

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

4 DATE: Wednesday, November 18, 2020
5 TIME: 2:30 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.
6 PLACE: Virtual Meeting via Zoom with link as published on the agenda
7

Members Present:

Eric Vorwald, Winooski
Ravi Venkataraman, Richmond
Dean Pierce, Shelburne
Joss Besse, Bolton
Alex Weinhagen, Hinesburg
Cymone Haiju, Milton
Katherine Sonnick, Jericho
Wayne Howe, CCRPC Representative
Jon Ignatowski, Bolton
Larry Lewack, Charlotte

Paul Conner, So. Burlington
Karen Adams, Colchester
Darren Schibler, Essex
Owiso Makuku, Essex

Staff:

Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
Melanie Needle, Senior Planner
Taylor Newton, Senior Planner
Eleni Churchill, Transportation Program Manager
Jason Charest, Senior Transportation Planning Engineer

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

11 Joss Besse called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m.
12

13 **2. Approval of October 21, 2020 Minutes**

14
15 Eric Vorwald made a motion, seconded by Ravi Venkataraman, to approve the October 21, 2020 minutes. No further
16 discussion. MOTION PASSED.
17

18 **3. VTrans Congestion Policy Draft**

19 Eleni Churchill explained that VTrans and the CCRPC are collaborating to revise the existing Level of Service Policy
20 and develop a new Congestion Policy for urban/suburban/rural areas that more appropriately evaluates transportation
21 impacts from land use developments. CCRPC and VTrans would appreciate feedback from the PAC.
22

23 Eleni Churchill provided the PAC with a presentation and explained that the hope is to replace the current policy
24 VTrans and all of us use for review of development. So far CCRPC and VTrans have been working on this but the
25 plan is to talk to many folks, including: VAPDA, other VTrans staff, maybe developers. Joss Besse suggested that
26 they talk with the Downtown Board about this. This change is proposed because the current Level of Service (LOS)
27 policy doesn't work great for congested areas planned for growth. Also Volume to Capacity (v/c) ratio is a more
28 effective measure to assess roadway capacity than LOS.
29

30 The current policy is designed in such a way that new developments accessing transportation infrastructure facilities
31 make improvements to the facilities in order to maintain a LOS "C" for the prescribed design period. The result is
32 very large intersections that aren't helpful for all types of users; and doesn't result in walkable/bikeable downtowns
33 and villages that we'd like. Want to look more at v/c because it is easier to measure the impacts at a high level of
34 congestion and still allow an incremental level of growth; whereas it is very difficult to do this for LOS.
35

36 **Proposed New Congestion Policy:**

- 37 - High Access Area – access prioritized over mobility. These areas are proposed to include: all State
38 designations, and Class 1 Town Highways (still not sure about Class 2 and 3). And RPCs can designate these
39 areas in their regional plans. Paul – could you also designate these areas at the local level? So. Burlington has
40 been working on this same thing with RSG there. Eleni stated that they haven't discussed that, but it's a good
41 question.
42 - Balanced Access and Mobility Areas – not our downtowns. These areas are proposed to include: commercial
43 corridors and arterials and VTrans Access Management 6 that are outside of state designations.

- High Mobility Areas – proposed to include everything else.

Area or Facility Type	VC Ratio (Existing or w/ development traffic) that Requires a Detailed Traffic Analysis.	When is Traffic Mitigation Required?	Mitigation Measures Prioritized
High Access	> 1.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When vehicle queues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cause a safety issue • Spill back and block (for specified time TBD) a downstream street or major driveway intersections; or • Block access to other lanes (for specified time TBD) or • If V/C Exceeds 1.0 for more than 2 hours 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. TDM Programs 2. Walking & Biking Facility Improvements 3. Transit 4. Traffic signal operational enhancements 5. Highway capacity if no adverse impacts to context
Balanced Access and Mobility (BAM)	> 0.90	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When vehicle queues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cause a safety issue • Spill back and block (for specified time TBD) a downstream street or major driveway intersections; or • Block access to other lanes (for specified time TBD); or • If V/C exceed 0.90 for more than one hour 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. TDM Programs 2. Walking & Biking Facility Improvements 3. Transit 4. Traffic signal operational enhancements 5. Highway capacity if no adverse impacts to context
High Mobility	>0.80	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vehicle queue issues as above; or • If V/C exceed 0.80 for more than one hour 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. TDM Programs 2. Transit 3. Traffic signal operational enhancements 4. Highway capacity if no adverse impacts to context

Owiso Makuku and Darren Schibler left the meeting.

PAC Questions/Comments:

Eric: Would it be possible to have two separate levels of congestion on Main Street in Winooski? As you get further out from DT do we want a different level of congestion? Eleni suggested that perhaps there should be a safety valve for municipalities to still say “we want mitigation measures here”.

Alex – what if an intersection is not over the threshold currently, but a big project puts it over the threshold. The policy/process would require that the developer at least know the base that the project will contribute – but that can be done without a full blown traffic impact study. If the data shows that the traffic contribution will put the intersection over capacity; then they’d need to do a traffic impact study. Also, Alex asked, what exactly is volume over capacity measuring? Jason Charest provided further information and will follow-up.

Dean Pierce will ask Eleni and Jason his question via email.

Process – definitely going to be talking with and getting feedback/comments from a lot of groups. They will come back to the PAC in early spring with the next round. However, the authority to change this is with the Secretary of Transportation. Along with the policy the guidance will be updated.

CCRPC will email the presentation and Report from RSG for Phase 1 to the PAC.

4. Upcoming Legislative Session

Regina Mahony stated that CCRPC is planning to continue to work on the Act 250 reform bill, but would like to know if there is any other legislation that our member municipalities will be following? We typically have a legislative breakfast in early December and we’ve been wondering whether to have it or not, so we’ve been asking the municipalities if you have other big issues of concern?

- Paul: A lot of parts of S.237 that didn’t move forward. Want to address those if a lot of what was in it is going to move forward this year. Alex’s understands that the hope is to get the technical correction on the

1 private covenants done quickly and early; but hasn't heard anything about the rest. Alex suggested that the
 2 housing groups might be interested and it would be helpful to reach out to them.

- 3 - Eric: will there be further changes to the marijuana legislation? Alex suggested that there may be tweaks and
 4 changes, but not sure of specifics. Most of the this bill rolls out in 2022.
- 5 - Paul: Registry of short-term rentals? Regina stated that we'll be discussing this at the Chittenden County
 6 Housing Convening on November 30th.
- 7 - Taylor: DPS asked PUC to open investigation into SHEI. The area is constrained for further solar
 8 development; and the proposal is to add a 'solar adder' to petitions – basically a solar impact fee to help pay
 9 for increased capacity in the system. May be of interest to Chittenden County because eventually the
 10 constrained area will move down here.

11
 12 **5. FY22 UPWP Preparation: CCRPC Land Use Billing Rate, and UPWP Committee Representative**

13 Regina Mahony stated that application materials will be going out shortly for CCRPC's FY22 UPWP. CCRPC is
 14 contemplating a shift in the land use fee for service rate of \$50/hour and would like to get your feedback. Regina
 15 explained that CCRPC charges a rate for this work so that the ACCD funding can stretch further, since many of the
 16 other grant programs don't cover our full cost and it ends up rolling over to ACCD. Of the RPC's that charge for this
 17 type of work (which is all but 2 of them), we are charging the least. The lowest is \$65/hour in the Kingdom. We are
 18 thinking about \$60 - \$65/hour and would like to know if any PAC members have any strong feelings about that one
 19 way or the other. The PAC members gave a general thumbs up to the idea. Regina stated that is anyone has any other
 20 feelings about it to please email her.

21
 22 Also, CCRPC is asking for up to 2 PAC representatives on the UPWP committee – interest was expressed by Eric
 23 Vorwald, Dean Pierce and Paul Conner (but not if Justin Rabidoux will still be the TAC Rep).

24
 25 **6. Members Items Open Forum**

26 Regina Mahony stated that the final tally for the future agenda topics was in the packet. CCRPC Staff will work to
 27 schedule these topics at future meetings. One topic idea was to hold space on the agenda every so often for members
 28 to discuss issues with each other. If anyone has anything they'd like to bring up with the group, please do so.

29
 30 Paul – how are folks modifying rules for tents etc. for COVID? Taylor mentioned that NRPC put together a
 31 temporary interim bylaw for municipalities if anyone is interested in this. Paul added that they've had interesting
 32 conversations about positive outcomes from their temporary rules, and have thought about what they might make
 33 more permanent. Hinesburg basically said to businesses – if you want to do a bunch of temporary changes you don't
 34 need a permit. But they haven't discussed making more long-term changes. In South Burlington some neighborhoods
 35 have hired food trucks to come for a night, and has created neighborhood connections that have been really valuable.

36
 37 Larry – In Charlotte they've been thinking about food trucks and accessory on farm businesses. Think about food
 38 trucks as a license/ordinance issue rather than zoning (at Taylor's suggestion). It's easier to yank a license than a
 39 zoning permit. More laissez-faire approach. The [AARP Winter Placemaking workshop](#) had a lot of great ideas. Joss
 40 cautioned that food trucks can be an issue in DTs, as they are competing with restaurants without paying rent. Adding
 41 a lot of competition for existing restaurants isn't always great.

42
 43 Eric – Public feedback is going to be interesting on whether some of this stuff ever needs to be regulated/permitted
 44 again. Also they've been thinking about ADUs and removing the owner occupancy requirement. Richmond is having
 45 those same conversations. Dealing with the “so then what's the difference between an ADU and duplex”
 46 conversation; but otherwise looking to do this to really make ADUs easier.

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

49 Regina asked the PAC to email Regina and Taylor any Act 250/Section 248 updates.

- 50 a. South Burlington provided via the chat: (1) OBrien "Eastview" neighborhood along Old Farm Road; (2)
 51 modifications to Gazebo Senior apartments on Williston Road; (3) new free-standing bank at Shaw's parcel
 52 on Shelburne St; (4) a variety of mid-sized projects at the Airport; (5) South Village final phases (previously
 53 approved as Master Plan)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11

8. Other Business

- a. Chittenden County Housing Convening – Monday, November 30th at 6pm. Save the dates were sent out, and a follow-up email will be sent with a meeting link.
- b. CarShare Vermont – Homes for People, Not Cars Report – this report was attached to the packet for your information.

9. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 3:46pm.

Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony