

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

5 DATE: Wednesday June 2, 2021
6 TIME: 5:45 PM
7 PLACE: Remote Attendance via ZOOM Meeting John Zicconi, Treasurer
8 PRESENT: Mike O'Brien, Chair Catherine McMains, Vice Chair
9 Bard Hill, at large <5000 Andy Montroll, Immediate Past Chair
10 Chris Shaw, at large >5000 (6:05 PM)
11 STAFF: Charlie Baker, Executive Director Regina Mahony, Planning Mgr.
12 Eleni Churchill, Transportation Program Mgr. Forest Cohen, Senior Business Mgr.
13 Amy Irvin Witham, Business Office Mgr.
14

15 1. Call to Order, Attendance. The meeting was called to order at 5:45 PM by the Chair, Mike O'Brien.
16

17 2. Changes to the Agenda, Members' Items. There were none.
18

19 3. Approval of the May 5, 2021, Joint Executive & Finance Committee Meeting Minutes
20 CATHERINE MCMAINS MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JOHN ZICCONI, TO APPROVE THE MAY 5,
21 2021, JOINT EXECUTIVE & FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES, AS PRESENTED. MOTION
22 CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
23

24 4. Act 250 & Section 248 Applications

25 a. Town of Hinesburg, Application #4C1336 – ratification.

26 Regina reminded members they previously received the draft form of this letter for review in
27 an e-mail on May 13, 2021. This is phase one of a two phase project to make necessary
28 upgrades to the wastewater treatment plant in Hinesburg. The project is located at 290
29 Lagoon Road and serves the village of Hinesburg. The CCRPC has reviewed the Act 250 Letter
30 and found the project is in conformance with the Planning Areas of the 2018 Chittenden
31 County ECOS Plan, as it is located within both the Rural Planning Area and the Hinesburg Village
32 Planning area (as defined in the 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan). Wastewater treatment
33 plan upgrades to meet the requirements of the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for
34 phosphorus in Lake Champlain, including the currently proposed upgrade in Hinesburg, are
35 specifically identified in the ECOS plan to meet this water quality related strategy. The
36 comments are based on the information currently available, the CCRPC may have additional
37 comments as the project moves forward.
38

39 JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BARD HILL, TO APPROVE THE LETTER TO RACHEL
40 LOMONACO DISTRICT #4 COORDINATOR, AS PRESENTED. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
41

42 5. Review DRAFT FY22-25 TIP

43 Eleni referred members to the Draft FY22-25 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) document
44 and corresponding Memo included with the packet. Eleni provided an overview for members and
45 said she would answer any questions they had. She explained the staff recommendation is that the
46 Executive Committee ask the Board to warn a public hearing at their June meeting and to approve
47 the TIP at the July Board meeting. Eleni also wanted to share a notable item that Christine shared
48 with the TAC; Christine said the TIP is projected to have significantly higher funds in the next two

1 years as compared with previous TIPs as some largescale projects come together in the county. She
2 also said the TIP is meant to be a planning document not the actual capital program, and
3 construction schedules shift as projects progress.
4

5 JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BARD HILL, TO RECOMMEND THE BOARD WARN
6 FOR PUBLIC HEARING AND APPROVE THE FY22-25 TIP AT THE JULY BOARD MEETING. MOTION
7 CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
8

9 6. VPSP2 Draft Scoring and Ranking

10 Eleni referred members to the following VPSP2 documents included with the packet; VPSP2 Memo,
11 VPSP2 Transportation Values chart, VPSP2 Project Input Data chart and the Racial Equity Report:
12 Equity Review of Regionally Driven Capital Projects. Eleni reminded members we have discussed the
13 VPSP2 project selection and prioritization process at previous meetings. Eleni said we received the
14 VTrans transportation values for all projects and Christine Forde added the regional scores in the
15 appropriate categories, so we now have the total project scores. The CCRPC also started developing
16 a methodology to address equity.
17

18 The memo outlines the process and explains Transportation equity is not currently a VPSP2
19 criterion, but it is necessary to ensure public funds are allocated to projects that minimize burdens
20 and maximize benefits to traditionally underserved populations. CCRPC has created a pilot
21 transportation equity screening process to incorporate equity into the VPSP2 process. The
22 transportation equity screening process considered a variety of factors including race, linguistic
23 isolation, and income below the poverty level, to identify project areas with higher numbers of
24 underserved populations. The process also considered the extent to which the type of infrastructure
25 improvements might either positively (e.g., improving safety, walkability) or negatively (e.g., new
26 facility construction, road widening) impact adjacent populations.
27

28 Eleni reviewed the 2021-VTrans VPSP2 – Preliminary Transportation Values for CCRPC Projects chart
29 with members and provided an overview of the following sections:

- 30 • The Asset Driven Potential Paving Projects and Slab Removal Projects section included the
31 following projects, in order, based on the Transportation Value and corresponding ranking:
 - 32 ○ St. George – Williston, Rt 2A Paving
 - 33 ○ Colchester- Essex, Rt 15 Paving
 - 34 ○ Colchester – Milton, US 7 Paving
 - 35 ○ Colchester – Milton - Georgia, US 7 Slab Removal
 - 36 ○ Hinesburg – South Burlington, VT 116 Paving
 - 37 ○ Williston, US 2 Slab Removal
 - 38 ○ Essex – Fairfax, VT 128 Paving
- 39 • The Potential Roadway and Traffic & Safety Projects: Asset Driven and Regionally Driven
40 section included the following projects, in this order:
 - 41 ○ Shelburne, US7/Harbor Road
 - 42 ○ South Burlington, US2 intersection and Roadway improvements, Dorset to VT 116
 - 43 ○ Winooski, East Allen Street improvements
 - 44 ○ Essex Jct., Train Station Access, and Circulation improvements
 - 45 ○ Burlington, Main Street/Battery to Union multi-modal streetscape improvements
 - 46 ○ Burlington, Colchester Ave/Riverside Ave intersection improvements
 - 47 ○ Colchester, Bayside Roundabout
 - 48 ○ Burlington, Colchester Ave/Prospect St intersection improvements

- 1 ○ Williston, Exit 12 Stage 3 Diverging Diamond interchange/CIRC Alt Phase III
- 2 ○ St. George, VT 2A/VT 116
- 3 ○ Jericho, VT117/Skunk Hollow Road
- 4 ○ Milton, US 7/Racine/Legion/Bartlett/West Milton Rd improvements
- 5 ○ Williston, Mtn View Road multi modal improvements
- 6 ○ South Burlington, VT 116/Cheesefactory Road
- 7 ○ Williston, Exit 12 Stage 2/new Grid Streets and VT 2A intersection, CIRC Alt Phase III
- 8 ○ Essex, North Williston Road Hazard Mitigation, CIRC Alt Phase III

9
10 Eleni explained this information was presented at the June 1, 2021, Transportation Advisory
11 Committee meeting (TAC). The TAC voted to accept the transportation values and corresponding
12 rankings of all projects as presented and recommended the transportation values and rankings be
13 presented to the Executive Committee and Board for acceptance. Eleni said the TAC voted only on
14 the transportation values as presented in the *2021 VTrans VPSP2 – Preliminary Transportation Value*
15 *for CCRPC Projects* table and did not vote on the equity screening.

16
17 In addition, the TAC provided comments on the transportation values of the projects and a possible
18 equity screening/methodology for VTrans' consideration. Eleni explained that the next step is for the
19 CCRPC and all other RPCs to submit their transportation project values to VTrans for a statewide
20 ranking and selection of projects that will be included in the VTrans proposed FY23-27 Capital
21 Program (CP) once all current CP obligations are met. Some of the regional projects we proposed
22 will end up being in the Capital Program for year 4 and later. We will receive the list from VTrans in
23 September as to how they propose to program our recommended projects.

24
25 Bard asked if there was a change in the categories and if the slab removal was a new category? Eleni
26 stated that there were always projects under this category, but they might have been under the
27 Paving instead of the Roadway program. She said that even though these projects are under the
28 Roadway program they are not considered "full-depth reconstruction" projects. CCRPC staff
29 grouped the paving and the slab removal together in the table because it makes sense. Bard asked if
30 the Asset Driven and Slab Removal Projects category were always under the same title? Eleni
31 explained, yes, the slab removal projects are under the asset driven category, but they were
32 combined in the table with the paving projects. Bard questioned this. He feels the characterization
33 may need to be changed, and not called Slab Removal, perhaps it should be in another category.
34 Member discussion ensued regarding the categorization and rankings. Eleni explained, there is a
35 nuance in terms of what can be included in what type of project, slab removal is somewhere in
36 between paving and roadway. Bard explained the most pressing issue for Richmond is that VTrans is
37 not replacing culverts with the US-2 slab removal project next year. Eleni said slab removal projects
38 have some limitations (compared to reconstruction projects); they try to avoid permitting for
39 stormwater infrastructure as well as other permits and they generally stay within the state ROW
40 similar to paving projects. Eleni said we will be sure to incorporate Bard's concerns and comments.
41 Mike reminded everyone the prioritization that we assign will end up being reassessed by VTrans,
42 and a project we set as a top priority could be moved far down the list.

43
44 John asked, with the equity scores that we currently have, is there a way to show what a system
45 would do, or are these more of an example? Eleni said the TAC questioned what their role was in
46 terms of the equity piece. The TAC voted purely on the transportation value and ranking. Since they
47 are a technical committee and not fully comfortable addressing the equity component, they decided
48 to leave any equity policy decisions to the Executive Committee and the Board. Eleni reminded

1 everyone this is the pilot program, serving as the starting point. Charlie agreed and for context
2 reminded everyone that equity is not currently incorporated into the VPSP2 scoring criteria, and as
3 presented with just the word “equity” it created confusion as to what is meant by equity. We should
4 get clearer that we mean racial equity. He said TAC members, in general, discussed equity in a
5 broader sense (socioeconomic, age, ability, etc.). When we presented this information to the TAC,
6 they decided they would focus on the technical aspects and leave the policy decisions (racial equity)
7 to the Executive Committee and Board. John asked if this is meant to serve only as an illustration?
8 Charlie explained there are different directions that the board could choose to follow as far as how
9 to address racial equity. We decided to take a quick, first pass at addressing racial equity because
10 VTrans and the Legislature are looking for recommendations as they approach the FY23 Capital
11 Program. In terms of the CCRPC serving our municipalities, it is imperative that we address racial
12 equity as a policy matter. We are trying to determine where this fits into the ranking and scoring in
13 terms of points. The Preliminary Transportation and Ranking Including Equity table provides some
14 possible scenarios that could be followed. The assigned points range from 0 to 20 and we worked on
15 this with Mark Hughes, from the Vermont Racial Equity Association. The Legislature is asking VTrans
16 to incorporate racial equity into the VPSP2 process and CCRPC will partner with VTrans and other
17 RPCs to hire a consultant to help us do that. Charlie explained, from the discussions he has had with
18 VTrans staff, Kevin Marshia and Michele Boomhower, they are open to comments or suggestions we
19 might have to get this conversation further down the road. We took a first look at adding a racial
20 equity evaluation to projects for their consideration.

21
22 John said he understands this is only the starting point, but if VTrans is already looking at working
23 racial equity into the process, are we going to throw the system out of alignment. Member
24 discussion ensued regarding confusion between our scores/ratings and the scores/ratings outlined
25 in the Racial Equity Association Report; Equity Review of Regionally Driven Capital Projects, as
26 prepared by Mark Hughes. Eleni and Charlie explained we are working on sending VTrans the
27 transportation values and providing comments on racial equity for VTrans consideration. John asked
28 what is the next step, in terms of what exactly we are taking to the Commission? Charlie explained,
29 we are providing the background work from CCRPC Staff and Mark Hughes in order that VTrans can
30 have information on how best to incorporate Racial Equity into the VPSP2 process. We are
31 acknowledging this is an important criterion and we need to start someplace. Eleni agreed, and
32 explained we are trying to develop a system and we are at the very beginning stages; we will need
33 to go much further and deeper with this to make it more objective. She agreed with members that
34 there needs to be a clear criterion for racial equity in the VPSP2 process. Members felt there should
35 be an overview presentation and a clear direction in what the Board is voting on in the June
36 meeting. Eleni and Charlie clarified with members the Board should be asked to vote on the
37 Transportation Project Values/Ranking with comments to VTrans on VPSP2 scoring process and
38 racial equity. CCRPC preliminary equity methodology will be forwarded to VTrans for consideration
39 as they develop the statewide equity process. John felt it was important to extend thanks to CCRPC
40 staff for their hard work and many contributions to this effort. Members agreed. Eleni will pass this
41 message along to Bryan and Christine.

42 43 7. Calendar of Meeting Dates

44 Charlie asked members to review the proposed FY22 schedule of meetings for the Commission and
45 Committees between July 2021 through June 2022. Members reviewed. John asked what the
46 September Celebration means. Charlie and Mike explained, like previous annual meetings we held
47 in June, this will be more of a social meeting than a business meeting. Members suggested that we

1 discuss this at the board meeting to determine people's comfort level with meeting in person in
2 September.

3
4 JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CATHERINE MCMAINS, TO RECOMMEND THE
5 MEETING SCHEDULE, AS PRESENTED, TO THE BOARD. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
6

7 8. Review VELCO Long Range Transmission Plan Comment Letter

8 Regina reminded members of the recent VELCO presentation given at the May Board meeting. She
9 explained the presentation highlighted multiple challenges associated with the State's renewable
10 energy goals. Regina referred members to the VELCO letter included with the packet and said this
11 letter would be presented to the board. Regional Planning Committees are working with the
12 Department of Public Service and assessing the criteria for energy determinations, for instance;
13 Does the criteria make sense? Are there items that need to be updated? Regina explained we will
14 work together because we need to figure out solutions. The staff offered the following draft
15 comments on the VELCO draft plan:

- 16 • CCRPC supports the plan's recommendation to focus on increased electric efficiency and
17 non-transmission alternatives to avoid negative impacts on electric transmission reliability in
18 the short-term.
- 19 • CCRPC understands the requirement that VELCO and the Vermont Systems Planning
20 Committee (VSPC) conduct least-cost integrated planning and seek non-transmission
21 alternatives to reliability issues (30 V.S.A. 218c and PUC Docket 7081). However, CCRPC
22 observes that the findings of the 2021 Vermont Long-Range Transmission Plan clearly
23 indicate that it will be extremely difficult for municipalities, regional planning commissions,
24 and the State of Vermont to achieve the goals of our enhanced energy plans (24 V.S.A.
25 4352) and the State Comprehensive Energy Plan through only non-transmission alternatives.
26 Additional transmission infrastructure will be needed, particularly in northern Vermont, to
27 ensure that each geographic region of the State is able to contribute to our future
28 renewable energy goals. Therefore, CCRPC recommends that VELCO establish a "next steps"
29 section of this plan to include work with all necessary partners to identify and plan for
30 transmission upgrades to ensure the state meets the future energy goals, and identification
31 of best locations for storage near distributed generation.
- 32 • CCRPC also recommends a summary of the findings and an action agenda with specific next
33 steps and identification of responsible entities for a clearer and more concise message to all
34 stakeholders.
35

36 John thanked Regina and staff. He voiced concerns with VELCO's long term strategy for dealing with
37 power distribution, specifically in areas where development calls for power upgrades. He feels the
38 current practice places an enormous financial responsibility upon a single developer, which will
39 (potentially) restrict economic development opportunities. John said he recently discussed this
40 issue with Taylor Newton. Taylor said it has been discussed at various State meetings, and that the
41 Vermont Public Service Department is also concerned. The Vermont Public Utility Commission is also
42 investigating imposing a possible impact fee in northern Vermont where power transmission is
43 already close to capacity. John would like this worked into the letter. Regina agreed and said this can
44 fit under comment number two. Catherine agreed. She feels VELCO needs a proactive approach,
45 that upgrades and planning need to be addressed now to meet the needs of the future. Bard said
46 he feels the plan is reactive rather than proactive, and lack of integration is an issue. Regina thanked
47 members for their comments and committed to updating the draft comment letter for
48 consideration by the board.

1
2 9. Equity Leadership Team Update Charlie said the team recently held their second meeting. He
3 explained we want to ensure we are sharing the information from the meetings with our board and
4 committee members. Mike asked if we have shared the reading materials yet? Charlie said no, in
5 addition to sharing with Board members, we also need to share the information with the TAC, PAC,
6 and various committees. Charlie said there will be information sent out over the next few weeks and
7 then after any subsequent meetings. Charlie said Creative Discourse is going to ask Board Members
8 to participate in an equity screening interview. Mike said we need to make sure everyone is aware
9 this is happening. Amy will e-mail board members once dates are determined. Everyone will be
10 given a choice between two dates for the equity screening interview.

11
12 10. Chair/Executive Director Report

13 a. I-89 2050 Study Update

14 Charlie stated there has only been one I-89 Study meeting since the last Executive Committee
15 meeting with the Central Vermont RPCTAC. We did meet with RSG to explore ways to reduce
16 traffic demands and we are going to hire them to provide strategic modeling analysis on how to
17 reduce traffic demand. Eleni said this will be a great tool for us that we can use in the I-89
18 Study but also during the next MTP update. More information on this will be shared in the fall.

19 b. Legislative Update

20 Charlie explained much of the policy work did not reach fruition. The Rental Registry Bill did not
21 move forward, nor did the Bylaw Modernization Bill. Specific to RPC funding, \$75,000 was
22 approved in additional planning grant funds for each RPC. This money can be spent over a
23 period of one to three years. There is also \$12,000 to \$13,000 in funding to be used to assist
24 municipalities with the ARPA Funding for each of the next couple of years. There was \$1
25 million in brownfield assessment funding passed for RPCs of which we should receive about
26 \$100,000. There was also a last-minute addition of \$1 Million Dollars to be used by RPCs to
27 support towns in implementing their energy plans. We believe that there is an intent for this
28 funding to be more than a one-year commitment. We are likely to receive between \$80,000
29 and \$120,000 in FY22. This will equate to a full-time staff person supporting energy
30 committees around Chittenden County. Regina said our municipalities' energy committees do
31 not typically have any dedicated staff. Catherine agreed, she said Jericho has no staff at all for
32 the energy committee, and funds are very helpful to help educate community members and
33 promote energy initiatives. We are looking into how best to staff these initiatives. Charlie
34 mentioned that Sandy Thibault, the Executive Director for CATMA, is still interested in office
35 sharing. Our staffing needs will be evaluated to see if that idea will make sense.

36

37 11. Draft CCRPC Board Meeting Agenda.

38 Charlie reviewed the June Board agenda with members. Mike suggested we add an Equity
39 Leadership update regarding interviews the Board members will be asked to participate in. Bard said
40 he would like to discuss staff working from home and ways the CCRPC can hold hybrid versions of
41 meetings to accommodate both in-person and video conference meetings. Member discussion
42 ensued. Regina said CATMA is currently doing research on telework trends.

43

44 12. Other Business: There was none.

45

46 13. Executive Session: CHRIS SHAW MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JOHN ZICCONI, TO MOVE INTO AN
47 EXECUTIVE SESSION TO DISCUSS PERSONNEL MATTERS WITH THE FOLLOWING MEMBERS IN

1 ATTENDANCE: MIKE O'BRIEN, CATHERINE MCMAINS, JOHN ZICCONI, CHRIS SHAW, BARD HILL, and
2 staff, CHARLIE BAKER, BEGINNING AT 7:18 PM. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

3

4 CHRIS SHAW MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BARD HILL, TO EXIT THE EXECUTIVE SESSION AT 7:43
5 PM. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

6

7 CHRIS SHAW MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BARD HILL, THAT THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
8 RECOGNIZE EMPLOYEE ACHIEVEMENT AND AUTHORIZE THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO SPEND UP TO
9 100% OF THE FY22 SALARY BUDGET, AS DETERMINED BY THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, FOR STAFF AND
10 AS DETERMINED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR. ALL IN
11 ATTENDANCE IN FAVOR.

12

13 14. Adjournment: BARD HILL MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CHRIS SHAW, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING
14 AT 7:44 PM. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

15

16 Respectfully submitted,

17 Amy Irvin Witham

DRAFT