Agenda  
Executive Committee  
Wednesday, February 5, 2020 – 5:45 p.m.  
Small Conference Room, CCRPC Offices  
110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT

1. Changes to the Agenda, Members’ Items
2. Approval of January 8th Joint Executive & Finance Committee Minutes* (Action)
3. Act 250 & Sec 248 Applications  
a. Colchester Avenue Housing, LLC, Burlington #4C1320* (Action)
4. Clean Water Service Provider (RFP forthcoming. Will print for meeting.) (Discussion)
5. Act 250 Proposed Comments* (Action)
7. Chair/Executive Director Report  
a. Annual Meeting Location* (Discussion)  
b. Legislative Update  
c. UPWP Update  
d. Compensation Study Update
8. Review Agenda for February 19 Board Meeting* (Discussion)
9. Other Business (Discussion)
10. Executive Session – none anticipated (Action)
11. Adjournment (Action)

*Attachments

NEXT MEETING – Executive Committee – Wed. March 4, 2020; 5:45 p.m.

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 x*21 or evaughn@ccrpcvt.org, no later than 3 business days prior to the meeting for which services are requested.
DATE: Wednesday, January 8, 2020
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
Chris Roy, Immediate Past Chair
John Zicconi, Secretary-Treasurer
OTHER: Amy Bell, VTrans (via phone)
ABSENT: Chris Shaw, At Large >5000
Barbara Elliott, At Large <5000
STAFF: Charlie Baker, Executive Director
Eleni Churchill, Transportation Program Mgr.
Forest Cohen, Senior Business Mgr.
Regina Mahony, Planning Program Mgr.
Amy Irvin Witham, Business Office Associate

The meeting was called to order at 5:46PM by the Chair, Mike O’Brien.

1. Changes to the Agenda, Members’ Items. There was one change, the addition of the draft January 15, 2020 Board Meeting Agenda for review.

2. Approve Quarterly Journal entries July to September 2019 (Finance Committee business)
Forest distributed copies of Journal Entries dated July 2019 through September 2019. Noting there was one significant issue, he explained he and Charlie closed a CD and deposited the funds into the Opportunities checking account. Members reviewed. CATHERENE MCMAINS MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JOHN ZICCONI, TO APPROVE THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL ENTRIES. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. FY20 Financial Statement Review July to October 2019 (Finance Committee business)
Forest Cohen provided a financial brief for the period covering July 2019 through October 2019.
Forest reviewed the financial statements with members.

Balance Sheet, October 31, 2019 - Cash in checking, operating at $87,996; Cash in Money Market and CDs (reserve) at $327,717. Current assets over liabilities, $761,201. Deferred Income Communities (match) at $192,256. John asked why there is a 28.5% change year to year; Forest explained that our VMERS pension liability adjustments account for much of the differences. Forest stated, per our auditor’s recommendation, the CCRPC portion of the pension plan liability should be listed on our balance sheet. This can result in a large expense on our financial statements that management has no control over; VMERS must be reflected on the books and it is a high liability. Forest also explained the timing of checks being written and the monthly VTrans billing can create swings in the cash.

Income Statement, through October 31, 2019: Forest explained FY19 was a difficult budget year, we ended with a deficit of $58,247. However, FY20 should show improvement, since our indirect rate is now closer in line with actual indirect costs. We are currently ahead of our budget year, which is 33.3% through October, with Operations Support revenue at 34.1% of budget. Expenses are just under 33.1%. We are generating positive income in this FY20 through October of $10,048. John
requested Forest provide details at the next meeting on why there is $329K less cash this October versus October 2018.

4. **Approve December 4, 2019 Executive Committee Minutes**
   CATHERENE MCMAINS MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CHRIS ROY, TO APPROVE THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES OF DECEMBER 4, 2019 WITH EDITS. Chris Roy requested more information be included in the executive session section of the minutes by adding the purpose of the executive session and the people present. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY, WITH JOHN ZICONNI ABSTAINING.

5. **Act 250 & Sec 248 Applications**
   There were none.

6. **Approve Mid-year Adjustment FY2020 UPWP and Budget**
   Charlie reviewed the Draft FY20 Mid-year Adjustment and Budget document with members. There were changes to deliverables and dollars. One project was eliminated, Task # 2.3.9.2 Chittenden County Freight Plan, and the following projects were added:

   **Land Use / Planning projects**
   - 2.1.3.23 Charlotte Zoning Assistance
   - 2.1.3.24 Essex Infographic
   - 2.2.6 Energy Plan Implementation
   - 5.2.4.1 Local Emergency Response Plans

   **Transportation Projects**
   - 2.3.4.34 Intermodal Facilities and Official Map (Williston)
   - 2.3.4.35 Elderly and Disabled Transit Service Review (phase II)
   - 3.2.3.29 Jericho Bolger Hill Drainage Improvements
   - 3.2.3.30 Westford Town Green Stormwater Assessment
   - 3.2.3.31 Jericho Road conceptual Plans (Richmond)
   - 2.3.13.3 Winooski Avenue Corridor study (Major changes were made)

   The result of these project changes created $44,000 in additional revenue and $36,559 in expenses, which yield a mid-year budget surplus of $7,448. These figures are true through November 2019.

   Members discussed why estimations of some projects proved more expensive while others were less than originally budgeted. Charlie explained there are multiple factors contributing to this; including changes in staff and staff time allocations. For instance, we’ve received an additional Emergency Management grant, and the Emergency Management MOU was billed for response to the Halloween storm. Amy Bell asked about the new project Task # 2.3.4.34 Intermodal Facilities and Official Map. She wanted to know if there was any feedback from the Federal highway regarding the eligibility of an official map project, as she is not sure this type of project has ever been completed with transportation dollars before. Eleni said she will check whether we had any communication with Chris Jolly (FHWA) on this project and get back to her.

   JOHN ZICONNI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CHRIS ROY, TO RECOMMEND THE BOARD APPROVE THE PROPOSED MID-YEAR ADJUSTMENT FY20 UPWP AND BUDGET. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
7. **Approve Clean Water Service Provider RFP Comments**

Charlie distributed copies of a draft Board cover memo and Draft Clean Water Service Provider (CWSP) RFP comment letter. Charlie reviewed the Board memo which provides a brief explanation of the intent of CWSPs; and a CCRPC comment letter on the draft RFP for review. An additional memo was handed out that outlines planned roles and responsibilities of Clean Water Service Providers. The memo also provides a map that highlights, geographically, the area that may make the most sense for the CCRPC to potentially be involved.

John Zicconi stated, based on previous information and discussion, he was under the impression the CCRPC was not in favor of the CWSP legislation and asked for clarification; Charlie said CCRPC was not necessarily opposed, though the original legislation was crafted for RPCs to do this work and other stakeholders wanted more flexibility. Charlie explained, currently Staff is only asking the Board to review the draft RFP and the comment letter on the draft RFP for submittal. Then over the next two months CCRPC staff wants to discuss whether the CCRPC should apply to be designated as the CWSP, potentially for the Northern Lake Champlain Direct Drainages (Basin 5). This area covers several of our MS4 towns, several towns in Grand Isle and Franklin County and a small portion of Ferrisburgh in Addison county. The final RFP is expected to be out by the end of January, and the anticipated deadline for submission of a proposal is likely in early April 2020. Charlie anticipates we will need a tentative Board decision at the February Board meeting with a final decision at the March Board Meeting.

Members asked how the process will work? Charlie explained, post RFP response, the state would propose who the providers are via rule in June, which will come with its own public input process. At the same time there will be rule making on how and what the CWSP will actually be responsible for (i.e. phosphorus reduction targets, etc.) and how they should operate. The rule-making process will be over the course of several months concluding by the end of the calendar year. Charlie explained, currently we are simply looking at our options. Even if we do respond to the RFP, it doesn’t mean the CCRPC will do it. We need to see a full picture of what this will look like before we would agree to enter into a grant agreement in early 2021.

John asked how staff and priorities align with Water Quality issues, and Chris asked what is the benefit for CCRPC and our municipalities to do this? Charlie explained the reality is, although these are not necessarily municipal projects, the legislation states if CWSP are not making good progress toward addressing the pollution reduction goals then the municipalities in that basin would not have access to water Quality grant monies for the regulatory programs. Becoming involved is a way for CCRPC to ensure our municipalities qualify for funding. Charlie said CCRPC’s role would likely be more of a supporting, grant administration, and oversight role because it’s the watershed and conservation groups that do these non-regulatory type projects on private land.

Chris Roy asked if Northwest RPC needs help because they have such a large area to cover and why a joint endeavor might be favorable to us. Charlie explained that this program is intended to address the gap between what can be addressed via the regulatory programs and the TMDL targets. It’s likely the basins with a lot of agricultural land will have a higher ‘gap’ target. Charlie indicated that Catherine in NWRP feels they will have their hands full with the Missisquoi basin and would be open to sharing the responsibility in Basin 5. Charlie explained grants funds would be separated from RPC funding in terms of accounting; and perhaps there might be some logic in establishing a separate non-profit to handle this work. Charlie said if there is another organization/entity better than the CCRPC to take the reins on this, that is great. Charlie believes over the next month or so entities...
that are interested in heading this up will surface. The State of Vermont has expressed they are open to any and all interested parties. Charlie wants to bring this to the board to see how the board members feel.

John stated this is not a simple issue, that water quality is important to our municipalities and there are changes and shifts in the work we do at CCRPC. He feels the work is needed, but exactly how it’s done (CCRPC v. non-profit or partnership) is a question for further down the road.

CHIRS ROY MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CATHERINE MCMAINS TO RECOMMEND the CCRPC BOARD REVIEW, EDIT, AND APPROVE SUBMISSION OF THE CCRPC COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT RFP FOR SELECTION OF CLEAN WATER SERVICE PROVIDER. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

8. Compensation Study – Potential Personnel Policy Changes

Compensation Study documents were included in the agenda packet for members to review. Charlie explained the compensation study shows CCRPC to be competitive within the labor market and that we do offer a competitive benefits package. Areas we may want to improve on, in terms of benefits, include potentially offering an expanded life insurance coverage as well as adding a floating holiday. Members agreed, the addition of a floating holiday puts CCRPC more in line with the State holiday structure. John had questions about the life insurance benefit, if from an employer standpoint, it is intended to cover burial services or to provide for the family of employee. Currently, life insurance provides $50,000 of coverage. Members discussed how the imputed cost of coverage in excess of $50,000 is taxed and must be included as income. Charlie stated there will be research done on the options and associated costs for increased life insurance amounts.

Charlie asked for more flexibility in PTO accrual when hiring more experienced employees. Members agreed that should be fine. Charlie explained, based on the compensation study, to remain competitive in the job market, there are proposed changes to current position groupings and salary ranges that he’d like the Executive Committee’s feedback on. He referred members to document Appendix A – Salary Ranges that provided an outline of different positions and where adjustments are suggested. Members discussed draft salary ranges, and the potential of making a distinction between engineers and planners. Eleni explained our Engineers could leave CCRPC and make more money at other organizations. Members discussed titles and job descriptions and how these correspond with the salary ranges. Members discussed how positions were outlined in the past, that the compensation study unearthed discrepancies in salaries and job descriptions. The Comp Study is designed to give us information to make sure that we are competitive in the job markets. Charlie reiterated that in general we are in a good place in terms of staff salaries and benefits. Next month there will be a request to approve changes.

9. Chair/Executive Director Report

a. Planner Recruitment – Charlie stated Emily Nosse-Leirer started her new position for Senator Leahy’s office in DC. We were lucky to have 30 applicants and 20 very strong candidates apply for the open planner position. Taylor Newton accepted our offer and will begin in February. Taylor currently works for the Northwest RPC and his transition to CCRPC should be seamless, as his position there covers much of what Emily was doing.

b. Amtrak Storage update - Eleni stated there will be a Transportation Energy and Utilities Committee (TEUC) meeting next week to review the ranking of the six potential Amtrak
Storage sites and take comments from the public. VHB is working to create a more detailed plan for a 6th site at the McNeil plant. Even though the McNeil site was ranked number one at the December Rail Council meeting the decision by VTrans of where to store the Amtrak train has not been finalized. VTrans is still waiting for feedback from Burlington.

c. **Legislative Update** – Charlie said the administration and VNRC have an agreement on the Act 250 bill. Chris Roy said the testimony they provided includes an alternative to the current review and appeals process that includes a 3-person board, with 2 additional members participating on hearings in their districts. This addresses the time issues because you eliminate a level of review. It may give an inordinate amount of power to the 3-person board –deciding major development in and outside of their regions. Chris said he will provide a quick update on this at the Board Meeting next week. Charlie mentioned the housing bill the Senate Economic Development, Housing & General Affairs Committee is working on appears to have a good bit of momentum.

Charlie mentioned that there may be some legislation on the Transportation Climate Initiative, and other potential climate change bills. He anticipates that water Quality will be quiet. There is currently a bill for RPC’s to become more involved with health planning, but he doesn’t have any sense yet of whether this will move. There is also discussion about expanding the scope of Efficiency Vermont to an all energy utility which may have some transportation and energy implications for us.

10. **[Item 1. Addition to Agenda]** Review the Agenda for January 15, 2020 Board Meeting

Members reviewed and made changes to the draft January 15, Board Meeting Agenda.

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

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

13. **Adjournment** CHRIS ROY MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JOHN ZICCONI TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:56PM. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Amy Irvin Witham
February 6, 2020

Aaron Brondyke
State Coordinator
111 West Street
Essex Junction, VT 05452

RE: Colchester Avenue Housing, LLC; Burlington; #4C1320

Dear Mr. Brondyke:

The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission’s Staff and Executive Committee have reviewed this Act 250 application for a Project described as the construction of a 71-unit residential apartment building with surface and underground parking on 3 adjoining lots. The project is located at 72, 80 and 94 Colchester, 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 served by municipal water and sewer, is located on bus lines and is within walking distance to many services/jobs.
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 a residential project.

The Traffic Impact & Parking Assessment dated 4/11/2017 conducted by Trudell Consulting Engineers with assistance from RSG was reviewed. We concur with the overall findings of the study and 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
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CCRPC Comments on VNRC/Administration proposed Act 250 Bill

DRAFT – 1/29/2020

Note: The comments herein include references to the “Discussion Document, Last Modified 1/14/2020, Version 1.1”

Here are a few broad thoughts for consideration before getting into specific provisions.

1. The substantive proposals in this draft bill have the potential of getting to a workable place much more so than the Enhanced Natural Resources Board concept and associated process. Therefore, CCRPC recommends that this Section be split from the rest of this proposal and be considered separately.

2. CCRPC believes that the state permit process should encourage development in appropriately planned places and discourage development in vulnerable and valued resource areas. Therefore, CCRPC strongly supports the concept that Act 250 should not have jurisdiction in areas planned for growth to encourage affordable housing and economic investment in our smart growth areas: walkable, transit-friendly, water and sewer-serviced areas. CCRPC appreciates the exemption for Designated Downtowns and Neighborhood Development Areas, but recommends further expansion of this exemption (see comment 7 below).

3. CCRPC supports the concept of relying on separate state permits to satisfy specific criteria as appropriate.

4. A general comment is to use existing definitions from other sections of statute wherever possible.

I. Act 250 Jurisdiction

5. Section A, pg. 6 – This section proposes to include construction of improvements for commercial, industrial or residential use on ridgelines of at least 1,500’ elevation and within 200 feet below the ridgeline.

Comment: CCRPC generally agrees with expanding protection of ridgelines, however the purpose of this jurisdictional expansion should be expressly stated (i.e. scenic viewshed or wildlife habitat). Further, if the land area for a proposed development project does not functionally serve the stated purpose, there should be a process for proving so and Act 250 review and a permit should not be needed (such as wetland re-classification from Class III to Class II). Otherwise, this is a blunt tool that will result in avoidance of Act 250 review and associated unintended consequences. Lastly, it would be best to include a specific map of the area regulated (http://anrmaps.vermont.gov/websites/ridges/index.html) and a process for how that map will be updated.

6. Section B, pg. 6 to 7 – This section proposes to include new road/driveway construction of 2,000 feet in length as development subject to Act 250.

