

1 CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
2 JOINT EXECUTIVE & FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES  
3 FINAL  
4

5 DATE: Wednesday May 5, 2021  
6 TIME: 5:45 PM  
7 PLACE: Remote Attendance via ZOOM Meeting  
8 PRESENT: Mike O'Brien, Chair Catherine McMains, Vice Chair  
9 Bard Hill, At Large <5000 Jeff Carr, Finance  
10 Andy Montroll, Immediate Past Chair Chris Shaw, At Large >5000 (6:05 PM)  
11  
12 STAFF: Charlie Baker, Executive Director Regina Mahony, Planning Mgr.  
13 Eleni Churchill, Transportation Program Mgr. Forest Cohen, Senior Business Mgr.  
14 Bryan Davis, Senior Planner Amy Irvin Witham, Business Office Mgr.  
15 Emma Vaughn, Communications Mgr.  
16  
17 ABSENT: John Zicconi, Treasurer  
18

- 19 1. Call to Order, Attendance. The meeting was called to order at 5:48 PM by the Chair, Mike O'Brien.  
20  
21 2. Changes to the Agenda, Members' Items. Mike stated there is one change to the agenda, item 12,  
22 there is no Executive Session this evening.  
23

24 Jeff Carr asked, since vaccination rates are increasing, will we continue holding remote meetings or  
25 are we considering a return to in-person meetings? Charlie stated he and Mike recently discussed  
26 this. We will continue to refer to the guidance, however, we may begin holding hybrid meetings in  
27 September. Mike suggested we add this topic to the June Executive Committee agenda. Charlie  
28 said we will also include the topic on the July Board agenda. Jeff and members agreed.  
29

- 30 3. Approval of the April 7, 2021 Joint Executive & Finance Committee Meeting Minutes  
31 ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JEFF CARR, TO APPROVE THE APRIL 7, 2021  
32 JOINT EXECUTIVE & FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES, WITH EDITS. MOTION CARRIED  
33 UNANIMOUSLY.

- 34 • Edit: Page 4, line 42, remove the second "e" from EV's.  
35 • Edit: Page 2, line 13, add the word 'increase' in front of the percentages.  
36 • Edit: Page 4, line 24, add the word 'zoning' in front of Bylaws.  
37 • Edit: Page 4, line 37, add the word 'appointments' after Equity Leadership Team.  
38

39 Per the Chair, Mike O'Brien, the meeting will move into the financial portion.  
40

- 41 4. Quarterly Financials  
42 Forest referred members to the quarterly financial documents distributed to members via e-mail,  
43 prior to the meeting.  
44

- 45 a. Journal Entries: July 2020 - March 2021  
46 JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CATHERINE MCMAINS, TO APPROVE THE  
47 QUARTERLY JOURNAL ENTRIES. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY  
48

- 1 b. Balance Sheet/Statement of Revenues and Expenses Forest reviewed the following items with  
2 members:

3  
4 Balance Sheet

- 5 • Cash in checking at \$80,515 (operating)
- 6 • Cash in money market at \$254,053 (reserve)
- 7 • Current assets over liabilities, \$661,361
- 8 • Deferred Income Communities – Match, \$109,470

9  
10 Statement of Revenues and Expenses

- 11 • FY21 Year to Date Surplus/Deficit (unaudited): \$8332
- 12 • Operations Revenue as a % of Budget at 75% of the Budget year: 72.1%
- 13 • Operations Expense as a % of Budget at 75% of the Budget year: 71.8%

14  
15 Jeff asked Forest if there was concern about having only \$80,515 in the checking account?  
16 Forest explained, although this amount is slightly lower than we like to see, it is not concerning  
17 based on the overall financial picture.

18  
19 Jeff asked what the outlook for the ACCD Grant is? Charlie explained we are going to receive  
20 approximately \$7000 less from the basic formula grant because Windham County has received  
21 larger amounts in property transfer tax, and our share went down. Also, the Agency of  
22 Commerce and Community Development shows us having a decline in population and that  
23 numbers factor into the formula. We are, however, slated to receive an additional \$75K in  
24 funds per the State Legislature, which more than makes up for the decrease in the formula  
25 grant.

- 26  
27 c. Cash Balances

28 Forest outlined the following to members:

- 29 • Revenue: We are in position to finish the fiscal year with a modest surplus of revenues  
30 over expenses. Typically, the last quarter of the fiscal year is our largest revenue  
31 generator. To reduce over-collection, we requested and received a lowered indirect  
32 rate reimbursement for January through June. We are hoping we can reduce a potential  
33 future penalty and reduce the amount of the 'swing' that changes in our indirect rate  
34 have on our budget. The reduction in reimbursement, combined with a reduced  
35 balance of excess dues to be distributed at the end of the year, (because we need funds  
36 to match relatively expensive regional projects), will likely contribute to a less dramatic  
37 increase in revenue generation during the last quarter.
- 38 • Expense: Expenses associated with in-person meetings and travel (Conferences,  
39 Program Workshops and Mileage) have tracked very low due changes in work patterns  
40 with the COVID pandemic. In contrast, the EV (Electric Vehicle) line is tracking higher  
41 because there is less usage expense offset occurring. Office cleaning costs also  
42 increased due to the established COVID protocols.
- 43 • Cash Flow: The cash flow picture is comparable to the overall financial situation. The  
44 cash flow is adequate for operations. We transferred \$80,000 from the operating  
45 account into the reserve account since the beginning of the fiscal year. Along with  
46 December, March is often another low point for cash, and this is true again. However,

1 we rebounded nicely through April and into May. The balances are within an acceptable  
2 range and are projected to remain this way.  
3

4 5. DRAFT FY2022 UPWP and Budget Recommendation

5 Charlie referred members to the Draft FY22 UPWP and Budget document included with the packet.  
6 He said a new task was added that the UPWP committee did not have a chance to review on line  
7 159, task number 8.1.3, Transportation Equity Framework. Charlie said there are \$50,000 in PL  
8 funds budgeted for this, and he is working with Michele Boomhower from VTrans. The work  
9 includes an analysis of how equity is addressed in the State's existing transportation project  
10 decision-making process and to make recommendations to the legislature by January 15, 2022.  
11 Charlie recommends this, in addition to what the TAC and UPWP committee are recommending.  
12

13 Charlie explained the yellow shading denotes pending projects and many of these are shaded yellow  
14 simply because we do not yet know the actual budgeted amounts. For instance, the Clean Water  
15 Service Provider work will begin soon, but we do not know the actual budget amount.  
16

17 Charlie said the overall budget ends showing a negative \$35,000, however, we have stopped the  
18 \$100K swings that were occurring due to indirect rate changes. We are trying to be conservative in  
19 the budgeting and hope to get closer to a balanced budget over the course of the year. Charlie does  
20 not feel this is necessarily bad, it is simply what is currently projected. The upcoming year will also  
21 bring funding changes related to the American Rescue Plan Act and, potentially, an Infrastructure  
22 bill.  
23

24 Chris Shaw asked about the budget line 45, DIBG (Design Implementation Block Grant). Charlie  
25 explained these are separate from the Clean Water Service Provider task in line 41 and it should  
26 perhaps be shaded yellow because he is unsure of the exact budget. Forest stated some of the  
27 DIBG's are currently under contract, so we do know some of these will go through.  
28

29 Jeff asked why there are so many pending projects as denoted by so many yellow lines? He said this  
30 number seems excessive. Charlie explained some of the yellow lines are set because staff wanted to  
31 highlight items they need to revisit. Regina and Eleni indicated there is not an excessive number of  
32 pending projects highlighted with yellow, but there is a greenish shade which denotes new  
33 transportation projects that looks very close to a yellow on the screen. Jeff agreed that he included  
34 the greenish shade with the yellow. Staff agreed to change the yellow and possibly green shading in  
35 the UPWP document.  
36

37 ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CHRIS SHAW, THAT THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
38 RECOMMEND THE DRAFT FY22 UPWP AND BUDGET TO THE BOARD FOR APPROVAL. MOTION  
39 CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.  
40

41 With the financial portion of the meeting being over, Jeff Carr excused himself at 6:23 PM.  
42

43 6. Act 250 & Section 248 Applications There were none, however, Regina said members will soon  
44 receive e-mail correspondence with an application pertaining to an upgrade to the wastewater  
45 treatment plant in Hinesburg. Although she is aware of this project, she has not seen any of the  
46 details yet.  
47

7. VPSP2-Equity Screening for Proposed Regional Projects

Charlie referred members to the VTrans Project Selection and Prioritization System, Transportation Equity Screen for Regionally Driven Projects memo included with the packet. He said we have been talking about the VPSP2 project selection and prioritization process at our last few meetings, and with this, we should also start to work on how to address equity in this process. Charlie explained we asked for assistance in this initial round of equity evaluation from Mark Hughes, of the Racial Justice Alliance, and also from the Transportation Equity Coalition assembled by Old Spokes Home. We were hoping that VTrans would provide their scoring by the May TAC and May Executive Committee meetings for members to review and then select the final list of projects to recommend to the CCRPC Board to send to VTrans for consideration in their capital program. However, there is more work to be done than anticipated so we expect to get the VTrans before the June meetings. Once we receive the Transportation Value scores from VTrans, CCRPC staff will apply the updated equity screen to the regionally driven projects, as directed by the TAC and Executive Committee, to present at the June meeting. Charlie reminded everyone this is a rough draft in the very early stages of development. He explained certain aspects of the draft could shift once we receive the scoring back from VTrans.

Charlie introduced Bryan Davis. Bryan addressed members and said Christine Forde has been an integral part of this process for the past two years. She is very familiar with the scoring and the assignment of points to certain processes. He explained what is missing is scoring /ranking/rating of how well the process addresses equity. We want to develop and employ a functional Equity Screening process, and we are seeking help from outside consultants to help set this up. We hope this will become the framework that VTrans, other RPC's, and our towns will find useful.

The first round of research focused on what other organizations are doing and reviewed project planning reports to develop understanding:

- Existing conditions such as traffic volumes, crash history, walk/bike facilities, transit service, destinations such as education, healthcare, civic centers, employment centers, natural areas, etc.,
- Recommended changes such as roadway redesign, intersection/signal changes, walk/bike facilities, streetscape changes, etc.

We utilized the ECOS Map viewer to understand some of the populations living in and near the project area. The data included:

- Race (currently categorized as % non-white; there is a need for disaggregated data)
- % of population linguistically isolated
- % of population with income below Federal poverty level
- Subsidized housing as well as type of housing (single, multifamily, group quarters, mobile home)
- Opportunity index, which includes data on poverty rate, school proficiency, homeownership rate, unemployment, and job access.

We considered our personal knowledge and experience of the project area, facilities, outreach during the scoping study, etc.

1 With this information, we applied an impacts-benefit based approach to assign a general equity  
2 “rating” as used by the NJ Transportation Planning Authority, and described in the [Transportation](#)  
3 [Equity Project Prioritization Criteria paper](#) by Augustina Krupp  
4

- 5 • Higher positive ranking: Address safety problems, results in reduced noise, air or pollutant  
6 impacts, mitigates community cohesion or other social impacts; mitigates cumulative  
7 impacts, or improves accessibility to employment, education, healthcare, and other  
8 essential services for Environmental Justice (EJ) communities.
- 9 • Medium positive ranking: Add/improve vehicle, bicycle, transit, or pedestrian connectivity  
10 within EJ communities.
- 11 • Lower ranking: Repair roadways or bridges, or streetscapes unless project would result in  
12 permanent negative impacts to traffic conditions in the neighborhood (e.g., by bringing in  
13 more vehicle traffic) or would involve significant right-of-way acquisition in EJ communities.  
14

15 Also, some projects would be considered “neutral” if they do not appear to have a positive or  
16 negative impact on EJ communities. We did not rate any projects as negative using this approach.  
17

18 Bryan reminded everyone this is simply a starting point. We are very open to feedback and would  
19 appreciate hearing members thoughts on various ways we can improve. Member discussion on the  
20 scoring ensued.  
21

22 Mike said he thinks this is a great idea, however, it seems we need to wait for VTrans to weigh in on  
23 it. Charlie, Eleni and Bryan said yes. Charlie said this is truly a first attempt and we are not sure how  
24 it will end up. Mike said in terms of the scores, rather than a number score, he prefers a High,  
25 Medium, Low, or Neutral ranking. Members discussed various ways to measure, score and rank.  
26 Bryan said some organizations have faced challenges in sorting out the weight of scores; but it is  
27 clear from the research that the scores need to be meaningful in order to have a real effect. Charlie  
28 stated that there are more discussions to be had, this is in the infancy stage of development and we  
29 will look for feedback from members. Mike thanked Bryan and Charlie.  
30

#### 31 8. Equity Leadership Team Update

32 Emma Vaughn provided a quick update on the recent Equity Leadership Team meeting. She said the  
33 purpose of the meeting was to get to know one another better. The team discussed shared  
34 experiences and roles. The next step in the work plan will be an equity assessment. The group will  
35 work on drafting a survey to distribute to area community leaders. The goal is to complete an  
36 assessment of how the CCRPC is doing with equity and to identify the areas of improvement. Mike  
37 thanked Emma and mentioned he felt discomfort in some parts of the meeting. Bryan said, yes; this  
38 is good because if it is uncomfortable, then we are doing it right.  
39

#### 40 9. Chair/Executive Director Report

41 Charlie said he wanted to provide an update on the I-89 Study, since there was a recent meeting  
42 held last Thursday in South Burlington. He said there were about 120 people in attendance and  
43 approximately 25 people spoke at the meeting. There were also about 70 questions submitted in  
44 the “Q&A”. There will likely be continued media attention on this. Much of the feedback was in  
45 relation to how well we are addressing the climate emergency and concerns with the potential  
46 interchange investments. Charlie explained that he and Eleni are looking for feedback from  
47 members because he wants to address the perception that the CCRPC is somehow against  
48 addressing climate change, however, we are completely committed to addressing climate change as

1 evidenced by our energy planning and want to reduce any negative effects transportation projects  
2 may have. Specifically, Charlie asked the Committee members if they have any reactions to him  
3 taking a stronger position to make it clear to the public that we will prioritizing all non-auto user  
4 improvements first, and as a last resort, investing in interstate interchange upgrades if needed.

5  
6 Charlie asked Chris Shaw if he had any thoughts after all the meetings in South Burlington. Chris  
7 said the feedback process can be overwhelming in this type of setting. Chris checked in with South  
8 Burlington City Councilors to confirm their desire is to keep both exits 12B and 13, in addition to exit  
9 14, as viable options. Those exits would help alleviate congestion at exit 14. He acknowledged the  
10 CCRPC is not tied to any specific outcome and that CCRPC would like to receive clear direction from  
11 the South Burlington community. The City Council needs more time to decide on their preferred  
12 direction based on additional input from the community.

13  
14 Mike stated traffic congestion is a key issue and, in the past, congestion has been tied to emissions.  
15 However, he feels moving toward more or exclusively electric vehicles does not really change the  
16 congestion problem. Charlie said these are long range questions; we'll need to focus more on what  
17 we can do to increase the use of other modes of transportation and decrease traffic. Member  
18 discussion ensued. Charlie stated, much of this analysis was done pre-pandemic, and there has  
19 been a reduction in traffic volumes during peak hours. Bard said he noticed there is less traffic. He  
20 also said there are different ways to approach the discussion and offered up an approach to fielding  
21 questions, instead of using the word 'but' replace it with "and" whenever answering questions.

#### 22 Legislative Update

23 Charlie explained the Rental Registry Bill is moving forward. This would take some responsibilities  
24 away from Town Health Officers and shift this work of a statewide inspection system to the Division  
25 of Fire Safety. The Project Based Tax Incremental Funding (TIF) bill will not move forward with that  
26 part of the bill, but will help in clarifying TIF requirements for the existing TIF districts. The Bylaw  
27 Modernization bill, to create an incentive for towns to update bylaws to create more affordable  
28 housing, is moving forward. There will be funding to help towns update their bylaws. The House  
29 Natural Resources Committee is taking up Act 250 Amendments and although conversations  
30 continue, it is unlikely to be acted on this year.

#### 31 32 33 10. Draft CCRPC Board Meeting Agenda.

34 Charlie reviewed the May Board agenda with members. The FY22-UPWP & Budget Public Hearing is  
35 an action item. If we receive the VPSP2 FY23 Transportation scoring from VTrans we will include  
36 this, however, we may wait until the June meeting for any formal action. If VTrans needs this in  
37 early June, we could ask the Executive Committee to make the recommendation. Since we have had  
38 many discussions about an electrified future, we will invite a representative from VELCO to attend  
39 the May Board meeting to share information about the electric grid and capacity.

#### 40 41 11. Other Business: We need to warn the Public Hearing on the TIP at our annual meeting in June. Also, 42 July will bring in new officers. Charlie said we can talk more about updating our COVID policies at 43 the June Executive Committee meeting.

#### 44 45 12. Executive Session: There was none.

#### 46 47 13. Adjournment: ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BARD HILL TO ADJOURN THE 48 MEETING AT 7:10 PM. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- 1
- 2 Respectfully submitted,
- 3 Amy Irvin Witham

FINAL