

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

5 DATE: Wednesday, June 16, 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: Jeff Carr
11 Essex Junction: Dan Kerin Hinesburg: Michael Bissonette
12 Huntington: Barbara Elliott Jericho: Catherine McMains
13 Jericho: Wayne Howe
14 Milton: Tony Micklus Richmond: Bard Hill
15 St. George: Absent Shelburne: Absent
16 So. Burlington: Chris Shaw Underhill: Absent
17 Westford: Absent Williston: Absent
18 Winooski: Michael O'Brien Cons/Env.: Absent
19 VTrans: Amy Bell Bus/Ind: Absent
20 GMT : Absent Agriculture: Absent
21 Socio/Econ/Housing: Justin Dextrateur

22
23 Others: Kevin Harms, CCTV Deirdre Holmes, Charlotte
24 Matthew Langham, VTrans

25
26 Staff: Charlie Baker, Executive Director Regina Mahony, Planning Prgm Mgr.
27 Eleni Churchill, Trans. Prgm Mgr. Amy Irvin Witham, Business Office Mgr.
28 Christine Forde, Senior Trans. Planer Forest Cohen, Senior Business Mgr.
29

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

31 The meeting was called to order at 6:02 PM by the Chair, Michael O'Brien. Jim Donovan noted that
32 he has a question regarding the Consent Agenda.
33

34 2. Public Comment Period on Items NOT on the Agenda. There were none.
35

36 3. Action on Consent Agenda, MPO Business.

37 Jim asked to take the TIP amendments off of the consent agenda. He questioned if there was a
38 recommendation from the TAC to approve the TIP amendments. Christine clarified the TAC did
39 recommend that the Board approve the TIP amendments. Jim said he understood and thanked her
40 for the clarification. The consent agenda included the following requested FY21 TIP Amendments:
41

- 42 • Lake Street Sidewalk and Stormwater Management, Burlington; Project BP114, Amendment
43 FY21-52. Add a new Transportation Alternatives award for a sidewalk on Lake Street in
44 Burlington. Add \$60,988 for preliminary engineering in FY21.
- 45 • VT15 Multiuse Path, Colchester-Essex; Project BP069, Amendment FY21-53. Advance
46 \$493,737 in Federal Funds from FY22 to FY21. The project is progressing faster than was
47 programmed in the TIP. Funds are available within the fiscal constraint
48

- 1 • Alder Brook culvert (VR2) on VT117, Essex; Project BR048, Amendment FY21-54. Advance
2 \$769,600 in Federal Funds from FY22 to FY21. The project is progressing faster than was
3 programmed in the TIP. Funds are available within the fiscal constraint.
4

5 JIM DONOVAN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JEFF CARR, TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA
6 ITEMS. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY MPO MEMBERS.
7

8 4. Approve Minutes of the May 19, 2021 Board Meeting.

9 JIM DONOVAN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY GARRET MOTT TO APPROVE THE MAY 19, 2021
10 BOARD MEETING MINUTES, WITH EDITS. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
11

- 12 • Edit: Page 6, change 'we' to 'CCRPC staff'.
13 • Clarification: Jeff stated he was the representative for Essex and 2nd Alternate for Essex Jct.
14

15 5. Election of Officers and Executive Committee for FY22

16 Andy Montroll stated the Board Development Committee met on April 7, 2021 and recommended
17 the following slate of officers for FY22.
18

- 19 • Catherine McMains, Chair
20 • Chris Shaw, Vice-Chair
21 • John Zicconi, Secretary/Treasurer
22 • Jacki Murphy, At-large for Towns over 5,000
23 • Bard Hill, At-large for Towns under 5,000
24 • Mike O'Brien, Immediate Past Chair
25

26 Mike opened the meeting for any additional nominations from the floor. There were none.

27 JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL TO CLOSE THE REQUEST FOR
28 ADDITIONAL NOMINATIONS. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
29

30 BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY GARRET MOTT, TO ELECT THE SLATE OF
31 OFFICERS AS PRESENTED. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
32

33 6. FY22 Calendar of Meeting dates

34 Charlie referred members to the Memo with the proposed FY22 schedule of meetings for the
35 Commission and Committees covering July 2021 through June 2022.
36

37 BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY GARRET MOTT, TO APPROVE THE FY22
38 MEETING SCHEDULE AS PRESENTED TO THE BOARD. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
39

40 7. Warn Public Hearing for the FY22-25 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) - MPO Business

41 Christine Forde referred members to the memo and the Transportation Improvement Program,
42 FY2022-2025 draft document included with the agenda packet. She reminded everyone this agenda
43 item is to publicly warn a public hearing in July. She explained the TIP is a prioritized, fiscally
44 constrained, multi-year list of federally funded multimodal transportation projects and operations
45 within the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission region. As a federally designated
46 Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), the CCRPC must prepare a TIP that covers at least a 4-
47 year period.

1
2 It is typically updated every year in coordination with the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC),
3 the Vermont Agency of Transportation (VTrans), and the Green Mountain Transit (GMT). The TIP
4 lists federal funding amounts in the federal fiscal year when they are expected to be needed.
5 Projects must be listed in the TIP to spend federal transportation funds. The TIP represents the
6 intent to construct or implement a specific project and the anticipated flow of federal funds. Funds
7 correspond to the following project development phases:

- 8
9
- 10 • Scoping – a process that develops safe and effective alternatives based on documented
 - 11 rational that meet the stated purpose and need while minimizing environmental impacts
 - 12 • Preliminary Engineering – detailed design of the preferred alternative
 - 13 • Right-of-Way - process of determining if land rights are needed for construction and
 - 14 negotiation of appropriate compensation
 - 15 • Construction

16 Christine said the FY22-25 total TIP Funding Levels are a total of \$254.7 Million dollars, comprised of
17 federal funds each year (and does not include Burlington International Airport projects) as follows:

- 18
- 19 • FY2022 \$57.8 Million
 - 20 • FY2023 \$105.2 Million
 - 21 • FY2024 \$66 Million
 - 22 • FY2025 \$25.7 Million

23 She reviewed the TIP projects by use categories as well as the CIRC Alternatives projects. Christine
24 noted the TAC and CCRPC staff recommends the Board warn a public hearing for the July 21, 2021,
25 Board Meeting on the FY2022-2025 TIP.

26
27 JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY DAN KERIN, TO RECOMMEND THE BOARD WARN AND
28 HOLD THE PUBLIC HEARING AT THE JULY 21, 2021, BOARD MEETING. MOTION CARRIED
29 UNANIMOUSLY.

30
31 8. VPSP2 FY23 Transportation Project Priorities

32 Christine referred members to the VPSP2 documents included with the packet; VPSP2 Memo, VPSP2
33 Transportation Values Scores for Chittenden County Projects, and the VPSP2 Project Input Data
34 Workbook Chart. She began with a PowerPoint presentation and stated the vision of the VSPS2:

35
36 *“Develop a performance-based, data driven project selection and prioritization framework that*
37 *maximizes the transportation value delivered to Vermont taxpayers.”*

38
39 The documents detail how VTrans and RPC partners have been working collaboratively to revamp
40 the annual project prioritization process to develop a performance-based, data driven project
41 selection and prioritization framework that maximizes the transportation value delivered to
42 Vermont taxpayers as currently measured by eight criteria identified by stakeholders as important:

- 43
- 44 • Safety
 - 45 • Asset Condition
 - 46 • Mobility & Connectivity
 - 47 • Economic Access
 - Environmental

- 1 • Resiliency
- 2 • Regional
- 3 • Health Access

4
5 VPSP2 scores were developed cooperatively between VTrans and RPCs using an Excel workbook
6 developed for this process. Of the criteria, VTrans scores five (safety, asset condition, economic
7 access, resiliency, environment), and RPCs score three (connectivity, regional, and health access).
8 RPCs can view and provide comments on the VTrans scores.
9

10 Christine explained the timeline; year one of this pilot will consider projects in the categories of
11 Roadway, Traffic & Safety, and Paving. Year 2 will consider bridge programs. These will continue to
12 be reviewed in an every other year cycle going forward. The Chittenden County projects are
13 identified through the VTrans asset management systems (Asset Driven Projects) or through our
14 CCRPC planning processes (Regionally Driven Projects). The Regionally Driven Projects were
15 endorsed by the TAC. The Asset Driven and Regionally Driven projects is listed in the VPSP2
16 Transportation Values table. Asset Driven paving and concrete slab removal projects are listed
17 separately because of their specific and limited scope. All Asset Driven and Regionally Driven
18 projects identified statewide will be sorted by VPSP2 Transportation Values and prioritized by
19 VTrans for input into the FY23-26 Capital Program, most likely in the last couple of years of the
20 program. CCRPC will have an opportunity to review and comment on that list in September or
21 October.
22

23 In addition to submitting transportation value scores, CCRPC may also submit comments on the
24 scoring methodology or results. The TAC provided one comment to be submitted to VTrans on the
25 Connectivity criterion which scores 2 points for enhancing or improving connectivity for
26 bicyclists/pedestrians and an additional 2 points for being on a high priority bike corridor. High
27 priority bike corridor is defined as a corridor identified in the VTrans Bicycle Corridor Priority Map.
28 The TAC requested that VTrans expand the definition of High Priority Bike Corridor to include
29 Regionally Significant Corridors as identified in a Regional Plan. The 2021 VTrans VPSP2 Preliminary
30 Transportation Values for CCRPC Projects Workbook, for reference, the workbook inputs for all
31 projects can be found [here](#).
32

33 The CCRPC staff also examined ways to add equity into this process. Eleni explained equity is not
34 currently part of the VPSP2 criteria; however, it is necessary to ensure public funds are being
35 allocated to projects that minimize burdens and maximize benefits, particularly to traditionally
36 underserved populations. In the last few weeks, the staff created a pilot equity screening process to
37 better understand how equity can be applied to and affect the VPSP2 project ranking process. A
38 more complete description of the pilot equity screening process, available [here](#) in the May 4,
39 agenda item 7, TAC Memo. In addition, staff asked for assistance in this pilot equity screen from
40 Mark Hughes of Vermont Racial Equity Association, his report is available [here](#).
41

42 Eleni reminded everyone we are only at the very beginning stages of developing a process to
43 address equity within the VPSP2, and there is much room for improvement. VTrans and the
44 Legislature also included a provision in the T-bill to develop recommendations for a transportation
45 equity framework and report back to the Legislature by December 15, 2021. CCRPC is partnering
46 with VTrans and contributing funding to this study. We believe that our preliminary research and

1 work into this issue will serve as a starting point for VTrans and the RPCs in developing
2 recommendations in the future.

3
4 Charlie stated not all the highest scoring projects in our urban areas were selected by the TAC and
5 there was a decision to apply a geographic equity distribution in addition to the other criteria for
6 projects in our smaller towns/rural areas. Chris asked for an example of Resiliency. Christine
7 explained the resiliency comes from a statewide map detailing flood-prone and vulnerable areas.
8 Every transportation segment in the state has a score. She explained it depends on the
9 characteristics of the surrounding area, for example if there is a small culvert in an area that has
10 flooding, it is a score of the area where it is located.

11
12 Jeff requested we hold a Board development workshop session on scoring and how to best include
13 diversity. He feels it is important for the Board to have a deeper understanding of the scoring
14 process. He suggested we invite our consultant, Creative Discourse to participate in this. Members
15 agreed. Christine said she also has slides that show how the scores are developed. She and Eleni will
16 set up a workshop to provide information on how scores were developed. Catherine suggested
17 holding two workshops; one that provides an overview on the development of scores and a second
18 that on how equity is woven into the process. Charlie agreed. He explained the Vermont Legislature
19 and VTrans have committed to developing and adding an equity component and VTrans is working
20 with the CCRPC for input. He said holding the workshops in October or November will work well.
21 Dan Kerin said, in terms of scoring and equity, it is easy to draw up metrics to gauge traffic and
22 pedestrians, but as far as the racial equity impact, he feels it is difficult to define with scores. Charlie
23 acknowledged that is important that the equity criteria be quantifiable with data.

24
25 Christine stated the recommendation to the Board from the TAC and CCRPC Staff as follows:

- 26
- 27 • Accept the VPSP2 Transportation Values as presented in the attached table and submit
- 28 them to VTrans for their use.
- 29 • Submit the following TAC comment to VTrans – Expand the definition of High Priority Bike
- 30 Corridor to include Regionally Significant Corridors as identified in a Regional Plan.
- 31 • Submit our preliminary work on equity (research on best practices, our preliminary equity
- 32 screening process, and Vermont Racial Equity Association report) to VTrans.
- 33 • Submit any additional Board comments on the VPSP2 methodology or scores.
- 34

35 JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JIM DONOVAN, TO RECOMMEND THE BOARD ACCEPT
36 THE VPSP2 ITEMS AS PRESENTED TO THE BOARD. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

37
38 Jim asked if the paving is a separate category? Christine explained the grouping consists of Paving,
39 Roadway, and Traffic and Safety. She explained paving is on its own and slab removal is combined
40 with roadway projects. She said this is a bit of a gray area as far as what defines one or the other,
41 but the list we submit to VTrans will be divided into three separate categories. Jim thanked her for
42 the explanation.

43 44 9. Draft VELCO Plan Comments

45 Regina reminded members of the presentation they saw on the VELCO Long Range Transmission
46 draft plan at the May Board meeting. She referred members to the memo and comment letter
47 included with the packet. She said after the VELCO presentation, the Board asked CCRPC staff to
48 follow up on the following items:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

- **How will the outcomes influence our energy plan update?**

Regarding the impact on our plan, CCRPC staff anticipate several state-wide planning efforts influencing the energy plan component of the 2023 ECOS Plan update. Factors include the transmission system challenges identified in VELCO's plan, the update to the State Comprehensive Energy Plan (currently underway), updates to the regional and local energy planning criteria (currently underway), and potential Climate Council impacts. It is too soon to say how each of these will influence our Plan update, but as it currently stands, we hope to not change the overall policy direction of the existing plan which supports the state's renewable generation goal (which is now in statute).

- **How might the outcomes change our Section 248 review process?**

We do not anticipate any impact on our current Section 248 review process. We already factor in a suitability policy as written in the current ECOS Plan: "Locate energy generation proximate to existing distribution and transmission infrastructure with adequate capacity and near areas with high electric load." We will not change our Section 248 review process until after we update our Plan, if needed.

- **Whether the CCRPC should submit comments to VELCO?**

Regarding providing comments to VELCO, it seems prudent to document CCRPC's concerns on the Long-Range Transmission Plan. While many of CCRPC's specific concerns are out of VELCO's jurisdiction, there needs to be a more complete and comprehensive approach to planning so that the energy goals can be met, and particularly the renewable generation goal. Staff prepared the attached draft comments for Board consideration. The Executive Committee reviewed the letter at the June meeting and their edits have been incorporated.

Regina noted the Executive Committee and CCRPC staff recommends the Board submit the comment letter with the following points:

1. CCRPC supports the plan's recommendation to focus on increased electric efficiency and non-transmission alternatives to avoid negative impacts on electric transmission reliability in the short-term.
2. CCRPC believes that existing law (30 V.S.A. 218c and PUC Docket 7081) does not sufficiently enable VELCO with the authority needed to effectively plan for grid modernization that meets State, regional, and local energy goals. The following two limitations are especially problematic from our perspective:
 - a. CCRPC understands the requirement that VELCO conduct least-cost integrated planning and seek non-transmission alternatives to reliability issues. However, CCRPC observes that the findings of the 2021 Vermont Long-Range Transmission Plan clearly indicate that it will be extremely difficult for the State of Vermont to achieve the goals of the State Comprehensive Energy Plan, and for municipalities and regional planning commissions to achieve the goals of our enhanced energy plans (24 V.S.A. 4352) through only non-transmission alternatives. Additional transmission infrastructure will be needed, particularly in northern Vermont, to ensure that each geographic region of the State is able to contribute to our future renewable energy goals.
 - b. CCRPC understands that VELCO operates within a federally regulated open wholesale market which prohibits VELCO, and/or the State of Vermont, from levying specific fees for transmission upgrades. This limitation will constrain possible locations for new

1 distributed generation facilities because it creates a system of reacting to grid
2 congestion instead of planning for sufficient transmission capacity. It puts financial
3 burden on the “last facility in,” and/or the ratepayers, in circumstances when
4 transmission upgrades are needed to accommodate additional distributed generation.
5 This is inequitable and will stifle long-term renewable energy goals due to inadequate
6 financial planning for transmission system upgrades. CCRPC recommends that VELCO
7 establish a “next steps” section of the Long-range Transmission Plan to include work
8 with all necessary partners to identify and plan for transmission upgrades to ensure the
9 state meets the future energy goals, and identification of best locations for storage near
10 distributed generation. Further, CCRPC supports any future effort by VELCO, and other
11 transmission utilities in New England, to work with Vermont Public Utility Commission
12 (PUC), ISO-NE and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) on the issue of
13 levying fees, or other equitable and proactive methods, to pay for planned transmission
14 system upgrades.

- 15 3. CCRPC also recommends a summary of the findings, and an action agenda with specific next
16 steps and identification of responsible entities, for a clearer and more concise message to all
17 stakeholders. This could be useful if transmission upgrade funding opportunities become
18 available from any available or future State or federal funding.

19
20 Garret said he appreciates all the work that was put into crafting the letter. Although the points
21 raised were brought up, he worries the message is not strong enough. He feels there is not enough
22 future planning and still many goals that need to be met. Regina agreed, but explained VELCO is not
23 necessarily the responsible party. Garret and members asked who is responsible, if VELCO is not?
24 Regina explained there are various entities; that some of the responsibility falls within the Public
25 Utilities Commission and rulemaking, and there may be some statues that need to be revised or
26 changed. Jeff said VELCO (and other entities like GMP and VEC) follow the State of Vermont’s 5-year
27 energy plan, which is currently being updated. He feels this is a very important consideration since
28 the timing of the State Energy Plan update allows an opportunity for integration between these
29 parties. Sharon said this is tied to ISO New England as well, so it goes beyond VT.

30
31 Bard asked about the letter content. He thinks we could frame the letter in a way that does not
32 necessarily place blame, but still makes a strong case that energy planning is not being adequately
33 addressed by VELCO and others. Charlie said the comprehensive energy plan is in process currently.
34 Regina advised members we are hosting the Central Vermont Energy Planning Forum on June 28,
35 2021, from 6PM to 9PM to provide feedback on the State Comprehensive Energy Plan process.

36
37 Garret asked if the letter will be modified or sent in as it is? Regina explained we can make the point
38 a bit stronger, but she is not sure how to work Jeff’s concerns in. Jeff said maybe we can add an
39 additional comment to remind VELCO there needs to be a broader view and to be willing to consider
40 acting as a conduit.

41
42 Bard said the hydropower generation to our north that we rely on has impacts on the first native
43 people.

44
45 GARRET MOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JIM DONOVAN, THAT THE BOARD SUBMIT THE
46 COMMENT LETTER TO VELCO WITH MODIFICATIONS AS DISCUSSED. MOTION CARRIED
47 UNANIMOUSLY.

48

1 10. Chair/Executive Director Report

2 Mike and Charlie reminded members this was Jim Donovan's last Board meeting. Mike thanked Jim
3 for his years of service and commitment to our communities. Jim explained he decided not to seek
4 reappointment and wanted to thank all Commission members for making our communities the best
5 they can be. He also added that the CCRPC staff is a group of the most talented individuals around.
6 He thanked the Town of Charlotte and mentioned the importance of the late Marty Illick' work. Jim
7 said Dana Haney will be the new Charlotte commissioner and Deirdre Holmes (who was present at
8 the meeting) was the new Alternate. Mike welcomed Deidre and asked her to introduce herself.
9 Deirdre said she has lived in Charlotte for the past 15 years and has served on the town's energy
10 committee. She is very excited to be involved at the regional level. Charlie thanked Mike, welcomed
11 Deirdre, and thanked Jim for all of his contributions.

12
13 a) I-89 Study Update.

14 Charlie said we have entered a contract with RSG to provide a strategic modeling analysis. This
15 will help dive down deeper and explore various ways to reduce traffic demand. More
16 information to come this fall.

17
18 b) Equity Leadership Team.

19 Charlie told members they will soon receive an e-mail with a request to sign up and participate
20 in one of two racial equity interview sessions. The sessions will be led by Dr. Nadia Mitchell from
21 Creative Discourse.

22
23 c) CEDS Update

24 Charlie said the CCRPC is working with three other RPC's (Addison, Rutland, and Central VT) on a
25 combined Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) called the West Central
26 Vermont CEDS. This will help update the 2023 ECOS Plan and open up the possibility of
27 becoming an Economic Development District which could potentially provide more consistent
28 EDA funding to the region.

29
30 d) Comprehensive Energy Plan Update

31 Charlie referred members to the flyer announcement included in the packet. As Regina
32 previously mentioned, the Central Vermont Energy Planning Forum will be held on June 28,
33 from 6-9pm.

34
35 e) Legislative Update. Charlie explained the impacts of the Legislative session were mostly financial
36 and there are expectations for additional work to help comply with all of the demands. \$75,000
37 was approved in additional regional planning grant funds for each RPC, to be spent over a period
38 of the next three years. There is \$12,000 to \$13,000 in funding to be used to assist
39 municipalities with the ARPA Funding. There was \$1 million in the budget for RPCs to support
40 towns in implementing their energy plans. One year is firmly committed, with intent to extend
41 after that as well. CCRPC's share of this energy plan implementation funding is about \$120,000
42 for FY22. This will equate to a full-time staff person supporting energy committees around
43 Chittenden County. A job posting will come out soon. There was also \$1 million in Brownfield
44 assessment funding passed for RPCs of which we should receive about \$100,000.

45
46 Charlie said there are also statewide investments in broadband and energy. Regina explained
47 we are reaching out to the State to look at our broadband options in Chittenden County. There
48 are approximately 2,000 households that are underserved. We will likely call a meeting together

1 to talk through the options for serving these pockets of underserved households. From these
2 conversations CCRPC hopes to have a better handle on what specifically we can do to help.
3 Charlie mentioned that the state has decided to issue their broadband funds to small internet
4 providers and Communications Union Districts. We do not have a Communications Union
5 District, but our surrounding regions do. We may need to develop one here if partnering with
6 others won't work.

7
8 Charlie said, from an overall staff management standpoint, it places additional stress on staff.
9 However, we will keep in good spirits and humor. The next two years will be very busy as there
10 is a lot going on. Charlie said this is not a complaint, simply an awareness that we are very busy.
11 He reminded everyone that CCRPC staff work on year to year contracts, and everyone is aware
12 that funding can change. Jeff recommended we make sure we are fair and not hire someone for
13 only a short term. Charlie agreed. He said this is a challenge and we may look to hiring
14 someone on as a consultant.

15
16 11. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports. Mike noted that minutes for our committees were included
17 as links as well as documents within the packet (Executive/Finance Committee, TAC, PAC, MS4 Sub-
18 Committee and CWAC).

19
20 12. Future Agenda Topics. Charlie reminded members in July we will have a vote on the TIP . Also, we
21 typically look at the committee assignments to see who wants to join various committees. These
22 assignments are typically finalized in September. We may look more into CEDS and teleworking
23 trends. He reminded everyone there is no meeting scheduled in August. We will hold an annual, in-
24 person celebratory meeting in September at Hula. Garret said he is concerned about people
25 attending whether they are vaccinated or not. He asked if the commission would consider requiring
26 masks for those who are not vaccinated. Charlie said our current in-office policy does require
27 unvaccinated individuals to wear masks, but we can certainly talk more about this as the date
28 approaches. Barbara asked if there will be an opportunity to hold this as a hybrid of remote and in-
29 person? Charlie said yes, the remote option will be available for the business portion of the meeting.

30
31 13. Members' Items, Other business. Mike thanked the CCRPC staff and members of the commission.
32 He said he has greatly appreciated his time as Chair, and he knows Catherine will do a great job as
33 the new Chair.

34
35 14. Adjournment. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CATHERINE MCMAINS, TO ADJOURN THE
36 BOARD MEETING AT 7:19 PM. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

37
38 Respectfully submitted,
39 Amy Irvin Witham
40