

1 CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
2 PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE - MINUTES
3

4 DATE: Wednesday, December 11, 2019
5 TIME: 2:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.
6 PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT
7

Members Present:

Joss Besse, Bolton
Eric Vorwald, Winooski
Matt Boulanger, Williston
Andrew Strniste, 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

8
9
10 **1. Welcome and Introductions**

11 Joss Besse called the meeting to order at 2:36 p.m. Joss Besse thanked Emily Nosse-Leirer for her work in the
12 County and wished her well in her new job with Senator Leahy in Washington D.C.
13

14 **2. Approval of October 9, 2019 Minutes**

15
16 Eric Vorwald made a motion, seconded by Paul Conner, to approve the October 9, 2019 minutes. Alex Weinhausen
17 was there and should be added. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.
18

19 **3. FY21 UPWP Solicitation**

20 Regina Mahony stated that the FY21 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) solicitation has been sent out to the
21 municipalities. Regina explained the land use projects: municipalities can apply for transportation funding for
22 furthering walkability (increasing land use density is eligible). Those projects can be free to the municipalities if
23 CCRPC staff do the work, or a 20% match if consultant is used. Or, if a land use project is not transportation related,
24 municipalities should still apply for it. It is a fee for service at \$50 per hour. However, Regina reiterated that
25 municipalities should not hesitate to apply if you need some help and don't have any funds. Just apply anyway and
26 we will figure out if we can fit it in. Regina Mahony listed a number of projects that CCRPC has worked on:
27 assistance in writing Town Plans (municipalities don't need to apply for a project for CCRPC review and approval of
28 Plans), zoning regulations, administer CDBG grant, inclusionary zoning, audit of zoning regulations for housing
29 barriers, etc. The application can be found on this page: [https://www.ccrpcvt.org/about-us/commission/annual-work-](https://www.ccrpcvt.org/about-us/commission/annual-work-plan-budget-finances/)
30 [plan-budget-finances/](https://www.ccrpcvt.org/about-us/commission/annual-work-plan-budget-finances/) and is due on Friday, January 17th.
31

32 **4. Energy Planning Best Practices Presentation**

33 Emily Nosse-Leirer provided the Act 174 presentation on the purpose of the energy planning and information on
34 implementation of the energy plans. This presentation is attached to these minutes.
35

36 Melanie Needle provided an overview of implementation programs including: assistance from Drive Electric VT; the
37 potential [Transportation Climate Initiative](#); the Efficiency Vermont grant CCRPC now has to help with
38 implementation (for example a button up workshops). Drive Electric Vermont has support from CCRPC to work
39 with a few towns on zoning regulation amendments to streamline the process for EV charging and encouraging more
40 EV charging in new developments.
41

42 Emily provided an overview of the PUC process and participation. Paul Conner added that in addition to holding
43 local hearings municipalities can provide space for more direct communication between applicants and neighbors.
44

45 **5. Chittenden County I-89 2050 Study**

1 Eleni Churchill provided an overview of this project; and requested feedback on the draft vision, goals and objectives
2 for the study (essentially the purpose and need). The presentation is attached for more detail.

3
4 The PAC had the following comments/questions:

- 5 1. What is the difference between the TIP and MTP model scenarios? The difference is: TIP projects are
6 committed and have funding v. MTP projects are projects where not all funding has been established.
- 7 2. Question the growth assumptions assume 35% employment growth (50,000 employees) v. 12% (20,000
8 people) population growth – assumes employees are coming in from out of the County so are we looking at
9 Franklin County and Washington County? Is it our objective that we will have this many commuters coming
10 in? There was discussion that it isn't a goal of the ECOS Plan to have more commuters; the goal is to have
11 more employees live where they work. However, the model is based on the forecasts which are based on
12 current and historic commute patterns. The scenarios also include investments of non-SOV and other ways
13 for the commuters to commute, but we can't change the forecasts in this project. Eleni Churchill will come
14 back to the PAC when the draft metrics and targets are established. [Post meeting note - this document will
15 shed some light on the difference between employment and population in the forecast:
16 <https://www.ccrpcvt.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Forecast-Questions-Comments-Responses.pdf>.]
- 17 3. Draft vision statement – suggestion to add energy savings, climate change, and alignment with the state
18 energy plan.
- 19 4. Draft goals – There was a comment that the interstate serves the needs of the community, and transportation
20 is intended to serve other things: land use, economic development, sustainability goals, etc. The goals of this
21 study should recognize and support these other community goals that we have.
- 22 5. Draft objectives – these provide much more detail; and get at some of the questions/comments the PAC was
23 expressing. Eleni Churchill explained that they are trying to figure out metrics for all of the objectives,
24 because these objectives will be measured under each scenario. There is no land use model to show how
25 these scenarios are going to play out.
- 26 6. The PAC likes “maintain reliable transportation times” because this doesn't mean fast, it just means reliable.
- 27 7. There was a comment that the objectives under #5 are all negative. And uses “discourage” rather than just
28 say what you want: “Investments support land use patterns that are consistent with regional and municipal
29 plans”.
- 30 8. There was a comment on the vision statement to “encourage reduction in vehicle miles travelled” or
31 “decrease vehicle miles travelled.” The statement should be much more clear on just stating what the land
32 use goal is “compact/concentrated settlement patterns surrounded by rural areas.”
- 33 9. There was a question about whether rail is considered in the study. Is there an objective about moving more
34 freight by rail than road? Currently reads as a business as usual objective as opposed to a goal for a change in
35 the future. But if there are other state-wide objectives then we should try to accommodate that in this
36 planning. Can we test it in the scenarios? If there was a goal to shift some freight to rail it might make sense
37 to test it.

38 39 **6. High Impact Economic Development Project List**

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

46 47 **7. Regional Act 250/Section 248 Projects on the Horizon**

48 Underhill: nothing.

49 Winooski: nothing to report.

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

51 Burlington: nothing

52 Colchester: SW Corner at Severance Corners – 57 units

53 So. Burlington: Tilley Drive and Hinesburg Road. Hampton Inn. 4 story-ish Hotel on Shelburne Road next to Larkin

54 Terrace and locally have seen a master plan (only one building going to Act 250). 133 DU in City Center (probably

1 meeting priority housing through earlier buildings.). Airport – terminal expansion. School Board likely \$209 million
2 improvement for HS and Middle School.
3 Essex: Leo building, RPC already deferred to Ag soils. Bank with drive through in Town Center.
4 Bolton: Encore Renewables working with Deslauriers family along Rte.2 at old driving range (toward Waterbury).
5 They are smaller panels that are movable, and in a floodplain.
6

7 **8. Other Business - none**

8
9 **8. Adjourn**

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

11

12 Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony