DATE: Wednesday, December 11, 2019
TIME: 2:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT

Members Present:
Joss Besse, Bolton
Eric Vorwald, Winooski
Matt Boulanger, Williston
Andrew Stronte, Underhill
Larry Lewack, Bolton
Paul Conner, South Burlington
Darren Schibler, Essex
Meagan Tuttle, Burlington
Sarah Hadd, Colchester

Staff:
Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
Emily Nosse-Leirer, Senior Planner
Melanie Needle, Senior Planner
Jason Charest, Transportation Planner Engineer
Eleni Churchill, Transportation Program Manager

1. Welcome and Introductions
Joss Besse called the meeting to order at 2:36 p.m. Joss Besse thanked Emily Nosse-Leirer for her work in the County and wished her well in her new job with Senator Leahy in Washington D.C.

2. Approval of October 9, 2019 Minutes
Eric Vorwald made a motion, seconded by Paul Conner, to approve the October 9, 2019 minutes. Alex Weinhaben was there and should be added. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.

3. FY21 UPWP Solicitation
Regina Mahony stated that the FY21 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) solicitation has been sent out to the municipalities. Regina explained the land use projects: municipalities can apply for transportation funding for furthering walkability (increasing land use density is eligible). Those projects can be free to the municipalities if CCRPC staff do the work, or a 20% match if consultant is used. Or, if a land use project is not transportation related, municipalities should still apply for it. It is a fee for service at $50 per hour. However, Regina reiterated that municipalities should not hesitate to apply if you need some help and don’t have any funds. Just apply anyway and we will figure out if we can fit it in. Regina Mahony listed a number of projects that CCRPC has worked on: assistance in writing Town Plans (municipalities don’t need to apply for a project for CCRPC review and approval of Plans), zoning regulations, administer CDBG grant, inclusionary zoning, audit of zoning regulations for housing barriers, etc. The application can be found on this page: https://www.cerpcvt.org/about-us/commission/annual-work-plan-budget-finances/ and is due on Friday, January 17th.

4. Energy Planning Best Practices Presentation
Emily Nosse-Leirer provided the Act 174 presentation on the purpose of the energy planning and information on implementation of the energy plans. This presentation is attached to these minutes.

Melanie Needle provided an overview of implementation programs including: assistance from Drive Electric VT; the potential Transportation Climate Initiative; the Efficiency Vermont grant CCRPC now has to help with implementation (for example a button up workshops). Drive Electric Vermont has support from CCRPC to work with a few towns on zoning regulation amendments to streamline the process for EV charging and encouraging more EV charging in new developments.

Emily provided an overview of the PUC process and participation. Paul Conner added that in addition to holding local hearings municipalities can provide space for more direct communication between applicants and neighbors.

5. Chittenden County I-89 2050 Study
Eleni Churchill provided an overview of this project; and requested feedback on the draft vision, goals and objectives for the study (essentially the purpose and need). The presentation is attached for more detail.

The PAC had the following comments/questions:

1. What is the difference between the TIP and MTP model scenarios? The difference is: TIP projects are committed and have funding v. MTP projects are projects where not all funding has been established.

2. Question the growth assumptions assume 35% employment growth (50,000 employees) v. 12% (20,000 people) population growth – assumes employees are coming in from out of the County so are we looking at Franklin County and Washington County? Is it our objective that we will have this many commuters coming in? There was discussion that it isn’t a goal of the ECOS Plan to have more commuters; the goal is to have more employees live where they work. However, the model is based on the forecasts which are based on current and historic commute patterns. The scenarios also include investments of non-SOV and other ways for the commuters to commute, but we can’t change the forecasts in this project. Eleni Churchill will come back to the PAC when the draft metrics and targets are established. [Post meeting note - this document will shed some light on the difference between employment and population in the forecast: https://www.ccrpvt.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Forecast-Questions-Comments-Responses.pdf ]

3. Draft vision statement – suggestion to add energy savings, climate change, and alignment with the state energy plan.

4. Draft goals – There was a comment that the interstate serves the needs of the community, and transportation is intended to serve other things: land use, economic development, sustainability goals, etc. The goals of this study should recognize and support these other community goals that we have.

5. Draft objectives – these provide much more detail; and get at some of the questions/comments the PAC was expressing. Eleni Churchill explained that they are trying to figure out metrics for all of the objectives, because these objectives will be measured under each scenario. There is no land use model to show how these scenarios are going to play out.

6. The PAC likes “maintain reliable transportation times” because this doesn’t mean fast, it just means reliable.

7. There was a comment that the objectives under #5 are all negative. And uses “discourage” rather than just say what you want: “Investments support land use patterns that are consistent with regional and municipal plans”.

8. There was a comment on the vision statement to “encourage reduction in vehicle miles travelled” or “decrease vehicle miles travelled.” The statement should be much more clear on just stating what the land use goal is “compact/concentrated settlement patterns surrounded by rural areas.”

9. There was a question about whether rail is considered in the study. Is there an objective about moving more freight by rail than road? Currently reads as a business as usual objective as opposed to a goal for a change in the future. But if there are other state-wide objectives then we should try to accommodate that in this planning. Can we test it in the scenarios? If there was a goal to shift some freight to rail it might make sense to test it.

6. High Impact Economic Development Project List

Regina Mahony provided a quick introduction to an effort to create a methodology/process through which critical and high impact economic development projects may be vetted and chosen. The overall goal is to have a statewide list of projects that are already identified, can attract resources, and be meaningful to communities. This is being done throughout the state at the request of Department of Economic Development. GBIC is working on this, and we will likely start with the CEDS list for this effort. This list will likely be different than project lists created for opportunity zones, because the opportunity zone projects need to be profitable. This list will likely be more capital project based.

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

Underhill: nothing.

Winooski: nothing to report.

Williston: 130 housing units on old Catamount golf course at corner of Mtn. View and CIRC ROW.

Burlington: nothing

Colchester: SW Corner at Severance Corners – 57 units

So. Burlington: Tilley Drive and Hinesburg Road. Hampton Inn. 4 story-ish Hotel on Shelburne Road next to Larkin Terrace and locally have seen a master plan (only one building going to Act 250). 133 DU in City Center (probably
meeting priority housing through earlier buildings.). Airport – terminal expansion. School Board likely $209 million improvement for HS and Middle School.

Essex: Leo building, RPC already deferred to Ag soils. Bank with drive through in Town Center.

Bolton: Encore Renewables working with Deslauriers family along Rte.2 at old driving range (toward Waterbury). They are smaller panels that are movable, and in a floodplain.

8. Other Business - none

8. Adjourn
Darren Schibler made a motion, seconded by Meagan Tuttle, to adjourn at 4:32p.m. MOTION PASSED

Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony