

1 CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
2 REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
3 DRAFT
4

5 DATE: Wednesday, January 21, 2021

6 TIME: 6:00 PM

7 PLACE: REMOTE ATTENDANCE VIA ZOOM MEETING VIDEO

8 PRESENT: Bolton: Sharon Murray Buel's Gore: Garret Mott
9 Burlington: Andy Montroll Charlotte: Jim Donovan
10 Colchester: Jacki Murphy Essex: Elaine Haney
11 Essex Junction: Jeff Carr, Alt. Hinesburg: Michael Bissonette
12 Huntington: Barbara Elliott Jericho: Catherine McMains
13 Milton: Tony Micklus Richmond: Bard Hill
14 St. George: Absent Shelburne: John Zicconi
15 So. Burlington: Chris Shaw Underhill: Absent
16 Westford: Absent Williston: Erik Wells
17 Winooski: Michael O'Brien
18 Cons/Env.: Absent VTrans: Amy Bell
19 Bus/Ind: Tim Baechle GMT: Jon Moore
20 Agriculture: Absent Socio/Econ/Housing: Absent

21
22 Others: Matthew Langham, VTrans Meghan O'Rourke, CCTV
23 Karen Horn, Director, VLCT Kelly Duggan
24 Laura Jacoby Doug Goodman
25 Luc Logan Laurie Smith
26 Meredith Rathborne Heidi Racht
27
28 Staff: Charlie Baker, Executive Director Regina Mahony, Planning Prgm Mgr.
29 Eleni Churchill, Trans. Prgm Mgr. Amy Irvin Witham, Business Office Mgr.
30 Forest Cohen, Senior Business Mgr. Christine Forde, Senior Trans. Planner
31 Marshall Distel, Trans. Planner Emma Vaughn, Communications Mgr.
32 Bryan Davis, Senior Trans. Planner Jason Charest, Senior Trans. Planner
33 Sai Sarepalli, Senior Trans. Planner Taylor Newton, Senior Planner
34 Dan Albrecht, Senior Planner
35

36 1. Call to order; Attendance; Changes to the Agenda.

37 The meeting was called to order at 6:01 PM by the Chair, Michael O'Brien.

38
39 Mike explained there were changes to the agenda; The following two items, Agenda item 5. UPWP-
40 FY21 Mid-Year Adjustments Public Forum and Agenda item 6. Municipal Powers moved into the
41 second and third spots. This allowed our guest speaker, Karen Horn, to exit the meeting earlier.
42

43 2. FY21-UPWP Public Forum

44 Mike opened the meeting to comments from the public regarding the UPWP-FY21 Mid-Year
45 Adjustments.
46

47 Doug Goodman stated he had questions regarding the recent ACT-250 application letter from the
48 Burton Corporation, Burlington; #4C0174-6, 4C0368-3. Doug explained he is checking in with us

1 because he is uncomfortable with the letter. Another guest, Laurie Smith expressed that she is in
2 alignment with Doug, and she is also concerned with the development on Queen City Park Road.

3
4 Charlie explained this public comment period is geared toward questions regarding the FY21-UPWP
5 Mid-Year Adjustment and Budget; however, he would be happy to address any questions they have
6 on the ACT-250 letter with them in an e-mail a later time and or if they would prefer to revisit the
7 topic during the public comment period a bit later in the meeting. Doug and Laurie agreed they
8 could wait and speak more about their concerns later in the meeting.
9

10 3. Municipal Powers, Karen Horn, VLCT

11 Charlie introduced Karen Horn, Director, Public Policy and Advocacy, Vermont League of Cities and
12 Towns. Karen referred members to the Self Governance Initiative document they received before
13 the meeting. She stated local governments may only do those things that the legislature specifically
14 grants them permission to do. Williston and Winooski have proposals that will be forwarded as bills
15 to the legislature, where any charter change approved for another municipality may be adopted by
16 majority vote of the town without the need to return to the General Assembly for approval. She
17 explained there is a bill, S.106, with a different approach that would support decision making at the
18 government level closest to the people, recognizing the capacity of local officials to govern
19 themselves. Highlights of this bill include:

- 20 • Establish a 5-year pilot program allowing up to 10 cities or towns to apply for self-
21 governance authority.
- 22 • Establish a 12 member Self-Governance commission to determine subject areas appropriate
23 for municipal decision making.
- 24 • Aggregate information about successful innovations, best approaches for addressing local
25 challenges and approaches that build an effective state-local partnership for the long term.
- 26 • Provide opportunities to revisit issues, amend approaches as ordinances are enacted and
27 apply lessons learned to evolving circumstances.
- 28 • Enable responsiveness and innovation with respect to economic recovery and growth.
- 29 • Implement locally agreed upon solutions to locally identified needs with transparent results
30 that would promote greater accountability.
- 31 • Gather proven best practices to enact into general state law for all cities, towns, and the
32 state.

33
34 Karen said the Senate took a bit of time to review and she is hopeful the House Committee will take
35 this up. She explained a few examples of self-governance upon voter approval are:

- 36 • Adopt Local Option Taxes.
 - 37 • Ordinances regulating installation of traffic calming studies, sidewalks, storm drains and
38 public improvements.
 - 39 • On street parking, speed limits, crosswalks, and other traffic regulations.
 - 40 • Implementing equity and social justice measures
 - 41 • Using Cemetery funds for property improvements
 - 42 • Health, safety, and rental housing codes.
 - 43 • Provide broadband service for its extension to last mile.
 - 44 • Conform municipal charters to current statutes upon approval of voters.
 - 45 • Address drivers of climate change.
- 46

1 John Zicconi stated he agrees a town should have as much control as they can, but this has been
2 debated for several sessions and has never gone anywhere. Karen explained a community would
3 provide a list of ordinances that they would like to have approved or implemented, and the self-
4 governance commission would have conversations to see if the request is pertinent to that
5 community. Garret Mott said there have been issues with speed limits in Buel's Gore; he said there
6 can be a feeling that the State's decision-making process is capricious and does not allow towns
7 input. Karen said one of the attributes of a commission would be to take issues out of the state
8 house, and instead have continuous conversations on the local level. Mike asked about the
9 Governance Charter; Karen explained some of the charters are very lengthy. Jeff Carr said this has
10 always been an issue for all 30 or so of the years he has been involved with local government. He
11 warned if local options tax is a part of the bill, it will prove very difficult to move through the
12 Legislature. Member discussion ensued. Charlie and Mike thanked Karen for her presentation.
13

14 4. Public Comment Period on Items NOT on the Agenda.

15 Mike asked if there were any comments from public on items not on the agenda and said we would
16 return to the discussion of concerns from residents in the Queen City Parkway neighborhood
17 regarding the ACT-250 application letter from the Burton Corporation, Burlington; #4C0174-6,
18 4C0368-3.
19

20 Doug Goodman stated, yes, he had additional questions on what is being addressed in the letter; he
21 said sidewalks and wastewater were not addressed. Doug said the area does not currently have
22 public transportation (bus) access or a safe pedestrian walking or cycling area, which should be of
23 most importance.
24

25 Regina explained we are a statutory party for ACT 250 letters, and we look at the following two
26 specific areas:

- 27 • Does the project fall in line with our future land use area, and, if this an area planned for
28 growth?
- 29 • What is the traffic impact aspect, is there going to be any impact beyond what the study is
30 calling for and is there a need for mitigation of those impacts?
31

32 Regina agreed the sidewalk and bus service are two good points and stated there is still plenty of
33 time to look at these, as the hearing has not yet been scheduled. She added, even if a hearing has
34 been scheduled, there is still time to look further into the concerns. Doug Goodman said there is a
35 group of community members actively participating in this and would like to see further
36 investigation that will assess the impact on the neighboring residential area. He appreciates the
37 consideration. Laurie Smith stated she agrees with what Doug is saying. She feels if the ECOS plan is
38 applied to this project, the whole aspect of climate change should be investigated since there is
39 potential for hundreds of cars to come into the venue and there is currently a lack of alternative
40 transportation infrastructure since there is no infrastructure provided for pedestrian foot traffic or
41 bicycling traffic. Michael Turner and Luc Logan said they live in this neighborhood and share the
42 same concerns expressed by Laurie and Doug.
43

44 5. Action on Consent Agenda, MPO Business.

45 There were three items on the consent agenda for the following TIP Amendments:

- 46 • Pinecrest Drive Sidewalk, Essex; Project BP091, Amendment FY21-12, add \$86,280.00 in
47 additional federal funds for the existing sidewalk project.

- 1 • Charlotte Rail Bridge over Thorp Brook, Charlotte; Project RR008, Amendment FY21-10, add
- 2 \$8000.00 in federal funds to complete the ROW documentation for the project.
- 3 • Amtrak Operating; Project RR012, Amendment FY21-11, add \$408,413 in federal Congestion
- 4 Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Program funds for Amtrak service in
- 5 Chittenden County.
- 6

7 JIM DONOVAN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO APPROVE THE CONSENT
8 AGENDA. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

9
10 6. Approve Minutes of the November 18, 2020 Board Meeting.

11 JIM DONOVON MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY SHARON MURRAY, TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER
12 18, 2020 BOARD MEETING MINUTES WITH EDITS. MOTION CARRIED WITH ONE ABSTENTION FROM
13 GARRET MOTT.

- 14
- 15 • Edit/Clarification: Catherine McMains requested the minutes clearly list Jeff Carr was the
- 16 Essex alternate since Elaine Haney was serving as the primary representative.
- 17

18 7. 2021 Policy Participation Review

19 Charlie referred members to the Policy Participation Topics document included with the packet and
20 thanked Regina for her work on this. He reminded members this goes back many months and asked
21 for feedback on items they would like to add or pay more attention to.

22
23 Jim suggested adding something pertaining to the opioid crisis to the list. Charlie agreed, he will add
24 this and went on to explain there was an item under the Opioid Alliance that had moved to the
25 Chittenden County Public Health Alliance and is still being formed.

26
27 Sharon Murray asked about the Climate Response Plan legislation. Charlie explained there is a small
28 bill that asks about being a resource to hospitals, there has not been any action on this lately. He is
29 not expecting this to move forward. Sharon said it was reintroduced this session.

30
31 **[Revisited due to the agenda order change]** FY21-UPWP Public Forum

32 Mike asked for any comments from the public regarding the UPWP-FY21 Mid-Year Adjustments.

33 Richard Watts introduced himself as a resident of Hinesburg and explained he had three interrelated
34 concerns. Based on the document, he said it is his understanding that the I-89 Study was approved
35 for approx. \$526K. He asked how much of the \$526 has been spent, to date and how much money
36 CCRPC and VTRANS has allocated for this project. He wants to know if this is expected to cost more
37 than was originally proposed. Charlie, explained yes, it is more. Charlie feels this will approach
38 \$800K. He knows this is a large amount of money and explained we share this cost with VTRANS.

39 (close to 1/3). He said with this project, we find ourselves in a situation where there was and
40 continues to be more questions and analysis needed. This includes working with the Project
41 Advisory Committee, the City of South Burlington and VTRANS to ensure this is a comprehensive
42 study that is more effective when it concludes. Eleni explained the additional \$160K we have asked
43 for in FY21 is mainly because there was a need for more analyses and additional work for the
44 interchange evaluation task of this study. Richard questioned this amount, as the figure seems to be
45 an additional \$260K in funds. Eleni explained this amount is the future projection, as this study will
46 continue through FY22. Richard voiced concerns that the timing of the project necessitates a pause;
47 given what is happening in the country due to COVID, we need to consider the changes that have
48 and continue to take place in terms of commuter traffic. It seems to make sense to pause the study

1 and look closely at what is currently happening around us and think about what types of
 2 investments we should make. The study is framed in a way that says we need to ‘fix’ the interstate,
 3 and the solutions are centered around vehicles. Perhaps there are solutions that will enable people
 4 to drive less. He feels the I-89 Study project is at odds with the ECOS plan. Lastly, Richard explained,
 5 planning is the guidance of future actions. We should plan the future we want, and the future might
 6 warrant different investments. Jeff explained the costs associated with the project are what needs
 7 to be done to accomplish a comprehensive and solid plan. Richard asked if there is a cap on the I-89
 8 Study project. Charlie deferred to Eleni. She explained that we do not know. We are working to
 9 evaluate all the possible changes and we do not want to have a lot of overrun. Once we move
 10 forward from the interchange evaluation stage and into the I-89 Corridor bundles will know more.
 11 We are hopeful the interchange evaluation is the big lift in this study, and we are very close to
 12 having this piece wrapped up. Eleni reiterated that we are currently asking for the additional 160K
 13 because there was a lot of additional work needed on the interchanges. Jim asked for clarification
 14 on the changes within the UPWP document; Charlie explained the color-coded legend. Jim thanked
 15 him for the clarification. Jeff reminded everyone the finance committee reviewed the specifics prior
 16 to the board meeting and they found the figures were warranted. John added that one of the
 17 interchange alternatives is looking to downgrade Interstate 189, the shortest interstate in the
 18 nation, and that these evaluations are important.

20 8. UPWP Mid-year adjustment

21 Charlie referred members to the FY21 UPWP Draft Mid-year Adjustment and FY21 Mid-Year Budget
 22 documents distributed to members. He reviewed the budget changes and explained we added an
 23 EDA Planning Grant, a project called the MTI Green Ride Bike share, COVID response items under
 24 Emergency Management. The changes in the budget included a \$300K increase on the revenue
 25 side. In terms of expenses, there was a 5% savings on the benefits due to an adjustment to the
 26 health care plan. Additionally, the indirect rate was lowered, and now shows as 81.5%. Charlie
 27 explained he and Forest decided we were slightly over collecting on the rate and proposed to bring
 28 it down from 83% to 80%, the result is an overall FY21 average of 81.5%. He said revenues are not
 29 down, and expenses are not up, we are simply adjusting the indirect rate to reduce the swing in the
 30 budget. Member discussion ensued.

32 Charlie said Richard Watts brought up the most significant change to the work plan, which is the I-89
 33 Study project. He said some of this was offset by several municipal projects that were deferred into
 34 the next fiscal year (which worked well for the municipalities). Additionally, we want to ensure we
 35 are doing everything we can to address racial equity, and climate change. This is a multi-modal
 36 effort that addresses the goals of our ECOS plan.

38 Mike asked if there were any other questions or comments. There were none. Mike closed public
 39 comment period at 6:46 PM.

41 JIM DONOVAN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL TO APPROVE THE
 42 TRANSPORTATION PORTION OF THE FY21 UPWP MID-YEAR ADJUSTMENT. (MPO BUSINESS) VOTE:

43 Bolton:	Yes	Burlington:	Yes (4)	Charlotte:	Yes
44 Colchester:	Yes (2)	Essex:	Yes	Essex Jct:	Yes
45 Hinesburg:	Yes	Huntington:	Yes	Jericho:	Yes
46 Milton:	Yes	Richmond:	Yes	St. George:	Absent
47 Shelburne:	Yes	So. Burlington:	Yes (2)	Underhill:	Absent
48 Westford:	Absent	Williston:	Yes	Winooski:	Yes

1 VTrans: Yes

2
3 MOTION CARRIED WITH 21 OF 24 VOTES: AND 15 OF 18 MUNICIPALITIES VOTING IN THE
4 AFFIRMATIVE.

5
6 GARRET MOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CATHERINE MCMAINS TO APPROVE THE ENTIRE
7 FY21 UPWP AND BUDGET MID-YEAR ADJUSTMENT. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

8
9 9. Racial Equity Update

10 Charlie provided the Board an update on the search and selection of an equity consultant. He
11 explained we presented the Executive Committee with a Draft Scope of Work document from
12 Creative Discourse and we will look for an approval at the February Executive Committee meeting.
13 Charlie explained the scope of work is very focused on examining our organization as a whole and is
14 not focused solely on training. Creative Discourse feels it is important to build relationships with all
15 members within our communities; to accomplish equity work in a meaningful way, the formation of
16 an internal group is very important. The group should be comprised of both staff and board
17 members. The hope is to create and develop a shared understanding of what the work is about and
18 what the goals are. This is about bringing staff and board members together with BIPOC community
19 members, as well as partner organizations.

20
21 10. Chair/Executive Director Report.

22 • I-89 Study Update

23 Charlie referred members to the I-89 Study Advisory and Technical Committees Memo included
24 in the packet. He stated we will provide a presentation next month.

25 • All Hazards Mitigation Plan

26 Charlie reminded members we talked about this previously and said we did not secure the
27 consulting contract from Vermont Emergency Management. We may have a small amount of
28 funding in our work program to help, but it is not the significant amount we thought we might
29 have. The State of Vermont hired the same consultant that they are using for the State
30 Response Plan.

31 • Draft State Rail Plan

32 Charlie explained that VTrans has a draft State Rail Plan that will be rolled out and available for
33 public review soon. The Transportation Advisory Committee will review and approve comments
34 on this plan. Jim said he is very interested in being involved with this.

35 • Draft Clean Water Service Provider Rules Charlie said these are out for public review final
36 comments will be recommended at the February CWAC meeting, then brought before the
37 Board. We will have a discussion with Board members regarding the role we are assuming.

38
39 Regina said we are thinking about scaling down the size of the Board Packets. Rather than including
40 various meeting minutes within the packet, we can add links to the minutes for the TAC, CWAC, and
41 PAC. Member discussion ensued. Members expressed concern with having to click on links and
42 worried that there could be technical issues to deal with. Although they agreed the packet can be
43 unwieldy at times, they prefer having the minutes readily available to read as a part of the packet
44 document. Discussion ensued; a compromise was proposed. It may be best to send out the
45 minutes for the TAC, CWAC, and PAC as a standalone document, separate from the Board Packet. It
46 was understood that the Board Meeting minutes, and Executive Committee Meeting minutes would
47 remain within the Board Packet.
48

- 1 11. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports. Minutes for various meeting were included in the packet
2 (Executive/Finance Committee, TAC, PAC, MS4 Sub-Committee and CWAC).
3
- 4 Jim asked about the 45-day notice of a Section 248 Petition to be filed for the 2.2 MW solar project
5 on Lake Road in Charlotte. He wondered in instances where the CCRPC requests more information,
6 how we proceed. Regina explained that we look for that additional information, or ways that the
7 applicant addressed the resources identified, in the next level of application.
8
- 9 12. Future Agenda Topics. Charlie said we begin looking at the FY22 work program in March and begin a
10 review of FY23 Transportation projects. This year will be a bit different as we will have multiple
11 projects to look at and prioritize. Charlie thanked Christine for partnering with VTRANS to develop
12 this. Jim asked if the policy updates will come through the Executive Direct reports; Charlie said yes,
13 but members can feel free to contact him if there is anything they would like more information on.
14
- 15 13. Members' Items, Other business. None.
16
- 17 14. Adjournment. JIM DONOVAN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JOHN ZICCONI TO ADJOURN THE
18 CCRPC BOARD MEETING AT 7:50 PM. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
19
- 20 Respectfully submitted,
21 Amy Irvin Witham