REGULAR MEETING &
PUBLIC HEARING AGENDA
Wednesday, September 18, 2019, 6:00 pm
CCRPC Offices; 110 W. Canal St; Suite 201
Winooski, VT  05404

AGENDA

TRAINING – RPC Overview 5:15 – 6:00 p.m. (Light dinner will be available)

CONSENT AGENDA –
   C.1   TIP Amendments*

DELIBERATIVE AGENDA
   1. Call to Order; Changes to the Agenda
   2. Public Comment Period on Items NOT on the Agenda
   3. Action on Consent Agenda  (MPO Action; 1 minute)
   4. Minutes of July 17, 2019 Meeting*  (Action: 1 min.)
   5. Burlington International Airport Draft Noise Compatibility Plan, Nic Longo  (Discussion: 30 min.)
   8. FY2020 Committee Appointments*  (Chair Action: 10 min.)
   9. Chair/Executive Director’s Updates  (Information; 10 min.)
      a. Building Homes Together Update
      b. Transportation Climate Initiative
      c. Amtrak Storage Study
      d. Clean Water Service Provider rulemaking
      e. Audit update
      f. Compensation Study
   10. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports*  (Information; 1 min.)
      a. Brownfields Advisory Committee (draft minutes August 2, 2019 and September 5, 2019)
      b. Transportation Advisory Committee (draft minutes August 6, 2019 and September 3, 2019)
      c. Clean Water Advisory Committee (draft minutes July 2, 2019 and August 6, 2019)
      d. Planning Advisory Committee (draft minutes August 7, 2019)
      e. MS4 Sub-committee (draft minutes July 2, 2019 and September 3, 2019)
      f. Executive Committee (draft minutes September 4, 2019)
   11. Other Business/Members’ Items
   12. Adjournment  (Action: 1 min.)

*Attachment

Upcoming Meetings - Unless otherwise noted, all meetings are held at our offices:

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.
Transportation Advisory Committee - Tuesday, October 1, 2019; 9:00 a.m.
Clean Water Advisory Committee - Tuesday, October 1, 2019; 11:00 a.m.
Executive Committee – Tuesday, October 2, 2019 5:45 p.m.
Planning Advisory Committee - Wednesday, October 2, 2019 2:30 p.m.
CCRPC Board - Wednesday, October 16, 2019 6:00 p.m.

Tentative future Board agenda items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 16, 2019</td>
<td><strong>RPC Training Session in advance of Meeting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY21 Municipal Dues – Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VTrans Circ Alternatives Progress Report, Jesse Devlin &amp; Michele Boomhower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 20, 2019</td>
<td><strong>RPC Training Session in advance of Meeting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY19 Audit – Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td><strong>Legislative Breakfast</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Potential Topics/Speakers:
- Results from Policy Discussion?
- 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.
FY2019 and FY2020 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendments

Issues

Make the following amendments to the FY19 and FY20 years of the TIP.

US7 Signal Upgrade, Shelburne-South Burlington (Project HP137, Amendment FY19-28)

- Description of Change - Add $10,000 in federal funds for preliminary engineering in FY19. These funds will come from project OT001 Regional Safety.
- Reason for Change – The FY18 TIP had $75,000 for scoping for this project. VTrans is now looking to add funds for design. Construction funds will be added when a construction cost estimate has been calculated.

VT15 Multiuse Path – St Mikes Crosswalk, Colchester-Essex (Project BP069B, Amendment FY19-29 and FY20-01)

- Description of Change – Add $115,202 in federal funds in FY20 for crosswalk improvements at St. Michael’s College’s East Entrance. These funds will come from project OT001 Regional Safety.
- Reason for Change – St. Michael’s College has been working with Colchester and VTrans to add a crosswalk and a small sidewalk connection to an existing TIP project; VT15 Multiuse Path. VTrans has agreed to add these improvements to the path project.

TAC Recommendation

Recommend that the Board approve the proposed TIP amendments.

Staff Recommendation:

Recommend that the Board approve the proposed TIP amendments.

For more information, contact:

Christine Forde
cforde@ccrpcvt.org or 846-4490 ext. *13
1. Call to order; changes to the agenda. The meeting was called to order at 6:05 p.m. by the Chair, Michael O’Brien.

2. Changes to the Agenda. There were no changes.

3. Public Comment Period on Items NOT on the Agenda. There were no comments.

4. Approve Minutes of April 17, 2019 board meeting. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JUNE 19, 2019. MOTION CARRIED WITH ABSTENTIONS FROM JOHN ZICCONI, BARBARA ELLIOTT AND DON MEALS.

5. Autonomous Vehicles Presentation. Joe Segale, the Director of Policy, Planning & Research at VTrans shared a presentation on Automated Vehicles. The State of Vermont passed legislation that will allow the testing of AV’s. The presentation covered several areas, including

- Automated Vehicles Overview
- Potential Benefits and Consequences
- Federal and State Roles
- VT Stakeholder Feedback
- S.149 - VT AV Testing Legislation
Joe explained there are five stages of automation, the lowest end represents conventional vehicles where the driver has total control, to assisted and finally the highest level of full system control. He stated humans are always the fallback, if a system fails, the human can take over. He noted projections forecast over the next decade there will be a mix of levels of automation seen on our highways. He also noted the different impacts that could affect the future system if a private/individual ownership scenario happens vs. a shared vehicle model. Congestion and parking impacts could be very different. Joe also described the federal vs. state and municipal roles in our transportation system and how AV related legislation is being considered in more and more states. There is opportunity to improve rural transit options using AV’s. He is also working to develop program guidance by 2021. Joe pointed out there is also an opportunity for Vermont to be on the cutting edge of technology. Vermont has a long tradition of public transparency and values public input. Member discussion ensued and questions regarding municipal roles and responsibilities, the liability issues that will arise and the types of vehicles that might be tested – cars, trucks or transit. Sharon wondered how AV’s will navigate changes in terrain and road closures. Members discussed Vermont’s rugged and varied roadways, the landscape, and how AV’s would perform under conditions such as ice, snow, and mud. Jeff Carr mentioned the issue of safety being a concern. He asked Joe what he thinks is the greatest benefit as well as greatest risk for a town to agree to test AV’s. Joe stated he thinks the greatest benefit is the opportunity for towns to be on the cutting edge of technology, however, in the event of an accident, a town could face a lot of scrutiny. Discussion amongst member ensured regarding municipalities liability and what insurances and protections would be in place and the potential benefits for rural transportation opportunities.

6. FY20-23 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

   a. Presentation & Public Hearing. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JOHN ZICCONI, TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 6:41 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Christine Forde provided a Power Point presentation on the TIP. She described what is involved with transportation planning and project implementation – Federal regulations require the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC), as the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for Chittenden County, to develop and maintain a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The TIP contains funding information for transportation projects proposed to spend federal transportation funds in Chittenden County. Projects must be listed in the TIP to spend federal transportation funds. The TIP includes all modes of transportation including highways, bicycle and pedestrian facilities and transit. The TIP covers a four-year period and it must be fiscally constrained. It is typically updated every year with the assistance of the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC), the Vermont Agency of Transportation (VTrans), Green Mountain Transit (GMT) and Burlington International Airport. Note that airport projects are included for information only and CCRPC has no control over FAA funded projects. The TIP lists federal funding amounts in the federal fiscal year when they are expected to be needed. It should be noted that the TIP is a planning and not a budget document. The TIP represents the intent to construct or implement a specific project and the anticipated flow of federal funds. Funds correspond to the following project development phases:

   - Scoping – a process that develops safe and effective alternatives based on documented rational that meet the stated purpose and need while minimizing environmental impacts
   - Preliminary Engineering – detailed design of the preferred alternative
   - Right-of-Way - process of determining if land rights are needed for construction and negotiation of appropriate compensation
   - Construction
Chris Roy voiced concerns with CIRC Alternative projects remaining in a perpetual state of slow to no progress; feels Williston has projects that need to be a higher priority such as the Phase I improvements at Exit 12 that include a shared use path through the Interchange that would drastically improve pedestrian safety at that location. This project will be especially important when construction of the Exit 12 Park and Ride moves forward as it will attract more cyclists and pedestrians. This project was scheduled years ago but nothing happened all these years. He is very concerned about the timeliness and prioritization of the CIRC Alternatives Projects.

Matthew Langman (VTRANS) stated many of the Williston projects are in Phase III. Chris would like to see progression and clarity brought for the timeframe on the projects. Discussion between members ensued regarding the pace and hierarchy of projects and impacts of the project choices by VTrans. Charlie stated he will follow up with VTrans and have a status update for the October Board Meeting.

JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CHRIS SHAW TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 7:05 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

b. Approval of the TIP. ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CHRIS ROY, TO APPROVE THE TIP AS PRESENTED. MPO VOTE:

Bolton: Yes  Burlington: Yes (4)  Charlotte: Absent
Colchester: Yes (2)  Essex: Yes  Essex Jct: Absent
Hinesburg: Yes  Huntington: Yes  Jericho: Yes
Milton: Yes  Richmond: Yes  St. George: Absent
Shelburne: Absent  So. Burlington: Yes (2)  Underhill: Yes
Westford: VACANT  Williston: Yes  Winooski: Yes
VTrans: Yes
MOTION CARRIED WITH 19 OF 24 VOTES; AND 14 OF 18 MUNICIPALITIES VOTING IN THE AFFIRMATIVE.

c. Certification of the Planning Process. Christine had provided a memo in the meeting packet describing the federal requirements CCRPC must follow and a description of what each of those regulations cover. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JOHN ZICCONI, TO AUTHORIZE THE CHAIR TO SIGN THE CERTIFICATION OF THE PLANNING PROCESS. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

7. FY2020 Regional Board Member and Committee Appointment: Charlie explained how Regional Board Member and Committee Appointments work per the Bylaws. Charlie presented a Memo listing current appointments and vacancies. Mike O’Brien urged members and alternates to serve on a committee and reach out to those who are not on any committees and work to generate interest. Discussion among members ensued regarding current appointments and best ways to generate interest.

ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CHRIS SHAW, TO AUTHORIZE THE CHAIR TO MAKE REGIONAL COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Members voted on Regional Appointments only and will refrain from voting on Committee Appointments to see if other members are interested by the next meeting.

8. Potential Policy Participation Topics. Charlie stated he and Regina Mahoney worked on a document Draft of Potential Policy Participation Topics. As discussed by the Board this spring, this will serve as our
first semi-annual agenda item 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. Currently, the draft holds 18 items with staff comments reflecting the level the degree of engagement they recommend. Staff will defer to the Board for decisions on which items to actively engage in. Members discussed the importance and validity of the endeavor. All members were appreciative of the work and in agreement with what was presented. Jeff Carr expressed great appreciation for the work done by Charlie, Regina and staff. He feels this was an important endeavor that will yield efficiencies and help ward off frustration. Members agreed. Charlie asked members for feedback on the current list of topics. Chris Shaw mentioned adding an item that addresses single family homes zoning on bus routes and near interchanges. Members discussed current issues and potential to revise or add others. Sharon asked that public safety consolidation be added to the list. There was consensus that this living document is a good tool and will be revisited at least every six months with the Board.

9. Chair/Executive Director Report. Charlie noted that tonight was the first meeting for the new chair and that there were also some new members and alternates attending. Chair, Mike O’Brien, asked everyone at the meeting to introduce themselves and members went around the table with introductions.

10. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports. Minutes for various meeting were included in the packet (CWAC, MS4 Subcommittee, and Brownfields Advisory Committee).

11. Members’ Items, Other business. Charlie reminded everyone there will not be a Board Meeting in August. Jeff Carr stated there will be an orientation training directly preceding the September Board meeting and encouraged participation. After a question about the I-89 Study, Eleni stated that the first Advisory Committee was a success and the Board will be getting regular updates on this study. There is a lot of technical work being done right now and the next Advisory Committee meeting will be in January.

12. Adjourn. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:28 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Amy Irvin Witham
Background: The most recent federal transportation bills place considerable emphasis on system performance and direct State Departments of Transportation (DOTs), Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and Public Transit Providers to evaluate how well the transportation system is performing. At the national level, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) have pulled these requirements together into a Transportation Performance Management (TPM) program. The TPM program is a strategic initiative that uses system information to direct investments and implement policies to help achieve national performance goals. The intent is to measure progress towards the national goals through a reliable data-driven process.

Performance measures are established at the federal level, and it is then up to state DOTs, MPOs and Transit Providers to set quantifiable targets to gauge progress towards national goals. The schedule to establish targets varies by measure. VTrans has already established targets in the following areas:

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

Last fall, the CCRPC agreed with the VTrans targets set for each of these areas. Federal regulations allow MPOs to establish their own targets, if desired.

Similar to VTrans, GMT must establish asset targets for rolling stock, equipment and facilities that the CCRPC must agree to, or, like the VTrans targets, CCRPC can establish their own targets. Last November, GMT approved a Transit Asset Management (TAM) Plan that, among other things, identified the required targets. Here is the target statement from the GMT TAM Plan:

“The Authority’s annual SGR performance targets for FY 2019 are that our fleet & equipment will not be more than 20% past the ULB and our facilities will be at least a 3.0 on the TERM rating scale.”

Here are the relevant definitions from FTA:

**SGR, State of Good Repair:** The condition in which a capital asset is able to operate at a full level of performance.

**ULB, Useful Life Benchmark:** The expected life cycle or the acceptable period of use in service for
a capital asset, as determined by a transit provider, or the default benchmark provided by FTA.

**TERM Scale:** The five (5) category rating system used in the FTA’s Transit Economic Requirements Model (TERM) to describe the condition of an asset: 5.0—Excellent, 4.0—Good; 3.0—Adequate, 2.0—Marginal, and 1.0—Poor.

In addition to target setting, TAM Plans also include detailed inventories of transit assets, a condition assessment of those assets, a description of its decision support tools, and a prioritized list of investments. TAM Plans are designed to support planning, budgeting, and communications to stakeholders.

**Staff Recommendation:** The CCRPC Board agrees to the GMT targets for rolling stock, equipment and facilities as established in their November 2019 TAM Plan.

Eleni Churchill, echurchill@ccrpcvt.org

**Staff contacts:** Peter Keating, pkeating@ccrpcvt.org
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
September 18, 2019


Issues: The Village of Essex Junction has requested that the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (1) approve the 2019 Village of Essex Junction Comprehensive Plan and Essex Community Enhanced Energy Plan, (2) confirm its planning process and (3) grant a determination of energy compliance to the 2019 Village of Essex Junction Comprehensive Plan and Essex Community Enhanced Energy Plan. The plan was adopted by the Village of Essex Junction Trustees on August 13, 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).


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.
Staff Review of the Village of Essex Junction Comprehensive Plan 2019-2027, including Enhanced Energy Plan Review

Emily Nosse-Leirer, Senior Planner

Reviewed by the CCRPC Planning Advisory Committee on May 8, 2019 – Annotated for CCRPC Board Review at 9/18/2019 Meeting

The Village of Essex Junction has requested, per 24 V.S.A §4350, that the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (1) approve its Village of Essex Junction Comprehensive Plan 2019-2027; and (2) confirm its planning process.

Additionally, the Village of Essex Junction 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 Village of Essex Junction Comprehensive Plan 2019-2027.

The draft Village of Essex Junction Comprehensive Plan 2019-2027 is an update and re-adoption of the 2014 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 Village Trustees. However, CCRPC staff understand that during the life of this plan, the Village of Essex Junction and Essex Town may move to adopt a new unified plan. CCRPC reviewed the 2014 plan in September 2017 as part of an informal review and consultation process. The draft Village of Essex Junction Comprehensive Plan 2019-2027 adds information to meet statutory requirements, provides updated data, addresses some recent changes in the community and incorporates an enhanced energy plan by reference. Staff have completed this formal review of the draft Village of Essex Junction Comprehensive Plan 2019-2027 and review of the draft Essex Community Enhanced Energy Plan against the Vermont Department of Public Service’s Energy Planning Standards for Municipal Plans in advance of the Planning Commission’s public hearing on May 23, 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 Village of Essex Junction Comprehensive Plan 2019-2027 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 Village of Essex Junction Comprehensive Plan 2019-2027 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 Village of Essex Junction Comprehensive Plan 2019-2027 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 Village of Essex Junction Comprehensive Plan 2019-2027 contains the required elements of §4382. See the attached Appendix A submittal that describes how the Plan is consistent with these goals.

4. The Village of Essex Junction Comprehensive Plan 2019-2027 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 Village of Essex Junction Comprehensive Plan 2019-2027 is compatible with the municipal plans for the Town of Essex, the City of South Burlington, and the Town of Williston.

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

Comments/Questions:
No changes are necessary to meet statutory requirements. However, the following suggestions and questions may be useful to help clarify the plan as editing continues following the Planning Commission’s public hearing. All issues were clarified with edits to the text before adoption.

- The text on pg. 35 states that median household income in Essex Junction is higher than the county, but it appears the graph shows the opposite.
- Consider updating the data on broadband availability on pg. 69, as the definition of broadband has changed significantly since 2011.
- There is a discussion of significant wildlife habitat in the plan on pg. 50 and 53, but how exactly is the Village is defining significant wildlife habitat? Is it everything that’s inventoried in Vermont Conservation Design? If yes, consider clarifying that.
- Does the Village have building codes or not? On pg. 76, Objective 4.3 implies no, but on pg. 87, Objective 1.2 implies yes.
- On pg. 89, the second paragraph seemed to say both that interconnected local streets are discouraged, but also that they are a central transportation policy for the village.

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 Essex Community Enhanced Energy Plan to determine whether:

7. The Essex Community Enhanced Energy 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 Essex Community Enhanced Energy 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.

9. The Essex Community Enhanced Energy 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>Met after PAC review</td>
<td>Necessary for final determination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Submit a copy of the adopted plan</td>
<td>Met after PAC review</td>
<td>Necessary for final determination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Plan contains an energy element</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Analysis of resources, needs, scarcities, costs and problems in the municipality across all energy sectors</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.a. Report Current energy use for heating, electricity, and transportation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.b. Report 2025, 2035 and 2050 targets for energy use</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.c. Evaluation of thermal-sector energy use changes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.d. Evaluation of transportation-sector energy use changes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.e. Evaluation of electric-sector energy use changes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.a. Encourage conservation by individuals and organizations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.b. Promote efficient buildings</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.c. Promote decreased use of fossil fuels for heat</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.a. Encourage increased public transit use</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.b. Promote shift away from single-occupancy vehicle trips</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.d. Promote shift from gas/diesel to non-fossil fuel vehicles?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.e. Demonstrate municipal leadership re: efficiency of municipal transportation?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.a. Promote Smart growth land use policies</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.b. Strongly prioritize development in compact, mixed use centers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.a. Report existing renewable energy generation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.b. Analyze generation potential</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.c. Identify sufficient land to meet the 2050 generation targets</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

Comments/Questions:
No changes are necessary to meet the enhanced energy planning standards. However, the following suggestions and questions may be useful to help clarify the plan as the editing process continues following the Planning Commission’s public hearing.

Edits were made to clarify these issues before adoption.

- Between Figure 4 and Figure 5 of this plan, the paragraph about electric generation refers to tables 12 and 13, but these should be renumbered. In this same paragraph, there is a clear explanation about the generation potential of base solar and how it can help Essex meet their low target. Consider adding a note about this to Table 9’s discussion of base solar generation, to clarify the fact that the text contains important extra information about the data in Table 9.
- Siting policy 3 says “development of renewable energy generation facilities shall not take place in areas with known constraints,” but below Table 10, the text says “Renewable energy generation facilities should be carefully designed to avoid undue adverse impacts to known constraints” instead. Consider using the same language in both places to avoid any confusion.

Staff finds that the draft Village of Essex Junction Comprehensive Plan 2019-2027 meets the requirements of the enhanced energy planning standards (“determination”) set forth in 24 V.S.A. §4352.

Proposed Motion & Next Steps:

PROPOSED MOTION: The PAC finds that the draft Village of Essex Junction Comprehensive Plan 2019-2027 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 Village of Essex Junction Comprehensive Plan 2019-2027 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 the required data and reference have not been added, or that substantive changes have been made, the materials will be forwarded to the PAC for review. Otherwise the PAC recommends that the Plan, and the municipal planning process, should be forwarded to the CCRPC Board for approval, confirmation, and an affirmative determination of energy compliance.
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 Village of Essex Junction, Vermont is a member municipality of this Commission;

WHEREAS, The Village of Essex Junction formally requested CCRPC to approve its 2019 Village of Essex Junction Comprehensive Plan and Essex Community Enhanced Energy Plan and confirm its planning process and grant a determination of energy compliance on April 19, 2019;

WHEREAS, the Planning Advisory Committee warned a public hearing on April 22, 2019 and held a public hearing on May 8, 2019 to review the 2019 Village of Essex Junction Comprehensive Plan and Essex Community Enhanced Energy 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, Winoski, Vermont;

WHEREAS, the Planning Advisory Committee reviewed the records and recommended that the Commission approve the 2019 Village of Essex Junction Comprehensive Plan and Essex Community Enhanced Energy 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 May 8, 2019.

WHEREAS, the Planning Advisory Committee reviewed the records and recommended that the Commission grant an affirmative determination of energy compliance to the 2019 Village of Essex Junction Comprehensive Plan and Essex Community Enhanced Energy 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 May 8, 2019; and

WHEREAS, the Village of Essex Junction Trustees adopted the 2019 Village of Essex Junction Comprehensive Plan and Essex Community Enhanced Energy Plan on August 13, 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 Village of Essex Junction Comprehensive Plan and Essex Community Enhanced Energy 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 Village of Essex Junction’s municipal planning process.


Dated at Winooski, this 18th day of September, 2019.

CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

____________________________
Michael O’Brien, Chair
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission

September 18, 2019

Agenda Item 8: Chair Action Item

FY2020 Committee Appointments

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

Finance Committee (Secretary/Treasurer, Vice Chair and 1 other board member): John Zicconi, Shelburne (Chair); Catherine McMains, Jericho; and Jeff Carr, Essex

Board Development Committee (past Chair and up to 4 other board members): Chris Roy, Williston (Chair); Dan Kerin, Essex Junction; Catherine McMains, Jericho; Jeff Carr, Essex; ______________

Unified Planning Work Program Committee (3-5 board members Catherine McMains, Jericho (Chair); John Zicconi, Shelburne; Michael Bissonette, Hinesburg; Jacqueline Murphy, Colchester; and Sharon Murray, Bolton.

Transportation Advisory Committee (1 board member): Barbara Elliott, Huntington

TAC Interest Group Reps: Elderly - Bob Henneberger; Bike/Ped - Allegra Williams; Rail - Mary Anne Michaels; Environmental - Richard Watts; Disabled - ________; Business - ________

Planning Advisory Committee (1 board member): Joss Besse, Bolton

Long Range Planning Committee (3-6 board members, one of them to be Chair of the LRPC): Appointments to be determined when the committee is needed again.

Clean Water Advisory Committee: (1 board member) Don Meals, Conservation/Environment

ad hoc Brownfields Advisory Committee: Curt Carter, GBIC (Chair); Matt Vaughn, LCBP (Vice Chair); Ian Jewkes, Burlington; Heather Carrington; Winooski; Dr. Pablo Bose, UVM; Razelle Hoffman-Contois; VT Dept of Health; Brett Long, VT Dept of Economic Development (ex officio); Patricia Coppolino, VT DEC (ex officio); Marcel Beaudin; Justin Dextadeur, Socio/Econ/Housing

ad hoc All Hazards Mitigation Plan Update Committee: Chris Shaw, So. Burlington.

ad hoc Committee on Act 250 Commission: Justin Dextadeur, Socio/Econ/Housing; Jim Donovan, Charlotte, Tony Micklus, Milton; Andy Montroll, Burlington; and Chris Roy, Williston

VAPDA representative: Andy Montroll, Burlington; ________________ (Alt.)

For questions, contact Charlie Baker, 735-3500 or cbaker@ccrpcvt.org
Brownfields Advisory Committee Meeting Summary  Friday, August 2, 2019  1:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.

CCRPC Main Conference Room, 110 West Canal St., Suite 202 Winooski, VT & via conference call

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

| In Attendance |
|----------------|-----------------|
| **Committee Members:** | **Staff:** |
| Curt Carter, GBIC (Chair) (via phone) | Dan Albrecht, Senior Planner |
| Heather Carrington, City of Winooski (via phone) | Emily Nosse-Leirer, Senior Planner |
| Kirsten Merriman-Shapiro, CEDO (via phone) | **Guests:** |
| **CCRPC Consultants** | Doreen Kraft, BCA |
| Alan Liptak, LEE | Chris Beling, EPA |
| Kurt Muller, VHB | Don Turner, Town of Milton (via phone) |

1. **Call to Order, Introductions and Changes to the Agenda**
   The meeting came to order at 1:03 p.m.

2. **Public comments on items not on the Agenda**
   None

3. **Review and action on 5/21 and 7/8 meeting summaries**
   Curt moved to approve the minutes from 5/21 with Kirsten seconding. The motion passed unanimously.
   Heather moved to approve the minutes from 7/8 with Curt seconding. The motion passed unanimously.

4. **Action on Site Nominations/Assistance Requests**

   a. **BURLINGTON: 405 Pine Street (Burlington City Arts), Phase II ESA, LE Environmental**
   Alan summarized the results of the Phase I ESA on this property. There were no previously testing data available for the site, so the Phase I “started from scratch.” There are three historic drycleaners upgradient near the site and the property adjoins the Barge Canal site, which has a great deal of naphthalene contamination. Vapor testing is needed during the Phase II ESA. Soil borings and groundwater testing are also needed in the Phase II. All RECs are from historic off-site use – the previous uses inside the building are not responsible for contamination. Dan asked whether the number of soil and water testing wells are excessive. Alan explained that for a site in an area of high contamination, this should be considered the industry standard. This testing also helps establish a baseline for contamination on the site and for groundwater flow across the property. Alan will provide a more detailed budget breakdown for staff.

   Doreen discussed BCA’s plans to expand camp programming in the building and stated that they are in process to buy the building and plan for its future use.

   Dan stated that staff are supportive of the request.
Heather made a motion to fund the full $24,400 for this Phase II and Curt seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

b. MILTON: 214-218 US Route 7 (Town of Milton), Phase II ESA, VHB (formerly Johnson Co.)
Kurt reminded the committee about the past struggles to get assessments completed at Parent Property at 204 Route 7. The Town of Milton would like to close on the property this year but would like to see testing completed first. 204 Route 7 remains at a standstill.

At 214 Route 7, the RECs are a 55-gallon drum, which shallow soil testing beneath it; an AST that needs shallow soil testing; and a broken car battery that may be causing lead contamination. All of the RECs can be evaluated with hand auger drilled shallow soil testing rather than monitoring wells. Dan expressed concern about whether the petroleum portion of this project is eligible for funding. Petroleum funding may not be an option as the petroleum contamination was caused by the current owner. Normally we would use hazardous money for this if there were combined hazardous and petroleum RECs, but this is a case where the RECs are clearly only petroleum contamination and the funding is not eligible for hazardous funding. Dan will work further with the DEC to figure out a way to get this funded through petroleum monies.

Curt stated that staff are supportive of the request.

Curt made a motion to fund the project up to $12,722 and Kirsten seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Updates
   a. Milton: 210-214 US Route 7
      Don gave an update on the property. There will be another public hearing on the plan in September 2019 and the Selectboard will approve a final plan in early 2020. Construction is planned in 2021.
   b. Barre: Bonacorsi
      This project has been completed.
   c. Westford: 1705 VT Route 128
      Alan gave an update on this project, which is likely contaminated due to past under- and aboveground storage tanks. The Phase I will likely recommend the need for GPR. Dan stated that staff is trying to get this paid for with petroleum funds. Alan suspects that this will be eligible for petroleum funding and the cost would be a few thousand dollars. The committee agreed to review a funding request for GPR via email.
   d. Other projects.
      Kurt mentioned that a Phase I might be forthcoming for a new children’s center at the St. Anthony’s parish hall near Pine Street and Flynn Avenue.

6. The meeting adjourned at 1:48pm.

Respectfully submitted by Emily Nosse-Leirer
Brownfields Advisory Committee
Meeting Summary
Thursday, September 5, 2019
Scheduled Time: 3:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

CCRPC Main Conference Room, 110 West Canal St., Suite 202 Winooski, VT & via conference call
To access various documents referenced below, please visit:
http://www.ccrpcvt.org/our-work/economic-development/brownfields/#advisory-committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Members:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curt Carter, GBIC, Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Jakus, Burlington CEDO, (via phone), acting member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCRPC Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Liptak and Angela Emerson, LEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurt Muller, VHB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Shellito, Waite-Heindel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCRPC Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guests:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Call to Order, Introductions and Changes to the Agenda**
   The meeting came to order at 3:00 p.m.

2. **Public comments on items not on the Agenda**
   None

3. **Review and action on 8/2 meeting summary**
   No action due to low numbers of Committee members present.

4. **Action on Site Nominations/Assistance Requests**
   a) **Burlington: Cannon residence, 134 Ferguson Avenue, Phase I ESA ($2,400) and BRELLA Enrollment fee ($500)**

   Ms. Cannon recounted the various brownfields issues she encountered at her property starting in 2006 when she went to dig a post hole in the backyard of her residential property. Subsequent investigations revealed that, unbeknownst to her, a dry-cleaning operation had been in place in a former structure from the 1930s to the 1950s. Additionally, a UST was also identified which was subsequently removed. These are detailed in the Sites Management Activities Complete (SMAC) letter issued to Ms. Cannon on May 2, 2019.

   Ms. Cannon would like to enroll in the state’s BRELLA program so as to remove the liability passed onto her as a landowner. Additionally, VT-DEC has requested that Phase I be performed so DEC can determine if any additional Site Investigation work is needed before they could issue a Certificate of Completion. She hopes to put the property on the market in the next few months once she is
Dan recapped the staff recommendation. 1) Based upon prior practice of covering the $500 BRELLA fee for non-profit and municipal projects but not for private projects, staff recommends that CCRPC not reimburse or pay this fee. (Note: the printed version of the recommendation posted to the Committee webpage had a typo which implied staff support for covering this fee). 2) With regards to covering the $2,400 in costs for the Phase I ESA, there are various issues both pro and con, therefore staff asks that the Committee decide what percentage of the $2,400 to cover. Dan noted that both Matthew Vaughan and Pablo Bose had expressed support for helping the project via email to Dan.

Discussion noted that no formal “redevelopment” was proposed but that preparation of the Phase I ESA would provide closure to Ms. Cannon as well as future landowners. It was also noted that given its history as a dry-cleaning site that EPA has issued a positive eligibility determination letter to CCRPC. Lastly, it was noted that Ms. Cannon has been trying to do the right thing all along but it’s been a challenge as she is not proposing a major redevelopment.

*Mr. Carter and Mr. Jakus concluded the discussion with a direction to Mr. Albrecht to poll the Committee members with regard to what percentage of the $2,400 Phase I ESA costs to cover.*

b) **Montpelier: Granite Works, 43-65 Granite Shed Lane, Phase I ESA ($4,500), VHB**

Mr. Connor and Mr. Muller recapped the elements of the proposed Phase I which will incorporate the results of recent Phase II ESA work and Soil Vapor Analysis Mr. Connor intends to purchase the site which is in a mixed-used zoning district and primed for redevelopment.

Dan recapped the recommendation. Completion of the proposed Phase I ESA would facilitate redevelopment of the property. CCRPC Staff has been using “80% of funds requested” (for Phase II ESA’s supplemental costing in the $25k-$30k) range as a general guideline for commercial only developments. Staff recommends that CCRPC fund up to 80% of the final Phase I ESA costs up to a not-to-exceed amount of $3,600. Dan noted that both Matthew Vaughan and Pablo Bose had expressed support for helping the project via email to Dan.

*Mr. Carter and Mr. Jakus concurred with the staff recommendation and thus the overall Committee recommendation was that CCRPC fund up to 80% of the final Phase I ESA costs up to a not-to-exceed amount of $3,600.*

c) **Colchester: NY Cleaners, 110 Heineberg Drive, increased costs ($4,471), Waite-Heindel, Wendy Shellito**

Ms. Shellito recapped the additional, unexpected costs incurred related to the ongoing Site Investigations and preparation of the Corrective Action Plan. Mr. Chamberlain noted his continued interest in the property.

Dan recapped the recommendation. Staff previously recommended that given the relatively low anticipated employment numbers of the proposed redevelopment, any costs beyond the $28,084, be supported by CCRPC at a 60% rate with overall CCRPC contributions not exceeding an additional $5,000 beyond the $22,067. On that basis, staff recommends CCRPC provide $3,761 or 60% of the overall increase of $6,269. Dan noted that both Matthew Vaughan and Pablo Bose had expressed support for
helping the project via email to Dan.

Mr. Carter and Mr. Jakus concurred with the staff recommendation and thus the overall Committee recommendation was that CCRPC fund up to 80% of the final Phase I ESA costs up to a not-to-exceed amount of $3,600.

5. Updates
None

6. The meeting adjourned at 3:47 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Dan Albrecht
DATE: Tuesday August 6, 2019
TIME: 9:00 a.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal St. Winooski, VT

Members Present
Nicole Losch, Burlington
Matt Langham, VTrans
Randy Snelling, VTrans District 5
Bob Henneberger, Seniors
Justin Rabidoux, South Burlington
Dean Pierce, Shelburne
Bryan Osborne, Colchester, TAC Chair
Josh Arneson, Richmond
Mary Anne Michaels, Rail
Allegra Williams, Local Motion

Staff
Bryan Davis, Senior Transportation Planner
Peter Keating, Senior Transportation Planner
Christine Forde, Senior Transportation Planner
Eleni Churchill, Transportation Program Manager

Others
Jack Hanson, Sustainable Transportation VT

NOTE: This meeting was conducted via conference call.
Bryan Osborne called the meeting to order at 9:04AM.

1. Consent Agenda: No items.

2. Approval of Minutes
DEAN PIERCE MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JUSTIN RABIDOUX, TO APPROVE THE
MINUTES OF JUNE 4, 2019. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. Public Comments: None

4. Consultant Selection for Way to Go!
Bryan Davis referred members to the memo in the meeting packet and highlighted some of its content –
historical background on the program and consultant help managing the program from Place Creative. He
described the solicitation and review process, and the two finalists and their interviews with the review
committee. That committee recommended that Place Creative be hired to continue their work with a two-
year contract and possible two one-year extensions pending availability of funds. Dean asked who served
on the review committee. Bryan mentioned that he, Eleni, Emma Vaughan, Ross McDonald (VTrans) and
Bethany Fleishman (Vital Communities) evaluated the proposals. DEAN PIERCE MADE A MOTION,
SECONDED BY JUSTIN RABIDOUX, TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDATION TO RETAIN
PLACE CREATIVE FOR WAY TO GO!

5. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports (Information Item): No discussion.

6. CCRPC June and July Board Meetings Report
Peter noted that the Board held a public hearing and approved the FY20 TIP, heard a presentation on
Autonomous Vehicles, and made at-large appointments to the TAC.

7. Chairman’s/Members’ Items: None

The meeting adjourned at 9:12 AM.
Respectfully submitted, Peter Keating
DATE: Tuesday September 3, 2019
TIME: 9:00 a.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal St. Winooski, VT

Members Present
Nicole Losch, Burlington
Matt Langham, VTrans
Ashley Bishop, VTrans District 5
Bob Henneberger, Seniors
Dean Bloch, Charlotte
Andrea Morgante, Hinesburg
Bryan Osborne, Colchester, TAC Chair
Josh Arneson, Richmond
Mary Anne Michaels, Rail
Allegra Williams, Local Motion
Joss Besse, Bolton
Jon Rauscher, Winooski
Larry Lackey, BTV
Brian Bigelow, Underhill
Bruce Hoar, Williston

Staff
Marshall Distel, Transportation Planner
Peter Keating, Senior Transportation Planner
Christine Forde, Senior Transportation Planner
Eleni Churchill, Transportation Program Manager
Jason Charest, Senior Transportation Planning Engineer
Sai Sarepalli, Transportation Planning Engineer
Chris Dubin, Transportation Planner

Others
Chris Clow, VTrans
Nic Longo, BTV

Bryan Osborne called the meeting to order at 9:00AM, calling for a round of introductions.

1. Consent Agenda: DEAN BLOCH MADE A MOTION APPROVING THE CONSENT AGENDA DOCUMENTING TWO TIP AMENDMENTS. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY DENNIS LUTZ AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

2. Approval of Minutes
NICOLE LOSCH MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BOB HENNEBERGER, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF AUGUST 6, 2019. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. Public Comments: None.

4. VTrans Corridor Management Planning
Chris Clow of VTrans introduced this concept in the context of VTrans long range transportation goals. Corridor planning involves a range of participants cooperatively identifying transportation issues and needs, as well as possible solutions, and the opportunities to implement those solutions along a defined stretch of roadway. The approach is to engage local and regional stakeholders as, well as staff from across AOT divisions, in the planning process. More specifically, corridor planning’s objectives are to:

- Incorporate local needs in a focused and effective way
- Coordinate & Leverage Asset Management Investments
- Identify practical, short term projects
- Identify longer term needs
- Integrate into maintenance, projects and permitting
- Annual Status Meetings to monitor progress and changes

Using the VT RT 100 corridor from Waterbury to Morristown (including VT 108 to Smugglers Notch) as a recent example, Chris described the planning steps:
Data Gathering and Analysis
- Traffic, Safety, Asset Condition, Bike/Ped, Transit, natural resources, wildlife, land use
- Currently Planned Transportation Projects

Input from VTrans Staff
Input from Municipal and RPC Staffs
Corridor Stakeholder Meeting: Issues and Ideas
Draft Implementation Plan

Also included are the types of recommendations that flow from the process. He also revealed the sources of ideas from the process and the planning results. One result is an implementation table showing details of project descriptions, their locations and implementation projects/strategies. Another result was cross-section types in Village/Activity Centers as well as contrasting ones in rural highway stretches. Chris then went to a story map on the project website to illustrate how this is used to convey project information in an interactive way. He then focused on project “harmonization,” using an on-line tool to align and closely coordinate project types over time. Chris concluded with the Corridor Management Planning home page and his contact information.

In the discussion that followed, the following topics came up:
- When the possibility of doing a Chittenden County corridor could arise
- Corridor plans will reside within the asset management section of VTrans
- Walking or biking the corridor to obtain firsthand information of these alternative modes would be useful
- Consider using the municipal regulatory tool of official maps in state corridor management plans
- The difficulties in having State highways through Village Centers that are not Class 1 and the reluctance of towns to take over routes as Class 1
- State highway rights-of-way may need to be larger to accommodate future uses
- Water quality at stream crossings should be incorporated in these plans

5. Burlington International Airport Draft Noise Compatibility Program (NCP)
Nic Longo, BTV’s Deputy Director of Aviation presented this project beginning with its recent history back to 2008 when the last NCP was approved by FAA. The latest effort to update the plan began in 2017. In the meantime, Noise Exposure Maps (NEM) were done in 2013 and 2015. Both NEMs and NCPs are part of the FAA’s Part 150 Noise Study. The NEM includes:
- A detailed description of airport layout, operations, noise exposure, land uses, and noise/land use compatibility for the study year and a forecast year

The NCP is:
- A proposed plan to reduce noise exposure, and identify land use mitigation measures to address existing non-compatible uses and land use control measures to prevent new non-compatible uses

The proposed NEM has been the subject of public meetings earlier this summer. It features noise contour lines drawn over land use types around the airport. Several maps and selected sections of the maps were shown by Nic, some that compared previous noise contours with the most current, also illustrating forecast conditions in the future. Noise contours are drawn at 65 DNL (Day-Night Average Sound Level). The noise contours are generated by a FAA computer model called AEDT. Nic then provided a primer on sound terminology with DNL examples and highlighted the 10-dB penalty for night sounds (between 10PM and 7AM) programmed into the AEDT. The process of updating the NEM is nearly complete and about to be sent for FAA review. The NCP is still in process and will be the subject of further public review over the coming months. Nic noted the following possible land use measures that could be part of any NCP:
- Sounds insulation for residential and community buildings
- Land acquisition and relocation,
- Sound buffers/barriers,
Nic reported that there are 2,600 dwelling units within the 65 DNL contour line and therefore potentially eligible for any sound insulation program. He anticipated that implementation of the draft NCP would results in between 50 and 100 buildings being insulated each year. Building selection will need to be prioritized by considering each whole number contour line – those closest to the higher DNL levels having higher priority, but taking into consideration construction materials and year-built information as well.

6. **Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports (Information Item):** Peter noted that the project list on the back of the agenda identifies new projects begun in FY20 and some older ones dropped off.

7. **CCRPC August Board Meetings Report**

   Peter noted that the Board did not meet in August.

8. **Chairman’s/Members’ Items:** A motion was made, seconded and approved to congratulate Peter Keating on his years of service to the RPC.

   The meeting adjourned at 10:30 AM.

Respectfully submitted, Peter Keating
1. **Call to Order.** The meeting was called to order by Annie Costandi at 11:00 a.m. 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 May 7, 2019**
   After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, Chelsea Mandigo made a motion, seconded by Claire Forbes to approve the minutes as drafted. **MOTION PASSED.**

4. **Start of Northern Lake Champlain (Basin 5) TBP process: Karen Bates, DEC (Discussion)**
   Karen Bates went over the timeline for this Direct to Lake Basin Plan update. The Plan will be adopted by August, 2020. Karen reviewed the main content that will be included in the Plan: agricultural best management practices, stormwater management, corridor/riparian buffer protection, logging roads, wetlands, 3 acre permit, lake shoreline, aquatic invasive species, outreach on water quality conditions, address toxics (Stevens Brook is listed specifically; there was a discussion about noting the two streams (Sunnyside Brook in Colchester and a tributary of Muddy Brook in Williston) on the impaired list for chloride), and identification of stream reclassifications. The map of the basin in Chittenden County was also provided – it includes streams that flow directly into Lake Champlain rather than into the Winooski or the Lamoille. The [Northern Lake Champlain Direct Basin Planning storymap](http://www.ccrpcvt.org/meetings/clean-water-advisory-committee/) was also shown to the CWAC. A lot of data is provided in the storymap and is easily accessible. It also includes the projects in the Watershed Projects database. Dan sent out a “water quality concerns” survey to municipal staff to help gather input to feed into the draft Basin Plan. He will send it out again and it is due by July 15th.

5. **Debrief on S.96**
   Dan Albrecht provided a quick overview of the final S. 96 bill, using the table summary. The bill identifies a strategy for addressing phosphorus reductions in non-regulatory programs. These targets will be set up in November 2021 for Lake Champlain. The bill sets up a structure for a Clean Water Service Provider to distribute funds based on watersheds. In Section 3, the final bill includes 6% of rooms and
meals tax as an additional revenue source. The bill itself is also uploaded on the CWAC page on CCRPC’s website; as well as a table of water quality funding that compares FY19 to FY20 programs. Funding is contingent upon each basin making progress toward phosphorus reduction. Dan Albrecht indicated that Charlie and Dan will have further discussions with the CWAC about whether CCRPC should apply to be the Clean Water Service Provider for one or more of the basins within our region.

6. Updates
a. Clean Water Block Grants, start of Year 2 funds. Dan Albrecht provided a quick update on the second year of funds for this project. Half of this money needs to be used for projects under $20,000; but it can be used for design only. There is still a 50% match for MS4 municipalities. This funding is available, but we are wrapping up year 1 funds before starting year 2 funding projects. There was a question about whether this grant can be used for public-private partnerships. Dan Albrecht does not know if that is possible yet.

b. NW Partnership Project Development Block Grant. Dan Albrecht provided an overview of this small project that we are working on with NW Regional Planning Commission. The intent of this project is to provide funds to RPCs and Watershed Groups to flesh out, update or remove Watershed Projects database projects that don’t have much information associated with them. Many of these projects came from the old corridor plans and need more investigation and planning. Dan will likely focus his efforts on Westford or Charlotte (municipalities that haven’t had a formal stormwater master plan done yet). This isn’t a huge effort, but Dan indicated that he wanted the CWAC to be aware of it.

c. Grants-in-Aid: FY19 wrap-up and start of FY20. Chris Dubin described the work that was done in FY19 under this grant program. A total of 14 towns initially participated with 12 likely the final number, an increase compared to the 10 towns that participated in FY18, the first year of the Grants-in-Aid program. The FY19 program was extended to July 31st for field work; paperwork needs to be wrapped up in August. It isn’t likely that the deadline in the future will be permanently extended to July 31, despite how helpful that would be. Approximately eighty-one 100-meter road segments were upgraded to meet MRGP standards under this program in FY19. After this paperwork is wrapped up, Chris and our interns will be reaching out to the Towns in later summer and early fall to get a handle on any other municipal work that was done on the municipal road segments so we can keep our database up to date. He will also help towns get started on their paperwork for the FY20 program although those projects do not need to be completed until no later than June 30, 2020.

7. Items for August 6th meeting agenda
   • Matt Vaughan’s tributary loading report from the Lake Champlain Basin Program.
   • May cancel if no other topics come up.

8. Adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 11:55 a.m.

Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony and Dan Albrecht
Committee Members in Attendance

Bolton: Hinesburg: Merrily Lovell St. George:
Buels Gore: Huntington: Darlene Palola Underhill:
Burlington: James Sherrard Jericho: Westford:
Charlotte: Milton: Williston:
Colchester: Karen Adams Richmond: Winooski: Ryan Lambert, Tim Grover
Essex: Shelburne: VAOT: Jennifer Callahan
Essex Junction: Chelsea Mandigo South Burlington: Tom DiPietro VANR: Christy Witters
Burlington Airport: Polly Harris (Stantec) University of VT: CCRPC Board: Don Meals, Co-Chair
Friends of the Winooski River: Lewis Creek Assoc: Winooski NRCD:

Other Attendees: Milly Archer, VLCT; Nisha Nadkarni Blue® Stormwater
CCRPC Staff: Dan Albrecht, Chris Dubin, Rachel Galus (intern)

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 July 2, 2019. After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, Chelsea Mandigo made a motion, seconded by Karen Adams to approve the minutes as drafted. MOTION PASSED. Abstentions by Harris and Lovell.

4. Presentation by Matt Vaughan, PhD. Concentration, load, and trend estimates for nutrients, chloride, and total suspended solids in Lake Champlain tributaries, 1990 – 2017

   For details see link to report here: https://lcbp-089519.s3.us-east-2.amazonaws.com/techreportPDF/86_LC_Tributary_Loading_Report.pdf or see Powerpoint at Committee webpage link above.

   Some key points from Dr. Vaughan’s presentation were:

   This analysis was made possible by having 18 tributaries with good long-term and concurrent data sets for water quality on one hand and water flow for the other

   - for Total phosphorus: The Winooski and Missisquoi Rivers, Lake Champlain’s two largest tributaries, each contributed roughly 100 to 300 metric tons of phosphorus to the lake most years. In 10 out of the 18 tributaries, no trends in flow-normalized total phosphorus load were found for any time period.

   - for Dissolved phosphorus: Dissolved phosphorus loads ranged from roughly 20 to 80 metric tons per year for the Missiquoi River and Otter Creek, and roughly 10 to 40 metric tons per year for the Winooski and Pike Rivers. Seven out of the eighteen tributaries showed no trend in flow-normalized dissolved phosphorus load for all of the three trend periods considered. The LaPlatte River showed a significant decrease in flow-normalized load throughout record, and Otter Creek and Winooski River showed a significant decrease for the first half of the record and full-record trend periods, but not for the second half of record.

   - for Total nitrogen: The Winooski and Missisquoi Rivers each delivered roughly 750 to 2,000 metric tons of nitrogen to Lake Champlain most years. The Pike River annual flow-normalized total nitrogen yield often exceeded that of other tributaries by a factor of two and Pike River annual mean total nitrogen...
concentrations were much higher than other tributaries. Trends, mostly downward, in flow normalized load were found for at least one trend period for all but three tributaries.

- for Chloride: The Winooski River delivered roughly 15,000 to 45,000 metric tons of chloride to Lake Champlain each year; its loads and yields often exceeded those of other tributaries. Full record significant increases in flow-normalized chloride load were observed in all but two tributaries, the LaPlatte and Pike Rivers, where decreasing trends were found.

Committee members thanked Dr. Vaughan. Discussion continued. Merrily Lovell noted the high potential price tag (~$10 Million) facing the Town of Hinesburg for mandated upgrades to their sewer plant to further lower phosphorus removal which seems illogical given that wastewater plants only contribute 4% of total P to the Lake. Others noted that further research is needed on tributary loading is needed particularly how it impacts the various lake segments identified in the Lake Champlain TMDL. It is also worth noting that USGS and the MS4s have been gathering similar data on smaller tributaries especially the “impaired” streams. However, while there is good water quality data for these other streams, their data track record is shorter when it comes to concurrent flow measurements.

5. Updates
Tom DiPietro noted that the Online ANR Atlas seems to be on the fritz as certain known subdivision permits are not showing up. Christy Witters said she would look into it. In the meantime, she encouraged people to use ANR “Environmental Interest Locator” online map.

6. Items for September 3rd meeting agenda.
   - Draft 3-acre permit

7. Adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 12:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Dan Albrecht
CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE - MINUTES

DATE: Wednesday, August 7, 2019
TIME: 2:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT

Members Present:
Matt Boulander, Williston
Larry Lewack, Bolton
Eric Vorwald, Winooski
Meagan Tuttle, Burlington
Cathynn LaRose, South Burlington
Dean Pierce, Shelburne
Dana Hanley, Essex
Michael Burris, Milton

Staff:
Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
Emily Nosse-Leirer, Senior Planner
Melanie Needle, Senior Planner

Marty Gilles, Colchester Intern
Sean Cannon, Colchester
Andrew Strniste, Underhill
Daryl Arminius, Charlotte

1. Welcome and Introductions
Regina Mahony called the meeting to order at 2:41 p.m.

2. Approval of May 8, 2019 Minutes
Eric Vorwald made a motion, seconded by Dana Hanley, to approve the May 8, 2019 minutes. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED. Daryl Arminius and Jessica Draper abstained.

3. Comprehensive Plans – General Topics
   a. Implementation of Plans: The PAC asked to discuss the expectations of Plan implementation/accountability at a PAC meeting outside of a specific Plan review, including whether CCRPC should review the Plans earlier than 24 months before they expire. Emily Nosse-Leirer provided some background information on this topic including an overview of the requirements of §4350. The Staff recommendation is to follow our normal plan review process, with a few changes: 1. As a part of the 18 to 24 month (before Plan expiration) review/consultation, staff will review whether the Plan has been implemented or not, the planning process of the municipality and if the municipality is maintaining efforts to provide funding for municipal and regional planning. 2. We will include these reviews on the PAC agendas to meet the public notice requirement, and to allow the PAC to weigh in on these early reviews/consultations. Emily indicated that staff would ask the municipalities for a self-assessment on Plan implementation before CCRPC prepares the review. Emily asked the PAC for thoughts and comments on this strategy. The PAC generally agreed that a check-in on Plan implementation is a great idea, and the self-assessment would make sense because it won’t be possible for CCRPC to know all the ways the Plan has been implemented (and the Planners don’t necessarily know either as other Departments and Committees are responsible for parts of the Plan). Members of the PAC added that this is either something that they are already doing in house already; or will help with annual reporting and Committee workplans at the municipal level. Several municipalities wondered whether CCRPC could help provide data on various indicators included in their plans as part of this review process. Regina said that CCRPC could possibly help with this on a case-by-case basis. There was a suggestion that Charlie add a plan implementation reminder into the annual discussions that he has with the legislative bodies. Regina thanked the PAC for the feedback and stated that Staff will play this out for a year or two before making a formal change to the Plan Review Guidelines.
   b. Plan Amendment in early stages of the 8-year cycle: Emily Nosse-Leirer explained that CCRPC has received a question about whether a Town can restart the clock with a Plan amendment, if they are still meeting all statutory requirements. The issue is that while all elements and goals may be met, the data will begin to get stale and out of date. This particular municipality adopted their Plan in 2017 (so the data is largely from the 2014 ACS and the 2010 Census); and they want to amend the Plan for energy planning. For all other purposes the plan meets all statutory requirements, so the question is whether they can amend the Plan and start a new 8 year clock. The PAC had a lengthy discussion about this. The discussion included:
i. Suggestions about alternatives to data analysis and updates so it in and of itself doesn’t hold up a Plan amendment or update.

ii. Concerns that if a municipality does small amendments along the way on a chapter or two, eventually other parts of the plan will be stale and very much out of date. This is not just a potential data issue, but a public engagement and policy issue as well.

iii. Acknowledgement that if all statutory requirements are met, the data is not too outdated, and the municipality asks for a new 8-year clock, CCRPC should be able to approve that.

iv. Understanding of the challenges of determining when data is outdated. It was stated that municipalities are supposed to update the information on which the plan is based; and the Regional Plan should be clear about new municipal plan updates so everyone is clear on the policy that we are operating under. Another member added that we should be flexible because statute doesn’t say that all the data needs to updated right away.

v. Regina added that this is tied back to the change from 5 year plans to 8 year plans, and the idea that with an 8 year plan there would be less re-adoption of older plans with outdated data. Dana added that the planning community did make a lot of promises during those discussions. There was a suggestion that perhaps an amendment within the first year or two would be okay for a new 8 year clock. Ultimately, it was acknowledged that this needs to be determined on a case-by-case basis. It is up to the municipalities to make the ask for whatever they want. If there is an ask for a new 8 year clock, then it will be on Staff to decide what the recommendation is to the PAC (from the standpoint of data, public input, policies, etc.).

c. Forest Integrity: CCRPC has received feedback from ANR on some of the Act 171/forest integrity plans we’ve been writing, and we’d like to discuss this feedback with the PAC. Emily Nosse-Leirer provided an overview of ANR’s feedback on the Huntington Plan. Essentially, the forest connectivity block data does not include wildlife connectivity data and should not be used as a surrogate for wildlife connectivity. Act 171 does have “habitat connector” requirements in addition to forest block requirements. Therefore, it is a good idea to get in touch with ANR for your own town plans (and bylaw work) for advice on what data to use for wildlife connectivity. Jens Hilke is really great at providing assistance and mapping potential habitat connector areas when he can.

4. Building Homes Together

Regina Mahony explained that we are finalizing the 2018 data for the third year of this campaign. This year the Building Homes Together team would also like to report all the municipal work that has been going into housing (i.e. housing committees, housing trust funds; inclusionary zoning, density improvements, development review process improvements, ADU improvements, etc.). Regina emailed a spreadsheet about this information last week; and passed it around for PAC members to fill in. Melanie also sent the final 2018 housing construction numbers a few days ago for one last review. Regina asked the PAC to take a look at that data one last time, as it will be finalized next week.

5. Census Update: PSAP and New Construction

Melanie Needle indicated that there is no update on the PSAP yet, as CCRPC has not heard back from the Census on the proposed changes that were submitted. Melanie Needle explained that the New Construction Program is intended to have an accurate count as possible by Census Day, 4/1/20. The purpose is to capture housing construction that began after 3/1/18 that would not have been submitted to the Census Bureau through any other program. The deadline for submitting addresses is 11/22/19. Regarding the new construction program, Melanie stated that for those municipalities that registered as CCRPC doing the work (Essex, Essex Junction, Hinesburg, Jericho, Milton, Richmond, Shelburne, Underhill, Westford and Williston). CCRPC needs your data by September 30th. The data needed is: zoning permit info from 2018 that didn’t close; and 2019 zoning permit data. While CCRPC staff do not yet know the exact information and methodology that will be needed to submit this information to the Census (the webinars are supposed to be scheduled in September), the deadline for submittal is November 22nd. Therefore, CCRPC needs the data in enough time to work with it. For those towns that didn’t register as CCRPC doing the work, VCGI is going to do this work for you. They will submit new construction data to the Census from e911 and DMV data. VCGI will take more local data from municipalities if you want to provide them with it as well. Bolton and Colchester are participating in the program on their own.

6. ACCD’s Zoning for Great Neighborhoods project
Regina Mahony stated that ACCD is leading a project to help municipalities throughout Vermont improve housing options in walkable places by updating land use regulations. Information about it can be found here. Regina indicated that Center for New Urbanism is the consultant for this work, and they’ve done a similar project in Minnesota. CNU is asking the RPCs to identify common and/or typical existing local zoning barriers to housing and neighborhood walkability, and the specific regulations that determine these barriers. This is supposed to be typical barriers not a complete assessment of each municipality’s regulations. Also, the RPCs need to suggest potential case study towns. These towns will receive specific recommendations and will be asked to participate in a charrette in November. However, there will only be four case study towns selected in the entire state, and the issues need to be replicable to other towns in Vermont. Regina asked the PAC to let her know if there is any interest in being a case study town.

7. **Regional Act 250/Section 248 Projects on the Horizon**

Milton: Several residential projects have been proposed in Milton, but local review is still preliminary and no Act 250 applications have been submitted yet.
Williston: just more phases of Finney Crossing and Cottonwood.
Underhill: nothing.
Shelburne: 63 units at the Yankee Doodle motel site (most significant FBC project so far). Other potential projects on Rte. 7. Kwiniaska development now held up by neighbors.
Richmond: Creamery project. Mobile home reconstruction on Rte. 2.
Bolton: Nothing Act 250 related.
Essex: New warehousing/storage in Saxon Hill.
South Burlington: FedEx proposal in Tech Park; Dorset Meadows development.
Winooski: A wall sign at VSAC needs to go to Act 250 for approval.
Colchester: Nothing new.
Burlington: A couple of projects under re-design. New Act 250 – proposed multi-family on Riverside for 50 units. Local permits expired, so they need to come back through for permitting.
Charlotte: Nothing new.

8. **Other Business**

a. As in past years, the Vermont Department of Housing and Community Development is issuing this memo to inform municipal planning and development officials of changes in statute.

b. Future Meetings are anticipated for: September 11, 2019; October 9, 2019; December 11, 2019. Note the NNECAPA conference conflicts with the second Wednesday in November.

b. MPG Grants due October 1st…let us know if you want our help, or want to discuss a potential MPG/UPWP application.

8. **Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony
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 12:17 p.m. An update on the Clean Streets street sweeping study was added to the agenda. No public comments made.

2. Review and action on draft minutes of May 7, 2019

After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, Karen Adams made a motion, seconded by Chris Robinson to approve the minutes as drafted. MOTION PASSED with abstentions by Harris, Lambert and Sherrard.

3. Blue® Stormwater (Nisha Nadkami): overview of program, followed by brief initial conversation about potential collaboration

Ms. Nadkami provided an overview of the program. They have conducted evaluations of several residences and businesses in several communities in the area. They have formal contracts in place with Burlington and Colchester with each procuring a set number of Blue staff hours and also providing rebates to homeowners to defray the cost of improvements. Burlington pays a rebate based upon square footage while Colchester used both a tiered and flat rate depending upon the project. Blue has also been in touch with Williston, South Burlington and Shelburne about developing contracts.

In terms of potential collaboration between Blue and Rethink Runoff, committee member discussed:
- having Blue provide services (e.g. X number of home evaluations per year) to each year’s three designated “project” communities
- having Blue serve on an “on call” or ad hoc basis with CCRPC paying Blue for services and then billing the appropriate towns as needed
- whether or not a partnership/contract is necessary given that existing Rethink Runoff programs already meet Minimum Measure #2
- how would costs be fairly allocated in overall dues increased to cover the partnership but some member communities (let alone the Airport, UVM and VTRANS) receive few Blue home/business evaluations

It was noted that none of the four communities with SW utilities currently provide a credit towards homeowners who receive such types of certifications.

The discussion concluded with Subcommittee members agreeing to the following two actions:
- that a link to Blue® be added to the Rethink Runoff website and
- that the issue should be discussed further at an upcoming meeting

4. Pluck
**a. Finalize Budget & Scope of Work for FY20**

Members made various suggestions to the proposed scope of work including removing the proposed Rain Garden PDF, shifting the focus from “endangered animal” to “habitat damage”, further effort put into the “Ms. Drop” character and removing the proposed animation addressing car washing and perhaps focus on downspouts or chloride use.

In the interim a small group of the two co-chairs plus Albrecht and Balschunat will meet with Dave Barron to finalize the FY20 scope of work.

A motion was made by Tom DiPietro to approve an overall FY20 budget of $12,000 for Pluck with the final scope to be completed by the small group, seconded by Jennifer Callahan. MOTION PASSED with Harris and Sherrard abstaining.

**b. Preliminary results of Rethink Runoff spring ad campaign**

No discussion. Chelsea Mandigo noted that she and Annie had authorized a carryover through July 5th of Stream Team ads suggested by Dave as the ad buy was running a surplus and many people’s attention will be drawn to the lake during the holiday week. (Editor’s Note: After the meeting, Barron indicating he would forward the information to Albrecht for distribution.)

**5. Winooski NRCD (Kristen Balschunat): Stream Team update**

Kristen provided a comprehensive update. She noted that it has been hard to secure stream cleanups in one of the given three project towns each year. Towns are not requesting them. Therefore, in order to be able to meet planned annual objectives to carry out a stream clean-up she asked for authorization to charge her time during a separate, planned September stream clean up in Williston being funded by CSWD in partnership with the Town. (just the cleanup day in question not organizing time). She can provide some RRST outreach during the event. Authorization was granted by the Subcommittee.

**6. Update: Clean Streets street sweeping study**

Jim Pease distributed a copy of USGS’s preliminary results which had been previously distributed this spring. In a nutshell, towns can gain credit for P-removal from street sweeping if they increase the frequency of their sweeping to 4 times each fall, two in October and two in November. Note that other non-study towns could work towards similar approvals as it is basically a GIS exercise to compare street sweeping routes with the percentage of tree cover overlapping with the town right-of-way. Final results of the study are anticipated in December 2019. A member asked Pease about credits for catch basin cleaning but he indicated that these numbers would be pretty low.

**7. Items for Tuesday, June 4th meeting**

Agenda to be developed. Potential for no meeting being held especially if no CWAC meeting is held.

**7. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 1:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Dan Albrecht
**CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION**

**MS4 SUBCOMMITTEE**

**OF CLEAN WATER ADVISORY COMMITTEE – DRAFT MINUTES**

**DATE:** Tuesday, September 3, 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.ccrpcvt.org/meetings/clean-water-advisory-committee/](http://www.ccrpcvt.org/meetings/clean-water-advisory-committee/)

### Committee Members in Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burlington: James Sherrard</th>
<th>Burlington Airport: Doug Campbell (Stantec)</th>
<th>Williston:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colchester: Karen Adams</td>
<td>Milton: Dave Allerton</td>
<td>Winooski: Tim Grover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex: Annie Costandi, co-chair</td>
<td>Shelburne: Chris Robinson</td>
<td>VAOT: Jennifer Callahan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Junction: Chelsea Mandigo, co-chair</td>
<td>South Burlington:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Attendees:</strong> WNRCD: Kristen Balschunat; Blue® Stormwater: Juliana Dixon; LC SeaGrant: Kris Stepenuck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CCRPC Staff:</strong> 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:

The co-chairs called the meeting to order at 12:01 p.m. No changes to the agenda nor public comments were made.

### 2. Review and action on draft minutes of July 3, 2019

After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, Karen Adams made a motion, seconded by Tim Grover to approve the minutes as drafted. **MOTION PASSED**

### 3. Blue® Stormwater (Juliana Dixon):

#### a. Further discussion of potential Blue® - Rethink Runoff collaboration

Juliana reported the current Blue project status. The contract with Burlington is still open with a small amount of funds available. A pilot project with Williston is on hold until their new Stormwater Coordinator starts work on September 15th. Shelburne and South Burlington are still interested, and she is working on grant applications to fund her time. Blue’s contract with LC SeaGrant is ongoing and not limited to certain towns. Essentially, the outreach and assessments have been well received but the data indicates that follow through on BMP implementation is rare unless rebates are offered.

James noted one option would be setting aside funds or raising dues to provide dedicated funds for a contract with Blue to conduct home assessments. Dan noted that would work especially if it was tied into the cycle of Outreach and Project so that such assessments are tied into the regular Stream Team schedule: i.e., we work with 3 dedicated towns each year. James noted the larger question remains, namely, that if are current Rethink Runoff and Stream Team programs meet the MS4 requirement do we need to add Blue assessments to our portfolio. Juliana stress that it was okay if Rethink Runoff declines a formal collaboration. The discussion concluded with Annie noting that these discussions regarding collaboration can continue offline.

#### b. Posting of Blue® link on rethinkrunoff.org

After a review of suggested text and Blue logos from Julianna, the Subcommittee agreed on the following language to be used in posting a link to Blue on [www.rethinkrunoff.org](http://www.rethinkrunoff.org)

"It is much less expensive to prevent polluted waters than to clean them up. BLUE® is an innovative program that certifies homes, businesses, and institutions as watershed friendly. Evaluators educate and collaborate with property owners to identify opportunities for stormwater mitigation, affect behavioral changes, and
establish stewardship principles to protect our waters. Perhaps you could use a rain barrel or rain garden, perhaps a water trench or French drain. Find out how you can make a difference by mitigating stormwater runoff before it leaves your land.

4. Winooski NRCD (Kristen Balschunat):
   a. **Stream Team update**

   Kristen recapped the highlights of both the July and August updates. The biggest news was the success of the Milton Storm Drain Mural project. It was featured on the front page of the *Milton Independent* and due to extensive sharing of the Facebook post, reached 4,500 people! Project towns for FY20 are Colchester, Essex and Essex Junction while Outreach towns are South Burlington, Williston and Winooski.

   b. **Door hanger and stencil, potential collaboration with LC SeaGrant (Kris Stepenuck)**

   Dr. Stepenuck provided a recap of LCSG programming first (see Cmtee webpage). They work with Ashley Eaton of UVM Watershed Alliance to implement a stormwater curriculum with local teachers. The curriculum does reference Rethink Runoff. With regards to adapting an existing door hanger to include the Ms. Drop or Rethink Runoff logo that would work. She’d also like to use/borrow RRST’s stormdrain stencils.

   After discussion, it was agreed that Kristin would put together an estimate of the time commitment needed for her to create several storm drain stenciling kits for use by teachers working in MS4 towns and the Subcommittee would discuss it further at its October meeting.

5. Pluck (Daniel Johansen)
   c. **Review of ad performance, April 15 – July 30**
   d. **Quick recap of current ad campaign, late August**
   e. **Preliminary review of Winter & Spring ads**

   Daniel first introduced himself. He’s from Champlain College and has been working with Dave for over a year. He’s pleased to note that web traffic to rethinkrunoff.org reached a new high for the January – July timeframe. Overall, ad design has shifted to being more conversational with less jargon. They’ve also update language to aid in Search Engine Optimization towards a statement of “how can you help” which seems to be working. They’ve also been tracking the types of devices being used to access the site with this info showing that mobile devices dominate at 45.48% compared to 37.2% for desktop and 17.32% for tablets.

   Chelsea noted that she, Annie, Kristin and Dan had met with Dave to refine the Scope of Work for FY20. In addition to web maintenance, ad design and ad placement/procurement, Pluck will be producing three new rack cards for use by the Stream Team, create a new watershed graphic on the website, create shorter 15-second animations, create new social media tiles for use across social media and launch a new secondary campaign in spring focusing on endangered creatures in Lake Champlain.

7. Updates
   a. Dan noted a new round of Clean Water Block Grant monies will be available soon. He’ll issue a formal solicitation for projects in the coming weeks. James asked Dan to convey to DEC his strong objections to the 50% match requirement for MS4 towns especially for Implementation projects and asked Dan to convey that to DEC as appropriate. That is only an internal policy of DEC leadership and is not in statute or rule.
   b. Dan noted that he had talked to Padraic Monks from DEC and he is penciled in to present on the 3-acre permit rule at our October 1st CWAC meeting.
   c. Kristen noted the the October 3rd Adirondack - Champlain Regional Salt Summit is coming up at Lake Placid. (Note: Register at fundforlakegeorge.org/saltsummit). After a brief discussion on a localize training,
Kris indicated she wants to see if she can secure a training commitment from Green SnowPro for some time later this fall.

d. In response to a query from Karen, Dan indicated that site selection and design development as part of the P3P Public Private Partnership 3-acre project with Watershed Consulting Associates is still on hold until the final 3-acre permit is issued.

7. Items for Tuesday, October 1st meeting
- Storm drain stenciling kit; collaboration with Blue®; introduction, new Williston SW Coordinator

7. Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 1:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Dan Albrecht
DATE: Wednesday, September 4, 2019
TIME: 5:45 p.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404
PRESENT: Mike O’Brien, Chair
Catherine McMains, Vice Chair
Barbara Elliott, At Large <5000
John Zicconi, Secretary-Treasurer
Chris Shaw, At Large >5000
Chris Roy, Immediate Past Chair

STAFF: Eleni Churchill, Transportation Program Mgr.
Forest Cohen, Senior Business Mgr.
Emily Nosse-Leirer, Senior Planner
Amy Irvin Witham, Business Office Associate

The meeting was called to order at 5:45 p.m. by the Chair, Mike O’Brien.

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

2. Approval of July 17, 2019 Executive Committee Minutes.
Catherine noted one technical correction on Page 2, Line 3 to add the word “of” into the sentence [...] “CCRPC has reviewed the constraints that exist on the site of the proposed project”.

JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BARBARA ELLIOTT, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES WITH EDITS. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. Draft FY19 Year End Financial Reports
Forest Cohen provided a fiscal year-end financial brief for FY19 covering the period of July 2018 through June 2019. Forest noted he and Charlie intend to close out the People’s Bank accounts within the month and funds will be transferred into our new Opportunities Credit Union accounts. Forest reviewed the Balance Sheet: Cash in Checking, including the Opportunities Credit Union account (operating) at $74,482; Cash in Savings, (match) $1001; Cash in Money Market, including Opportunities Credit Union account, and CD’s (reserve) $201,936. Current assets over liabilities $533,617. Deferred Income Communities is at 0. Income Statement: Unaudited FY19 Year End Income is negative ($58,247). Forest noted, although FY19 was a difficult year, we improved our budgeted deficit by approximately $40,000.

Expenses: Forest expenses were in control, at under 97% of budget and a more positive financial year is expected for FY20. Staff billing was noteworthy, at 99.4% despite the low FY19 indirect rate at 68%.
Chris Roy asked about the FY20 indirect rate, Forest explained it was negotiated at 80%. Mike O’Brien asked Forest to provide an explanation of the indirect rate. Forest explained, the indirect rate is negotiated each year with VTrans. The indirect rate reimburses the CCRPC for “overhead” items like rent, utilities, and administrative work. There are federal rules that we must follow when negotiating the rate, however, there are no prescribed rates or caps. Because the rates are based on estimates of future financial periods, the rates are not typically exactly in line with actual experience. There is a mechanism built into the process where an overestimation or an underestimation is remedied in the future period by increasing or decreasing the indirect rate. Due to these factors, we sometimes have penalty years (such as FY19) where our rate is low, and we ran a deficit. We have an MOU with the State of Vermont that allows VTrans to review and approve our rates, and we are very grateful for this.
Forest told the members the audit field work for FY19 has been completed. Forest has already performed the annual adjusting entry for the pension system liability, and it adds $114,000 of
retirement expense to FY19. This is only book expense, but it will show up on the financial statements. As in past years, the auditors will break out the Operating results and the pension liability expense in the Audit Report so it’s clear to the Board which is which. Forest noted we follow our auditor’s advice and instruction in terms of the Pension, and we have no control over those numbers year to year. The recent audit seemed to go very well. The report will be presented by Fred Duplessis to the Executive Committee and then to the Board in November. Forest explained, we were conservative with cash earned in previous fiscal years used those funds to stay ahead during negative income years. The goal for the coming year will be to shift money into reserves as income stabilizes.

4. FY19 4th Quarter Journal Entries. Members reviewed the Quarterly Journal Entry reports distributed by Forest Cohen. CATHERINE McMAINS MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JOHN ZICCONI TO APPROVE THE 4TH QUARTER JOURNAL ENTRIES. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. Act 250 & Sec. 248 Applications:
   a. VELCO Sandbar Substation Upgrades; Milton; #19-3222-AN. Emily noted this project is located at 586 Bear Trap Road in Milton and is an upgrade to an existing substation that does not change the existing footprint. The project is located within the Rural Planning Area, ECOS plan and in general conformance with the planning areas of the 2018 Chittenden County Regional Plan. The project meets the intent of the Energy Goal (#17) of the 2018 ECOS Plan and complies with the plan’s constraint policies. The letter is favorable. CCRPC will review the project location again, after the final application is submitted to confirm initial findings. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CATHERINE McMAINS, TO APPROVE THE LETTER TO VERMONT ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY, INC. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
   b. ER Jericho Landfill Solar, LLC 1.6MW; Jericho; #19-3257-PET. Emily noted this is a second project for Jericho and very similar to a previous solar array. This project is for a 1.5MW Solar Array located off Ethan Allen road in Jericho Vt. The project location meets the suitability policies of the 2018 ECOS plan. The CCRPC is highly supportive of projects sited on previously developed sites like this parcel, which is a former gravel pit. CCRPC has reviewed the constraints that exist on the site of the proposed project and the final site plan and natural resources assessments confirm that these constraints are not impacted. CCRPC strongly supports locating renewable energy development on this site. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CHRIS ROY, TO APPROVE THE LETTER TO WILSCHER IARRAPINO LAW OFFICE, PLLC. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
   c. Preferred site letter; Colchester; #19-2770-NMP. Emily noted that this for a 500kW solar project at 0 Creek Farm Road/3943 Roosevelt Highway, in Colchester Vt. The project complies with the 2018 ECOS Plan constraint policies. Emily noted Colchester is unique, as they use their Preferred Site Designation Scorecard. Colchester’s Scorecard is incorporated by reference into the 2019 Colchester Town Plan. Sites designated by the scorecard should be equivalent to individual sites included in an adopted municipal plan. CCRPC granted an affirmative determination of energy compliance to the 2019 Colchester Town Plan with the understanding that the Scorecard would be used to designate sites as part of the municipal plan. CCRPC understands the Dept. of Public Service has questioned the validity of the Scorecard to designate preferred sites without a joint letter. Member discussion on the purpose of scorecard ensued. Emily explained the town uses the scorecard to categorize preferred sites. The CCRPC encourages the PUC to find the Scorecard is adequate to designate preferred sites in Colchester, for this project and going forward. The CCRPC supports the identification of the property at 0 Creek Farm Road/3943 Roosevelt Highway as a preferred site for net metering. CATHERINE McMAINS MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BARBARA
ELLIOTT TO APPROVE THE LETTER TO VERMONT PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

d. FYI: Appeal of air pollution permit AOP-18-044; Colchester

JOHN ZICCONI RECUSED HIMSELF FOR THIS PORTION THE MEETING AND LEFT THE CONFERENCE ROOM AT 6:17p.m. Emily noted there is no action necessary at this time and she is presenting information only. We received a copy of the Appeal; Air Pollution Draft Permit AOP-18-044 regarding the Whitcomb Quarry located at 115 Whitcomb Street, Colchester VT. The objections are coming from surrounding property owners, Highpoint Center Area Association, Inc., Farrell/Antell Properties, LLP, TKP, LLC and Grandview Farms, Inc., located approximately 400 feet from Whitcomb Quarry. Member discussion ensued. Mike O’Brien stated he thinks the organization should stay out of this, unless there is a technical standpoint that needs to be addressed. Chris Roy noted the CCRPC is a statutory party and needed to be made aware of the appeal but agreed that no action should be taken at this time. The discussion ended. JOHN RETURNED TO THE MEETING AT 6:24p.m.

6. FY2020 Regional Board Members and Committee Appointments. Members discussed the current level of participation in the FY2020 Regional Board Members and Committee Appointments as per the bylaws. Mike stated he will reach out to our current members and alternates who are not currently signed up for any committees. Forest stated he will provide Mike with a contact list. NO ACTION TAKEN/NO ACTION NEEDED.

7. Chair/Executive Director Report:

a. Building Homes Together – Year 3 Results to be released within the month. Eleni explained Regina has been working with partners on this. An event will be announced when data collection wraps up.

b. Transportation Climate Initiative Forum. Eleni explained RPC’s have been invited to join a consortium of Northeastern States and DC to investigate a cap and trade system for transportation emissions. Doing so could generate funding for Transportation projects to help reduce greenhouse gas emissions. We are currently unsure how this will work and how potential funding will be distributed. There is a lot to be determined, but we plan to explore the opportunity and have been asked to help VTrans host a forum with Northeast RPC on September 24. Once details are determined, a presentation will likely be schedules at future TAC and BOARD meetings. John stated he would like to see more focus on smart traffic patterns, including signals that correlate to a reduction in emissions. Members discussed current infrastructure and initiatives in the area. Eleni mentioned a project coming up over the next two years to upgrade several traffic signals on Shelburne Road.

c. Compensation Study. Forest stated Hickock and Boardman will conduct a compensation study this fall, to be completed by the end of December. We typically have a compensation study every 5 years.

d. Clean Water Service Provider. Eleni stated this passed in the last legislative session and ANR started rulemaking to be complete by November of 2020.

e. Amtrak Overnight Storage and Servicing Study. Eleni stated VTRANS and the City of Burlington asked the CCRPC to conduct an independent study on the feasibility of five sites in Burlington as overnight Amtrak storage sites, and the recommended site was on the waterfront by Union Station. Immediately following the publication, there was opposition to the findings and several public requests for documents related to the decision-making process. Eleni explained we stand by our methodology. Our report does not determine the final site, it makes a recommendation that VTrans can consider, along with other factors.
8. **CCRPC September Meeting Agenda review.** The Board agenda was in the packet, members reviewed the proposed agenda. Eleni reminded everyone there will be general RPC training session held from 5:15 – 6:00 p.m., and a light dinner will be available. Members wondered if enough time had been allocated for various items, but everyone agreed it should be fine, since the agenda is light.

9. **Other Business.** There was none.

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

11. **Adjournment.** CHRIS ROY MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BARBARA ELLIOTT, TO ADJOURN THE JOINT EXECUTIVE & FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING AT 6:55 PM. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Amy Irvin Witham
June 28, 2019

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

RE: 3-11 1/2 George Street, LLC; Burlington; #4C1082-1

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 merging of 4 lots, demolition of 64/68 Pearl Street, 13-15 and 19 George Street and the construction of a 93 unit hotel with 1,700 square feet of commercial space, a 20 unit senior housing complex and an underground parking area. The project is located at 64 Pearl Street, in Burlington, Vermont. The City of Burlington’s Development Review Board has approved the project. We offer the following comments:

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

1. The Center Planning Area is identified in the Plan as an area planned for growth, and therefore this project helps implement Strategy #2 of the Plan, which calls for 80% of new development in the areas planned for growth.
2. The project is proposed in a Designated Downtown, is served by municipal water and sewer, is located close to the Downtown Transit Center in Burlington and is within walking distance to many services.
3. The density and uses are consistent with the local regulations, as evidenced by the Burlington DRB’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.

Additionally, we find that this project complies with Criterion 9(L), as it is located in a Designated Downtown.

The Traffic Impact & Parking Assessment dated 5/20/2019 conducted by Lamoureux & Dickinson Consulting Engineers, Inc was reviewed along with a Technical Memorandum dated 4/2/2019. After reviewing both of these documents we do not have any concerns regarding the Project’s anticipated 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
June 28, 2019

Anthony Iarrapino  
Wilschek Iarrapino Law Office, PLLC  
35 Elm Street, Suite 200  
Montpelier, VT 05602

RE: Petition for a Certificate of Public Good for ER Jericho Landfill Solar, LLC’s Proposed 1.6MW Solar Array at 508 Browns Trace Road in Jericho, VT (Case #19-1774-PET)

Dear Mr. Iarrapino:

Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission has received the Petition for a Certificate of Public Good 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.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Charlie Baker  
Executive Director

cc: CCRPC Board  
Katherine Sonnick, Jericho Planning Coordinator
July 23, 2019

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

RE: Petition for a Certificate of Public Good for Bullrock Solar, LLC’s Proposed 150 kW Project in South Burlington, VT – 650 Spear Street (Case #19-2515-NMP)

Dear Ms. Wilschek:

Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission has received the Petition for a Certificate of Public Good for a 150kW solar project at 650 Spear Street in South Burlington, VT. We have reviewed this project in light of CCRPC’s 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan, which gained a Determination of Energy Compliance from the Vermont Department of Public Service on August 9, 2018.

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

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

Based on the site plan included in the advance notice, CCRPC has reviewed the constraints that exist on the site of the proposed project. **While there are constraints on this site, this project will be completely located on an existing concrete pad and will not have any impact on constraints.**

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
    Paul Conner, Director of Planning & Zoning, City of South Burlington
July 23, 2019

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

RE: Petition for a Certificate of Public Good for Bullrock Solar, LLC’s Proposed 80 kW Project in South Burlington, VT – 705 Spear Street (Case # 19-2282-NMP)

Dear Ms. Wilschek:

Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission has received the Petition for a Certificate of Public Good for an 80kW solar project at 705 Spear Street in South Burlington, VT. We have reviewed this project in light of CCRPC’s 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan, which gained a Determination of Energy Compliance from the Vermont Department of Public Service on August 9, 2018. CCRPC is aware that the City of South Burlington Planning Commission has submitted comments regarding plantings near the project.

**ECOS Energy Goal**

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

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

**Suitability Policies**

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

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

CCRPC finds that the location of this project meets the suitability policies of the 2018 ECOS Plan.
Constraints

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

In our comments on the advance notice for project, we noted that the ANR Natural Resources Atlas showed potential wetlands and buffers on the project. The Natural Resources Assessment by VHB that was submitted with this application indicates that the project avoids all wetlands and wetland buffers. The Assessment also indicates that the project will impact some statewide agricultural soils. CCPRC will continue to defer to the Vermont Agency of Agriculture, Food and Markets in determining appropriate mitigation. **CCRPC is not requesting further information or action related to any constraints.**

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
   Paul Conner, Director of Planning & Zoning, City of South Burlington
July 23, 2019

Eric Phaneuf, Director of Business Development
Aegis Renewable Energy, Inc.
340 Mad River Park, Suite 6
Waitsfield, VT 05673
ephaneuf@aegis-re.com

RE: Petition for a Certificate of Public Good for Aegis Renewable Energy’s Proposed 500kW Solar Array near 3943 Roosevelt Highway in Colchester, VT (Case #19-2770-NMP)

Dear Mr. Phaneuf:

Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission has received the Petition for a Certificate of Public Good for a 500kW solar array located 1,100 feet west of 3943 Roosevelt Highway in Colchester, VT (also known as O Creek Farm Road). 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 with adequate grid capacity.
- The project is outside of any state designated centers or historic districts.
- The project’s location has been designated as a preferred site by the Town of Colchester (see the town’s letter to the PUC dated May 28, 2019).

CCRPC finds that the general location of this project meets the suitability policies of the 2018 ECOS Plan.

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

CCRPC has reviewed the constraints that exist on the site of the proposed project. Based on our review of this project’s location using the ANR Natural Resources Atlas and the conceptual site plan, it appears that statewide agricultural soils will be impacted by this project. CCRPC will defer to the Vermont Agency of Agriculture, Food and Markets in determining the impact of development on agricultural soils. CCRPC is not requesting further information or action related to this constraint at this time.

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

Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Charlie Baker
Executive Director

cc: CCRPC Board
Sarah Hadd, Director of Planning and Zoning, Colchester
Sean Cannon, Planning and Zoning Coordinator, Colchester
August 12, 2019

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

RE: Petition for a Certificate of Public Good for ER Museum Solar LLC’s Proposed 500kW Project in Shelburne, VT – 6000 Shelburne Road (Case #19-2792-NMP)

Dear Mr. Foy:

Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission has received the Petition for a Certificate of Public Good for a 500kW solar project at 6000 Shelburne Road in Shelburne, 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 in an area proximate to existing distribution and transmission infrastructure with adequate grid capacity.
- The project will provide more than 50% of energy produced to the Shelburne Museum. It is therefore a preferred site as defined in the Vermont Public Utility Commission’s Net Metering Rule (Rule 5.100).
- The project is located in one of Chittenden County’s areas planned for growth (Metro Planning Area).
- The project is outside of any state designated centers or historic districts.

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

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

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

Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Charlie Baker
Executive Director

c: CCRPC Board
Lee Krohn, Manager, Town of Shelburne
Dean Pierce, Director of Planning & Zoning, Town of Shelburne
September 5, 2019

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

Re: Aegis Renewable Energy, Inc. 500kW Group Net Metered Array – 3943 Roosevelt Highway, Colchester
Preferred Site Letter of Support (#19-2770-NMP)

Dear Ms. Whitney,

On July 9, 2019, Aegis Renewable Energy, Inc. submitted a Petition for a Certificate of Public Good for a 500kW group net metered solar array at 0 Creek Farm Road/3943 Roosevelt Highway. The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission submitted comments on July 23, 2019. Our comments indicated that this project complied with the ECOS Plan’s constraint policies because the project does not impact known constraints and the impacts to possible constraints (agricultural soils) would be addressed by the Vermont Agency of Agriculture, Food and Markets. Further, the comments indicated that the location of this project meets the suitability policies of the 2018 ECOS Plan because the location has adequate grid capacity, is located outside of state designated centers or historic districts, and it had been designated as a preferred site by the Town of Colchester using their Preferred Site Designation Scorecard. (See Colchester’s letter to the PUC, dated May 28, 2019.)

Colchester’s Scorecard is incorporated by reference into the 2019 Colchester Town Plan. Sites designated by the scorecard should be equivalent to individual sites included in an adopted municipal plan per Commission Rule 5.103 subsection (7). CCRPC granted an affirmative determination of energy compliance to the 2019 Colchester Town Plan on April 17, 2019 with the understanding that these preferred sites would not require a “joint letter” from CCRPC to be designated as such. CCRPC continues to support the use of Colchester’s Preferred Site Designation Scorecard.

We understand that the Department of Public Service has questioned the validity of the Scorecard to designate preferred sites without a joint letter. CCRPC encourages the PUC to find that the Scorecard is adequate to designate preferred sites in Colchester, for this project and going forward. However, if the PUC finds that a joint letter is required, please consider this our letter supporting the identification of the property at 0 Creek Farm Road/3943 Roosevelt Highway as a preferred site for net metering.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

Charlie Baker
Executive Director

CC: CCRPC Board
    Sarah Hadd, Director of Planning and Zoning, Colchester
    Sean Cannon, Planning and Zoning Coordinator, Colchester
    Allison Bates Wannop, Special Counsel, Vermont Department of Public Service
September 5, 2019

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

RE: Petition for a Certificate of Public Good for ER Jericho Gravel Solar, LLC’s Proposed 1.5MW Solar Array off Ethan Allen Road in Jericho, VT (Case #19-3257-PET)

Dear Ms. Wilschek:

Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission has received the notice of a Petition for a Certificate of Public Good for a 1.5MW solar array off Ethan Allen Road in Jericho, VT. We understand that a CPG was issued for a 500kW solar array on this site in 2018 and that this CPG would replace the previous one. 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
- 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 gravel pit.**

**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. Our comments on the advance notice noted that the conceptual site plan raised the possibility of impacts to river corridors, floodplains and surface water setbacks. The final site plan and natural resources assessments confirm that these constraints are not impacted. Mapping shows that there are statewide primary agricultural soils mapped on this particle. However, given this parcel’s history as a gravel pit, CCRPC strongly supports locating renewable energy development on this site.

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
    Katherine Sonnick, Jericho Planning Coordinator
September 5, 2019

Scott Mallory, Project Manager
Vermont Electric Power Company, Inc.
366 Pinnacle Ridge Road
Rutland, VT 05701

RE: Advance Notice of Petition for Upgrades to the Sandbar Substation at 586 Bear Trap Road in Milton, VT (Case #19-3222-AN)

Dear Mr. Mallory:

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 the Sandbar Substation at 586 Bear Trap Road in Milton, VT. The project is an upgrade of an existing substation. We have reviewed this project in light of CCRPC’s 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan, which gained a Determination of Energy Compliance from the Vermont Department of Public Service on August 9, 2018.

The project is located within the Rural Planning Area as defined in 2018 ECOS Plan. The plan states that “the Rural Planning Area...provides for low density commercial, industrial, and residential development...that is compatible with working lands and natural areas.” The Plan is not intended to prescribe uses and we find that a replacement of existing infrastructure without expansion of the footprint is consistent with this planning area. Therefore, we find this project to be generally in conformance with the Planning Areas of the 2018 Chittenden County Regional Plan.

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

Strategy 2, Action 4b of the ECOS Plan states “CCRPC supports the generation of new renewable energy in the County to meet the Vermont Comprehensive Energy Plan’s goals of using 90% renewable energy by 2050, in a manner that is cost effective and respects the natural environment.” Development of this substation will increase efficiency and allow for future installations of distributed renewable energy generation.

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). The 2018 ECOS Plan also states that energy facilities on “existing structures and parking lots” meet the constraint policies of the plan. As this project replaces existing infrastructure without expanding the existing impervious substation yard, it complies with the plan’s constraint policies.

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
    Michael Burris, Town of Milton Planning and Zoning Director