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 (10 minutes)

3. Action on Consent Agenda - (MPO Business) (Action; 1 minute)

4. Approve Minutes of April 17, 2019 Meeting * (Action; 1 minute)

5. Autonomous Vehicle Testing – Joe Segale, VTrans (Discussion; 30 minutes)

6. FY20 Draft UPWP & Budget Public Hearing and Vote * (Action; 15 minutes)


8. Board Development Committee – Report on FY20 Officer nominations* (Information; 2 min.)

9. Policy Engagement Decision Process * (Discussion; 20 minutes)

10. Chair/Executive Director Report (Discussion; 15 minutes)

a. Legislative Update

b. Annual Meeting

11. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports (Information; 2 minutes)

a. Brownfield Advisory Committee – draft minutes April 29, 2019*

b. Joint Executive & Finance Committee - draft minutes May 1, 2019*

i. Act 250 Sec 248 letters*

c. Transportation Advisory Committee – draft minutes May 7, 2019*

d. Clean Water Advisory Committee – draft minutes May 7, 2019*

e. MS4 Subcommittee – draft minutes May 7, 2019*

f. Board Development Committee - draft minutes May 8, 2019*

12. Members’ Items, Other Business (Information; 5 minutes)

13. Adjourn

The May 15th 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.

* - Attachment

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

- Transportation Advisory Committee - Tuesday, June 4, 2019; 9:00 a.m.
- Clean Water Advisory Committee - Tuesday, June 4, 2019; 11:00 a.m.
- CWAC MS4 Subcommittee – Tuesday, June 4, 2019; 12:15 p.m.
- Executive Committee – Wednesday, June 5, 2019; 5:45 p.m.
- CCRPC Annual Board Meeting - Wednesday, June 19, 2019; 5:30 p.m. The Mansfield Barn, Jericho

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Agenda Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 19, 2019 - Annual Meeting</td>
<td>FY20 Officers Election</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY20 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></td>
<td>Policy Engagement Decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approval of Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BTV Airport Noise Compatibility Plan</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.
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
May 15, 2019
Agenda Item C1: Consent Item

FY2019 Transportation Improvement Program Amendments

Issues
Add the following Interstate Paving projects to the FY2019-2022 TIP. Interstate projects are not subject to CCRPC’s fiscal constraint limit and adding a new non-constrained project is defined as a Minor TIP Amendment according to CCRPC’s TIP Amendment Policy.

This amendment request was received after the May TAC meeting. VTrans wants to advertise these projects for construction as soon as possible so the TAC was notified of this amendment via email.

I-189 Paving, Burlington-South Burlington (Project HP143, Amendment FY19-24).
  • **TIP Change**: Add a new project to the TIP for paving the entire length of I-189 eastbound and westbound in Burlington/South Burlington, including ramps. Add $500,000 in Federal Funds in FY19 and $580,000 in Federal Funds in FY20.

I-89 Paving, Richmond-Colchester (Project HP144, Amendment FY19-25)
  • **TIP Change**: Add a new project to the TIP for paving I-89, northbound and southbound lanes and ramps, in Richmond, Williston, South Burlington and Colchester beginning just south of the Williston/Richmond town line (mile marker 79) and extending to just north of Exit 16 (mile marker 91.88). Add $4,000,000 in FY19 and $4,200,000 in FY20.

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

Staff Recommendation:
Recommend approval of the proposed TIP amendments.

For more information, contact:
Christine Forde
cforde@ccrpcvt.org or 846-4490 ext. *13
DATE: Wednesday, April 17, 2019
TIME: 6:00 p.m.
PLACE: CCRPC offices; 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404

PRESENT:
Bolton: Sharon Murray
Buel’s Gore: Absent
Burlington: Andy Montroll Charlotte: Jim Donovan
Colchester: Jacki Murphy Essex: Jeff Carr
Essex Junction: Dan Kerin Hinesburg: Andrea Morgante
Huntington: Barbara Elliott Jericho: Catherine McMains
Milton: Tony Micklus Richmond: Absent
St. George: Absent Shelburne: John Zicconi
South Burl: Chris Shaw Underhill: Brian Bigelow
Westford: Absent Williston: Chris Roy
Winooski: Abby Bleything VTrans: Amy Bell
Socio/Econ/Housing: Absent Business/Industry: Absent
Agriculture: Absent Cons/Env: Absent
Others: Matthew Langham, VTrans Scott Moody, CCTV
Mike Bissonette, Hinesburg Alternate
Staff: Charlie Baker, Executive Director
Christine Forde, Sr. Trans. Planner Emily Nosse-Leirer. Sr. Planner
Amy Irvin Witham, Business office Assoc. Bryan Davis, Sr. Trans. Planner

1. Call to order; changes to the agenda. The meeting was called to order at 6:01 p.m. by the Chair, Chris Roy. There were no changes to the agenda.

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

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

4. Approve Minutes of March 20, 2019 board meeting. CATHERINE MCMAINS MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JIM DONOVAN TO APPROVE THE MINUTES WITH EDITS, IF ANY. Jacki Murphy asked for a correction regarding attendance. Jacki Murphy noted that she believed Colchester Representative Jeff Bartley was present, however, he is listed as Absent. [Staff followed up with Jeff directly and confirmed Jeff was not present at the March 20, board meeting – so no change was made to the minutes.] MOTION TO APPROVE WAS APPROVED BY ALL EXCEPT FOR ABSTENTIONS FROM JOHN ZICCONI AND JACKI MURPHY.

5. Warn Public Hearing for the FY20 UPWP and Budget. Charlie noted the Executive Committee, the UPWP Committee, and CCRPC Staff recommends the Board warn for Public Hearing at the May 15th, 2019 meeting for the draft FY20 UPWP and budget. He reviewed the memo and attachments that were included in the board packet and asked if there were any questions. There were none.
BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, THAT THE BOARD WARN A
PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE FY20 UPWP AND BUDGET AT THE MAY 15TH MEETING AT 6PM. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

6. Road Erosion Inventory Status presentation. Chris Dubin gave a PowerPoint presentation (see attached) that provided an overview of the CCRPC’s efforts in assisting municipalities meeting the goals of the Municipal Roads General Permit. The presentation focused on the Road Erosion inventory work that has been conducted over the past few summers, some of the reporting, analysis, and work tracking tools that the RPC has developed, as well as future planned work. Discussion ensued between members regarding future considerations, specifically the potential shortages of stone as well as continued funding for maintenance of work that has been done.

7. Charge to Board Development Committee to Develop slate of officers for FY20. Chris Roy charged the Board Development Committee with developing a slate of officers for FY20. Andy Montroll asked if anyone is interested in serving on the executive committee, they should contact him before the May 16, 2019 board meeting as this information needs to be formalized by the June board meeting.

8. Winooski Master Plan Approval, Confirmation of Planning Process, and Determination of Energy Compliance. Emily Nosse-Leirer reported that the Planning Advisory Committee recommended 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 agrees and recommends the same.

9. Colchester Town Plan Approval, Confirmation of Planning Process, and Determination of Energy Compliance. Emily Nosse-Leirer reported that the Planning Advisory Committee recommends 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 plan. Staff agrees and recommends the same.

Emily suggested considering these two actions together since they are quite similar. She noted that each of the town plans include new content and have 8 years before expiration. Emily noted Regina Mahoney did the writing for the Winooski plan. Staff agrees that both are meeting statutory requirements as well as energy planning requirements. JIM DONOVAN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY DAN KERIN, TO APPROVE BOTH THE WINOOSKI MASTER PLAN AS WELL AS THE COLCHESTER TOWN PLAN RESOLUTIONS. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY THE MUNICIPAL MEMBERS.

10. S.96 Recommendations. Charlie reviewed the Legislature considerations of bill S.96. The bill is now under consideration by the House and we are seeking review and finalization of the comments by the CCRPC Board. Jeff Carr had concerns about the status and process, how much revenue would this involve and where revenue would come from. Charlie offered clarification that the bill provides for a new structure for distributing funds and has a section for the House Ways and Means to provide about $8 million of new revenue as soon as they get the bill from House Natural Resources. Discussion ensued between members. Andrea Morgante stated there is difficulty in encouraging land owners to agree to these projects, since most of the projects will happen on private land. Jeff asked if anyone feels CCRPC should accept responsibility in management and enforcement of the issue. Lengthy discussion ensues between members regarding what entity should take responsibility for monitoring and enforcing. Members feel the CCRPC role and mission are not
aligned with this potential enforcement role as described in §924(f)(2). CCRPC is a municipal service provider, not an enforcement entity. Jeff stated our mission should not be changed, we can contribute to shaping and supporting, but we cannot take on role of enforcement as this is inconsistent with our mission. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO COMMUNICATE TO THE LEGISLATURE THAT CCRPC IS NOT IN A POSITION, EITHER TECHNICALLY OR FINANCIALLY, TO TAKE ON THIS ENFORCEMENT ROLE AND THAT THIS IS INCONSISTENT WITH OUR MISSION. MOTION CARRIED WITH AMY BELL ABSTAINING.

11. Chair/Executive Director Report
   a. Legislative updates. Charlie stated the draft of the Act250 Bill will be held through the summer months as changes are still being discussed. A major area of focus for us in this bill will be how to better promote smart growth in our region.

12. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports. Chris Roy noted that Act 250 and Sec 248 letters as well as the minutes of various committee meetings were included in the meeting packet.

13. Members’ Items, Other business. Andrea Morgante remarked about hearing a story about VLCT taking a position on autonomous vehicle testing in Vermont. She wondered if we should have a position on this. Amy Bell stated Joe Segale, from VTRANS, can present on this topic. Discussion ensued between members as to the suitability of Vermont given the challenges of the terrain as well as winter driving conditions. After some discussion it was agreed to have Joe Segale from VTrans present to the board and determine if, and what, position we might take after that. Chris Shaw brought up two additional concerns related to expansion of fossil fuel infrastructure and 5G service. After discussion about how to address emergent issues, Chris Roy asked staff to develop some ideas about how CCRPC might best address these types of issues going forward. Chris Roy agreed to place this topic on the next agenda.

Abby Bleything announced UVM is holding a forum at the Burlington Hilton on May 3, 2019 from 9:30am – 3:30pm. The three topics are Electric and Autonomous Future, Vermont Leading the Way with Transportation Innovations and Micro Mobility and Macro Transit. More information can be found on the UVM website at www.uvm.edu/transportation.

14. Adjourn. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JIM DONOVAN, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:26 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Amy Irvin Witham
CCRPC Board Meeting
May 15, 2019
Agenda Item 6: Action Item

FY20 Unified Planning Work Program & Budget

Background:

Each year the CCRPC undertakes the development and implementation of a Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). The Board of Directors of the CCRPC has established a Committee process for the development of the UPWP. The following FY20 UPWP Committee members were appointed by the Chair:

- **Board:** Mike O’Brien, Chair; John Zicconi, Michael Bissonette, Jeff Bartley, and Sharon Murray
- **PAC:** Dean Pierce; Jess Draper
- **TAC:** Barbara Elliott, Justin Rabidoux
- **VTrans:** Amy Bell
- **Ex-Officio:** Chris Jolly, FHWA; Rachel Kennedy, GMT

The UPWP Committee met on January 24th, February 21st, and March 21st to discuss and evaluate all project applications from Chittenden County municipalities, partner organizations and the public.

At their April 17th meeting, the CCRPC Board voted to warn the FY20 UPWP & Budget Public Hearing for Wednesday, May 15, 2019 at 6:00 p.m. The public hearing draft documents were posted on the CCRPC website (http://www.ccrpcvt.org/about-us/commission/annual-work-plan-budget-finances/) and sent to all municipalities with a public hearing notice advertised in the Burlington Free Press. As expected, small technical adjustments were made to the UPWP after the public hearing documents were posted as more details were known for the upcoming fiscal year with regard to carryover consultant dollars, staff hours, and state agency grant agreement scope tasks.

Recommendations:

- **UPWP Committee:** The UPWP Committee recommended the FY20 UPWP to the CCRPC Board at their March 21st meeting.

- **Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC):** The TAC recommended the FY20 UPWP to the CCRPC Board at their May 7th meeting.

- **Executive and Finance Committees:** The Executive and Finance Committees recommended the FY20 UPWP and Budget to the CCRPC Board at their May 1st joint meeting.

- **CCRPC Staff:** Staff recommends approval of the FY20 UPWP & Budget as presented.

For more information contact: Charlie Baker, cbaker@ccrpcvt.org or 735-3500 or Marshall Distel, mdistel@ccrpcvt.org or 861-0121
Agenda Item 7: 2019 planBTV: Comprehensive Plan Approval, Confirmation of Planning Process, and Determination of Energy Compliance

Issues: The City of Burlington has requested that the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (1) approve the 2019 planBTV: Comprehensive Plan, (2) confirm its planning process and (3) grant a determination of energy compliance to the 2019 planBTV: Comprehensive Plan. The plan was adopted by the City of Burlington City Council on March 25, 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 planBTV: Comprehensive Plan, confirm Burlington’s planning process, and grant an affirmative determination of energy compliance to the 2019 planBTV: Comprehensive Plan.

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

Staff Contact: Contact Emily Nosse-Leirer or Regina Mahony with any questions: enosse-leirer@ccrpcvt.org or rmahony@ccrpcvt.org, 846-4490 ext. *15 or *28.
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC)
Resolution

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

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

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

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

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

WHEREAS, The City of Burlington formally requested CCRPC to approve its 2019 planBTV: Comprehensive Plan and confirm its planning process and grant a determination of energy compliance on October 30, 2018;

WHEREAS, the Planning Advisory Committee warned a public hearing on October 22, 2018 and held a public hearing on November 7, 2018 to review the 2019 planBTV: Comprehensive Plan for approval and confirmation of the planning process and for granting a determination of energy compliance, at the CCRPC offices, located at 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, Vermont;

WHEREAS, the Planning Advisory Committee reviewed the records and recommended that the Commission approve the 2019 planBTV: Comprehensive Plan as meeting the requirements of 24 V.S.A.§ 4350 and the Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes, Approval of Municipal Plans and Granting Determinations of Energy Compliance and confirm the community’s planning process as consistent with Title 24, Chapter 117, as described in CCRPC’s staff review and the minutes of the Planning Advisory Committee, dated November 7, 2018.

WHEREAS, the Planning Advisory Committee reviewed the records and recommended that the Commission grant an affirmative determination of energy compliance to the 2019 planBTV: Comprehensive Plan as meeting the requirements of Title 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 planBTV: Comprehensive Plan and the Commission finds that said Plan:

1. is consistent with the goals established in Section 4302 of Title 24;
2. is compatible with the 2018 Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the ECOS Plan, adopted June 20, 2018;

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 planBTV: Comprehensive Plan and the Commission finds that said Plan:

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

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

Dated at Winooski, this 15th day of May, 2019.

CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

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

Additionally, the City of Burlington 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 planBTV Comprehensive Plan 2019 Update.

This draft planBTV Comprehensive Plan 2019 Update is an update and re-adoption of the 2014 Municipal Development Plan. In accordance with statute, re-adoption means that this is a fully compliant plan that will expire eight years after adoption by the City Council. CCRPC reviewed the 2014 plan and met with Burlington staff to discuss it in April 2017 as part of an informal review and consultation process. The draft planBTV Comprehensive Plan 2019 Update is a complete reworking of the 2014 Municipal Development Plan. planBTV ties all of Burlington’s planning efforts together through adopting many other city and regional plans by reference and providing summaries of ongoing relevant work. 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 Planning Commission upcoming public hearing, which will be warned soon.

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 planBTV Comprehensive Plan 2019 Update 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 planBTV Comprehensive Plan 2019 Update is consistent with the general goals of §4302. See the attached excerpt from the plan (Appendix C: Statutory Requirements) that describes how the Plan is consistent with these goals.
2. The draft plan BTV Comprehensive Plan 2019 Update is consistent with the specific goals of §4302. See the attached excerpt from the plan (Appendix C: Statutory Requirements) that describes how the Plan is consistent with these goals.

3. The draft plan BTV Comprehensive Plan 2019 Update contains the required elements of §4382. See the attached excerpt from the plan (Appendix C: Statutory Requirements) that describes how the Plan is consistent with these goals.

4. The draft plan BTV Comprehensive Plan 2019 Update 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 plan BTV Comprehensive Plan 2019 Update is compatible with the municipal plans for South Burlington, Colchester and Winooski.

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

Additional Comments/Questions:

This plan provided a very clear explanation of how Burlington’s multiple planning processes fit together, and the document connects various components very well. Framing sections through Burlington’s goals to be a “Distinctive,” “Dynamic,” “Inclusive” and “Connected” city provided a nice link to the City’s vision for itself, and splitting land use into areas to “Conserve,” “Sustain” and “Grow” was unique and useful.

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 plan BTV Comprehensive Plan 2019 Update to determine whether:

7. 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.

8. The plan is consistent with following State goals:
   a. Vermont's greenhouse gas reduction goals under 10 V.S.A. § 578(a); (see note #12 below)
   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.

9. The plan meets the standards for issuing a determination of energy compliance included in the State energy plans as developed by the Vermont Department of Public Service.
Staff Review Findings and Comments

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
<th>N/A</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></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Analysis of resources, needs, scarcities, costs and problems in the municipality across all energy sectors</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.a. Report Current energy use for heating, electricity, and transportation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.b. Report 2025, 2035 and 2050 targets for energy use</td>
<td></td>
<td>X – see note 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.c. Evaluation of thermal-sector energy use changes</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.d. Evaluation of transportation-sector energy use changes</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.e. Evaluation of electric-sector energy use changes</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.a. Encourage conservation by individuals and organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.b. Promote efficient buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.c. Promote decreased use of fossil fuels for heat</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.a. Encourage increased public transit use</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.b. Promote shift away from single-occupancy vehicle trips</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.d. Promote shift from gas/diesel to non-fossil fuel vehicles?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.e. Demonstrate municipal leadership re: efficiency of municipal transportation?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.a. Promote Smart growth land use policies</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.b. Strongly prioritize development in compact, mixed use centers</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.a. Report existing renewable energy generation</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.b. Analyze generation potential</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.c. Identify sufficient land to meet the 2050 generation targets</td>
<td></td>
<td>X – see note 10 below</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.d. Ensure that local constraints do not prevent the generation targets from being met</td>
<td></td>
<td>X – see note 10 below</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.e. Include policy statements on siting energy generation</td>
<td></td>
<td>X – see note 11 below</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.f. Maximize potential for generation on preferred sites</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.g. Demonstrate municipal leadership re: deploying renewable energy</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Include maps provided by CCRPC</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As drafted, the draft planBTV Comprehensive Plan 2019 Update meets the requirements above.
Notes and Comments:

10. Renewable energy generation within Burlington already exceeds the 2050 high target for the City established by CCRPC, so no additional targets were established by CCRPC’s 2018 ECOS Plan. planBTV indicates that the targets have already been met, but that the City is actively continuing to pursue additional generation opportunities.

11. Certified municipal enhanced energy plans gain substantial deference for their land use policies. According to 30 VSA §248, “‘substantial deference’ means that a land conservation measure or specific policy shall be applied in accordance with its terms unless there is a clear and convincing demonstration that other factors affecting the general good of the State outweigh the application of the measure or policy.” It is CCRPC’s understanding that the City of Burlington has chosen not to include prohibitions on renewable generation siting in planBTV, and has chosen instead only to define places to encourage generation. This meets Standard 9e.

12. Enhanced energy plans are required to be consistent with State goals, including Vermont's greenhouse gas reduction goals under 10 V.S.A. §578(a) (50% reduction from 1990 levels by 2028 and 75% reduction from 1990 levels by 2050). Burlington’s Climate Action Plan is incorporated into planBTV by reference, and it includes a greenhouse gas inventory with somewhat different goals than described in state statute. However, Burlington’s emissions goals are likely to change significantly as the City further develops their Net Zero Community by 2030 goal. CCRPC staff views the Net Zero by 2030 goal as a substantial step towards meeting Vermont’s greenhouse gas reduction goals and considers the draft planBTV Comprehensive Plan 2019 Update consistent with these goals.

Proposed Motion & Next Steps:

PROPOSED MOTION: The PAC finds that the draft planBTV Comprehensive Plan 2019 Update, as submitted, 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 planBTV Comprehensive Plan 2019 Update 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.
CCRPC Board Meeting
May 15, 2019
Agenda Item 8: Information Item

Report on Nominations for FY20

From: Andy Montroll, Board Development Committee Chair

The Board Development Committee met on May 8th and recommended the following the slate of officers for FY2020.

- Mike O’Brien, Chair
- Catherine McMains, Vice-Chair
- John Zicconi, Secretary/Treasurer
- Chris Shaw, At-large for Towns over 5,000
- Barbara Elliot, At-large for Towns under 5,000
- Chris Roy, Immediate Past Chair

The Election of Officers will occur at the CCRPC Board’s Annual Meeting on June 19, 2019. The bylaw provisions regarding election of Officers and the Executive Committee are as follows (please note that Article VII, Section C. specifies the inclusion of the Immediate Past Chair as a member of the Executive Committee):

ARTICLE VII. OFFICERS & EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
A. Election of Officers and Executive Committee
   The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission shall annually elect three officers, a Chair, Vice-Chair, and Secretary/ Treasurer. In addition, the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission shall annually elect two municipal Board members to the Executive Committee. One municipal Board member of the Executive Committee shall represent a community of 5000+ population; the other, a community of less than 5000 population, based on information from the latest census or population estimate completed by the US Census Bureau.

   The Board Development Committee shall render its report of nominations to fill ensuing vacancies prior to the June meeting. The Board Development Committee may nominate one or more candidates for each office. Candidates may also be nominated from the floor.

   The officers of the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission shall be elected by a two-thirds majority of the Board members present and voting pursuant to 24 V.S.A. § 4343(b). The results of the voting shall be announced at the June meeting of each year. In the event a majority for any office is not reached, the top two vote getters will have a run-off election and the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission will continue to vote until a majority is reached.
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
May 15, 2019
Agenda Item 9:

Policy Engagement Decision Process

Issues
At the April Board meeting there was discussion about how we decide in which public policy issues to engage and the extent of our engagement.

At the Executive Committee, it was suggested that our policy engagement would primarily be based on our ECOS Plan and our Top 10 Actions for the Next Five Years (see attached). However, we also want to maintain some flexibility to address other relevant issues as they arise.

It was suggested that we add a standing agenda item in July and January to discuss relevant policy issues and our interest, ability, and need to engage in those issues. This will allow for a discussion with the full board to decide when and how to engage on various topics that we can anticipate. We may still have issues that come up on an ad hoc basis, but hopefully this process will effectively identify the major issues to engage in

Executive Comm. Recommendation:
To bring this issue to the Board for discussion and decision, as appropriate.

Staff Recommendation:
To add a standing agenda item in July and January to discuss relevant policy issues and CCRPC’s interest, ability, need and extent of proposed engagement in those issues.

For more information, contact:
Charlie Baker cbaker@ccrpcvt.org or 735-3500
The CCRPC has 10 top actions for the next five years.

While the Strategies, full list of Actions, and the Project Lists make up the full implementation program, CCRPC has highlighted a number of actions to focus on over the next five years. These actions will help inform the development of CCRPC’s annual Unified Planning Work Program: [https://www.ccrpcvt.org/about-us/commission/annual-work-plan-budget-finances/](https://www.ccrpcvt.org/about-us/commission/annual-work-plan-budget-finances/)

### TOP 10 ACTIONS

1. **Support and inform municipalities on setting the stage for smart, multi-modal development in our areas planned for growth, and protection of our rural planning area, through plan and bylaw assistance, participation in the Act 250 Next 50 Years Committee, brownfields assessments, etc.**

2. **Invest in our transportation system by maintaining our existing transportation system, addressing safety and localized congestion issues on our roadways and investing in Intelligent Transportation Systems to facilitate traffic flows on our arterials and minimize the need for major roadway expansion projects; and supporting our areas planned for growth by expanding bike and pedestrian infrastructure, improving transit services, investing in and supporting Transportation Demand Management partners and programs such as Green Mountain Transit, Chittenden Area Transportation Management Association, CarShare, Local Motion and NeighborRides.**

3. **Assist and inform municipalities with research and technical assistance to support housing development in our areas planned for growth, and continue participation in the Building Homes Together campaign.**

4. **Assist and inform municipalities on enhanced energy planning for the heating, electricity and transportation sectors including a shift away from gas/diesel vehicles to electric or other nonfossil fuel transportation options.**

5. **Assist the State and municipalities in implementation of the Lake Champlain Total Maximum Daily Load and other water quality improvement efforts through participation in the Tactical Basin Plans, Municipal Road General Permit assistance, Regional Stormwater Education Partnership/Rethink Runoff, etc.**

6. **Assist municipalities and the state in emergency management planning through implementation of the All Hazards Mitigation Plan, Local Emergency Planning Committee coordination, Local Emergency Operation Plan assistance, regional dispatch support, etc.**

7. **Support municipal efforts to support population health by continuing coordination with the University of Vermont Medical Center, United Way of Northwest Vermont, Chittenden Prevention Network, and the Vermont Department of Health.**

8. **Monitor the advancement of autonomous vehicles and work with the state, municipalities, and other partners on preparations for this technology**

9. **Continue annual coordination with our municipalities and partners to monitor and report on progress toward our shared goals through the ECOS Annual Report, ECOS Scorecard and annual performance reports to our municipalities and state funding agencies.**

10. **Monitor our shifting demographics and support workforce development by focusing on these top actions and continuing coordination with GBIC.**

To learn more about the 2018 ECOS Plan, visit ecosproject.com/2018-ECOS-Plan.
Brownfields Advisory Committee Minutes  
Monday, April 29, 2019  
Scheduled Time: 3:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

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

Attending:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Members</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curt Carter, GBIC (Chair)</td>
<td>Dan Albrecht, Senior Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Carrington, City of Winooski</td>
<td>Emily Nosse-Leirer, Senior Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirsten Merriman-Shapiro, CEDO</td>
<td>CCRPC Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trish Coppolino, Vermont DEC, ex-officio, (via phone)</td>
<td>Kurt Mueller, VHB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guests:</td>
<td>Jeremy Roberts, KAS (via phone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doreen Kraft, Burlington City Arts</td>
<td>Miles Waite, Waite-Heidel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Call to Order, Introductions and Changes to the Agenda  
The meeting began at 3:05 p.m. No changes to the agenda.

2. Public comments on items not on the Agenda  
None

3. Action on Site Nominations/Assistance Requests
   a) Shelburne: 5531 Spear Street, Snyder Homes, Phase I ESA request  
      Staff were very supportive of this proposal, since there are 91 units of housing proposed. Miles explained  
      that his staff will look for former farm dumps and past pesticide uses on the golf course. Dan asked why the  
      Phase I is $3,000, higher than some past estimates. Miles stated that some past estimates have been too low,  
      and it’s a large site to walk. The committee felt favorably about the proposal. Kirsten asked whether any of the  
      housing will be designated as affordable and expressed her concern that these are large units and commercial  
      developers don’t have as much of a need. In the future, she hopes that we will be keeping track of this.  
      Kirsten moved to pay for the cost of the Phase I as proposed, seconded by Heather. The motion passed  
      unanimously.
   b) Burlington: Sara Holbrook Community Center, KAS request, additional CAP preparation fees
This request is to cover additional time, not included in the original budget, for KAS staff to include the presence of impacted soils on the property. Dan relayed a comment from Pablo Bose, who asked why these impacted soils were not included in the original scope of work. Jeremy stated that the original cost estimate was derived from the project’s architect, and that at some point in the process, the estimate for the soils was accidentally dropped. Kirsten asked how much it will cost to deal with the impacted soils that were found, and Jeremy replied that it is estimated that it will add about $230,000 to the construction costs of about $3-4 million total. This high cost of soil management was discussed, and Trish and Jeremy stated that there are very high lead levels and no room on site to turn into a receiving site to prevent landfilling costs. Curt wondered if we could have learned about this sooner, but it was determined that there wasn’t much that could be done differently.

*Heather moved that the additional costs be covered, and Kirsten seconded. The motion passed unanimously.*

**c) Burlington: 405 Pine Street, Burlington City Arts, Phase I ESA request**

Doreen Kraft explained the history of the site and the organization’s move there. This property is very constrained by the fact that it’s adjacent to the Barge Canal site and subject to its institutional controls. The property will be purchased by the foundation arm of BCA, rather than the City Department. The purchase cost is estimated at about $7.5 million. Miles asked whether there is concern about additional load in the building if extra stories are added. Doreen said that it’s unclear, but it’s not their plan to add more stories right now. Emily stated that she would revise the scoring to be higher on the economic benefit of it, now that she had learned more about the project.

*Heather made a motion authorizing staff to secure a Phase I for the property, and Curt seconded. Kirsten abstained. The motion passed.*

4. **Updates**

a) **DEC: Proposed revisions to Investigation & Remediation of Contaminated Properties Rule.**


Trish explained that this rule is being rushed towards completion to ensure that the rule will be in place to replace the emergency IRule that dealt with PFAS.

Changes to the IRule are:

1. The Standards will change due to the following:
   a. The current IRule uses the EPA Regional Screening Levels (RSLs) and VDH calculated values; RSLs will no longer be used;
b. The VDH assumptions have changed; the current Rule has a hazard index of 0.2 for non-carcinogens, the new IRule will use a HI of 1;

c. A snow modifying factor has been applied to the timeframe for direct contact to soil; the current IRule uses 350 days a year; and

d. The groundwater temperature used to calculate the volatilization factor was adjusted to reflect Vermont groundwater temperatures.

2. There is a new provision to exempt historic fill from certain requirements in the IRule after an exemption request is submitted and approved.

3. There is a new subchapter dedicated to soil that allows for limited soil removal/stockpiling to happen outside of corrective action (which is the only way to remove or stockpile soil currently). And the Development soil section has been streamlined and clarified.

4. Data Evaluation Subchapter NEW
   a. Describes how to evaluate lab data that is received specifically for the following:
      i. PFAS
      ii. PCBs
      iii. PAH
      iv. Dioxin
      v. Use of data related to the Minimum Detection Limit (MDL) that is above the set standard for that compound
      vi. Direction on how to conduct cumulative risk for surficial soil and indoor air when multiple compounds are detected at a sample location above the MDL but below the standard – new depth requirements
         1. To help ease this new requirement and make the math associated with this process “fool proof” VDH created a calculator that will be hosted on the SMS web page for consultants to use

5. Several new definitions have been added to the IRule.

6. No EPA regional screening levels are used, all have been replaced by VDH levels.

7. A full summary will be available from DEC this week.

Curt asked if Trish considers any of these changes particularly controversial. Trish said that she hopes this fixes some existing concerns with development soil and historic contaminated fill issues by creating some limited exemption processes on a case-by-case basis and emphasized the short timeline for this rulemaking process.

b) Milton: US Route 7 properties, “hourglass” road project, (Johnson Company)

Kurt described past challenges with property access on the property at 204-210 Route 7. Since there is an existing pump island on the property and no evidence that the tank was removed, GPR was completed to look for the tank or lack thereof. They didn’t find a tank, but they did find a pipe leading 8 feet to the north of the
pump island. It appears that the tank was likely removed. As the property is definitely going to be acquired by the Town of Milton and the price is pretty much set already, it’s not clear that much more investigation will be allowed by the property owner. Kirsten asked whether it’s possible that the tank is in the ROW. Kurt said that the fact that the feed lines lead away from the ROW indicate that it’s unlikely. It’s unclear whether there were leaks from the tank or whether there is any groundwater contamination. The Town works with the property owner, Kurt does not directly work with him.

c) Project Updates: Road Res-Q (Waite-Heindel), 3 Maple St. (KAS) and Bonacorsi (VHB)
Road Res-Q: Miles explained that WHEM has completed their Phase I on the Road Res-Q property and has recommended additional petroleum testing on the property prior to Village acquisition. PCF may be able to pay for this.
3 Maple Street: Jeremy noted the SSQAPP has been approved. They will now move to conduct the Passive Soil Gas survey the results of which will then be incorporated into the CAP.
Bonacorsi property, Barre: Kurt reported that the results of the indoor air sampling had no exceedances.

5. **Review and action on 2/11 meeting summary**
The summary was approved by unanimous consent of the members.

6. **Adjourn**
The meeting adjourned at 4:17 p.m.

*Summary respectfully submitted by Emily Nosse-Leirer and Dan Albrecht*
DATE: Wednesday, May 1, 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
Jeff Carr (via phone)
Mike O’Brien, Vice-Chair
Barbara Elliott, At-Large (via phone)
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

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 no changes.

2. Approval of April 3, 2019 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. Approval of March 27, 2019 Finance Committee Meeting Minutes. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O’BRIEN, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. Approve Quarterly Journal Entries (Jan-Mar 2019) MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JEFF CARR, TO APPROVE THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL ENTRIES. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. Review Financial Reports – FY19 (Jul 2018- Mar2019) a. Balance Sheet: Forest reviewed the Balance Sheet with members; Cash in checking, including OCU operating account - $134,212, Cash in Savings - $153,469, cash in Money Market, including OCU account, and CDs - $141,259. Current Assets over Current Liabilities - $606,210. Deferred Income Communities - $125,802. Members reviewed the Balance Sheet. Income Statement through March 2019: Forest reviewed the current income statement and explained FY19 has proved to be as difficult a fiscal year as was budgeted. With an indirect rate approximately 10 percentage points lower than actual indirect costs, we are struggling to generate enough revenue to cover costs. Members reviewed the Income Statement. Jeff voiced concerns over swings that are occurring because of our indirect rate changes year to year. Discussion between members ensued. It was noted that we have received excess revenue in previous years to cover this year’s deficit. Charlie explained a new negotiated rate with VTRANS for FY20 should help and we expect that the swings should be minimal going forward. b. Cash position/Targets. Forest reviewed the Cash Flow Report. He explained the need to use previously collected cash reserves this fiscal year, with negative income at 100K. He stated March is the first month that shows the transfer of our accounts from Peoples United Bank to the Opportunities Credit Union. OCU should yield better interest amounts on our accounts. Jeff asked if OCU offers the same level of insurance protection on the accounts; Forest explained yes; funds are collateralized to protect funds over the FDIC/NCUA limit from catastrophic events.
6. **Review Draft FY19 UPWP and Budget.** Charlie briefly reviewed the draft FY20 UPWP. The Bolton Valley Community Development Block Grant was approved. He pointed out the pink shaded rows in the UPWP denote work items that were funded and completed in FY19 and will be deleted from the FY20 UPWP. In reference to line 101 on the budget, Andy asked what is an Internal Consultant? Charlie and Forest explained that internal consultants are those we hire for work on the organization itself versus consultants we hire to work on UPWP projects for our member communities, partners, and the region. Forest pointed out that the Internal Consultant expense line for FY20 is budgeted for a compensation study consultant. Charlie pointed out that salaries make up the largest portion of expenses and are going down in FY20 with Bernie’s and Peter’s retirements. Charlie reviewed the capital expense box noting that we are renewing the current lease and getting renovations to the intern area. However, the total capital expense is coming in significantly less than the $25,000 noted. The renovations will require some investment in workstations for that area totaling less than $7,000. Additionally, we would like to replace the conference room tables with ones that have wheels and fold down. Various meetings are held at the CCRPC, narrow tables with wheels will accommodate more flexibility in function and arrangement. The quote for new conference room tables is less than $6000 and would also be capitalized. There was discussion about the necessity of making this investment including the age and lack of easy flexibility of the current tables. It was noted that the space is used for multiple different public meetings and trainings. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JEFF CARR, THAT THE FINANCE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS THE DRAFT FY19 UPWP & BUDGET TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR REVIEW. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Jeff Carr left the meeting at 6:20 P.M.

7. **ACT 250 & Section 248 Applications**
   
a. **Section 248: Underhill GLC Solar, Beartown Road (#19-1000-NMP)** Regina noted that the project meets all criteria and we are in support of this with no concerns. JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BARBARA ELLIOT, TO APPROVE THE SUBMISSION OF THE LETTER TO THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
   
b. **Comments on PUC Rulemaking on Net Metering (#19-0855-RULE).** Regina stated we are proposing to comment on this draft rulemaking where there is a direct tie to our ECOS Plan and work; much of the draft is out of scope in terms of the work we do. The items we would like to provide comments on are in the letter: 1. we agree with permitting solar canopies over parking lots under the easiest permit process as there are no additional environmental impacts; 2. there are challenges with a maximum net metering allowance of 500 kW for individuals who own many properties (for example municipalities and VTrans) and we are asking for some flexibility on that; and 3. there should be a recommendation from both a municipality and the RPC for identification of a preferred site, it just shouldn’t be in the form of a “joint” letter. The comment is to clarify approval can be in separate letters from each entity. JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CATHERINE MCMAINS, TO APPROVE THE SUBMISSION OF THE LETTER TO THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
   
8. **Policy Engagement Decision Process.** Chris reviewed the discussion at the most recent board meeting about how we decide in which public policy issues we decide to engage. He offered thoughts as to if an organic ad hoc is the best way or if there should be a schedule to review issues.
Charlie noted there have been many internal discussions on how to choose what to be involved in as well as what level of involvement is appropriate. Discussion among members ensued. After the discussion, Charlie suggested that, in addition to addressing issues as they arise on an ad hoc basis, we add a standing agenda item in January and July to discuss policy issues. It was also noted that our policy engagement would be based on our ECOS Plan and our Top Actions for the Next Five Years. This will allow for a discussion with the full board to decide when and how to engage on various topics.

9. **Chair/Executive Director Report**
   a. **Legislative Update.** Charlie noted the S96 Clean Water service bill has been voted out of House Natural Resources. The funding gap is now being addressed in House Ways and Means. We succeeded with support from all of the RPCs in getting the enforcement provision eliminated in the latest version. As expected, ACT 250 will remain in the House Natural Resources Committee over the summer, through January.
   b. **Annual Meeting.** The location for the Annual Meeting will be held at the Mansfield Barn in Jericho. The focus will be on Bernie and Peter’s retirement. Guest speakers will include existing and previous board and staff members.

10. **CCRPC May 15, 2019 Agenda Review.** Members reviewed and discussed the proposed agenda. The need to list Joe Segale early in the agenda was noted. John stated Joe is very engaging and his presentation will likely be very informative.

11. **Other Business.** There was no further business

12. **Executive Session.** There was none needed

13. **Adjournment.** JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO ADJOURN AT 6:55 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Amy Irvin Witham
May 2, 2019

Public Utilities Commission
c/o of Ms. Judith Whitney, Clerk
Vermont Public Utility Commission
112 State Street
Montpelier, VT 05702
(Filed electronically via ePUC)

RE: State of Vermont Public Utility Commission Case #19-0855-RULE

Dear Commissioners:

The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC) is providing these written comments in response to the Public Utility Commission Order initiating a proceeding to review Commission Rule 5.100, which governs the construction and operation of net-metering systems and the Commission’s draft of potential changes to Rule 5.100. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the draft changes to Rule 5.100 and on the questions raised in the order opening investigation.

The Commission’s order seeks comments on whether there should be a registration process for obtaining a CPG for a solar canopy over an existing parking lot, such as the current process for rooftop systems.

CCRPC supports a registration process for solar canopies over parking lots. The addition of a solar canopy does not increase the environmental impact of a parking lot that already exists or has been permitted, and removing barriers for these systems will help Vermont meet its renewable energy goals. To ensure that this registration process mirrors the process for solar on existing structures, CCRPC encourages the Commission to consider whether it would be appropriate to waive the setback requirements for solar canopies. Many existing parking lots are located within the setbacks required by Section 5.113 of the Net Metering Rules.

Section 5.129(D-E) of the draft rules allow up to 500 kW of cumulative capacity of net-metering systems to be attributed to an individual or a group, removing the need for Commission approval for multiple systems attributed to a single group.

We encourage the Commission to use this rulemaking process to investigate whether this limit should be raised or eliminated for large electricity users. This limit on group net metering especially impacts entities with multiple facilities (e.g. school districts, municipalities and state agencies).

The draft rule (pg. 10-11, Preferred Site Definition 7) eliminates the option for a preferred site to be identified through a “joint letter of support from the municipal legislative body and municipal and regional planning commissions in the community where the net-metering system will be located.”

CCRPC strongly opposes this change. It is imperative to allow municipalities and regions to designate preferred sites without amending the municipal plan. Instead of eliminating this
option, the “joint letter of support” should be replaced with language allowing municipalities and regions to define a preferred site based on the policies in their respective plans, and to clarify that the specifics of a project will be subject to additional review when more details are provided in a site plan.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment and we look forward to reviewing further drafts of Rule 5.100. We understand that this investigation is ongoing, and we may submit further comments as the process continues.

Please let me know if you have any questions or would like to discuss further.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Charles Baker
Executive Director
May 2, 2019

Sam Carlson, Director of Project Development
Green Lantern Solar
PO Box 658
Waterbury, VT 05676
Submitted via ePUC

RE: Petition for a Certificate of Public Good for Underhill GLC Solar LLC’s Proposed 150 kW Project in Underhill, VT – 97 Beartown Road (Case #19-1000-NMP)

Dear Mr. Carlson:

Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission has received the application for a Certificate of Public Good for a 150kW solar project at 97 Beartown Road in Underhill, Vermont. 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 in an area proximate to existing distribution and transmission infrastructure with adequate grid capacity.
- The project is located on a preferred site, as designated through letters from the Underhill Planning Commission, the Underhill Selectboard, and CCRPC (CCRPC letter dated 12/6/2018)
- The project is outside of any state designated centers or historic districts.

CCRPC finds that the location of this project meets the suitability policies of the 2018 ECOS Plan. As demonstrated in our preferred site and advance notice letters, 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 development should be located to avoid state and local known constraints that have been field verified, and to minimize impacts to state and local possible constraints that have been field verified (Strategy 3, Action 1.f and Strategy 4, Action 1.f and Action 2.e).

Based on the site plan included in the application, CCRPC has reviewed the constraints that exist on the site of the proposed project. In our review letter following the advance notice for this project, CCRPC requested more information about the impact this project will have on slopes over 15%, including any plans to retain vegetation, stabilize the slopes after clearing and whether the full extent of clearing is required for the project. Erosion prevention and sediment control details (Exhibit C-102) have been submitted with this application. Based on this information, it appears that this project minimizes impacts to possible constraints. CCRPC has no further comments on constraints at this time.

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

Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Charlie Baker
Executive Director

cc: CCRPC Board
Andrew Strniste, Director of Planning & Zoning, Town of Underhill
Certificate of Service via ePUC
DATE: Tuesday May 7, 2019  
TIME: 9:00 a.m.  
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal St. Winooski, VT

Members Present
Lisa Schaeffler, Williston  
Brian Bigelow, Underhill  
Jon Rauscher, Winooski  
Nicole Losch, Burlington  
Richard Watts, Hinesburg  
Chris Jolly, FHWA  
Matt Langham, VTrans  
Dennis Lutz, Essex  
Amy Bell, VTrans  
Bob Henneberger, Seniors  
Justin Rabidoux, South Burlington  
Dean Pierce, Shelburne  
Ashley Bishop, VTrans District 5  
Bryan Osborne, Colchester, TAC Chair  
Allega Williams, Local Motion

Bryan Davis, Senior Transportation Planner  
Charlie Baker, Executive Director  
Chris Dubin, Transportation Planner  
Jason Charest, Senior Transportation Planning Engineer  
Peter Keating, Senior Transportation Planner  
Christine Forde, Senior Transportation Planner  
Marshall Distel, Transportation Planner  
Sai Sarepalli, Transportation Planning Engineer  
Dan Albrecht, Senior Planner

Others
Karen Adams, Colchester  
Gina Clithero, CCRPC Intern  
John Ohlin, Hoyle Tanner  
John Jackman, Hoyle Tanner  
Derek Lyman, VTrans  
Spencer Palmer, VTrans

Staff Present
Eleni Churchill, Transportation Program

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

1. Approval of Minutes
DEAN PIERCE MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BOB HENNEBERGER, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF APRIL 2, 2019. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

2. Public Comments
None.

3. Colchester’s Stormwater Infrastructure Inspection: Process and Findings (Information Item)
Karen Adams introduced this with an explanation as to why the Town decided to undertake this project. She cited several concerns including: The need to take stock of the Town’s infrastructure, establishing a stormwater utility in 2017, the age of the system, an expected high level of failure given its age, and its location under roadways and implications for the transportation system should failures occur. Karen then turned the presentation over to John Jackman of Hoyle Tanner who went over preparation of a GIS layer and the several attributes developed. He next described the video inspection equipment and imaging techniques. He also described manhole inspection, the Google form developed for data collection, linking the collected data to the GIS system and the collection of GPS data in three dimensions. He then went into project results giving an example of pipe assessments and reported on the project’s budget and schedule, and illustrated findings with some GIS maps. He concluded with the following lessons learned:
- Confirmed that a top down inspection method would be incomplete.
- Much of the system has outlived its expected life.
- Intrusions into the system from gas and electrical utilities as well as unpermitted connections, and
- Having a valuable video record of the entire system.

Next steps in the process will include reinspection as needed (the Town expects a 5 year reinspection cycle), repairing the highest priority pipes (only .7% were judged bad/critical), develop worksheets for
capital planning, prioritize and risk manage the rest of the system, and setting up database queries for further analysis and capital planning.

4. CENTRACS Traffic Management Software (Information Item)
Sai Sarepalli introduced Derek Lyman and Spencer Palmer of VTrans to present the State’s Automated Traffic Signals Performance Measures (ATSPM). Derek began with a map and background information of all of VTrans signals (Chittenden County has 75 of the State’s 163 total signals, not counting municipal signals on Class 1 town highways in other Chittenden County municipalities). Derek provided details on many signal characteristics including:

- Signal structures
- Cabinets
- Controllers
- Econolite TS2
- Econolite Centracs 2.0
- Signal communications

He then went over elements of VTrans Traffic Signal Management Plan describing its program goals, stakeholder involvement, budget and staffing, and examples of the data worksheets related to all signals. Derek then switched to details of the ATSPM, illustrated by various charts displaying:

- Purdue Phase Termination
- Pedestrian delay
- Emergency preemption,
- Wavetronix SmartSensor,
- Purdue Coordination,
- Approach volumes
- Lane by lane movement counts, and
- Yellow and red actuations

Derek concluded by describing next steps that included connecting more state signals to the network, installing radar detection equipment, investigating other possible metrics for data collection, using Bluetooth to measure travel times, and preparing for signal upgrades for 16 intersections along Shelburne Road.

5. FY20 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) (Action Item)
Marshall reported that at last month’s meeting we had a presentation on this but we are now seeking TAC approval before sending along to the Board for their action later this month. BRIAN BIGELOW MADE A MOTION RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF THE FY20 UPWP. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY JUSTIN RABIDOUX AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

6. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports (Information Item)
Peter gave a brief report on the rural transit roundtable discussion from the day before. Chris Jolly asked out the hiring of a contractor for the I-89 corridor study. Eleni replied that we had.

7. CCRPC March Board Meetings Report
Peter noted that the Board met on April 17th. There was a presentation on road erosion inventory work and the Board warned a public hearing for the FY20 UPWP.

8. Chairman’s/Members’ Items
No items this month.

BRIAN BIGELOW MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BOB HENNEBERGER, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 AM. Respectfully submitted, Peter Keating
CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
CLEAN WATER ADVISORY COMMITTEE – DRAFT MINUTES

DATE: Tuesday, May 7, 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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bolton:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buels Gore:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington: Jenna Olson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester: Karen Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex: Annie Costandi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Junction: Chelsea Mandigo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Stantec), arr. 11:10 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington Airport: Polly Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winooski River:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the Winooski River:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Attendees:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCRPC Staff:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Call to Order.** The meeting was called to order by Annie Costandi 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 April 2, 2019.**
   After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, Karen Adams made a motion, seconded by Chelsea Mandigo to approve the minutes as drafted. MOTION PASSED with abstentions by Costandi, Forbes and Palola.

4. **CCRPC UPWP Process and proposed FY20 WQ projects: Marshall Distel**
   Marshall Distel explained the annual UPWP process. We received $1.7 million in requests and were able to accommodate $1.4 million. The water quality projects are increasing over the last few years. Marshall indicated that we’d like two representatives from the CWAC on next year’s UPWP Committee because we’ve been getting more and more water quality requests. This commitment includes reviewing the requests that come in and participate in the three UPWP Committee meetings in January, February and March. We may also be asking the CWAC for a formal recommendation on the water quality program. Annie volunteered, but the CWAC will wait until the next meeting to formalize the appointment in case anyone else is interested.

5. **Legislative Water Quality Update**
   Charlie Baker provided an update on S. 96. Charlie went over a Side by Side comparison done by Legislative staff to explain the difference between the Senate bill and the House bill. This has not yet passed the House. Ways and Means did vote on Friday to use $8 million from the Ed fund, and then backfill the Ed fund with a cloud software tax. A few changes that Charlie mentioned include: They’ve made it more open to which organization will make up the Clean Water Service Provider where it was more clearly described as the RPCs before. They’ve added that the Secretary will adopt guidance on implementation which is in response to comments that ANR should still be involved. Trying to give more weight to the Water Quality Council over the provider. The enforcement provision has been removed. It is possible that in the future there may be an evolution of the CWAC into the Basin Water Quality Council; not really sure how this will work out. The new bill lists two persons from each municipality on the Council, but this is likely a mistake. Charlie thinks that they may have intended “two persons from municipalities within the basin” which is not as inclusive as our CWAC. Section 926 is intended to help address the assumed
phosphorus reduction gap that the regulated programs won’t be able to address. Section 927 is intended to replace the current ERP grant program and intended to help address the regulatory programs. Section 928 is intended to cover the municipal required programs: MRGP, MS4s, municipally owned 3+ acre impervious permits. Under Section 930 there is a section to address the water quality basin funding that the RPCs have received for the last few years and explains the relationship with the watershed associations. Section 3 addresses a concern that land conservation funding is still an important component of the program to help address water quality concerns. Starting on page 23 there is a clear intent to shift the priority of water quality funding: the municipal stormwater implementation grant is a second priority. An entire section has been added to describe that most of these grant programs aren’t set up yet; it will take about 2 to 3 years to get it all going.

Questions/Comments:
1. There was a comment that businesses that rely on cloud-based data and services are not happy about the proposed revenue component of the bill; and Governor Scott has already indicated that he may have an issue with the bill.
2. Why is there a three-year push back on page 4? Want to focus on basins with specific TMDLs and are trying to be realistic about how long this is going to take.
3. Able to use any “extra” money on other projects required by Federal or State law but only if Secretary declares a provider has met pollution reduction goals.
4. If the Clean Water Service provider is not meeting its goals, then this will hold back grant funds from all members in the basin. It is quite punitive and un-necessary. There is a section that indicates if there are insufficient funds available that should not be a reason to hold back funding from all other partners. Further, in the instance of insufficient funds, the Secretary of Natural Resources “shall consider additional regulatory controls to address water quality improvements that could not be funded.” Which could be holding municipalities to adherence, even if the State hasn’t been successful or can’t provide funds.
5. What about Grants in Aid and other VTrans money? It was inferred that those programs will not go away. However, the Clean Water Block Grants might.
6. Which group will be overseeing the evolution of the current ERP program? Will the program get harder to access? The idea is to make it easier to get the funds out through a regional Clean Water Service Providers rather than DEC because it has been difficult for them to get the funding out.
7. There are a lot of assumptions worked in. It seems like the structure assumes that all municipalities have the same water quality priorities, but that isn’t necessarily true (particularly for communities like Burlington with a combined sewer overflows). The intent makes sense, but it seems like a lot has been lost in translation because some of these details are not workable. Charlie’s understanding is that this is just re-jiggering a small portion of the overall funding pie (just the Clean Water Funds raised funds which is approximately $7 million, not the full $50 million). So, the vast majority of the programs will stay as is. Charlie Baker will send the table that helps describe this.
8. Is there any thought process about streamlining? Currently for ERP a project will typically take 2 summers, and with Vtrans a project will typically take 3 summers. It would be great if these funds could be used quickly without a lot of un-necessary process.
9. On page 27 the section that stated the Secretary will take action was removed. Who is going to ultimately be the responsible party to ensure these non-regulatory projects are properly implemented in the long-term. The bill has been clarified that the Secretary will not take enforcement action on the Clean Water Service Provider. It has also been clarified that the Clean Water Service Provider is not responsible for enforcement of these projects. Should it be clarified that ANR will be responsible for this enforcement?

6. Updates.
Jenna Olson going to moving up to be Program and Policy Coordinator. Therefore, Burlington is going to be hiring a Stormwater Coordinator. Jenna will also be going out on maternity leave for the summer.
7. **Items for June 4th meeting agenda.**
   - UPWP Representative.
   - Legislative fall out.
   - A number of people will not be able to make it to the June 4th meeting; stay tuned via email about whether the meeting will stay on or not.

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

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

DATE: Tuesday, May 7, 2019
SCHEDULED TIME: 12:30 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT
DOCUMENTS: Minutes, documents, and presentations discussed accessible at:
http://www.crrpcvt.org/meetings/clean-water-advisory-committee/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Members in Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burlington: Jenna Olson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington Airport: Polly Harris (Staniec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williston: James Sherrard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester: Milton:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winooski: Tim Grover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelburne: Chris Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAOT:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Junction: Chelsea Mandigo, co-chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Burlington: Tom DiPietro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of VT: Claire Forbes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Attendees: WNRCD: Kristen Balschunat, Gianna Petito;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCRPC Staff: Dan Albrecht</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 April 2, 2019
After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, Karen Adams made a motion, seconded by Chelsea Mandigo to approve the minutes as drafted. MOTION PASSED with abstentions by Costandi, Forbes and Harris.

3. WNRCD:
a. Activities update
Kristen Balschunat provided a brief update. Items to note in particular are the high turnout at the Burlington Rain Barrel workshop, 15 volunteers have been secured for water quality sampling with only 3 sites left that need a monitor and the high number (100!) of individual residents reached this month.
b. Revisions to Water Quality sampling program for 2020
Kristen, Gianna and the members discussed in general terms some potential ideas for changes to implement beginning in 2020 which included: perhaps more chloride monitoring as this is a growing concern, some research regarding monitoring to address changes in water quality long term due to development in general, and as well as a more narrow time frame analysis to understand water quality before a given subdivision is built versus water quality after. Kristen indicated she will work over the coming year to have dedicated discussions on an individual basis with town staff to collect more feedback on what changes would be desired.
c. Requested increase to current FY contract for Stream Team services
Kristen presented a detailed budget breakdown showing expenses through April 19th and anticipated remaining costs. Overall costs ran higher than initially project before the start of the fiscal year mostly due to a higher level of interest from the public for stream team events/projects coupled with additional staff time invested to strengthen the water quality sampling program. Additionally, and through no fault of either WNRCD or Burlington, the costs of rain barrels jumped dramatically with little notice. On that basis, WNRCD was projecting remaining expenses from April 19 through June 30th requesting an overall increase of $4,422.83 to cover remaining cost for FY19.

4. Rethink Runoff budget update
Dan Albrecht presented a detailed spreadsheet showing expenses paid to date as well as projected expenses for the remainder of the fiscal year. The take home message is that he is projecting that FY19 will end with an accessible surplus of about $9k with another $6 set aside consisting of $3k for building a $15k survey reserve by 2023 and $3k as a committed carryover to the FY20 budget. The co-chairs and Dan noted that they had previously indicated to WNRCD and to the Subcommittee that an increase in WNRCD time and expenses was
warranted from an effectiveness and demand standpoint and feasible as FY19 started with a healthy $18k surplus.  
A brief discussion and a review of the minutes from prior meetings, it was confirmed that the Subcommittee had actually previously approved that the Stream Team promo materials (totaling $1,556) were to be paid for out of the projected current funds surplus and not counted against WNRCD’s total contract amount of $23,000.
On that basis, a motion was made by Karen Adams to approve an overall budget increase of $2,886 to WNRCD’s contract, seconded by James Sherrard. MOTION PASSED with Harris abstaining.

5. Updates
None

6. Items for Tuesday, June 4th meeting
Agenda to be developed. Potential for no meeting being held due to members attending New England Water Environment Association meeting.

7. Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Dan Albrecht
Date: Wednesday, May 8, 2019  
Time: 5:30 p.m.  
Place: CCRPC offices; 110 W. Canal Street; Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404

Members present: Andy Montroll (Chair) and Jeff Carr. Charlie Baker, staff

1. Committee Chair, Andy Montroll opened the meeting at 5:34 pm.

2. The agenda was revised to move other business before officers.

3. Jeff Carr moved to approve the May 9, 2018 Board Development Committee Minutes as drafted. Andy Montroll seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

4. Jeff proposed that there should be three board education/training sessions in the fall. Should be a broad training session, a focused one on RPC responsibilities, and a focused one on MPO responsibilities. The committee felt they should encourage new board members, more tenured board members, and alternates to attend the sessions.

5. There was discuss about efforts to solicit Executive Committee appointments. Jeff motioned to recommend the slate of officers to the Board for FY 2020 as Chair - Mike O'Brien; Vice-Chair - Catherine McMains; Treasurer – John Zicconi; Large Town – Chris Shaw; Small Town – Barbara Elliott; Past Chair – Chris Roy. Andy seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Jeff moved to adjourn. Andy seconded. Meeting was adjourned at 5:41 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Charlie Baker
May 8, 2019