Comment: CCRPC is supportive of the goal of preventing forest fragmentation but believes that this is too blunt of a tool. Similar to the comment above, CCRPC recommends a connection between the 2,000’ road distance and the intended purpose of this jurisdictional trigger (habitat protection? Forest fragmentation?) and allowing an applicant to indicate if the stated purpose is being achieved with the proposed development.

7. Section C, pg. 7 to 21 – This section proposes to exclude development in designated Downtowns and Neighborhood Development Areas from Act 250 jurisdiction. The proposal also includes underlying changes to the mixed income housing definitions.

Comment: CCRPC agrees with and appreciates this approach. However, development in both Growth Centers and New Town Center designations should also be excluded. These are also state approved growth areas and there is no need for additional Act 250 review. Further, if the conditions from previous Act 250 permits are going to be a responsibility of the municipalities, it is critically important that the municipalities have the authority to re-evaluate a previous condition already addressed by a municipal regulation and municipal standards (as stated on pg. 17 line 17 – 18). Changes to the mixed income housing definitions including specification of unit...
types/bedrooms have been added which can be much more difficult to address and administer. It is unclear why these changes are being proposed.

8. Section D, pg. 21 – This section allows for a reduction in the project area for certain transportation projects for previously disturbed area. The idea is that these projects could then fall under the 10-acre jurisdictional trigger. 
   Comment: CCRPC agrees with and supports this adjustment.

9. Section E, pg. 23 to 24 – This section proposes to expand Act 250 jurisdiction to commercial and industrial developments within 2,000 feet of interstate interchanges. 
   Comment: CCRPC feels that this is not necessary. Further, it is unclear if the Regional Planning Commission role in the exemption is a one-time exemption for the whole area or needs to be done on a case-by-case basis. If this is to be put in place, the process for exemption should be one-time for the whole area. We would also suggest that interchanges in a Census-defined urbanized area (Interstate 89 Exits 12 to 16) be excluded from jurisdiction since these areas are already developed and will only be infilling over time.

II. Changes to Act 250 Criteria

10. Section A & B, pg. 26 to 29 – These two sections propose changes to standardize regulation of river corridors in Act 250. 
   Comment: CCRPC does not agree with this approach. The proposed language does not adequately address new and infill development in historic village areas that overlap with river corridor areas. CCRPC recommends that this issue be studied rather than changed this year, and/or ANR regulate these areas through a state permit program with appropriate infill in our already developed downtowns and villages (with the presumption provided in IV. Act 250 Permit Conditions and Permit Process, Section C, pg. 40 of this proposed bill).

11. Section E, pg. 30 to 32 – This section proposes to expand the Act 250 wildlife criteria to consider impacts to forest blocks and connecting habitat. 
   Comment: CCRPC agrees with protection of these resources, however, there needs to be clarity on how these resources will be defined. The recommendation from CCRPC is to refer to the local and regional plan maps for how these resources are defined, rather than the current broad definitions in the proposed bill.

12. Section G, pg. 33 to 34 – This section proposes modification to better address climate change. 
   Comment: CCRPC feels that there should be one consistent energy code applied throughout the state, not a higher standard in Act 250 (the stretch energy code is proposed). Further, the proposed climate adaptation amendment is broad and unspecific. It will require guidance on how to meet this standard.

13. Section H, pg. 34 – This section proposes that a municipal plan must be approved by the Regional Planning Commission for consideration under Act 250 criteria. 
   Comment: CCRPC agrees with this approach.

IV. Act 250 Permit Conditions and Permit Process [should be III]

14. Section A, pg. 36 – This section proposes a 30-day pre-application notice requirement to the public and affected agencies for larger Act 250 cases. The proposed bill contemplates rulemaking to determine when a pre-application process would be needed. 
   Comment: CCRPC agrees with this approach; however, there are some process heavy components that may not be appropriate in Act 250, such as formal scheduling (pg. 37, lines 3 to 5). Also, CCRPC recommends that projects should be vested at time of submittal of the pre-application materials.

15. Section C, pg. 40 – This section proposes to make all ANR permits, and municipal permits, have a presumption automatically. 
   Comment: CCRPC agrees with and appreciates this approach, especially the addition of municipal permits being considered.
IV. Enhanced Natural Resources Board

16. Section A. Creation of an Enhanced Natural Resources Board, starts on pg. 44 - This proposal recommends a professional three-person board to review major Act 250 applications instead of the current District Commissions. The three-person board would be joined by two regional commissioners who would hear applications and help decide on findings of fact, but would not participate in drafting conclusions of law, and not vote or help decide the case. Appeals of the Act 250 permits would go directly to the Supreme Court, rather than the Environmental Board.

Comments: CCRPC appreciates what this proposal is trying to do regarding consistency throughout the state. However, there are a number of challenges with this proposal, and overall CCRPC recommends that this section of the proposal be studied further and considered in a separate bill.

V. Reports and Miscellaneous Changes

17. Section A. Municipal and Regional Planning Review, pg. 71, line 15 to 17 – Overall this section requires ACCD to develop a report and recommendations with respect to the capabilities and development plan requirements under Act 250. Comment: CCRPC agrees that this issue should be further studied. However, this report will also include recommendations for “how regional plans are reviewed and approved…”

Comment: CCRPC agrees with this general concept and asks that this bill require consultation with VAPDA and VLCT on development of the recommendations and report.

18. Section A. Municipal and Regional Planning Review, pg. 71, line 18 to 19 - This report will also include “whether designations of growth centers and new town centers should be appealable.” Comment: CCRPC feels that this is out of place, and not necessary for consideration of capability and development plan requirements. CCRPC recommends that this be removed from the proposed bill or if it remains that VAPDA and VLCT be consulted in the preparation of the report.
CCRPC Executive Committee  
February 5, 2020  
Agenda Item 6: Action Item

Safety Performance Targets for the Metropolitan Planning Area

Background:
The latest Federal Transportation Acts (MAP-21 and FAST Act) placed considerable emphasis on system performance and directed State Departments of Transportation (DOTs), MPOs and Transit Providers to evaluate how well the transportation system is doing. At the national level, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) have established a Transportation Performance Management (TPM) program, a strategic initiative designed to achieve national transportation performance goals. The intent is to measure progress against the national goals through a reliable data-driven process. FHWA has established measures in the following areas: Safety, Infrastructure Condition (Pavement & Bridges), Congestion, System Reliability (NHS Performance), Freight Movements (Interstate), and Environmental Sustainability. Once the measures were established, it was up to state DOTs and MPOs to set quantifiable targets to gauge progress towards national goals. The schedule to establish targets, varies by measure. Federal regulations generally have state DOTs set performance targets in various categories (safety, asset condition, system performance, etc.) and then give MPOs another 180 days to either adopt the State targets or establish their own.

Safety Measures and Targets:
Safety targets were the first to be established and reported to FHWA by all DOTs and MPOs. VTrans, in collaboration with the CCRPC, established the first statewide safety targets in the summer of 2017 and reported these targets to FHWA in the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) report. The CCRPC Board acted at their February 2018 meeting to accept these statewide safety targets for the metropolitan planning area. The CCRPC is asked again to review and take action on the statewide targets set in the 2019 HSIP report.

Under federal regulations the CCRPC can either:
1. Accept the state targets for each performance measure and support them through programming; or
2. Define their own quantifiable targets for the MPO area

The 2020 statewide safety measures and targets are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VTrans Safety Performance Measures</th>
<th>2018 Targets (5 Year Averages)</th>
<th>2020 Targets (5 Year Averages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Fatalities</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality Rate (Fatalities per 100M VMT)</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Serious Injuries</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Injury Rate (Serious Injuries per 100M VMT)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Non-motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Executive Committee recommends that the CCRPC Board accepts the VTrans statewide safety targets as reported in the 2019 HSIP Report for the metropolitan planning area.

Several factors that were considered to reach this recommendation are listed below:

1. The regional level data on fatalities and injuries fluctuates (sometimes wildly) from year to year making it difficult to establish a clear, reasonable data-driven target.

2. There are no practical policy or financial consequences for the CCRPC to set (or not set) regional targets.

3. Safety is important and the CCRPC is committed to incorporate the federal safety performance measures into the ECOS/MTP report (together with other transportation measures) and track and report regional safety data annually as part of the ECOS Scorecard.

4. The CCRPC will have an annual opportunity to set safety targets for the MPO region, if it so chooses.

Staff contact: Eleni Churchill, echurchill@ccrpcvt.org
Hi, all -

If time allows on 2/5, can you please get a sense from the Executive Committee where we should have the Annual Meeting this year (June 17)? I’m looking for a general preference in terms of town(s) and can go from there – but happy to look into specific suggestions if anyone has them. In case it’s helpful, here are the previous locations (since I’ve been doing them anyway!):

2014: St. Mikes, Colchester  
2015: Essex Resort, Essex  
2016: Champlain College, Burlington  
2017: Catamount Country Club, Williston  
2018: ECHO, Burlington  
2019: Mansfield Barn, Jericho  

Thanks!
Emma

Emma Vaughn  
Communications Manager  
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission  
110 West Canal Street, Suite 202  
Winooski, VT 05404  
(802) 846-4490 ext. *21  
www.ccrcvt.org
REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
Wednesday, February 19, 2020 - 6:00 p.m.
CCRPC Offices; 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202
Winooski, VT 05404

CONSENT AGENDA – DRAFT
C.1 Minor TIP Amendment
C.2 Safety Performance Targets for the Metropolitan Planning Area

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, if needed; 1 minute)
4. Approve Minutes of January 15, 2020 Meeting* (Action; 1 minute)
5. US7 Signal Upgrades, Shelburne-South Burlington, Major TIP Amendment* (MPO Action; 15 minutes)
6. Clean Water Service Provider* (Discussion; 20 minutes)
7. Act 250 Proposed Comments* (Action; 20 minutes)
8. Proposed Capital Program Projects* (Discussion; 20 minutes)
9. Clean Water Service Provider RFP Comments* (Discussion/Possible Action; 30 minutes)
10. Chair/Executive Director Report (Discussion; 10 minutes)
   a. Legislative Update
   b. FY21 UPWP Development
   c. ECOS Annual Report
11. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports * (Information, 2 minutes)
    a. Executive Committee (draft minutes January 8, 2020)
       i. Act 250 Sec 248 letters
    b. TAC (final minutes December 3, 2019 and draft minutes January 7, 2020)
    c. Clean Water Advisory Committee – MS4 Subcommittee (final minutes December 3, 2019)
    d. Clean Water Advisory Committee (draft minutes January 7, 2020)
    e. Planning Advisory Committee (draft minutes December 11, 2019)
    f. Brownfields Committee (draft minutes December 16, 2019)
12. Members’ Items, Other Business (Information, 5 minutes)
13. Adjourn

The October 17th Chittenden County RPC streams LIVE on YouTube at https://www.youtube.com/Channel17TownMeetingTV. The meeting will air ____________________at 1 p.m. and is available on the web at https://www.cctv.org/watch-tv/series/chittenden-county-regional-planning-commission.

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

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

- Transportation Advisory Committee – Wednesday, March 3, 2020, 9am
- Clean Water Advisory Committee - Wednesday, March 3, 2020, ~11am
- CWAC MS4 Subcommittee - Wednesday, March 3, 2020, ~12:30pm
- Planning Advisory Committee – Wednesday, March 11, 2020, 2:30pm
- Executive Committee – Wednesday, March 4, 2020, 5:45pm
- CCRPC Board Meeting - Wednesday, March 18, 2020 6:00pm

Tentative future Board agenda items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 19, 2020</td>
<td>Clean Water Service Provider RFP Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Act 250 Recommendations (Act 250 and Housing bills)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TCI &amp; other climate change bills, if moving?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 18, 2020</td>
<td>Clean Water Service Provider RFP Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Act 250 Recommendations (Act 250 and Housing bills)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TCI &amp; other climate change bills, if moving?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 2020</td>
<td>Warn Public Hearing for FY21 UPWP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 20, 2020</td>
<td>FY21 UPWP and Budget Public Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 17, 2020</td>
<td>Annual Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warn FY21-23 TIP Hearing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potential Guest Speakers: