d. Demonstrate municipal leadership re: efficiency of municipal buildings X
7.a. Encourage increased public transit use X
7.b. Promote shift away from single-occupancy vehicle trips X
7.d. Promote shift from gas/diesel to non-fossil fuel vehicles? X
7.e. Demonstrate municipal leadership re: efficiency of municipal transportation? X
8.a. Promote Smart growth land use policies X
8.b. Strongly prioritize development in compact, mixed use centers X
9.a. Report existing renewable energy generation X
9.b. Analyze generation potential X
9.c. Identify sufficient land to meet the 2050 generation targets X
9.d. Ensure that local constraints do not prevent the generation targets from being met X
9.e. Include policy statements on siting energy generation X
9.f. Maximize potential for generation on preferred sites X
9.g. Demonstrate municipal leadership re: deploying renewable energy X
10. Include maps provided by CCRPC X

As drafted, the draft 2019 Winooski Master Plan meets the requirements above.

Proposed Motion & Next Steps:

PROPOSED MOTION: The PAC finds that the draft 2019 Winooski Master Plan will meet all statutory requirements for CCRPC approval, and that the municipality's planning process meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC confirmation.

The PAC also finds that the draft 2019 Winooski Master Plan meets the requirements of the enhanced energy planning standards (“determination”) set forth in 24 V.S.A. §4352.

Upon notification that the Plan has been adopted by the municipality, CCRPC staff will review the plan, and any information relevant to the confirmation process. If staff determines that substantive changes have been made, the materials will be forwarded to the PAC for review. Otherwise the PAC recommends that the Plan, and the municipal planning process, should be forwarded to the CCRPC Board for approval, confirmation, and an affirmative determination of energy compliance.
To: Winooski Planning Commission  
From: Emily Nosse-Leirer, Senior Planner  
Date: December 13, 2018 — Annotated for PAC review on February 6, 2019  

Per the City of Winooski’s request, the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission’s staff and Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) reviewed the draft 2019 Winooski Master Plan in advance of tonight’s public hearing. The review evaluated requirements for plan approval and confirmation; as well as whether the plan meets the standards of the Vermont Department of Public Service’s Energy Planning Standards, should the City choose to pursue a determination of energy compliance. I completed a formal review of the plan against the statutory requirements of 24 V.S.A. Chapter 117 and the Vermont Department of Public Service’s Energy Planning Standards for Municipal Plans in advance of the PAC discussion of the draft plan. You may access the formal review starting on page 19 here:  https://www.ccrpcvt.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/PAC_Packet1_20181212.pdf.

Overall, staff and the PAC enjoyed the plan and especially liked the format of arranging topics under relevant city vision areas. The PAC also found that the Plan does a great job of describing who Winooski is and where you want to go. The PAC identified a few changes (summarized below) necessary for the plan to meet Vermont’s planning statutory requirements. Additionally, the PAC had a few other comments, summarized below, which may be useful to you as your public hearing process commences. After the requirements below are addressed, the PAC will review the plan again to recommend it to CCRPC’s Board.

Amendments to Meet Statutory Requirements

1. To be consistent with statutory planning requirements, the Winooski Master Plan must better address Goal 10 (Use of Resources).
   - To address Goal 10 (Use of Resources), the plan should include information about why the goal isn’t relevant for Winooski. The plan’s section on adjoining municipalities does mention that there is an existing quarry operation just over the northern border with Colchester. However, compliance with the goal would be improved by including a table showing where each statutory requirement is met and indicating that this goal is not relevant to Winooski. (The City of Burlington included a similar table in their latest draft of planBTV.)
   - Appendix 1, “Alignment with State Requirements,” has been added to the plan and addresses this requirement.

2. On the future land use map on page 18 of the draft plan, the areas designated as “City Parks Zoned for Commercial or Industrial” caused confusion. The PAC understands that the City’s plan is to retain these areas to support recreation in some way, rather than to sell them for commercial or industrial use. The PAC requests that the future land use map designate these areas as you would like to see them in the future, rather than expressing the existing zoning/use mismatch. (This mismatch is already shown on the existing land use map).
   - Map 2, Future Land Use, has been updated to indicate that the future land use of these areas are not yet determined, and text has been added to explain the current situation and call for future conversations about it.
3. The PAC liked the City’s idea to implement the plan by completing an annual work program. However, it was suggested that the Implementation Program section on Page 29 say more explicitly that each plan incorporated by reference has specific actions that will be completed via these work programs.

- This section has been updated to refer to the specific plans, the adoption of committee and staff work plans and planning for the increased tax revenue that is expected to occur with the expiration of the City’s TIF district in 2024.

The PAC had a few other suggestions that may be helpful:

4. Not all maps have a legend, which can make some of them difficult to understand. Consider adding a legend to each map and/or having a separate appendix where each map can be seen in full size with legends. Legends were added where necessary and larger maps were added at the end of the plan.

5. There are policies in the plan’s energy section and energy supplement that seem to be contradictory. On page 23, the plan describes Winooski’s urban density and says that it is not the intent of the plan to protect primary agricultural soils. On page 22, the plan states that the City will need to work with DEC to determine whether the mapped river corridor is accurate and figure out how to best protect those areas. However, the energy planning supplement contains a policy protecting state-defined constraints, including river corridors and agricultural soils, during all development, not just energy. To gain a determination of energy compliance, the plan needs to identify constraints, map them and take these areas into account when determining the amount of generation potential in the municipality. The standards do not state the municipality is responsible for enforcing these state constraints. For the sake of clarity in the plan, I suggest the following:

a. The plan’s statement about Winooski’s agricultural soils no longer holding any value for mitigation is tucked into the text of the plan and is not included in the Goals/Objectives section at the end of the chapter. To make sure the policy stands out to the reader, consider moving it or repeating it there. This statement has been removed from the main body of the plan and replaced with a side bar indicating the city’s intention to increase the Neighborhood Designation to decrease agricultural mitigation fees in the city. The caveat remains in the energy section to alert potential developers to the possibility of state review on this constraint.

b. The statements about known and possible constraints should be edited to reflect the City’s attitude towards these development restrictions. Currently, the energy supplement includes statements that “known constraints are areas in which development, including renewable energy generation, is not appropriate,” and that “possible constraints are areas in which the effects of development, including renewable energy generation, may need to be mitigated,” as well as policy 11, “site renewable energy generation to avoid state known constraints and to minimize impacts to state possible constraints.” Consider explaining in the constraint section that known and possible constraints have been defined by the state and will be monitored and protected during the PUC process (and in many cases, during Act 250 review) by relevant state agencies, but not by the City of Winooski. This will alert residents and developers to constraints that may be in place from outside forces, furthering Winooski’s “get to yes” development review culture. Further, policy 11 in the Supplement might be replaced with a statement such as “Encourage renewable energy generation facilities in areas that have reached their full development potential and educate potential developers on development constraints that may be applied by the State of Vermont.” The previous statements about known and possible constraints have been removed and replaced with the suggested text. As discussed in my edits to a. above, explanatory text about the constraints and their possible role in state review of renewable energy facilities has been added.
6. The PAC understands that the City has not decided whether or not to pursue a determination of energy compliance. If the City decides to pursue a recommendation, simply inform us before the next time the plan is reviewed by the PAC. Staff and the PAC did review the plan against the energy planning standards to keep this option open for the city, and found that the plan would meet the standards. Several suggestions are below.

a. The PAC discussed the fact that Winooski’s biggest contribution to meeting Vermont’s energy goals is its energy efficient high density land use, and multi-modal transportation options. The PAC was not concerned that Winooski does not have much land area available for energy generation. However, the PAC suggests including more text in the plan celebrating Winooski’s great work on density, walkability and low transportation energy use. Text was added to the energy plan to describe the city’s transportation demand management (TDM) strategies, as outlined in the Transportation Master Plan.

b. Since Winooski has a building code, the PAC suggested including requirements for electric vehicle charging in the code, especially to make sure that the necessary conduits are in place for installing future charging stations. One member also suggested that the City consider the stretch energy code (a standard higher than the base building code). Text was added to consider the stretch code, or at least the electric vehicle conduit requirements for new development.

c. The plan could be improved by including Vermont Gas service lines on the map showing existing energy facilities. Utility lines were added to the Winooski online map viewer, which is linked in the Municipal Infrastructure chapter.
Agenda Item 9: 2019 Colchester Town Plan Approval, Confirmation of Planning Process, and Determination of Energy Compliance

Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
April 17, 2019

Issues: The Town of Colchester has requested that the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (1) approve the 2019 Colchester Town Plan, (2) confirm its planning process and (3) grant a determination of energy compliance to the 2019 Colchester Town Plan. The Plan was adopted by the Town of Colchester Selectboard on March 26, 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 Colchester Town Plan, confirm Colchester’s planning process, and grant an affirmative determination of energy compliance to the 2019 Colchester Town Plan.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the CCRPC Board approve the 2019 Colchester Town Plan, confirm Colchester’s planning process, and grant an affirmative determination of energy compliance for the 2019 Colchester Town 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)
Draft Resolution
2019 Colchester Town Plan, Planning Process and Enhanced Energy Plan

WHEREAS, Title 24, V.S.A. §4350 in part requires that CCRPC shall review the municipal planning process of our member municipalities including review of plans; that each review shall include a public hearing which is noticed as provided in 24 V.S.A.§ 4350(b); and that before approving a plan the Commission shall find that it:

1. is consistent with the goals established in Section 4302 of this title;
2. is compatible with its Regional Plan;
3. is compatible with approved plans of other municipalities in the region;
4. contains all the elements included in § 4382(a)(1)-(12) of this Title;

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

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

WHEREAS, the CCRPC’s 2018 Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the ECOS Plan, adopted June 20, 2018, received an affirmative determination of energy compliance on August 9, 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 Colchester, Vermont is a member municipality of this Commission;

WHEREAS, The Town of Colchester formally requested CCRPC to approve its 2019 Colchester Town Plan and confirm its planning process and grant a determination of energy compliance on January 21, 2019;

WHEREAS, the Planning Advisory Committee warned a public hearing on January 28, 2019 and held a public hearing on February 13, 2019 to review the 2019 Colchester Town 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 Colchester Town Plan as meeting the requirements of 24 V.S.A.§ 4350 and the Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes, Approval of Municipal Plans and Granting Determinations of Energy Compliance and confirm the community’s planning process as consistent with Title 24, Chapter 117, as described in CCRPC’s staff review and the minutes of the Planning Advisory Committee, dated February 13, 2019.

WHEREAS, the Planning Advisory Committee reviewed the records and recommended that the Commission grant an affirmative determination of energy compliance to the 2019 Colchester Town Plan as meeting the requirements of Title 24, V.S.A. §4352 and the Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes, Approval of Municipal Plans and Granting Determinations of Energy Compliance, as described in CCRPC’s staff review and the minutes of the Planning Advisory Committee, dated February 13, 2019; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Colchester Selectboard adopted the 2019 Colchester Town Plan on March 26, 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 Colchester Town Plan and the Commission finds that said Plan:

1. is consistent with the goals established in Section 4302 of Title 24;
2. is compatible with the 2018 Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the ECOS Plan, adopted June 20, 2018;
3. is compatible with the approved plans from other adjacent Chittenden County municipalities; and
4. contains all the elements included in § 4382(a)(1)-(12) and/or is making substantial progress toward attainment of the elements of this subsection;

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

Dated at Winooski, this 17th day of April, 2019.

CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

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

Additionally, the Town of Colchester 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 draft 2019 Colchester Town Plan.

This draft 2019 Colchester Town Plan is an update and re-adoption of the 2014 Colchester Town Plan. In accordance with statute, re-adoption means that this is a fully compliant plan that will expire eight years after adoption by the Selectboard. CCRPC reviewed the 2014 plan and met with Colchester staff and the Colchester Planning Commission to discuss it in June 2017 as part of an informal review and consultation process. The draft 2019 Colchester Town Plan addresses several new required elements, provides updated data, addresses recent changes to the community and includes an enhanced energy plan. The plan has an engaging breakdown of sections and clearly demonstrates the challenges and future plans for each area of town in an understandable manner. Additionally, the enhanced energy section has clear and useful descriptions of the limited municipal role in energy planning. The preferred site designation section and related scorecard is a great step towards making preferred site designations objective without limiting them to a few parcels identifying in the town 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 first public hearing on the plan on February 5, 2019 hearing.

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 Colchester Town Plan to determine whether it is:

- Consistent with the general goals of §4302;
- Consistent with the specific goals of §4302;
- Contains the required elements of §4382;
- Compatible with the 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 draft 2019 Colchester Town Plan is consistent with the general goals of §4302. See the attached Appendix A submittal that describes how the Plan is consistent with these goals.

2. The draft 2019 Colchester Town Plan is consistent with the specific goals of §4302. See the attached Appendix A submittal that describes how the Plan is consistent with these goals.
3. The draft 2019 Colchester Town Plan contains the required elements of §4382. See the attached Appendix A submittal that describes how the Plan is consistent with these goals.

4. The draft 2019 Colchester Town 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 draft 2019 Colchester Town Plan is compatible with the municipal plans for South Hero, Milton, Westford, Essex, South Burlington, Winooski, and Burlington.

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

Comments/Questions:
While no changes are needed to meet statutory requirements, the following suggests may help clarify the plan:

- Land Use pg. 14, Action 3 says “Within three years of adoption of this plan, fluvial erosion hazard standards should be evaluated for incorporation into the Development Regulations.” When I first read this, the intent was not clear. To clarify, I suggest the following:
  - Consider updating this action to clarify that the plan is to move away from the town’s current static setback on rivers and streams and towards the areas defined in the state’s draft river corridor maps.
  - Add the FEH overlay to one of the maps (possibly the state and local known constraints map) to clarify that it is what is currently being regulated (Map 11 shows the ANR River Corridor, which shows what you will be investigating moving towards).

  Please see the attached memo from Sarah Hadd about the PC’s agreed upon changes to the text, which may be available online by the time of the PAC meeting.

- In the Land Use chapter, think about adding parentheses or a side bar in the text to define each zoning district abbreviation. They are often presented without that information.

- The plan effectively draws on many other planning processes and documents, such as the Economic Development Action Plan and the 2017 Housing Needs Assessment. It would be very useful for the reader if the final PDF of the plan had a link to each of these plans as they are discussed.
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:

1. 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.

2. 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.

3. 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>See note below</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.b. Report 2025, 2035 and 2050 targets for energy use</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.c. Evaluation of thermal-sector energy use changes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.d. Evaluation of transportation-sector energy use changes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.e. Evaluation of electric-sector energy use changes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.a. Encourage conservation by individuals and organizations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.b. Promote efficient buildings</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.c. Promote decreased use of fossil fuels for heat</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.a. Encourage increased public transit use</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.b. Promote shift away from single-occupancy vehicle trips</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.d. Promote shift from gas/diesel to non-fossil fuel vehicles?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.e. Demonstrate municipal leadership re: efficiency of municipal transportation?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.a. Promote smart growth land use policies</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.b. Strongly prioritize development in compact, mixed use centers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.a. Report existing renewable energy generation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.b. Analyze generation potential</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.c. Identify sufficient land to meet the 2050 generation targets</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.d. Ensure that local constraints do not prevent the generation targets from being met</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.e. Include policy statements on siting energy generation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.f. Maximize potential for generation on preferred sites</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.g. Demonstrate municipal leadership re: deploying renewable energy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Include maps provided by CCRPC</td>
<td>X See note below</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Changes Necessary for a Determination of Energy Compliance**

**Two changes need to be made to the energy chapter to ensure that the standards are met.**

- On pg. 5 of the Energy chapter, “Energy for our Future” states that no data are available for EV ownership in Colchester. We actually do have this datapoint from the Department of Motor Vehicles, and it should be reported in the plan to meet the data standard related to current transportation use (there were 39 EVs registered in Colchester in July 2017).

**Please see the attached memo from Sarah Hadd about the PC’s agreed upon changes to the text which may be available online by the time of the PAC meeting.**

- The plan’s text discusses state and local constraints, but all state and local constraints also need to be mapped to meet the energy planning standards. The easiest way to do this is to include two additional maps, one of state and local known constraints and one of state and local possible constraints. These maps were provided in the original data package sent to the town in February 2018, and CCRPC can update them and resend them.

**Please see the attached memo from Sarah Hadd about the PC’s agreed upon additional maps which may be available online by the time of the PAC meeting.**

**Additional Comments/Questions:**

The edit discussed above is the only changes necessary for the draft plan to be granted an affirmative determination of energy compliance. However, the questions below may be useful as the plan continues to be edits, or in future versions of the plan.

- In the Land Use section, there are many statements that renewable energy is appropriate if it follows the same standards as commercial and residential development and if it doesn’t detract from the area’s rural character. However, I don’t see definitions of these standards or of rural character, which means these statements about standards for commercial and residential development and rural character may not be
specific enough to be applied by the Public Utilities Commission, and may create uncertainty for applicants.
  o A solar screening bylaw is one clear way to make sure that the same screening standards are applied to solar as to commercial development.
  o Page 11 of the natural resources chapter says that the Open Space plan should continue to be used in the development review process (Policy 4). Should this also apply to energy siting? *Please see the attached memo from Sarah Hadd about the PC’s agreed upon changes to the text which may be available online by the time of the PAC meeting.*

- A clarification is needed in the introductory text to the preferred site scorecard. On page 13 of the energy chapter, it states that the PUC does not regulate non-net-metering development over 500 kW. This is not entirely accurate – while you’re correct that generation facilities over 500 kW don’t qualify for net metering, the PUC does still regulate them.
- The overview document for your net metering preferred site scorecard says that the Water Protection Overlay District, the Shoreland Overlay District and the Floodplain District “would not be acceptable at all for net metering.” Are they also definitely not acceptable for other kinds of non-net metering energy generation? This isn’t stated as clearly in the main text of your plan, which just states that these districts are “a constraint” to energy development (Energy chapter pg. 11).

**Proposed Motion & Next Steps:**

PROPOSED MOTION: The PAC finds that the draft 2019 Colchester Town Plan meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC approval, and that the municipality’s planning process meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC confirmation.

The PAC also finds that the draft 2019 Colchester Town Plan will meet the requirements of the enhanced energy planning standards (“determination”) set forth in 24 V.S.A. §4352 with the addition of data on current electric vehicle registration and state and local constraint maps.

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 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.
Emily,

Your comments were well received by the Commission last night. The changes you recommended to the Preferred Sites Overview and Scorecard were incorporated. The following changes were made to the plan and will be updated on the website this PM:

1. Land of Colchester Chapter, pg. 14, Action 3. “Within three years of adoption of this plan, fluvial erosion hazard standards should be evaluated for incorporation into the Development Regulations.”
   Clarify to state: “Within three years of adoption of this plan, fluvial erosion hazard standards IN THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW REGULATIONS should be UPDATED TO REFLECT THE VERMONT RIVER CORRIDOR MAPS evaluated for incorporation into the Development Regulations.”

2. The Lands of Colchester Chapter has statements that renewable energy is appropriate if it follows the same standards as commercial and residential development and if it doesn’t detract from the area’s rural character. Statements about standards for commercial and residential development and rural character may not be specific enough to be applied by the Public Utilities Commission, and may create uncertainty for applicants. It is recommended that the following actions 11 and 12 be added:
   11. In evaluating the rural character of a neighborhood, the Open Space plan should be looked to for guidance.
   12. Within a year of adoption of this plan, the Development Regulations should be revised to include a solar screening bylaw to ensure that the similar screening standards are applied to solar as to commercial development.

3. Our Home Chapter, first page, line 33 should be 42% rentals and not 2%.

4. Powering Colchester Chapter, pg. 5, line 191 “An example is that it is unknown how many electric vehicles are owned in Colchester and how many homes are being weatherized.” We now know there are 39 EVs and should strike “how many electric vehicles are owner in Colchester” from the above sentence. Line 266 should have a new sentence “As of 2018 there were 39 electric vehicles registered in Colchester not including hybrids.”

5. The Power Colchester Chapter’s text discusses state and local constraints, but all state and local constraints also need to be mapped to meet the energy planning standards (in our plan and not rely upon the CCRPC maps). The easiest way to do this is to include two additional maps (map 15 & 16), one of state and local known constraints and one of state and local possible constraints. These maps were provided in the original data package sent to the town in February 2018 (see attached). Where these constraints are noted in the chapter, parenthetical references to map 15 and 16 should be added.

6. The Power Colchester Chapter will have sidebars added with the following facts:
   i. Green Mountain Power, Colchester’s electricity provider, stated in their December 13th 2018 article that 90% of its power source is carbon free and 62% renewable. Half of GMP’s power is provided by Hydro-Quebec with a contract that expires in 2038.
   ii. Vermont spends between two and three billion dollars a year for energy services according to the Vermont Climate Action Commission. Locally generated renewable energy increases the amount of energy dollars that stay in our community and Vermont.
iii. Moving energy generation away from fossil fuels such as oil, gasoline, kerosene, and natural gas will help guard against energy cost volatility and decrease carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions that impact climate change.

7. Cultivating Colchester Chapter, page three, third line, delete “maintain one district status” as this statement is not factual as it implies that the School District has decided not to unify with other district as part of Act 46. This is not a decision or discussion that the School District has had.


9. Attached intro, contents, and acknowledgements will be added.

Thank you for pulling everything together for us!
-Sarah

Sarah Hadd, AICP, CFM
Director of Planning & Zoning

Town of Colchester
781 Blakely Rd.
Colchester, Vermont 05446
P: 802.264.5602 | F: 802.264.5503

colchestervt.gov

Notice - Under Vermont’s Public Records Act, all e-mail, e-mail attachments as well as paper copies of documents received or prepared for use in matters concerning Town business, concerning a Town official or staff, or containing information relating to town business are likely to be regarded as public records which may be inspected by any person upon request, unless otherwise made confidential by law. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by return email. Thank you for your cooperation.
The Legislature is considering bill S.96 that would create clean water service providers to work with basin water quality advisory councils to implement non-regulatory projects in each watershed basin. The amount of pollution needed to be reduced beyond what will be achieved by regulatory compliance in each basin will be determined by the Secretary of the Agency of Natural Resources. Grant funds will be made available based upon the amount of pollution reduction needed.

The bill also provides a vehicle for the raising of additional dedicated revenue for water quality investments.

To see the bill as passed by the Senate, see this link: https://legislature.vermont.gov/Documents/2020/Docs/BILLS/S-0096/S-0096%20As%20Passed%20by%20the%20Senate%20Unofficial.pdf

The bill is now under consideration by the House. Testimony started in the House Committee on Natural Resources, Fish and Wildlife on April 9th. Charlie Baker was asked to testify on April 11th.

The testimony is attached for review and edits by the Board. The testimony was developed after review by the Clean Water Advisory Committee on April 2nd and the Executive Committee on April 3rd.

Additional edits were made by Baker based upon his review of the Senate version which was not available for review by the date of the Committee meetings and based on conversations with partner organizations including ANR.

Those edits not reviewed or developed by the committee include the idea of a technical committee and encouraging the retention of all municipalities on the basin council.

We are seeking review and finalization of these comments by the CCRPC Board. If significant changes are made, Baker will provide them to legislature after the Board meeting.

For questions, contact Charlie Baker, 735-3500 or cbaker@ccrpcvt.org
Thank you for the opportunity to testify this morning on S.96. These comments and recommendations have been developed by CCRPC staff, reviewed by CCRPC’s Clean Water Advisory Committee and Executive Committee and are scheduled for CCRPC Board action at their April 17th meeting.

Sec. 3, 10 V.S.A. § 1387. FINDINGS, PURPOSE, CLEAN WATER INITIATIVE - The bill includes language that the State should commit to annually appropriate $50-60 million to ensure the maintenance of effort. As we have testified previously, CCRPC supports the State investing adequately in the efforts to achieve clean water. We support the development of a long-term, consistent funding mechanism this session.

Sec. 1, 10 V.S.A. §922. WATER QUALITY IMPLEMENTATION PLANNING AND TARGETS - The Secretary of ANR shall determine any additional pollutant reduction needed beyond what can be expected to be achieved from the existing regulatory programs. If there are additional pollutant reductions required, the Secretary shall make an allocation of the pollutant reductions to each basin and clean water service provider in annual and five-year pollution reduction targets. The Secretary shall also determine the standard cost per unit of pollutant reduction starting with Lake Champlain by November 1, 2021. CCRPC supports allocating grant funding by basin based upon pollutant reduction need.

Sec. 1, 10 V.S.A. §923. QUANITIFICATION OF POLLUTION REDUCTION; CLEAN WATER PROJECTS – The Secretary shall publish methodologies for calculating pollution reduction values and design life associated with clean water projects. CCRPC supports this effort, but would like to see the same language to determine pollution reduction values in (a) that is in (b) to determine design life: “...shall be determined based on a review of values established in other jurisdictions, values recommended by organizations that regularly estimate the [pollution reduction] of clean water projects, actual data documenting the [pollution reduction] of a practice, or a comparison to other similar practices if no other data exists.” In addition, we would like to see a more general statement that this shall be determined by the best science. We would also like to see a provision added that would allow a person to justify a higher pollution reduction or longer design life by providing supporting data to the Secretary. We want to make sure that we and the State are getting full credit for additional efforts in design and maintenance that may go beyond the normal project.

Sec. 1, 10 V.S.A. §924. CLEAN WATER SERVICE PROVIDER; RESPONSIBILITY FOR CLEAN WATER PROJECTS – The Secretary shall assign clean water service providers through rule making, defaulting to an RPC. This section describes responsibilities of a CWSP including selecting projects, funding clean water projects, maintaining clean water projects, reporting on progress, and measures the Secretary may take to hold a CWSP accountable. CCRPC supports formalizing a process for all the partners in a basin to work together as the basin water quality council in deciding, not advising, upon priority clean water projects with advice from technical staff. CCRPC supports holding a CWSP accountable, however, would like to see the following changes made to reduce the risk to a CWSP and share more responsibility with ANR, a basin water quality advisory council, and property owners. We are concerned that no regional planning commission or other entity will agree to take on this work with these risks. Recommended changes are detailed below.

- In (a)(4) When selecting projects for implementation or funding, a basin water quality advisory council regional planning commission shall prioritize projects identified in the basin plan for the area where the
In (c) Maintenance responsibility. A clean water service provider shall be responsible for maintaining reporting on the maintenance of a clean water project by the property owner or other responsible party or ensuring the maintenance for the entirety of the design life of that clean water project. The Secretary and clean water service providers shall develop mutually agreeable language to be used in grant agreements, maintenance agreements, and easements between the clean water service provider, ANR, and a property owner clearly defining the maintenance responsibilities and consequences for failing to maintain the project.

In (e) Reporting. A clean water service provider shall report annually, after approval of the report by the basin water quality council, to the Secretary.

In (f) Accountability for pollution reduction goals. ...The Secretary may take the following steps:
(1) Enter a plan to ensure that clean water service provider meets current and future year pollution;
(2) Initiate an enforcement action pursuant to chapter 201 or 211 of this title for the failure of a clean water service provider to meets its obligations; or
(3) Initiate rulemaking to designate an alternative entity as accountable for the basin.

(g)(1) ...The purpose of the council is to make decisions recommendations to the regional planning commission on identifying the most significant water quality impairments that exist in the basin and prioritizing the projects and partners to be funded by the clean water service provider that will address those impairments.

(g)(2) CCRPC feels that is important that all municipalities be represented on the basin council and participate in the decisions. We do not think municipalities will be interested in taking on these types of clean water projects as they work to comply with requirements on municipal roads and stormwater projects. Adding a technical committee that is more balanced with technical staff can address concerns about inequity.

Sec. 1, 10 V.S.A. §925. WATER QUALITY GRANT PROGRAMS - The Secretary shall administer four grant programs: 1) a Water Quality Restoration Formula Grant to address annual pollution reduction targets in impaired watersheds, 2) a Water Quality Enhancement Grant of at least $1.5 million to protect high quality waters, 3) a Stormwater Implementation Grant for persons who are required to obtain a permit, and 4) a Municipal Stormwater Assistance Grant for municipalities required to obtain a permit. CCRPC is supportive of these grant programs, but are concerned about the implications on other funding programs such as for municipal roads. Will this new grant program take away from the grant assistance that the State has been providing municipalities, farmers, conservation districts, and watershed associations? Will a shift reduce or improve the State’s ability to achieve our clean water goals? Also, we suggest clarifying the language to make it clear that clean water service providers are only involved in the Water Quality Restoration Formula Grant program.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments and recommendations.
DATE: Wednesday, March 20, 2019
TIME: 5:30 p.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices; 110 W. Canal St; Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404
PRESENT: Chris Roy, Chair
Mike O’Brien, Vice-Chair
Barbara Elliott, At-Large
Catherine McMains, At-Large
Andy Montroll, Immediate Past Chair
Staff: Charlie Baker, Executive Director
Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
Forest Cohen, Senior Business Manager
Amy Irvin Witham, Business Office Associate

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

2. Approval of February 6, 2019 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes. ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CATHERINE McMAINS, TO APPROVE THE FEBRUARY 6, 2019 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES, WITH CORRECTIONS IF ANY. Barbara had minor grammatical corrections that she gave to Bernie to insert into the draft minutes. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THE MINUTES.

3. Act 250 & Section 248 Applications – previously reviewed. Regina noted that the Executive Committee members had reviewed these letters via email and approved them and the letters have been sent. The Executive Committee needs to ratify the approvals of the letters at this meeting.
   a. §248 Advance Notice; GMP Solar Canopy; Colchester #19-0385-AN.
   b. §248 Petition; Jolina Court Solar; Richmond; #19-0452-NM.
   c. Act 250 Hearing; JJJ South Burlington, LLC/Cider Mill II; South Burlington, #4C1128-5
BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO RATIFY THE LETTERS FOR THE THREE PROJECTS. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. Updated Act 250 Recommendations. Regina noted that the board approved eight recommendations to the legislature regarding the proposed Act 250 revisions. The Ad Hoc Act 250 committee has added two new recommendations. One of the proposals in the large draft bill (19-0040) 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. It suggests the Environmental Board serve this function. The Vermont Planners Association (VPA) notes that most local plans are approved by regional planning commissions, and this requirement would be an 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 process. VPA feels that since regional plans are used in the Act 250 regulatory process under Criterion 10, the Environmental Board should not be reviewing and approving regional plans. The second recommendation deals with appeals for regional plan approvals. Suggested language is:

   #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 Cabinet; 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.” After a brief discussion, members agreed to amend the second line to read “...plans are reviewed for compliance with statutory planning goals and approved by a Development Cabinet...” Regina noted that the Development Cabinet, though not active, is in statute (3 V.S.A. §2293) for the purpose of collaboration and consultation among State agencies and departments.

#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.”

MICHAEL O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BARBARA ELLIOTT, TO RECOMMEND BOARD APPROVAL OF THESE ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS AS AMENDED. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. Chair/Executive Director’s Report.
   a. FY20 UPWP Update. Charlie reported that the UPWP committee will hold its final meeting tomorrow. We have a pretty good draft document and will review a request from UVM. We added six new stormwater projects. The Executive Committee will review the draft UPWP at the April meeting to make a recommendation to the Board.
   b. Legislative Update. Charlie thinks the Act 250 amendments will be a two-year process as there is no formal bill yet, so we will have more time to review and update our position as changes are made. We do hope there will be a bill by spring. The other significant bill is S.96 dealing with clean water service providers. The Senate is likely to vote it over to the House on Friday without including any funding recommendations. The bill includes the idea to distribute funding through a clean water service provider and they’d default to RPCs to do that. However, the service provider would also have to deal with ongoing operation and maintenance of these projects, which is not appealing to the RPCs. Catherine McMains mentioned H.353 which deals with weatherization and energy issues.

6. Other Business. There was no further business.

7. Executive Session. There was none needed.

8. Adjournment. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 6:55 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc
DATE: Wednesday, April 3, 2019
TIME: 5:45 p.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404
PRESENT: Chris Roy, Chair
John Zicconi, Secretary-Treasurer
Catherine McMains, At-Large
Staff: Charlie Baker, Executive Director
Mike O’Brien, Vice-Chair
Barbara Elliott, At-Large
Andy Montroll, Immediate Past-Chair
Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
Forest Cohen, Senior Business Manager
Amy Irvin Witham, Business Office Associate

The meeting was called to order at 5:47 p.m. by the Chair, Chris Roy.

1. Changes to the Agenda/Members’ Items. There were none.

2. Approval of March 20, 2019 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes. CATHERINE MCMAINS MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BARBARA ELLIOTT, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES. MOTION CARRIED WITH JOHN ZICCONI ABSTAINING.

3. Act 250 & Section 248 Applications.
   a. Snyder Shelburne Properties, LLC (Fairway at Spear); Shelburne; #4C1318. Regina noted that is a project located near the golf course and has been in the works for a while. It is in the Suburban planning area and meets criterion 9(L). BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL TO APPROVE THE LETTER TO THE ACT 250 DISTRICT #4 COORDINATOR. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
   b. O’Brien Brothers Northside Neighborhood - Colchester #4C1319. This project is off Route 7 north of Exit 17. It’s a conceptual plan and they are just asking for review under Criterion 9(B), Ag soils. Our letter notes it’s in the Metro planning area, but we reserve further comment until it comes for a full review. (Mike O’Brien noted that he is not related to them.) BARARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL TO APPROVE THE LETTER TO THE ACT 250 DISTRICT #4 COORDINATOR. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
   c. Section 248 Advance Notice; Jericho Landfill Solar, 1.65 MW; Jericho. Catherine McMains recused herself from discussion/action on this project. Regina noted that we saw this application about a year ago. CCRPC highly supports projects on previously developed sites like this parcel, which is a former landfill. JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO APPROVE THE LETTER TO ENCORE RENEWABLE ENERGY. MOTION CARRIED, WITH CATHERINE ABSTAINING.

4. Charge to Board Development Committee to develop slate of officers for FY20. Charlie noted that the bylaws require that the Board Development Committee report on a slate of officers a month before the June Annual Meeting. After reviewing the bylaws, it was noted that members can serve in any one office for up to four years, but they are elected annually. Andy Montroll, as chair of the Board Development Committee, asked Executive Committee members to let him know if they wish to continue in their current positions. John Zicconi and Barbara Elliott would like to continue. Chris Roy is stepping down as chair and will become immediate past chair.
5. **FY20 UPWP and Budget** – recommend board warn public hearing for May. Members received a draft UPWP in the meeting packet, which includes the UVM project for commuter bus ridership pilot program. There have been some minor changes since that draft - we added the deliverables required by the Transportation Planning Initiative (TPI) which is a program VTrans has with each of the 11 RPCs, and an additional $10,000 Carryover for CarShare. When asked, it was noted that the $10,000 for UVM was taken from the Technical Assistance task, so the consultant budget didn’t change. Charlie said we are asking the Executive Committee to recommend the board warn the public hearing for the May meeting and that we allow the staff to make additional administrative changes for the final draft. We are still waiting for deliverables on our ACCD funded projects. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BARBARA ELLIOTT, TO RECOMMEND THE BOARD WARN A PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE UPWP AND BUDGET FOR OUR MAY MEETING, AND INCLUDE ANY MINOR CHANGES STAFF DEEMS NECESSARY. Charlie then reviewed the budget. On the income side there is just one yellow item for the Bolton CDBG grant which is pending. We should hear by the end of April. Staff has worked the budget to get to a $29 positive balance. There is still a question on the depreciation line as we still negotiating our lease and are asking for some renovations, and this would necessitate furniture purchases. When asked how we were able to get to a $29 surplus vs. last year’s projected $100,000 deficit, Charlie said we used an 80 % indirect rate, which VTrans just approved. There will a savings in salaries with Bernie’s retirement, Lee’s position and Peter only working one quarter of FY20. When asked the lease term, Charlie noted it had been every five years, but with the renovations Redstone is asking for 7 or more. They have agreed to reducing annual rent increase of 3% to 2%. Brief discussion about the benefits of not relocating the offices. VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

6. **Draft S.96 Recommendations.** S.96 proposes to redesign the way in which funding is determined and distributed for clean water projects that are not subject to a permit. Charlie noted that S.96 was voted out of the Senate committee yesterday, and while they didn’t fund it, they moved responsibilities to the regions. Today, Charlie talked with the chair of the House Natural Resources Committee to see when they might take it up. Then Ways and Means will look at it for the funding aspect. In the meeting packet was a first draft of recommendations for changes/clarifications to various sections of the bill. Charlie reviewed the additional suggestions made by the CWAC at yesterday’s meeting. Members supported some of the CWAC suggestions, but not others. One big concern is that clean water service providers will be responsible for operation and maintenance. Since the service providers will funnel funding to the owners of a project, the owners should operate and maintain a project. Keep ANR as party to these agreements because they have enforcement authority to take action. Lengthy discussion ensued. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO FORWARD THESE RECOMMENDATIONS INCLUDING EDITS TO THE BOARD. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. (John Zicconi left the meeting.)

7. **Chair’s/Executive Director’s Update.** Charlie said the only other legislative update is Act 250. He feels the House Natural Resources Committee will hold over the proposal this session and work on an actual bill over the winter for action early in the 2020 legislative session. Andy noted it’s hard to review something that is still a concept without an actual bill.

8. **Review agenda for April 17, 2019 Board Meeting.** Barbara Elliott suggested that we add Road Erosion Inventory update to the agenda, since it appears to be light. Members agreed.

9. **Other business.** There was no other business.
10. Executive Session. ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BARBARA ELLIOTT, TO GO INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION AT 6:40 P.M. TO DISCUSS PERSONNEL ISSUES WITH THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PRESENT. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc
April 4, 2019

Rachel Lomonaco
District #4 Coordinator
111 West Street
Essex Junction, VT  05452

RE: Snyder Shelburne Properties, LLC and ABC/MRC, Inc. (Fairway at Spear); Shelburne; Application #4C1318

Dear Ms. Lomonaco:

The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission’s Staff and Executive Committee have reviewed this Act 250 application for a project described as the construction of 91 residential units with related site improvements. The project is located west of Spear Street and north of Webster Road in Shelburne, Vermont. The Town of Shelburne Development Review Board approved the project on February 20, 2019. 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 will be served by municipal water and sewer, and constructs a new multi-use path on the west side of Spear Street that connects to the existing path on Webster Road.
3. The density and uses are consistent with the local regulations, as shown by the Shelburne Development Review Board’s approval of the project.

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

We also find that this project meets the requirements of Criterion 9(L). Though the project is not located in a state designated center or in an existing center as defined in 10 VSA §6001(16), the project makes efficient use of land and utilities. The project is located between two existing developments and has a compact, clustered form that preserves approximately 3/5 of the site as open space. The project is within the existing water and sewer service area and provides a multi-use path connection to the existing multi-use path on Webster Road. Finally, the project is purely residential.

We have reviewed the Traffic Impact Analysis, revised 9/21/2018, conducted by Lamoureux & Dickinson Consulting Engineers, Inc. We concur with its findings and have no concerns regarding the project’s expected traffic impacts.

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
April 4, 2019

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

RE: O’Brien Brothers Northside Neighborhood; Colchester; Application #4C1319

Dear Ms. Lomonaco:

The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission’s Staff and Executive Committee have reviewed this Act 250 application for a project described as a planned unit development consisting of between 200 and 300 residential units, located on 6200 Roosevelt Highway in Colchester, Vermont. The District Commission intends to narrow the scope of the hearing to 9B (primary agricultural soils) unless the scope is expanded at the hearing. We understand that this project has not yet sought local approval from the Town of Colchester. We offer the following comments:

The project is located within the Metro 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 Metro Planning Area is identified in the Plan as an area planned for growth, and therefore this project helps implement Strategy #2 of the Plan which calls for 80% of new development in the areas planned for growth. Therefore, we find this project’s general location to be in conformance with the Planning Areas of the 2018 Chittenden County Regional Plan.

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

Due to the detailed level of development review in most Chittenden County municipalities and the environmental permit reviews at the Department of Environmental Conservation, CCRPC will give specific attention in its Act 250 reviews to the type of use and the Planning Areas section of the 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,

Charley Z. Baker
Executive Director

Cc: CCRPC Board
Certificate of Service
April 4, 2019

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

RE: Advance Notice of Petition for ER Jericho Landfill Solar, LLC’s Proposed 1.6MW Solar Array at 508 Browns Trace Road in Jericho, VT (Case #19-0736-AN)

Dear Mr. Foy:

Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission has received the 45-day notice of a Section 248 Petition to be filed with the Vermont Public Utility Commission for a 1.6MW solar array at 508 Browns Trace Road in Jericho, 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 meets the following suitability policies:

- The project is located on a previously impacted site and is located on a state-designated preferred site for net metering.
- The project is outside of any state designated centers or historic districts.

CCRPC finds that the general location of this project meets the suitability policies of the 2018 ECOS Plan. CCRPC is highly supportive of projects sited on previously developed sites like this parcel, which is a former landfill.

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

CCRPC has reviewed the constraints that exist on the site of the proposed project. The natural resources assessment and conceptual site plan submitted by the applicant show that there are Class II Wetlands and Primary Agricultural Soils on the parcel. However, the project’s conceptual location appears to avoid these resources. CCRPC is not requesting further information or action related to these constraints at this time.

This project located on the Mobbs Farm property, an area conserved by the Town of Jericho. Conserved lands in general are a possible constraint. However, the Jericho Selectboard has approved the use of town land for the solar project. This project’s location does not negatively impact constrained conserved lands.

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

Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Charlie Baker
Executive Director

cc: CCRPC Board
Katherine Sonnick, Jericho Planning Coordinator
DATE: Tuesday April 2, 2019
TIME: 9:00 a.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal St. Winooski, VT

Members Present
Bruce Hoar, Williston
Brian Bigelow, Underhill
Jon Rauscher, Winooski
Elizabeth Gohringer, Burlington
Richard Watts, Hinesburg
Chris Jolly, FHWA
David Allerton, Milton
Dennis Lutz, Essex
Mary Anne Michaels, Rail
Dean Bloch, Charlotte
Josh Arneson, Richmond
Bob Henneberger, Seniors
Justin Rabidoux, South Burlington
Barbara Elliot, Huntington
Joss Besse, Bolton
Dean Pierce, Shelburne
Ashley Bishop, VTrans D5

Staff Present
Eleni Churchill, Transportation Program Manager
Bryan Davis, Senior Transportation Planner
Charlie Baker, Executive Director
Chris Dubin, Transportation Planner
Jason Charlest, Senior Transportation Planning Engineer
Peter Keating, Senior Transportation Planner
Christine Forde, Senior Transportation Planner
Marshall Distel, Transportation Planner

Others
Chapin Kaynor, GMT Board
Katie Martin, CATMA
Andrea Hamre, CATMA
Karen Adams, Colchester
Kathyrn Koberna, CCRPC Intern
Jim Ryan, VTANR/DEC

Peter Keating called the meeting to order at 9:03AM, calling for a round of introductions.

1. Approval of Minutes
DEAN BLOCH MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY RICHARD WATTS, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 8, 2019. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

2. Public Comments
None.

3. GMT’s NextGEN Plan (Information Item)
Rachel Kennedy from GMT provided a presentation on GMT’s NextGen Plan. This included routes that are proposed to be eliminated, route headway changes, explanation of “interlining” routes, proposed route maps, a proposed fare increase from $1.25 to $1.50 and an updated cellphone app that includes mobile ticketing. She concluded by noting the following next steps:

- Municipal Staff and Stakeholder Meetings
- Public Hearings (late March into mid-April)
- GMT Board Approval (April 16th)
- Service and Fare Change Implementation June 17th

Richard Watts expressed his appreciation of the positive service and other transit changes Rachel described. Chapin Kaynor discussed the Williston 1V loss and how there is still a need for that first/last mile transit trip. Joss Besse asked about the status of the Williston Park & Ride (P&R) and if there are further expansions planned for the Richmond P&R. The Williston P&R is moving forward but there is no firm construction date of the facility and there are no plans to expand the Richmond P&R. Dennis Lutz asked about new signage for new stops. Rachel explained there are no new stops planned or new signage at this point. Andrea Hamre talked about a meeting that CATMA had with three rural communities (Cambridge, Jericho and Underhill) and their interest for intra-regional transit services. Chris Jolly asked...
if the changes would have an effect to CMAQ funding. Rachel explained that none of the routes changed are funded through CMAQ.

4. FY20 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Update (Information Item)
Marshall Distel spoke to the memo in the TAC packet on the draft FY20 UPWP. In order to fit the budget, some staff-generated regional projects were removed and the budget of some municipal requests reduced but the UPWP committee did not fully remove any municipal or partner project requests. The biggest portion of the FY20 budget for new consultant projects is going towards water quality/transportation projects. The Executive Committee will be reviewing the draft on 4/3 and from there it will go before the Board on 4/17 for review and warning of a public hearing. After the 4/17 Board meeting the draft will become a final draft. The Finance Committee reviews the final draft on 4/24. In May it will come back to the Executive Committee, PAC, TAC, QWAC and CCRPC Board as a final draft UPWP. At the May CCRPC Board meeting there will be a public hearing and a final action on the FY20 UPWP and Budget. Responding to a specific question, Charlie Baker confirmed that this will be an action item at the May TAC meeting.

Dean Bloch asked what the Municipal Energy Planning and Assistance line item consists of. Eleni Churchill responded this is a task that VEIC works together with CCRPC staff to assist with Energy and Electric Vehicle (EV) planning in the county. The VEIC scope of work for FY20 has not been finalized yet but staff will work on that in the near future.

5. Road and Bridge Standard Synchronization (Information Item)
Jim Ryan gave a presentation on the Draft Vermont Road and Bridge Standards and their relation to the municipal roads general permit and stream encroachment permit. Some towns have chosen not to adopt these in the past due to pieces of the standards such as the guardrail standard or driveway access. New version pulls these pieces apart into seven sections and allows towns to choose what pieces they are going to adopt. April 26 is the deadline for comments on draft standards.

Bruce Hoar and Dennis Lutz asked questions about the Class 4 roadways as it pertains to a FEMA event. Jim clarified that the FEMA event would cover the cost of the damages, not rebuilding the road. Dean Bloch asked about driveway standard and its available flexibility for an adopted standard. Jim responded that it was intentionally written that way. Dennis Lutz asked whether the new draft Road standards released about a month ago will be used this construction season, once finalized in May. Dennis also asked about the status of the ERAF grants as it pertains to these draft standards. Ashley Bishop clarified for FY20 grants they are based on the 2013 road and bridge standards. Dennis wondered if there had been any discussion with FEMA about these draft changes and potential events this season. A discussion ensued about whether or not there is a grace period between when the draft standards are adopted by VTrans and ANR in May and when the towns adopt them. Ashley explained this discussion is ongoing and this very concern has been previously raised at the table and the state agencies are aware of and working to resolve it. To qualify for the highest level of State cost share in the event of a disaster, these standards must be adopted and used by the municipality. Ashley highlighted a piece to the draft standard where values are underlined and where towns could insert their own values if they so desire.

6. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports (Information Item)
Richard Watts asked about adding capacity to I-89 with regard to the I-89 Study. He raised the issue of how expensive it is to fund Interstate expansions. Eleni Churchill explained that expansion of the Interstate is something that will be considered as part of the I-89 Study along with other options for addressing congestion. The study and its advisory committee will determine how best to address congestion on I-89 into the future.

7. CCRPC March Board Meetings Report
Peter noted that the Board met on March 20th. There was a presentation on GMT’s NextGEN Plan and Project Prioritization was approved.
8. Chairman’s/Members’ Items
Bryan Davis passed out flyers for a regional bikeshare update and GOTCHA survey. Dean Pierce asked about a rural transit meeting and if he could be added to the invite list. Peter Keating spoke about the Transportation Alternatives (TA) grant updates. Dennis Lutz let everyone know that the intersection of Susie Wilson and Kellogg Road is about to be reconstructed. Starbucks is about to be approved at the corner of VT-15/Susie Wilson Road. Radar detection will be installed at both signals as part of the reconstruction/development. Ashley Bishop mentioned that Class 2 paving grants are due April 15th. A general discussion amongst TAC members ensued. Burlington has been looking at parklets in various areas. Elizabeth Gohringer explained what these are and where they are planned (Drifters, Archives, El Cortijo, and 55 Main St). Bob Henneberger added that AARP is assisting with these efforts.

DENNIS LUTZ MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY RICHARD WATTS, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

The meeting adjourned at 10:29 AM.

Respectfully submitted, Jason Charest
DATE: Tuesday, April 2, 2019  
SCHEDULED TIME: 11 a.m. to 12:15 p.m.  
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT  
DOCUMENTS: Minutes, documents, and presentations discussed accessible at:  
http://www.ccrpcvt.org/meetings/clean-water-advisory-committee/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Members in Attendance</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bolton:</td>
<td>Hinesburg: Merrily Lovell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buels Gore:</td>
<td>Huntingdon:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington: Jenna Olson</td>
<td>Jericho:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte:</td>
<td>Milton: Dave Allerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester: Karen Adams, Andrew Douglas</td>
<td>Richmond: Jessica Draper (dep. 12:01 p.m.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex:</td>
<td>Shelburne: Chris Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Junction: Chelsea Mandigo</td>
<td>South Burlington: Tom DiPietro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington Airport: Polly Harris (Stantec)</td>
<td>University of VT: Lani Ravin (arr. 11:06 p.m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the Winooski River:</td>
<td>Lewis Creek Assoe:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Attendees:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCRPC Staff: Dan Albrecht, Charlie Baker, Kathryn Koberna (CCRPC UVM intern, departed after introductions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Call to Order.** The meeting was called to order by Don Meals at 11:00 a.m. Introductions were made.

2. **Changes to the Agenda and public comments on items not on the agenda** None.

3. **Review and action on draft minutes of March 6, 2019.**  
   After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, **James Sherrard made a motion, seconded by Chelsea Mandigo to approve the minutes as drafted. MOTION PASSED with abstention by Meals, Harris and Lovell.**

4. **Road and Bridge Standards Synchronization**  
   Jim Ryan explained how the VTRANS “Town Road and Bridge Standards” are being updated especially via incorporation of various standards from DEC’s Municipal Roads General Permit. There are seven different sections as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road and Bridge Standards Sections</th>
<th>Hydrologically-connected road segments*</th>
<th>Non-hydrologically-connected road segments**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 1 – Municipal Road Standards</td>
<td>YES (Required by Act 64)</td>
<td>YES NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2 – Class 4 Road Standards</td>
<td>YES (Required by Act 64)</td>
<td>YES NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town wide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3 – Perennial stream- bridge and culvert standards</td>
<td>YES (Required by DEC Stream Alteration Standard)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4 – Intermittent stream crossings</td>
<td>YES NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5 – Wayway construction standards</td>
<td>YES NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 6 – Guardrail standard</td>
<td>YES NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 7 – Driveway access standard</td>
<td>YES NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To qualify as meeting one of the four mitigation measures for achieving a favorable amount of State match from the Emergency Relief and Assistance Fund (ERAF), municipalities will need to adopt Sections 1 through 4 plus Section 7. Jim and Dan noted upcoming opportunities to learn more in detail about the proposed update to the Standards. These include: a VTRANS Local Roads “Road Roundtable” in Lincoln (editor’s note: this is on May 13th at 3 p.m.) and a CCRPC Road Foremen’s meeting here at CCRPC at 8 a.m. on April 24th. Jim concluded noting that DEC has recently announced the “Grants-in-Aid” allocation for the next fiscal year to be $3.2 Million which is slightly higher than last year.
5. **Draft CCRPC recommendations on S.96**

Charlie briefed the committee on the proposed CCRPC comments on S.96 which is scheduled for a 3rd reading today in the Senate. After the CWAC and Executive Committee reviews the draft letter the full CCRPC Board will act on the final version of the letter at its April 17th meeting. CWAC suggested edits were as follows:

- Sec. 3 10 VSA § 1387: strengthen the language to emphasize that a long-term funding solution is needed soon otherwise EPA will impose penalties such as requiring even more cost-inefficient upgrades to sewer plants;
- Sec. 1, 10 VSA § 922: change to read “….allocating grant funding based upon pollution reduction need.
- § 923: add language to improve how “design life” issues are addressed. Members noted that design life depends upon maintenance; best available science should be used to determine design life; efficacy drops over time but does not drop precipitously after design life is exceeded
- § 924: this is the most complicated part. The overall concept of the bill was originally to set up a regional structure for subgranting and project administration but now its morphing into a permit program where a “clean water service provider” (an RPC) would be responsible for maintenance to assure pollution reduction targets are met and could be subject to an enforcement action by the ANR Secretary if it failed to do so. Members supported the proposed comments to soften these requirements but still have “providers” responsible for reporting on project implementation and maintenance practices
- § 925: by and large, members agreed with the proposed comments. James Sherrard noted that in the end establishment of this new regional program would divert a finite amount of money needed for permit-regulated obligations to new, non-obligatory programs. Don Meals disagreed saying that argument seems a little bit like “turf-protection” for municipalities. Tom DiPietro said that it is somewhat the case but for him its about making sure funds are allocated towards projects that get the most efficient pollution reduction per dollar spent.
- Sec. 1, 10 VSA §926, Sec. 6, 24 VSA §4345a. and Sec. 7, 24 VSA §4353: Members agreed with these comments. Clean water service providers should work off of standardized partner and maintenance agreements, basin water quality advisory councils should be the ones prioritizing projects and allocating funding to partners. Dan Albrecht noted that RPCs are well suited to handle sub-grants for projects as well as project tracking and annual reporting as it is similar to their work with CWBG grants and tracking progress on the Municipal Roads General Permit.

Charlie indicated he would incorporate the suggested revisions into an updated draft.

6. **Updates.**

Dan noted the following:

- April 24th Road Foremen’s meeting here
- April 11th webinar by DEC on the (editor’s note: see info here: [https://dec.vermont.gov/watershed/cwi/outreach/lecture-series](https://dec.vermont.gov/watershed/cwi/outreach/lecture-series)

The Basin 5 (Direct-to-Lake) TBP update process is underway. Dan will be reaching out soon to gather info on town input on new water quality concerns, problem sites, etc.

7. **Items for May 7th meeting agenda.**

- Chairman Meals asked members to contact Dan if they have agenda items for consideration.
- Legislative update will likely be on the agenda

8. **Adjournment.** The meeting adjourned at 12:11 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Dan Albrecht
CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

MS4 SUBCOMMITTEE

OF CLEAN WATER ADVISORY COMMITTEE – DRAFT MINUTES

DATE: Tuesday, April 2, 2019
SCHEDULED TIME: 12:30 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/

Committee Members in Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burlington: Jenna Olson</th>
<th>Burlington Airport: Polly Harris (Stantec)</th>
<th>Williston: James Sherrard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colchester: Andrew Douglas</td>
<td>Milton: Dave Allerton</td>
<td>Winooski: Tim Grover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex:</td>
<td>Shelburne: Chris Robinson</td>
<td>VAOT: Jennifer Callahan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Junction: Chelsea Mandigo, co-chair</td>
<td>South Burlington: Tom DiPietro</td>
<td>Univ. of VT: Lani Ravin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Attendees: WNRCD: Kristen Balschun; Pluck: Dave Barron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCRPC Staff: Dan Albrecht</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Call to Order, Changes to the Agenda and Public Comments on Items not on the agenda:
Chelsea Mandigo called the meeting to order at 12:30 p.m. No changes to the agenda nor public comments made.

2. Review and action on draft minutes of March 6, 2019
After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, Tom DiPietro made a motion, seconded by James Sherrard to approve the minutes as drafted. MOTION PASSED with abstentions by Harris, Ravin and Callahan.

   a. Review & approve final MCM-#1 2018 Calendar Year report
Dave Barron provided a brief update. Digital web will start on April 15th with other formats launching shortly after. He showed what the two rack cards, the interchangeable art banner and the seed cards will look like. Total estimated costs are about $1,180 (if 250 rack cards purchased) or $1,334 (if 500 purchased). The original total budget authorized was $1,200, Dave would like to request a higher allocation. He believes this can be supported as the winter ad buy completed with a savings in the range of $400-$600. After a brief discussion, James Sherrard made a motion with a second by Chris Robinson to raise the overall budget limit for the rack cards, banner and seed cards to $1,600. The motion carried.

Upon inquiry from a member, Dave indicated that he would have high-resolution versions of the various ad graphics done in about two weeks. These would be sufficient quality for downloading to print for posting.

4. WNRC: Stream Team update
Kristen Balschun provided a brief update. Upcoming events are: Burlington (May 4th rain barrel workshop), Shelburne (late August storm drain mural), Milton (July storm drain mural and stenciling). Additionally, a May 10th “mini” rain barrel workshop is planned with Essex Middle School students and outreach continues to local libraries to host Stream Display along with recommended books related to water quality. In other items, she anticipated receiving final approvals from the LaRosa lab this week regarding water quality sampling and the budget is getting fairly close to being spent with $19,101.77 spent through March 23rd out of the overall $23,000 budget.

She would like to speak further with the subcommittee about first, revisiting the planned sites for water quality sampling to see about potential changes to locations for 2020 and second, consideration of an increase to cover additional work in this current fiscal year. Chelsea indicated both those items can be addressed at the May 7th meeting.

5. Updates
James Sherrard asked Kristen if the Stream Team could come to the Williston July 4th parade again. She indicated that Williston is not one of their outreach towns, but she will see what she can do.

Kristen noted that in a last-minute request she will be speaking to 4th and 5th graders at Shelburne Community School about water quality.

Tom DiPietro reported that Christy Wittens said she is looking over all the annual reports submitted by the MS4s.

8. Items for Tuesday, May 7th meeting
   Discussion of revisions to water quality sampling program for 2020
   Consideration of increase to current fiscal year contract with WNRCD for Stream Team services.

9. Adjournment
   The meeting adjourned at 12:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Dan Albrecht
FY2020 UPWP Committee Meeting 3
March 22, 2019
Location: CCRPC, Winooski

Attendees: Jessica Draper, PAC
Mike O’Brien, Committee Chair Bryan Davis, CCRPC
Amy Bell, VTrans Charlie Baker, CCRPC
Chris Jolly, FHWA Eleni Churchill, CCRPC
Rachel Kennedy, GMT Regina Mahony, CCRPC
Dean Pierce, PAC Bernie Ferenc, CCRPC
Michael Bissonnette, Board Forest Cohen, CCRPC
Sharon Murray, Board Marshall Distel, CCRPC
Barbara Elliot, TAC

1. Committee Chair Mike O’Brien called the meeting to order at 5:32 p.m. Introductions were made.

2. The minutes from the second UPWP Committee meeting were reviewed with one change to add Sharon Murray to the attendance list. Barbara Elliot made the motion to approve the minutes with the change and Sharon Murray seconded. Dean Pierce abstained from the motion. All others in favor. Motion passed.

3. Marshall Distel reminded the committee that the non-municipal partner reports were posted for review and asked if there were any comments. There were no comments made on any of the reports.

4. Eleni Churchill introduced the draft FY2020 UPWP to the committee and outlined the color coding. Rachel Kennedy briefly highlighted GMT’s level funded request. Charlie described the technical assistance task and mentioned that if the UPWP Committee decided to add Richard Watts’ project back in the UPWP, then the easiest thing to do may be to reduce the technical assistance task by $10,000. Chris Jolly asked about the SPR funds being used for the Way to Go! task. Bernie Ferenc explained how SPR funds relate to this task. Bernie Ferenc and Amy Bell also mentioned that the SPR funds for the I-89 study have changed to NHP(?) funds. CCRPC staff will make this change within the UPWP.

   Eleni and Marshall highlighted the correction made to the budget for the Burlington ROW Condition Inventory. The $70,000 added to the UPWP will now be sufficient to complete both Wards 5 and 6 during FY20. Eleni outlined a minor change to the Transportation Management Services task with a sub-task for each municipality and described how $5,000 was being added to the Public Participation task to assist with outreach for underserved populations. Charlie described the overall funding for FY2020, with the total transportation budget of $3,353,492.

The UPWP Committee then moved on to discuss Richard Watts’ proposed project. Michael Bissonnette started the conversation by describing why he thought the project should be added back into the UPWP. He explained that the current timeline is very important to the success of
the project and that the project itself would help to evaluate opportunities to increase bus ridership, reduce roadway congestion and identify how transit savings may benefit individual commuters. He also mentioned the importance of balancing a large roadways study such as the one for I-89 with a study that specifically evaluates transit. Dean Pierce also spoke in favor of adding the project back into the UPWP and mentioned how he would have been opposed to its removal at the second UPWP Committee meeting. Marshall Distel shared written comments from John Zicconi and Jeff Bartley in opposition to adding the project back in the UPWP. Mike O’Brien said that he was still struggling to understand the exact goal of the effort and has been on the fence about the project, but may feel persuaded to add it back in the UPWP Committee because of the support from GMT and several of the UPWP Committee members. Dean Pierce felt that the proposal was at least as good as the rest of the proposals and was concerned about the level of scrutiny being given towards this particular project. Eleni Churchill explained the contracting issues with UVM. Forest expressed confidence that CCRPC staff would be able to overcome the administrative hurdle. Mike O’Brien asked why a well-funded organization like UVM wasn’t funding this effort. Dean Pierce mentioned that a similar observation could be made about numerous other requests. Amy Bell asked that if we add this back in the UPWP, we should convey the message that future applications need to answer more questions on their own without staff and the committee having to spend extra effort to track down answers. With all the new information, it makes more sense to add this to the UPWP. Dean Pierce made motion to add Richard Watts’ project to the FY2020 UPWP, with the second from Mike Bissonnette. Amy Bell and Chris Jolly abstained from the motion. All others in favor. Motion passed.

Dean Pierce made a motion to approve the FY2020 UPWP as amended, with a second from Mike Bissonnette. All in favor. Motion passed.

5. Dean Pierce made a motion to adjourn the meeting, with a second from Michael Bissonnette. All in favor. Motion passed. The meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marshall Distel
DATE: Wednesday, March 27, 2019
TIME: 5:45 p.m.
PLACE: CCRPC offices at 110 W. Canal Street; Suite 110; Winooski, VT 05404
PRESENT: John Zicconi, Secretary-Treasurer  Mike O’Brien, Vice-Chair

The meeting was called to order at 5:47 p.m. by John Zicconi, Secretary-Treasurer who chairs the Finance Committee.

1. Approve the minutes from the November 1, 2018 Finance Committee Meeting.  MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JOHN ZICCONI, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS WRITTEN.  MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

2. Review of Financial Reports – FY19 (July-Feb.).
   a. Balance Sheet.  Cash in checking (operating) - $76,752; Cash in savings (match) - $188,026; Cash in money market & CD (reserve) - $217,606; current assets over liabilities - $654,710; Deferred income communities - $143,650.  Income Statement.  Forest noted that through February we show a negative income of ($104,659).  We usually experience an increase in billing to ACCD in the latter half of the fiscal year.  We are experiencing an indirect rate “penalty year”.  He calculated our actual indirect rate costs for this fiscal year through February and came up with 83%.  Our approved rate for this year is 68.12%.  This is greatly contributing to our deficit.  We had projected a deficit for this fiscal year of about $100,000 when we budgeted.  We may be able to improve on our current trend later in the fiscal year, but it seems clear that we will finish substantially negative this year.  Forest and Charlie are preparing the indirect rate for FY20 to present to VTrans and will ask for 80% which appears to be our new norm and we feel it’s reasonable.  Discussion ensued.  Charlie asked if members felt the board would like more frequent updates on the financials.  John and Mike agreed that reviewing the budget when we adopt the UPWP in May and again at the Mid-Year Adjustment was sufficient.
   b. Cash Flow.  Our cash position is good.  Forest noted that we have switched financial institutions from Peoples United Bank to Opportunities Credit Union so our cash flow projections will look different.  We won’t have a savings account, because the money will be in a money market account because of the improved interest earnings.  We will continue to have balances considered to be in reserve and breakout for match, but they won’t be represented in a separate cash account.

3. Approve Quarterly Journal Entries October-December 2018).  MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JOHN ZICCONI TO APPROVE THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL ENTRIES FOR OCTOBER-DECEMBER 2018.  Forest noted that there are a lot more grants being recorded using journal entries. The reason that’s happening is because we have a lot of deliverables-based grants vs. reimbursable grants.  These are mostly state grants from DEC for water quality projects.  We still have to track revenue and expenses monthly.  When asked, Forest explained unbilled revenue.  MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
4. **Review DRAFT FY20 budget.** Members reviewed the draft budget. Pink rows are going away. Yellow rows indicate questions about the funding amounts or pending grants. When John questioned the lower consultant amount, it was noted that we have not yet included funds from FY19 that will be carried over into FY20. That number will be added in the next couple of drafts. When asked if we are replacing Peter Keating’s position when he retires at the end of September, Charlie said we are not advertising at this time. We think we can do absorb the tasks with existing staff. We anticipate hiring an additional intern; and we may need a different skill set as we take on more water quality vs. transportation projects. Discussion ensued. We then reviewed the expense side. For the last three years we have had two electric vehicles, but are down to one hybrid. We’ve decided to stay with one for now. The rent is a question because we’re negotiating a new lease. We have been here 10 years. There may be some capital investment if we redo the intern area. This is not an action item. We will be reviewing the draft UPWP and budget at the April Executive Committee and board meetings to warn a public hearing for our May board meeting.

5. **Other Business.** John Zicconi said that because he and Mike are on the Executive Committee, he’d prefer to tandem the Finance Committee with the Executive Committee meetings and start at 5 p.m. rather than meet another week. We’ll check with Jeff Carr to see if that is doable.

MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION TO AJOURN AT 6:25 P.M. JOHN ZICCONI SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc