

# REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

Wednesday, November 17, 2021 – 6:00 p.m.  
Large Conference Room, CCRPC Offices  
110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT



## Or preferably by Remote Attendance:

Join Zoom Meeting: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84211849618>

One tap mobile: +16468769923,,84211849618#

Dial in: +1 646 876 9923 Meeting ID: 842 1184 9618

## CONSENT AGENDA –

C.1 Minor TIP Amendments – none

## DELIBERATIVE AGENDA

1. Call to Order; Attendance; Changes to the Agenda (Action; 1 minute)
2. Public Comment Period on Items NOT on the Agenda (Discussion; 5 minutes)
3. Action on Consent Agenda - none (MPO Action, if needed; 1 minute)
4. Approve Minutes of September 22, October 6, and October 20, 2021, Meetings\* (Action; 1 minute)
5. FY21 Audit\* (Action; 15 minutes)
6. Telework trends, Sandy Thibault, CATMA (Discussion; 20 minutes)
7. 2020 Census results and forecast for use in 2023 ECOS Plan\* (Action; 20 minutes)
8. Legislative Breakfast topics \* (Discussion; 20 minutes)
9. Chair/Executive Director Report (Discussion; 5 minutes)
  - a. Equity Summit follow-up and de-brief\*
  - b. UPWP application request to be sent by 11/19
10. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports (Information, 2 minutes)
  - a. [Executive & Finance Committee](#) ([draft minutes](#) November 3, 2021)\*
    - i. Act 250 Sec 248 letters
  - b. [Transportation Advisory Committee](#) ([draft minutes](#) November 2, 2021)\*
  - c. [Clean Water Advisory Committee](#) & ([draft minutes](#) November 2, 2021)\*
  - d. [Equity Leadership Team](#) ([notes](#) October 25, 2021) \*
  - e. [Hazard Mitigation Committee](#) (final minutes June 12, 2021, and draft minutes October 13, 2021) \*
11. Future Agenda Topics (Discussion; 5 minutes)
12. Members' Items, Other Business (Information, 5 minutes)
13. Adjourn

\* Attachment

The November 17, 2021, Chittenden County RPC streams LIVE on YouTube at:

[https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLIjLFn4BZd2O0l4hJU\\_nI9q0l3PdQR0Pp](https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLIjLFn4BZd2O0l4hJU_nI9q0l3PdQR0Pp).

The meeting will air Sunday, November 21, 2021 at 1 p.m. and is available on the web at:

<https://www.cctv.org/watch-tv/series/chittenden-county-regional-planning-commission>.

*In accordance with provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, the CCRPC will ensure public meeting sites are accessible to all people. Requests for free interpretive or translation services, assistive devices, or other requested accommodations, should be made to Emma Vaughn, CCRPC Title VI Coordinator, at 802-846-4490 ext. \*21 or [evaughn@ccrpcvt.org](mailto:evaughn@ccrpcvt.org), no later than 3 business days prior to the meeting for which services are requested.*

Upcoming Meetings - Unless otherwise noted, all meetings are held at our offices:

- Executive Committee – Wednesday, December 1, 2021, 5:45pm
- Legislative Breakfast - Tuesday, December 7, 2021, 8am
- Transportation Advisory Committee – Tuesday, December 7, 2021, 9am
- Clean Water Advisory Committee - Tuesday, December 7, 2021, 11am
- CWAC MS4 Subcommittee - Tuesday, December 7, 2021, ~12:30pm
- Planning Advisory Committee – December 8, 2021, 2:30pm
- Regional Emergency Management Committee – TBD
- Hazard Mitigation Committee - TBD
- Next CCRPC Board Meeting - Wednesday, January 19, 2022, 6:00pm

Tentative future Board agenda items:

December 7, 2021 from 8-9am Via Zoom	Legislative Breakfast
January 19, 2022	UPWP and Budget Mid-year Adjustment Initial Climate Action Plan comments? Comprehensive Energy Plan comments? All Hazard Mitigation Plan draft? I-89 2050 Study – TDM results? Equity recommendations? Transit Financing?
February 16, 2022	ECOS Annual Report Transportation Resiliency Project? Transportation Performance Measures - Safety Targets
March 16, 2022	All Hazard Mitigation Plan adoption?

CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
**DRAFT**

DATE: Wednesday, September 22, 2021  
TIME: 6:00 – 6:12 PM  
PLACE: CCRPC Offices; 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404  
and/or REMOTE ATTENDANCE via ZOOM MEETING VIDEO

PRESENT:	Bolton:	Absent	Buel's Gore:	Garret Mott
	Burlington:	Andy Montroll	Charlotte:	Dana Hanley
	Colchester:	Jacki Murphy	Essex:	Tracey Delphia (Alt.)
	Essex Junction:	Dan Kerin	Hinesburg:	Michael Bissonette
	Huntington:	Barbara Elliott	Jericho:	Catherine McMains
	Milton:	Tony Micklus	Richmond:	Bard Hill
	St. George:	Absent	Shelburne:	John Zicconi
	So. Burlington:	Chris Shaw	Underhill:	Brad Holden
	Underhill:	Kurt Johnson (Alt.)	Westford:	Absent
	Williston:	Andrew Watts	Winooski:	Abby Bleything (Alt.)
	Cons/Env.:	Absent	VTrans:	Absent
	Bus/Ind:	Absent	GMT:	Absent
	Agriculture:	Absent	Socio/Econ/Housing:	Absent

Others: None

Staff: Charlie Baker, Executive Director Regina Mahony, Planning Mgr.  
Amy Irvin Witham, Business Office Mgr.

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

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 PM by the Chair, Catherine McMains.

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

3. Action on Consent Agenda, MPO Business.

The consent agenda included the following requested FY20-2023 TIP Amendments, as outlined in the Memo:

- **Champlain Parkway, Burlington (Project HC001A, Amendment FY21-58)**

**Description of TIP Change:**

Transfer \$1,000,000 from construction to preliminary engineering in FY21.

- Move \$5,227,121 in Federal funds for construction from FY21 to FY22. \$100,000 remains for construction in FY21.
- Add \$5,227,121 for construction in FY22. The FY20 TIP has \$4,162,460 for construction in FY22. The new total is \$9,389,581.
- Add \$10,000,000 for construction in FY23.
- Add balance of construction funds in FY24 - \$9,960,419.

**Reason for Change:** The current estimated advertising date for this project is late September so there will be minimal expenditures in FY21. Construction is expected to take

place in FY22, FY23 and FY24. This change does not result in an increase in the construction cost but just changes the funding schedule. The funding changes will be accommodated outside of CCRPC's fiscal constraint limit.

Add the following 2021 VTrans Bicycle and Pedestrian Program grant awards to the TIP. Note that both the current TIP and the FY2022-2025 TIP will be updated.

- **VT15/Underhill Flats Sidewalk, Underhill (Project BP077, Amendment FY21-62)**

**Description of TIP Change:** Add \$76,000 in additional federal funds to construct a sidewalk along VT15 from Park Street to Dumas Street in Underhill. This project previously received a 2013 Bicycle and Pedestrian Program award of \$347,022.

- **Intervale Road Shared Use Path, Burlington (Project BP115, Amendment FY22-01)**

**Description of TIP Change:** Add \$207,490 in federal funds for design in FY22. Burlington was awarded a 2021 VTrans Bicycle and Pedestrian Program grant (\$1,162,000 in federal funds) to construct a curb-separate, ten-foot-wide shared use path along Intervale Road from Riverside Avenue to the Intervale Center.

- **Riverside Village Sidewalk, Jericho (Project BP116, Amendment FY22-02)**

**Description of TIP Change:** Add \$112,000 in federal funds for design in FY22. Jericho was awarded a 2021 VTrans Bicycle and Pedestrian Program grant (\$600,000) to construct a sidewalk on the east side of VT15 between the Jericho Market and Park Street.

Make the following rail project changes to the FY2021 and FY2022 years of the TIP. Note that both the current TIP and the FY2022-2025 TIP will be updated.

- **Burlington Train Station Platform (Project RR007, Amendment FY22-03).** Reduce federal funds (TIGER VII) in FY21 by \$480,000 to a new total of \$400,000 and add \$294,200 in federal TIGER VII funds in FY22.
- **Vermont Railway Switch Replacement, Burlington (Project RR013, Amendment FY22-04).** Revise the comment section to read "2 switches", instead of 3. Add the latest cost estimate -- \$2,417,813 of which 53.94% is Federal TIGER VII funds. Remove \$1,874,500 in federal TIGER VII funds from FY21 and add \$2,469,055 in federal TIGER VII funds in FY22.
- **Amtrak Siding, Burlington (Project RR014, Amendment FY22-05).** Change VTrans project number to VTRY(51). The latest cost estimate is \$4,577,411. This project is funded with 100% state funds, so no funds are shown in the TIP. Construction will take place in FY22.
- **Intervale Road Rail Crossing Improvements, Burlington (Project RR015, Amendment FY22-06).** This project is included in the FY2022 TIP, which has not yet been approved by FHWA so this amendment adds this project to the current TIP. Add \$135,000 in federal Section 130 Rail Grade Crossing funds for preliminary engineering in FY22 and \$405,000 in Section 130 funds for construction in FY22.
- **Mallets Bay Rail Crossing Improvements, Winooski (Project RR011, Amendment FY22-07).** Reduce federal Section 130 Rail Grade Crossing funds in FY21 from \$315,000 (CON) to \$31,500 (PE) and add \$380,880 in Section 130 Rail Grade Crossing funds for construction in FY22

Please note: Due to a scheduling need of VTrans and FHWA, the Executive Committee approved the aforementioned TIP Amendments on behalf of the Board on September 15, 2021. Tonight's meeting is a request for the Board to review and ratify the decision of the Executive Committee to approve the proposed TIP amendments.

JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BARBARA ELLIOTT, TO RATIFY THE DECISION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY MPO MEMBERS

4. Approve Minutes of the July 21, 2021, Board Meeting.

BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JACKI MURPHY, TO APPROVE THE JULY 21, 2021, BOARD MEETING MINUTES, WITH EDITS. MOTION CARRIED WITH ONE ABSTENTION BY GARRET MOTT.

- Edit: pg 2, Line 4, add a zero to the \$100,000 dollar amount
- Edit: pg 4, Line 16, all three words need capitalization in "Cannabis Control Commission"

5. Hinesburg Energy Plan

Regina referred members to the memo and accompanying documents included with their packet. She explained the Town of Hinesburg requested the CCRPC grant a determination of energy compliance to the amended Hinesburg Town Plan, adopted by the Selectboard on July 7, 2021. The Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) held the required hearing and reviewed the plan. Both the PAC and CCRPC Staff recommends that the CCRPC Board grant an affirmative determination of energy compliance to the amended Hinesburg Town Plan.

JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BARBARA ELLIOTT, TO APPROVE THE TOWN OF HINESBURG DETERMINATION OF ENERGY COMPLIANCE. MOTION CARRIED WITH ONE ABSTENTION FROM DANA HANLEY.

6. Underhill Town Plan

Catherine introduced Brad Holden and Kurt Johnson from Underhill. Regina explained this was a complete rewrite of the Underhill Town Plan. She also said the plan was ready to go last March, however, considering that COVID restricted public meetings, they decided to take a bit more time with the plan and obtain more public input. Regina referred members to the memo included in the packet and provided a brief overview of the Underhill planning process. The town of Underhill has requested CCRPC, 1) approve the *2021 Underhill Town Plan*, 2) confirm its planning process, and 3) grant a determination of energy compliance to the *2021 Underhill Town Plan*. Both the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) and CCRPC staff recommends approval, confirmation of the planning process, and granting an affirmative determination of energy compliance.

JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY GARRET MOTT, TO APPROVE THE 2021 UNDERHILL TOWN PLAN, CONFIRM THE UNDERHILL PLANNING PROCESS, AND GRANT AFFIRMATIVE DETERMINATION OF ENERGY COMPLIANCE FOR THE 2021 UNDERHILL TOWN PLAN. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Brad and Kurt thanked everyone and said they very much appreciated the CCRPC's help. Brad also stated the process had seven total hearings and went well overall.

1 7. Chair/Executive Director Report

2 Regina said she would provide the updates since Charlie had to phone into tonight's meeting.

3  
4 a. Elected Body visits to review CCRPC Annual Reports:

5 Regina explained Charlie is currently doing the county-wide tour and meeting with each of  
6 the legislative bodies. So far, he has visited at least half of the municipalities.

7  
8 b. Senior Energy Project Manager Hired, Ann Janda

9 Regina stated we are excited and very pleased to have hired Ann Janda as our Senior Energy  
10 Project Manager. Regina asked that members reach out with any energy projects they might  
11 want or need help with. Catherine said Ann has already been in touch with the Town of  
12 Jericho about energy planning.

13  
14 c. Housing Convening – September 30, 6:00 PM

15 Regina reminded members we are hosting the Housing Convening meeting on September  
16 30<sup>th</sup> at 6:00 PM. There will be an overview on the first 5 years of the Building Homes  
17 Together campaign as well as a summary of where we landed in terms of campaign goals.  
18 This information will also be shared in the CCRPC newsletter. Regina said we are hoping to  
19 develop a second phase of Building Homes Together to satisfy more of the housing needs  
20 within the County. Regina asked members to stay tuned as there will be more information  
21 to come on this.

22  
23 8. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports. Catherine noted the minutes for various committees are  
24 included with the packet and as links to the online documents. (Executive/Finance Committee, TAC,  
25 PAC, CWAC MS4 Sub-Committee and Equity Leadership Team).

26  
27 9. Members' Items, Other business. There was none.

28  
29 10. Adjournment. JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY GARRET MOTT, TO ADJOURN THE  
30 BOARD MEETING AT 6:12 PM. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

31  
32 Respectfully submitted,  
33 Amy Irvin Witham

CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

DATE: Wednesday, October 6, 2021  
TIME: 6:00 PM  
PLACE: CCRPC Offices; 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404 and  
REMOTE ATTENDANCE via ZOOM MEETING VIDEO

PRESENT:	Bolton:	Sharon Murray	Buel's Gore:	Garret Mott
	Burlington:	Andy Montroll	Burlington:	Max Schindler (Alt.)
	Charlotte:	Dana Hanley	Charlotte:	Deidre Holmes (Alt.)
	Colchester:	Jacki Murphy	Essex:	Jeff Carr
	Essex Junction:	Jeff Carr (Alt.)	Hinesburg:	Andrea Morgante (Alt.)
	Huntington:	Barbara Elliott	Jericho:	Catherine McMains
	Jericho:	Wayne Howe (Alt.)	Milton:	Tony Micklus
	Richmond:	Bard Hill	St. George:	Absent
	Shelburne:	Absent	So. Burlington:	Chris Shaw
	Underhill:	Kurt Johnson	Westford:	Absent
	Williston:	Andy Watts	Winooski:	Mike O'Brien
	Cons/Env.:	Don Meals	VTrans:	Amy Bell
	VTrans:	Matthew Langham	Bus/Ind:	Absent
	GMT:	Absent	Agriculture:	Absent
	Socio/Econ/Housing:	Absent		

Others: Kevin Harms, CCTV Susan McCormack, Creative Discourse  
Dr. Nadia Mitchell, Creative Discourse

Staff:	Charlie Baker, Executive Director	Regina Mahony, Planning Program Mgr.
	Eleni Churchill, Trans. Program Mgr.	Forest Cohen, Senior Business Mgr.
	Amy Irvin Witham, Business Office Mgr.	Christine Forde, Senior Trans. Planner
	Dan Albrecht, Senior Planner	Ann Janda, Senior Energy Proj. Mgr
	Bryan Davis, Senior Trans Planner	Marshall Distel, Senior Trans Planner
	Chris Dubin, Senior Trans. Planner	Jason Charest, Senior Trans Engineer
	Pam Brangan, GIS & IT Mgr.	Sai Sarepalli, Senior Trans Engineer
	Taylor Newton, Senior Planner	Melanie Needle, Senior Planner

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

The meeting was called to order at 6:01 PM by the Chair, Catherine McMains.

There were two changes to the agenda. First, the addition of a TIP Amendment as Item 3.a in place of the consent agenda. The VPSP2 update was moved up to item 3.b.

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

3. A. TIP Amendment, MPO Business.

Christine Forde referred members to the memo they received in a separate e-mail prior to the meeting. She explained this is on the TIP as a rail-bridge project and is the rehab of an existing structure. The project is part of the work that needs to be done for the Amtrak extension to Burlington and is on the critical path. Christine asked Matthew Langham from VTrans to elaborate. Matthew explained the project is being funded with western corridor earmark funds and is not subject to fiscal constraint. Dana from Charlotte asked if there are any concerns with environmental and water quality issues with the repair that is taking place. Matthew answered, no; when the work on the culvert is being done measures will be taken to ensure water quality is maintained. Andrea Morgante said she appreciates this as well as the explanation of the costs associated with this project. She said there have been a lot of water quality assessments and this had been identified as an undersized structure. She feels it is important that all interested parties understand the poor condition of our railways and bridges throughout Vermont and feels we need to be addressing these issues. She wants awareness brought to these structures to ensure we are not compromising safety. Bard wonders if the topic of the safety and condition of rail structures could be an agenda item to discuss at another time. Members agreed. The requested FY21 TIP Amendment is as follows:

- **Charlotte Rail Bridge over Thorp Brook, Project RR008, Amendment FY22-07.** Add \$470,715 in Federal funds for the construction in FY21. This project will repair and repoint an existing stone culvert and repair the headwall. The FY22-25 TIP has construction funding in the FY23 budget, but the project is ready to advance to construction in FY22.

BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED TIP AMENDMENT. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY MPO MEMBERS.

3. B. VPSP2 Update

Charlie referred members to the VPSP2 memo included with the packet. He wanted to make sure everyone had a chance to review because it will be an action item at the next Board Meeting to be held on October 20th, 2021.

4. Equity Training, The Creative Discourse Group.

Charlie and Catherine introduced Sue McCormack and Dr. Nadia Mitchell, our Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) consultants from The Creative Discourse Group. Nadia said she has been working with CCRPC as well as other organizations within our community. She said her team likes to focus the work on group engagement and have had a nice journey with the CCRPC. They are excited to continue to share in this journey with us. Sue said she lives in Essex Junction with her wife and has two grown daughters. Like Nadia, Sue said she is also excited about the partnership with CCRPC and wants to help us find better ways to engage with the community. She explained, when these connections go well, new relationships and innovations that may not have seemed possible before can happen.

Sue and Nadia reminded everyone this will be the first of two trainings, and the second session is scheduled for the October 20, 2021, Board Meeting. Sue went on to provide a presentation with members and an outline of the format for tonight's session:

- Welcome
- Session Context & Overview
- Personal Journey – Becoming Aware of Race
- A History of Injustice



- The Legacy of Racist Planning Decisions: An Introduction
- Closing Reflection

Sue explained, when we are successful in creating equity for one group, it often benefits many other groups of people within a community. She explained this work is very important right now and reminded everyone the City of Burlington and the CDC both declared Racial Inequities a public health emergency. She shared an excerpt from our ECOS Plan and the CCRPC website regarding our Racial Equity work:

“Achieving a healthy, inclusive, and prosperous future for Chittenden County is the vision of our regional ECOS Plan. However, we know we cannot achieve that future without addressing the systemic racism and inequities in our community... We at CCRPC are committed to working through the racial and economic disparities in our community together with our member municipalities, partner organizations, employers, and residents.”

Sue said tonight’s learning session will start from a personal lens, but at the next session we will look at the issues in a systemic and statistical way. Nadia said having personal conversations can be tricky, as it can be a challenge to know if we are saying the right thing. There are shifts and changes in how we think about inclusion and diversity and equity. She said Creative Discourse heard this loud and clear in the work we have done together so far.

Nadia went on to share the Saturday Night Live skit “Black Jeopardy” with everyone. After viewing, Nadia asked members what they noticed about the video and Sue asked if anyone noticed changes in the characters’ body language as the skit went on? Members discussed how they gradually became more comfortable with one another and more accepting of perceived differences. Chris Shaw said he thought the characters were trying to find commonality between all. Sue and Nadia stated once common ground is found, it won’t be linear. There could still be awkwardness and moments of discomfort, but we can lean into these moments and move into a better place. Wayne Howe said he feels when cultural perspectives can be shared, we may be more likely to meet others in the middle. Sue agreed and said it is nice to see each other’s humanity before we engage in social discussions.

Sue and Nadia created small break out groups of 3 to 4 people to discuss and share information from the Personal Journey Timeline and the History of Racial injustice calendar items that were included in the packet.

The Personal Journey Timeline: Becoming Aware of Race asked the following questions:

- When did you first realize you were considered by others to have a particular racial identity?
- What were you taught about other people’s races?
- What are your earliest memories of interacting with people of a different racial identity?
- Where and when did you first experience or witness an act of racism?
- Where and when was the first time you intervened during an act of racism?

Members joined their breakout groups for 15 minutes to discuss findings from the Personal Journey Timeline exercise and came back together for a large group discussion. Mike O’Brien said he was part of Room 9 with Forest and Marshall. He stated they all had a hard time pinpointing the exact

time they acknowledged racial identity, but Mike felt television played a role in how he noticed race. Wayne said he moved to Vermont from New York and within the white community he said the French Canadians were singled out. Sue said she has had the opportunity to facilitate many conversations about race and explained how many of us have had experiences in our childhood where race played a part of shaping us and our views.

Sue said we would move into work about systemic racism. Members joined a second 15 minute breakout group to discuss findings from the History of Racial injustice calendar with examples of injustice that occurred during their birth month. After the breakout groups, members came back together for a large group discussion. Sue asked everyone how they felt policy and government played a part in the injustice? Nadia asked if there were any connections to planning that the CCRPC does? Mike O'Brien said his group discussed how there continues to be racism despite historical knowledge, education, and media reports. Jacki Murphy said in 2009 there was a KKK group that violently protested the having a black neighborhood too close to a white neighborhood. Kurt said these instances are shocking and horrific and it is long overdue that racist views and prejudices go away. He said we need major change, and this shouldn't be our reality in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Members shared various experiences with racism. Nadia asked how we engage personally, as individuals, with these experiences we are hearing about and what are the implications of the history of racism, in the moment that we are in right now? Wayne Howe stated, it is not anti-American, rather it is American to be working to make these important changes, that we, as Americans are strong enough to do this work. Garret agreed with Wayne, he feels America is strong enough to do this work and he feels the forces actively fighting against advancements in unification, justice, and equity, is the worry. Should these be groups be exposed or should we ignore them? Does acknowledgement add fuel to their fires? Sue agreed; there are instances of people becoming more aware of progress being made and actively working against it.

Sue mentioned how the book *Caste*, by Isabel Wilkerson, highlights the history of racism in America and likens it to owning an old house, where there are always repairs and a lot of work to be done. Nadia said we will come back this this topic at our next session to discuss new ways to approach our systems. We will have conversations about systemic racism, housing issues and redlining. Nadia thanked everyone for a great session and said she and Sue look forward to more discussions at our next Board Meeting. Catherine and Charlie thanked Nadia and Sue for joining us and presenting us with the activities.

#### 5. Committee member review/volunteers

Catherine referred members to the memo included with the packet and reviewed the FY2022 Regional Board members. Charlie stated he is working on filling the Socio-Economic-Housing spot since Justin Dextradeur has moved out of state. He wanted to recognize Justin as he was on the board for 20 years.

MIKE O'BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY GARRET MOTT, TO APPROVE THE REGIONAL BOARD MEMBER APPOINTMENTS. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Catherine reviewed the Committee Appointments. She noted there are still a few open spots on the Board Development Committee, The UPWP Committee, TAC Interest Group, Disabled, Long Range Planning, Brownfields Advisory, and the All Hazards Mitigation Plan committees. Andy Montroll said he would like to volunteer to join the Board Development Committee and the Long Range Planning Committee. Charlie noted Max Schindler, also from Burlington, volunteered for the Long Range Planning Committee too. Members agreed it was fine for both Max and Andy to serve on the LRPC. Dan said the AHMP will wrap up in the spring and should have only a few more meetings.

CHAIR CATHERINE MCMAINS APPROVED THE COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS, AS THERE WAS NO OBJECTION FROM THE BOARD.

6. Chair/Executive Director Report

Charlie referred members to the Building Homes Together news release and infographics included with their packets. He said the press release went out last week (September 27). The information provides a summary of the Building Homes Together five year campaign. Regina thanked Melanie for the detailed data over the last five years and Emma for creating the infographics. The information highlighted included: Total New Home Construction, Chittenden County Vacancy Rates and Affordable Housing Goals. Regina reminded everyone the information is also on the ECOS page on our website.

Charlie also thanked members for their attendance and patience with holding multiple meetings over the past few weeks.

7. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports. Catherine noted the minutes for our committees are included with the packet and as links to the online documents. (Executive/Finance Committee, TAC, PAC, CWAC MS4 Sub-Committee and Equity Leadership Team).

8. Future Agenda Topics: There were none.

9. Members' Items, Other business. There were none.

10. Adjournment. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O'BRIEN, TO ADJOURN THE BOARD MEETING AT 7:58 PM. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,  
Amy Irvin Witham

CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
**DRAFT**

DATE: Wednesday, October 20, 2021  
TIME: 6:00 PM  
PLACE: CCRPC Offices; 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404 and  
REMOTE ATTENDANCE via ZOOM MEETING VIDEO

PRESENT:	Bolton: Absent	Buel's Gore: Garret Mott
	Burlington: Andy Montroll	Charlotte: Dana Hanley
	Colchester: Jacki Murphy	Essex: Jeff Carr
	Essex Junction: Dan Kerin	Hinesburg: Mike Bissonette
	Huntington: Barbara Elliott	
	Jericho: Catherine McMains	Jericho: Wayne Howe (Alt.)
	Milton: Tony Micklus	Richmond: Bard Hill
	St. George: Absent	Shelburne: John Zicconi
	So. Burlington: Chris Shaw	Underhill: Brad Holden
	Underhill: Kurt Johnson (Alt.)	Westford: Absent
	Williston: Andy Watts	Winooski: Mike O'Brien
	Cons/Env.: Absent	VTrans: Amy Bell
	Bus/Ind: Absent	GMT: Absent
	Agriculture: Absent	Socio/Econ/Housing: Absent
Others:	Dr. Nadia Mitchell, Creative Discourse	Susan McCormack, Creative Discourse
	Kevin Harms, CCTV	
Staff:	Charlie Baker, Executive Director	Regina Mahony, Planning Program Mgr.
	Eleni Churchill, Trans. Program Mgr.	Forest Cohen, Senior Business Mgr.
	Amy Irvin Witham, Business Office Mgr.	Christine Forde, Senior Trans. Planner
	Dan Albrecht, Senior Planner	Ann Janda, Senior Energy Project. Mgr.
	Bryan Davis, Senior Trans Planner	Marshall Distel, Senior Trans Planner
	Chris Dubin, Senior Trans. Planner	Jason Charest, Senior Trans Engineer
	Pam Brangan, GIS & IT Mgr.	Taylor Newton, Senior Planner
	Emma Vaughn, Communications Mgr.	

1. Call to order; Attendance; Changes to the Agenda.  
The meeting was called to order at 6:01 PM by the Chair, Catherine McMains. She let everyone know Charlie would join the meeting a little late.
2. Public Comment Period on Items NOT on the Agenda. There were none.
3. Action on Consent Agenda. There were none.
4. Equity Training, The Creative Discourse Group.  
Catherine introduced Sue McCormack and Dr. Nadia Mitchell, our Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) consultants from Creative Discourse Group. Sue said this was the second of two trainings; the first session was held October 6. She reminded everyone the Equity Summit is scheduled for

1 Saturday, November 6, 2021. Sue explained their work with the CCRPC has been very engaging so  
2 far. They know that we are committed on working with the people in our communities to create  
3 new ways of thinking. Sue explained the first session focused on personal views, whereas this focus  
4 was to address racial equity in a systemic and statistical way. She provided a presentation to  
5 members and an outline of the format for session two:  
6

- 7 • Welcome & Overview
- 8 • The Legacy of Racist Planning Decisions
- 9 • Analysis of Structural Inequities - Addressing Systemic Inequities
- 10 • Closing Reflection
- 11

12 Sue explained, they do understand these conversations could be uncomfortable, however, it is  
13 important to be open in our dialogue with others. Sharing experiences and leaning into the difficult  
14 conversations is an important step in the process.  
15

16 Nadia addressed the group and explained, to understand the CCRPC's work in terms of equity, it is  
17 very important to understand the history of inequities and systemic racism. Nadia went on to share  
18 a video on the legacy of racist planning decisions. The video provided an overview on housing  
19 segregation, the history of redlining in America, and highlighted the interconnectedness between  
20 housing, healthcare, school systems, and the justice system.  
21

22 Nadia explained, much of the generational wealth American families experience came from home  
23 ownership. Home ownership is an area where black people were completely excluded. Due to this  
24 exclusion, white families have been able to accumulate more wealth. Redlining is the discriminatory  
25 practice of denying financial services to residents of certain areas based on race. Redlining and  
26 zoning laws kept new housing developments entirely white.  
27

28 Nadia stated this practice also occurs in Vermont, where zoning continues to discourage multifamily  
29 and low-income housing. She shared a slide that included excerpts from the original covenants for  
30 Mayfair Park and the Birchwood subdivision in South Burlington. The covenants stated, "No persons  
31 of any race other than the white race shall use or occupy any building or any lot [...] except that this  
32 does not prevent occupancy of domestic servants of a different race domiciled with an owner or  
33 tenant." Nadia said segregation affects every aspect of our lives. Nadia let members know she  
34 understands embarking on this journey can feel overwhelming and having these conversations can  
35 be difficult. She also understands our desire to jump into a place of doing something. She reminded  
36 everyone an important part of the process is to understand the history of how we arrived at this  
37 place. Sue and Nadia created small break out groups of 3 to 4 people to discuss and share thoughts  
38 on the video, and asked us to think about answering the following questions:  
39

- 40 • What stood out to you about the video?
- 41 • What were some things that were surprising to you?
- 42 • Can you draw a connection between housing segregation, schools, the justice system, and  
43 the health system?
- 44 • What ways can this knowledge inform the CCRPC's Equity work?
- 45

46 Members joined their breakout groups for the 15 minutes discussion exercises and came back  
47 together for a large group discussion. Dana Hanley said she has been at community meetings where  
48 people openly discourage development of multifamily housing and affordable single-family housing,

that they wanted price points to remain high enough to prohibit lower income housing. Bard feels moving from a performative to practical phase is very difficult. Chris Shaw said this does feel like a confirmation bias, which is what happens when a person feels confident their view is correct. Member discussion continued. Garret said in the early seventies he volunteered at two separate hospitals in Lawrence Massachusetts. One of the locations was in the white part of town and the other was not. The difference in funding and services between the two hospitals was enormous. Regina said she was not surprised much of the video, mostly because she read the book The Color of Law, by Richard Rothstein, which explains many of these themes. However, the video did make her think differently about the role of the justice system and policing in certain neighborhoods. Tony Micklus said as a realtor, some of his training has focused on fair housing. However, he is interested in how to help break perpetual cycles of poverty, he asked how can we help teach people it doesn't have to continue? Nadia thanked everyone for their comments. She also addressed Tony, and said, rather than asking how to teach people to break the cycle, could this be an opportunity to ask ourselves how we can break cycles of poverty?

Sue explained many systems of inequity were put into place very specifically so that white people could keep hold of the power while black people worked without any pay to build the country. However, this system did not just negatively impact black people, it also negatively impacted low-income white people. She reminded everyone we can't do a true analysis without a background understanding of these systemic practices of racism. Instead, we will take a race first approach to understand these systems, but we don't end with race. We want to understand how the systems affect everyone. Ann said she feels our elected public officials would benefit from training on the Fair Housing Act. Nadia said we will expand on many themes in this dialogue at the November 6<sup>th</sup> Equity Training Summit.

Sue returned to the presentation and shared a slide featuring the following quote: "Systems change is about shifting the conditions that are holding the problem in place" from The Water of Systems Change, FSG, John Kania, Mark Kramer, and Peter Senge.

Sue continued with the presentation and said when she began this work one of the perceptions is that people are not involved or engaged: "Meetings are inaccessible and poorly attended by underrepresented populations of people. In particular there is too much jargon, a digital divide, and a lack of translated materials. This is perpetuating marginalization of diverse peoples' voices and experiences." Sue asked why this is difficult to change? She went on to explain there are many things adding to structural racism and inequities, including:

- Personal - biases, beliefs attitudes and actions.
- Cultural - formal and informal practices.
- Institutional – policies and procedures

These informal practices can create a lot of barriers. At the institutional level there are policies and procedure that keep things inequitable. The question is, how do we show up as leaders in our county, as municipal leaders, when engaging with people who are underrepresented?

- When you think about trying to create more equitable opportunities for people to have a voice in decisions that impact them, what personal attitudes and beliefs impact your ability to imagine or implement a different way of achieving this?

- What holds you back from building relationships with people in your community you don't often hear from?

Sue said we tend to externalize this work and it requires a mindset shift in how we think about ourselves, our roles and what is possible. She encouraged everyone to think about what personal beliefs inhibit our ability to engage. How do we reframe our work in a way to make connections in our work, in ways that multiple pathways people can interact? She said she often hears, "there is not enough time."

Andy Watts stated he feels, as individual public servants, we tend look at things from a macro view; since we are trying to encompass so many things, it is oftentimes difficult to implement a micro view. Taylor Newton feels there are limitations with time, particularly at the institutional level where there are pressures to keep projects moving forward to the finish. Sue said she understands that people worry if they reach out to different people in our communities, they will say the wrong thing and there is fear of doing it wrong; she understands where efficiency is important and institutional is how we are paid. Jacki agreed, it is very difficult to know how to access people who you aren't regularly engaged with. She said she rarely hears from anyone in town, unless there is something bothering them. She doesn't know how to engage others to build these types of relationships. Sue said elected officials in Essex have been holding regularly scheduled coffee breaks with community members and being available in an informal way can be very beneficial. Members discussed various ways to engage with their communities in a way that will welcome diversity and varying perspectives.

Sue and Nadia said they are very excited for our upcoming November 6, 2021, Equity Summit. Sue encouraged everyone to adhere to the following three guidelines:

- First, to believe people when they share their experience.
- Second, use this as an opportunity to listen and hear different perspectives.
- Finally, to listen with an open mind. Even if people are sharing ideas that may not work, she asked us to entertain the ideas and think about ways to shift structures in a way that new ways of working can be implemented.

Jeff said he feels we need more time in small group break-out rooms and less time in the large group settings. Sue agreed the small groups are helpful and said the Equity Summit in November will provide more time within smaller groups. Sue and Nadia thanked everyone for their participation. Charlie and Catherine thanked Nadia and Sue for joining us again.

#### 5. VPSP2 Update and Recommendations to VTrans

Christine referred members to the VPSP2 memo and VPSP2 Full VPSP2 Statewide Potential Project list included with their packets. She explained this is the next to last step in the process and the process identifies funds available.

The Lists for Paving, Roadway, and Traffic & Safety, with a total of 23 Chittenden County projects were sorted into the following categories:

- Asset Driven Paving Projects: Total of 5
- Asset Driven Roadway Projects: Total of 2
- Asset Driven Traffic & Safety Projects: Total of 5
- Regionally Driven Projects: Total of 11

The 23 Chittenden County projects were combined with projects from VTrans and all other RPCs to create Statewide Potential Project Lists for Paving, Roadway, and Traffic & Safety. Projects were sorted by Transportation Value. From those lists, VTrans made recommendations regarding which projects to fund and which projects to reserve for later consideration. The list includes funded Chittenden County projects by program as well as the projects that were reserved for later consideration. The TAC was asked to review the project lists and provide comments to VTrans. As a starting point for discussion, staff drafted comments for consideration by the Board. These comments were reviewed by the TAC at their October meeting. Christine explained the staff and TAC recommend the comments be submitted to VTrans for consideration in the VPSP2 process, but asked if members wanted to add any edits? Charlie noted that Chittenden County projects scored quite well. He explained we are submitting comments, but we are also trying to be realistic. He wants to thank VTRANS for opening this process to us and reminded members this is the first time VTrans has opened the process up to this extent.

DAN KERIN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JEFF CARR, TO APPROVE THE COMMENTS AND SUBMIT TO VTRANS AS DRAFTED. MOTION CARRIED WITH ONE ABSTENTION BY AMY BELL (VTRANS).

6. Lamoille Tactical Basin Plan regional plan conformance memo

Dan referred members to the three Tactical Basin Plan documents included in their packets. He also thanked Danielle Owczarski for her extensive work with the Clean Water Advisory Committee and on the Draft Lamoille Vermont Tactical Basin Planning.

Dan provided an overview presentation to members. He explained Chittenden County has three watersheds: the Winooski, the Lamoille, and Northern Lake Champlain. The Draft Lamoille Vermont Tactical Basin Planning document provides an overview of the different basins and focus areas as well as the priority strategies for each. Tactical basin plans focus on the projects or actions needed to protect or restore specific waters and identify funding sources to complete the work, based on monitoring and assessment data. The issues identified in the plans will be prioritized for management attention and funding. The plan was released to the public on October 13 and was followed by a public meeting held in the Town of Jericho on October 14, 2021. Comments are welcomed and can be sent via USPS or e-mail. Comments must be received or postmarked or before 4:30 PM, November 12, 2021. We were directed to analyze the relative conformance of the Draft Lamoille Tactical Basin Plan with the relevant goals, strategies and recommend actions of the Regional Plan to provide recommendations regarding project prioritization. There are several focus areas that include various priority strategies, including:

- Agriculture
- Developed lands-Stormwater
- Developed lands
- Wastewater
- Rivers
- Lakes
- Wetlands
- Forests

The 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan serves as the County's regional plan. The ECOS Plan also serves as the Metropolitan Transportation Plan and the Comprehensive Economic Development



1 Strategy for the County. The Regional Plan has 17 goals organized under four broad goals; the goals  
2 applicable to this review are the following:

- 3
- 4 • **Broad Goal, Natural Systems:** Design and maintain a strategically planned and managed  
5 green infrastructure network composed of natural areas, working lands and open spaces  
6 that conserve ecosystem values and functions and provide associated benefits to our  
7 community.
- 8 • **Broad Goal, Build Environment:** Make public and private investments in the built  
9 environment to minimize environmental impact, maximize financial efficiency, optimize  
10 social equity and benefits, and improve public health.
- 11

12 Dan closed his presentation by sharing the following statement with members:

13 “As detailed in the CCRPC staff analysis of the TPB’s strategies, the CCRPC Board of Directors  
14 affirms that the draft Lamoille Tactical Basin Plan is in conformance with the applicable goals  
15 and objectives of the 2018 Chittenden County Regional Plan.”

16  
17 Catherine asked for clarification if the Lee River is part of the Lamoille tactical basin? Dan said yes.

18  
19 GARRET MOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY TONY MICKLUS, TO APPROVE THE REGIONAL PLAN  
20 CONFORMANCE LETTER FOR SUBMISSION TO THE DEC, AS DRAFTED. MOTION CARRIED  
21 UNANIMOUSLY.

22  
23 7. FY23 Municipal Dues

24 Charlie referred members to the FY2023 Municipal Dues memo included with the packet. He  
25 explained the staff and Executive Committee are recommending a 2% increase in dues for FY23.  
26 Charlie said the increase is clearly needed for local funding to match federal funds and that we had  
27 not raised dues the last two fiscal years. The municipal dues assessment amounts distributed to the  
28 member municipalities are based on the Equalized Education Grand List (EGL).

29  
30 MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY GARRET MOTT, TO APPROVE THE 2% INCREASE IN  
31 MUNICIPAL DUES FOR FY23. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

32  
33 8. Chair/Executive Director Report

34 Regina said the ECOS Plan needs to be updated every five years and the 2023 ECOS plan will need to  
35 be adopted by June of 2023. The Draft 2023 ECOS plan will be prepared by January of 2023.

36 Items that will be incorporated in the new update, include:

- 37 • MTP: I-89 Study, Active Transportation Plan, Park & Ride Plan, etc.
- 38 • CEDS: West Central Vermont CEDS
- 39 • Regional Plan: Equity, Building Homes Together 2.0, State Climate Action Plan, State  
40 Comprehensive Energy Plan, All Hazard Mitigation Plan
- 41

42 Regina thanked the Long-Range Planning committee. Charlie reminded everyone this was an  
43 informational item, and no action is needed. He said the 2023 plan will be developed over the next  
44 15 months. There are various issues within our communities we want to incorporate.

45  
46 Charlie said the Greater Burlington Industrial Corporation (GBIC) was requested/required to consult  
47 with us as they are required to provide the State of Vermont a top 10 list of Economic Development

1 projects. Staff is providing edits to the list now and Charlie will circulate the list so we can discuss at  
2 the November Board meeting.

- 3  
4 9. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports. Catherine noted the minutes for our committees are  
5 included with the packet and as links to the online documents. (Executive/Finance Committee, TAC,  
6 PAC, CWAC MS4 Sub-Committee and Equity Leadership Team).

- 7  
8 10. Future Agenda Topics: There were none.

- 9  
10 11. Members' Items, Other business. There were none.

- 11  
12 12. Adjournment. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CHRIS SHAW, TO ADJOURN THE BOARD  
13 MEETING AT 7:52 PM. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

14  
15 Respectfully submitted,  
16 Amy Irvin Witham



**Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission**  
**November 17, 2021**

**Agenda Item 7: Action Item**

**2020 Census results and forecast for use in the 2023 ECOS Plan**

**Background:** Vermont statute requires that all regional plans be based on existing conditions and probable future trends. As such, CCRPC worked with consultants to prepare a [2050 demographic and employment forecast](#) which estimates future household, population, and employment conditions for the county. This forecast is part of the 2018 ECOS Plan. To prepare for the 2023 update of the ECOS Plan, staff has compared current (Year 2020 and Year 2019) Census, American Community Survey, and Bureau of Economic Analysis data to the forecast to determine whether an update of the forecast is needed. Currently, the number of households and population for the county is 2% more than the 2020 population and household forecast. Additionally, current total employment is 6% less than the 2020 estimate for employment.

Given the minimal difference between the current demographic and employment data and the forecast, staff determined that the forecast is still valid and recommends that the 2018 ECOS Plan forecast be utilized for the 2023 ECOS Plan.

**For more  
information  
contact:**

Melanie Needle, Senior Planner, [mneedle@ccrpcvt.org](mailto:mneedle@ccrpcvt.org)



## **Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission**

**November 17, 2021**

**Agenda Item 8: Discussion Item**

### **Potential Legislative Briefing Topics**

**Background:** Below is a beginning list of potential policy initiatives implementing aspects of our ECOS Regional Plan that we might discuss with our legislators on December 7<sup>th</sup> at 8am. A few of these items have links to specific bills in case you would like to dig in deeper although we are not suggesting that we advocate for any specific bill. The links are provided as a resource only. Are these the right topics? Any missing? Any major points that should be made?

#### **Broad Themes of Economic Recovery, Climate Action, and Equity**

1. Promoting Smart Growth and Housing – Expand neighborhood development area exemption to villages; rental housing health and safety ([S.79](#)); State and local permit process improvements ([S.101](#)); etc.
2. Implementation of water, wastewater, and stormwater infrastructure projects
3. Transportation funding – increase amount going to municipalities
4. Expand broadband funding beyond CUDs to allow municipalities to access
5. Economic and Workforce Development initiatives ([H.159](#)) – include option for project specific TIF
6. Environmental Justice ([S.148](#)), equity assessments, and inclusive engagement - transportation equity framework analysis is starting soon
7. Climate Action Plan and Comprehensive Energy Plan recommendations – to be reviewed and prioritized; smart growth should be a key strategy to be resilient
8. Municipal and Regional Planning investment to support the above

#### **Governance Issues**

9. Open Meeting Law revision to allow flexibility in meeting access
10. Cannabis retail – provide opportunity for host municipalities to receive portion of excise tax
11. Transit Financing Study – options to continue fare-free service and decrease inequitable demands on property tax
12. Update municipal authorities to reduce need for charter changes
13. State Planning Office study – include RPCs if this moves forward

**For more  
information  
contact:**

Charlie Baker, [cbaker@ccrpcvt.org](mailto:cbaker@ccrpcvt.org) or 802.735.3500



Fred also said page 9 of the Draft Audit provides good insight under the “Explanation of Changes in Net Position for years ending 2021 and 2020.” Charlie agreed; VMERS is confusing as it is a large liability that must be highlighted in the Audit, and it is important that the Board sees this presentation of CCRPC’s financial position.

Fred said this audit outlined CCRPC’s indirect rate and the change; The approved Indirect Rate for FY21 was 83%, but the actual indirect costs for FY21 were 76.91%. This difference accounts for approximately \$49K to \$50K of surplus and differences within small percentage points are somewhat expected and can be managed. Larger discrepancies, around 10 percentage points, result in a swing. The CCRPC used 83% for part of the year and dropped it down to 80% in January, which Fred felt was as a good move by the CCRPC.

He explained in a single audit, the focus is the major program spending, which is typically categorized under the Highway Planning and Construction; the CDFA (Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance) is 20.205. There are two reports on compliance at both the federal and state level and there is a summary of the entire audit. Overall, the audit was very good. There were no findings of any control weaknesses. Fred stated the CCRPC has done a great job of having systems in place to meet federal requirements and manage federal funds. The CCRPC continues to qualify as a Low-Risk Auditee, since it has maintained at least two years in a row of favorable audits. Fred explained this is an important designation to federal funders, as it ensures grant funds are managed appropriately.

Charlie thanked Fred for providing members with the audit overview and thanked the CCRPC Business office for another clean audit.

JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O’BRIEN, TO RECOMMEND BOARD ACCEPTANCE OF THE FY21 DRAFT AUDIT REPORT. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

#### 6. Legislative Breakfast

Charlie explained there are multiple topics he expects to be covered at the Legislative Breakfast, including the following:

- American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds
- Affordable Housing
- Water and Wastewater
- Transit financing
- Permits/Permitting
- Broadband beyond CUD’s (Communications Union Districts)
- Equity and Inclusion initiatives
- Climate Action Plan
- RPC & Municipal Planning Grants funding

Chris asked about the Climate Action Plan status at the state level. Charlie said there is a deadline to present the Initial Climate Action plan by December 1; with this deadline, he feels there will be feedback early in the legislative session.

Charlie stated, regarding transit funding, we’ve partnered with GMT and VTRANS on a transit study. We may want to follow up on this because it may take financial pressure off our municipalities. It also addresses the cost of providing “fare-free” transit. He also said rather than discussing Act 250,

1 we should discuss the permit system in broader terms. Charlie asked members if there were any  
2 additional topics or specific topics they would like to see added to the list? Members discussed and  
3 agreed the current list included adequate topics.  
4

5 Mike asked Charlie if any of our Legislatures signed up for the November 6, Equity Summit? Charlie  
6 said there are a few, including Kesha Ram and Taylor Small.  
7

8 Charlie said he will have a better formed presentation of the topics at our next meeting scheduled  
9 just prior to the Legislative Breakfast to be held remotely on December 7, at 8:00 AM. This topic will  
10 be discussed with the full CCRPC Board at our next meeting.  
11

12 7. Chair/Executive Director Report

13 a. Priority Economic Development Project List

14 Charlie referred members to the Priority Economic Development Projects handout included in  
15 the packet. He explained the list comes from the Greater Burlington Industrial Corporation,  
16 (GBIC) and includes economic development projects they have identified, in partnership with  
17 the CCRPC. The projects include:

- 18 • Crescent Connector; Village of Essex Jct.
- 19 • Winooski Main Street; City of Winooski
- 20 • Water Supply Increase; Town of Hinesburg
- 21 • Trader Lane; Town of Williston
- 22 • HULA Transit Center; HULA
- 23 • Municipal Parking, Hotel & Residential Condo project; City of Winooski
- 24 • Railyard Enterprise Project; City of Burlington
- 25 • Community Sewage Disposal System; Town of Westford
- 26 • Community Sailing Center Improvements; Lake Champlain Sailing Center
- 27 • Water and Sewer Extension; Town of Richmond
- 28 • Multi-Generational Recreation Center; Town of Colchester
- 29 • Community Sewer and Water; Town of Charlotte
- 30

31 Charlie explained this is an interim and living list, however, over the course of the next twelve  
32 or so months we will have a well vetted list from the CEDS process. Charlie wanted to share  
33 what we have currently to solicit feedback from Executive Committee members and discuss  
34 presenting to the Board. Charlie noted there are several Transportation projects on this list,  
35 and he wants to make ensure everyone is aware. Mike said the only concern with bringing it to  
36 the Board before it is further developed is that it can create pointless discussions. He suggested  
37 Charlie provide an informational overview. Members agreed. Charlie also agreed and said he  
38 will create a memo for the Board that summarizes the process at the current stage. He also said  
39 this is a living document and if any of our municipalities have ideas for a good economic  
40 development project, they can forward directly to us and GBIC to be added to the list. John  
41 agreed that giving towns the information and asking they present ideas to GBIC, rather than  
42 through Board members, is a good plan. Members agreed.  
43

44 b. Planning for Equity Summit

45 Charlie thanked everyone for signing up to attend the Equity Summit scheduled for Saturday,  
46 November 6. Charlie said there are currently seven board members attending. Between CCRPC  
47 Staff, legislatures and municipality representatives, there are approximately 90 total

participants. He explained the format will begin with 15 minutes of introductions, followed by an 'icebreaker' question before participants move into smaller breakout groups where more time to work through the exercises will be set. The topic will center on discussions on how to improve equity in our communities. Charlie thanked Jacki and Mike for their participation in the Equity Leadership group. Members asked about moving from having discussions about equity and into action to create equity. Charlie said one of the messages coming from Creative Discourse is that we need to continue moving slowly on this path to hear from the community before we move to action. He said we should have a better sense of more actionable items from the upcoming summit.

8. Draft CCRPC Board Meeting Agenda

Charlie referred members to page 52 of their packets and reviewed the draft November 17, 2021, Board meeting agenda. He said he is hoping Sandy Thibault from CATMA will join the meeting to discuss telework trends. Charlie said the CCRPC also engaged RSG to perform strategic modeling that includes research of what is going on holistically with transportation. There will be a discussion on the 2020 Census results and the forecast for use in our 2023 ECOS plan, based on staff recommendations, it makes sense to keep existing projections in place, as they are close to the Census data. Charlie reminded everyone this will be an action item.

9. Other Business: There was none.

10. Executive Session: There was none.

11. Adjournment: JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O'BRIEN, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:00 PM. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,  
Amy Irvin Witham



CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MINUTES

DATE: Tuesday, November 2, 2021  
TIME: 9:00 a.m.  
PLACE: Hybrid Meeting: In-person at CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal St. Winooski, VT, and  
virtually via Zoom

**Members Present**

Justin Rabidoux, South Burlington  
Dennis Lutz, Essex  
Robin Pierce, Essex Junction  
Amy Bell, VTrans  
Ashley Atkins, VTrans  
Chris Jolly, FHWA  
Jonathon Weber, Local Motion  
Bob Henneberger, Seniors  
Deirdre Holmes, Charlotte  
Sam Andersen, GBIC  
Wayne Howe, Jericho  
Chris Damiani, GMT  
Kirsten Jensen, Milton  
Barbara Elliott, Huntington  
Andrea Morgante, Hinesburg  
Sandy Thibault, CATMA  
Kurt Johnson, Underhill

Lisa Schaeffler, Williston  
Jon Rauscher, Winooski  
Joss Besse, Bolton

**Staff**

Charlie Baker, Executive Director  
Eleni Churchill, Transportation Program Manager  
Bryan Davis, Senior Transportation Planner  
Christine Forde, Senior Transportation Planner  
Jason Charest, Senior Transportation Planning Engineer  
Marshall Distel, Senior Transportation Planner  
Chris Dubin, Senior Transportation Planner  
Sai Sarepalli, Senior Transportation Planning Engineer  
Sam Berry, Intern

**Guests**

Christopher Clow, VTrans  
Joe Segale, VTrans

1. Justin Rabidoux called the meeting to order at 9:01 AM.

**2. Consent Agenda**

No consent agenda this month.

**3. Approval of October 5, 2021 Minutes**

Justin Rabidoux asked for any changes, which there were none. SAM ANDERSEN MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 5, 2021, SECONDED BY BOB HENNEBERGER. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

**4. Public Comments**

None.

**5. VTrans Presentation of Act 145**

Joe Segale and Chris Clow, VTrans staff, provided background and an overview of Act 145 Transportation Impact Fees, which became effective on July 1, 2014. The intent is to reduce the “last one in pays” situation, to reduce costs, and facilitate permitting. There are two ways that impact fees can be authorized: through VTrans established Transportation Impact Districts, and through Act 250 District Commission established fees. The presentation is posted to the CCRPC TAC webpage and includes more information such as the formula used to calculate fees, potential adjustments, other requirements, and statistics since its inception: <https://www.ccrpcvt.org/about-us/committees/transportation-advisory-committee/>. The fee isn’t a flat rate and can be adjusted. Chris provided the Catamount Industrial Park in Milton as a project example, for which there were an estimated number of trips to be generated. Developers were exempt from the fee until the trip number is met, then the fee amount would kick in. Chris also offered that pass-by trips aren’t included in impacts fee and offered a gas station as a project

1 example; trips to the station would already be on the transportation system rather than being new trips  
2 solely to visit the gas station. There are also fee deductions for projects located in designated centers and  
3 neighborhoods. Chris provided another project example: a hospital paid \$10,000 for intersection  
4 improvements at an intersection slated to become a roundabout in the future. The \$10,000 would be  
5 deducted from the hospital's anticipated \$40,000 fee as part of building the roundabout. In another  
6 example, if a project were to come and go without any fees, then the project would close without 145  
7 being assessed. In another example, a first developer pays the fee in a project area and is reimbursed by  
8 future developers. This happened in South Burlington when FedEx paid for a new signal, and is being  
9 reimbursed by other developers within 3 miles of the project. There is more guidance and information on  
10 the [Act 145 Transportation Impact Fee Guidance](#), and interactive online [Act 145 Transportation Impact](#)  
11 [Fee Map](#).

12  
13 Discussion:

14 Jonathon asked whether lifetime maintenance costs are accounted for in the fee and process, and Chris  
15 said not that he's aware of this. For example, traffic signal head maintenance wouldn't be accounted for.  
16 Joe noted that for the impact fee you're not allowed to charge for maintenance costs, only projects that  
17 add capacity. Jonathon asked that if a new lane is added, then is VTrans or municipality responsible for  
18 future maintenance. Joe said yes that's normal for regular projects, non-Act 145 as well. Jonathon asked if  
19 there is math to show that building a project is worthwhile relative to property tax values, etc.? Joe said  
20 probably but it may not be useful and it's not the practice to do that. Justin said that each municipality has  
21 to certify that they have ability to maintain a project, or that they don't. Andrea asked that when you're  
22 evaluating developer traffic studies, what kind of verification do you have that their numbers are realistic,  
23 and are there any instances of checking traffic study projections with data collected later to see what the  
24 reality is to determine the accuracy of traffic studies? Chris said this is verified in a couple of ways:  
25 Engineers use the ITE Trip Generation Manual to estimate trips, and Chris uses collected traffic data to  
26 check against those numbers. Also, the appendix of consultant traffic studies includes files by a traffic  
27 model called Synchro, and he looks at those to make sure there aren't errors. For Andrea's second  
28 question – yes, there are instances of the Act 250 District Commission asking some developers to do  
29 traffic counts at certain time intervals after construction. So far he's seen data that either matches what  
30 was in the estimates, or traffic volumes that are less than the projections. Andrea asked projects in  
31 designated zones, and Chris said that by building in those areas you create different types of non-auto  
32 trips. Joe said the policy is designed to encourage developing in those areas, so the developer gets a  
33 discount. Andrea asked what if an area doesn't have infrastructure, like sidewalks? Joe said the  
34 infrastructure would already be there, or the fees would go toward that infrastructure. Andrea asked that  
35 there has to be some scrutiny when those centers are created and what the true cost is, but that's probably  
36 not part of this discussion. Dennis noted the Circ Highway in Essex, it's labeled red on the VTrans map  
37 with an impact fee, that project was fully built out using federal funds as part of the Circ Alternatives  
38 project, so what's happening to the funds collected to that account if that project is fully built; are fees  
39 being collected, and what happens to them? Joe said that if the new capacity is built, then the fee  
40 continues to be collected until all the capacity is used. Federal and state funds were used to build the  
41 project so fees collected went to that project. VTrans fronted the cost to build the project using state and  
42 federal funds, so over time as fees are collected they go into the transportation fund and get distributed in  
43 other ways through that process. Dennis said that bothers him, if that project has no future worth  
44 associated with it for a reasonable lifetime, why should local developers pay an impact fee to have those  
45 funds distributed elsewhere when the project is already paid for. Developers might have an argument in  
46 court using that reason. Joe responded that for the fairness question, developers have paid before, the state  
47 gets a fixed amount of federal funds, the state doesn't get reimbursed when funds are used. You keep  
48 paying until the capacity is gone, the capacity is the resource that you're selling. We may not agree on  
49 this but that's what the statute is, so that's how we operate. Dennis said he would prefer those funds are  
50 directed back to the community, not across the state. Dennis said that within the 3- or 5-mile project  
51 radius he can identify other projects that could use that money. We're not talking big dollars, but it's  
52 about the fairness of the system. Jonathon said that for pass by trips, like the gas station example, doesn't  
53 access to the gas station degrade the roadway level of service so why isn't that considered an impact?  
54 Chris said that the project isn't adding capacity to the signal or whatever, he agrees that the driveways

1 create extra turning movements, but the fee doesn't address that. Andrea asked about an increase in  
2 crashes in that example, and Chris said that's getting away from Act 145 but in review the developer will  
3 do a crash study if the project is in that kind of area. Andrea asked how Act 145 is going to evaluate  
4 service stations, whether they're gas or electric, especially as more of them become quick stops, are they  
5 held to same criteria, don't you have to account for a new gas station to be part of the Act 145 process?  
6 Joe said it's never 100% pass by trips, a new gas station will attract some new trips, so this is probably in  
7 the weeds but it's part of the traffic analysis that goes into it, there's never 100% pass by, so you could  
8 look at turns into and out of driveways, but there's always additional trips for new development, unless a  
9 less intensive use replaces a high intensive use. Restaurants also have pass by trips. Amanda said that 3  
10 miles is a relatively large distance for charging fees. Can a developer submit a traffic analysis that shows  
11 their operations will not add any additional traffic to the area that may be close to three miles away?  
12 Would you waive any fees? Chris said he hasn't come across that, traffic impact studies have volume  
13 distribution going in that direction, and Act 145 only addresses trips that will go through that intersection  
14 project, not all trips go in the same direction, so they look at the volume distribution to determine the  
15 number of trips to get assessed fee. Amanda said it looks like the guidelines come out of the Act 250  
16 process, is there a way outside of Act 250 that triggers 145, like checking 1111 permits? Chris said the  
17 simple answer is no, only Act 250 projects. The transportation improvement district (TID) process is the  
18 more complicated method, if a TID was established then we would have 145 fees against 1111 permits,  
19 but a TID hasn't been established yet. Andrea asked if there was any thought of creating new districts so  
20 that whenever there's an 1111 process it triggers 145? Joe said in thinking back on process, that change  
21 could be added, the law is seven years old and we've learned a lot, the issue Dennis raised comes up all  
22 the time, maybe that needs to be fixed, at some point it may be worthwhile to look at the whole thing  
23 objectively and decide if there are changes, and if it's necessary. This really started with Exit 16 in  
24 Colchester, the DDI project that costs more than 10 million dollars, there were projects being created and  
25 the Act 250 Commission was struggling, the Natural Resources Board was struggling with how do we  
26 allow development to go forward knowing this big project is coming. It's been helpful but the downside  
27 is you go from the last person pays a lot, to everyone pays a little, there's opportunity for conflict. In  
28 some cases people have been surprised about having to pay rather than being against the process. Sandy  
29 asked if VTrans is hearing any interest from developers about transportation demand management  
30 (TDM), which reduces impact on roadways, she hasn't heard interest yet. Joe said they haven't been  
31 asking developers if they are a member of a transportation management association (TMA) but if a  
32 project has TDM impacts then that affects the fee. Chris said he also hasn't heard specific TDM interest,  
33 it's mostly related to sidewalks, Rice Lumber looked into building a bus shelter which could help with  
34 TDM, even if the bus stop already existed. Other projects have been near bus stops but VTrans hasn't  
35 granted TDM because the bus stop was already there. Some developers say they'll contact GMT and see  
36 if they can get some bus service or something additional. Joe said VTrans should encourage developers to  
37 contact CATMA and Upper Valley TMA and join them. Criterion 5B requires looking at bike ped  
38 impacts, there are small little changes as part of developments, but they may not always be in line with  
39 what a municipality has planned. Jonathon said it's interesting in TDM to think about if an employer  
40 charges for parking, what kind of facilities are provided on-site like indoor bike parking, showers. Joe  
41 said certain strategies get TDM credit like indoor parking and showers. Sandy said they are looking to  
42 expand bikeshare so this would be helpful.

#### 43 44 **6. Municipal General Roads Permit Update**

45 Chis Dubin, CCRPC staff, and Sam Berry, CCRPC Intern, provided an update on the town status related  
46 to the Municipal General Roads Permit. Chris said the CCRPC summer intern program assists with data  
47 collection related to permits, and intern Sam Berry presented MRGP progress in Chittenden County. The  
48 presentation is posted to the CCRPC TAC webpage: [https://www.ccrpcvt.org/about-](https://www.ccrpcvt.org/about-us/committees/transportation-advisory-committee/)  
49 [us/committees/transportation-advisory-committee/](https://www.ccrpcvt.org/about-us/committees/transportation-advisory-committee/). Today the focus is on non-MS4 towns, which have a  
50 different process and goals. She shared the MRGP timeline with some key dates and the progress  
51 overview slide, noting that CCRPC can only report what we know, so please let us know if we're missing  
52 information. One summer project was finding and assessing some of the missing segments, we updated  
53 most of them but there are some remaining so will work with towns to finish. Very High Priority Segment  
54 Compliance has a later deadline of December 31, 2025. All data is tracked in ArcGIS dashboard online,

1 which can be updated in the field. This is the most current, so she encourages towns to check and make  
2 sure they're meeting deadlines. Chris said last December was a big lift to get data into the DEC portal,  
3 which is complete, so moving forward year to year the lift will be smaller, he will be working this  
4 December to send updated info to DEC. MS4 communities are looking at the April 1, 2022 deadline.

5  
6 Andrea asked that if Class 4 roads are unassessed, what are the options for addressing those sections with  
7 erosion, are there standards, and if it's downgraded to a trail, can you change alignments within a Class 4  
8 so it's not so steep? Chris said according to MRGP there aren't roadway standards for Class 4 but if there  
9 are gullies of certain type, or erosion issues, there are ways to address that. Downgrading is an option and  
10 DEC knows that municipalities may go that route. Eleni said we'll keep an eye on this, we're not aware of  
11 instances in Chittenden County. Andrea hopes that erosion issues get addressed whether road is  
12 downgraded or not, which will help with water quality.

#### 13 14 **7. FY 2023 Unified Planning Work Program**

15 Marshall Distel, CCRPC, provided information about the FY23 UPWP process, which serves as the  
16 CCRPC's annual workplan, with materials to be released on November 19. New this year the CCRPC is  
17 seeking energy projects for which we can provide staff assistance, and no match is required. He also  
18 asked for two representatives from the TAC to participate on the FY 2023 UPWP Committee, which will  
19 convene for three meetings in January, February and March. Justin said he has served on the committee  
20 for years but is stepping down, please contact Marshall if interested. Barbara agreed to continue on the  
21 Committee, and Robin also volunteered.

#### 22 23 **8. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports**

24 See bulleted list at the end of the agenda for current CCRPC projects. TAC members are encouraged to  
25 ask staff for more information on the status of any of these on-going or recently completed projects.

26  
27 Justin guessed that the Route 15 path is stalled due to ped and traffic signal equipment delay? Ashley said  
28 she has the question out to the contractor but assumes that's this issue because that has stalled other  
29 projects in the state. Christine said CCRPC can also reach out to the project manager. Jonathon said he  
30 has been in touch with someone who reported that the delay in October was due to Green Mountain  
31 Power and moving utility poles. Justin asked clarification from CCRPC staff about the status of traffic  
32 data, speed monitoring, etc., is that in post-processing? Eleni said we are working on it, we have most of  
33 the data and are doing post processing so municipalities should be receiving results soon.

#### 34 35 **9. CCRPC Board Meeting Report**

36 In October the Board participated in two racial equity trainings led by consultant Creative Discourse,  
37 voted to approve a TIP amendment, voted to approve comments on the VPSP2 projects and submit to  
38 VTrans, voted to approve the regional board member appointments, and heard updates from the Executive  
39 Director on the Building Homes Together campaign, voted to approve the Lamoille Tactical Basin Plan  
40 regional plan conformance, and voted to approve an increase in municipal dues.

41  
42 The 2% increase in municipal dues is across the board but could be a little more or less depending on  
43 grand list. There was no dues increase the last two years. CCRPC was finding it a challenge to draw down  
44 federal funds through the UPWP process, which municipal fees help with by serving as match. Eleni  
45 noted the Board also approved the VPSP2 comments from the TAC.

#### 46 47 **10. Chairman's/Members' Items**

- 48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53
- **VTrans Transportation Alternatives Grant Program** – Applications are due by e-mail by Wednesday, November 24, 2021. <http://vtrans.vermont.gov/highway/local-projects/transport-alt>
  - **EPA Recreation Economy for Rural Communities** planning assistance program helps communities identify strategies to grow their outdoor recreation economy and revitalize their Main Streets. This is not a grant program. Communities will not receive funds directly from EPA. Partner communities will receive help from a planning team to consider challenges and

1 opportunities, convene a community workshop, and develop an action plan for community  
2 revitalization through the recreation economy. Applications due Monday, November 22, 2021.  
3 <https://www.epa.gov/smartgrowth/recreation-economy-rural-communities>  
4

5 The next TAC meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, December 7, 2021.

6  
7 The meeting adjourned at 10:26 am.

8  
9 Respectfully submitted, Bryan Davis

DRAFT



CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
CLEAN WATER ADVISORY COMMITTEE – DRAFT MINUTES

DATE: Tuesday, November 2, 2021  
SCHEDULED TIME: 11 a.m. to 12:15 p.m.  
PLACE: In-person at CCRPC office and ONLINE VIA ZOOM  
DOCUMENTS: Minutes, documents, video recording and presentations discussed accessible at:  
<http://www.ccrpcvt.org/meetings/clean-water-advisory-committee/>

Committee Members in Attendance (all online unless otherwise noted)		
Bolton:	Hinesburg: Merrily Lovell	St. George:
Buels Gore:	Huntington: Darlene Palola	Underhill:
Burlington: James Sherrard	Jericho:	Westford:
Charlotte:	Milton: Kirsten Jensen	Williston: Christine Dougherty
Colchester:	Richmond: Ravi Venkataraman	Winooski: Ryan Lambert
Essex: Annie Costandi, co-chair	Shelburne: Chris Robinson	VAOT: Jennifer Callahan
Essex Junction: Chelsea Mandigo	South Burlington: Dave Wheeler, Tom DiPietro	VANR: Christy Witters
Burlington Airport: Catie Calabrese (EIV)	University of VT: Lani Ravin	CCRPC Board:
Friends of the Winooski River:	Lewis Creek Assoc:	Winooski NRCD: Remy Crettol
Other Attendees: DEC: Karen Bates Other:		
CCRPC Staff: Dan Albrecht (at CCRPC office), Sai Sarepalli, Charlie Baker, Chris Dubin, Marshall Distel		

- 1. Call to Order.** With the consent of the co-chair, Annie Costandi, it was agreed to have Dan Albrecht facilitate the meeting. The meeting was called to order at 11:04 a.m.
- 2. Changes to the Agenda and public comments on items not on the agenda** Dan noted that the proposed CCRPC comments do not need to be vetted by the Executive Committee so that agenda item will just read as CWAC Review and Action on Comments on draft Lamoille River Watershed TBP.
- 3. Review and action on draft minutes of October 5, 2021** After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, *Darlene Palola made a motion, seconded by James Sherrard to approve the minutes as drafted. MOTION PASSED.*
- 4. Two (2) CWAC Volunteers to serve on Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Committee**  
Marshall Distel briefed the CWAC on the purpose of the UPWP. The UPWP is update annually and describes our numerous programs and identifies the transportation, land use and other planning activities and projects that the CCRPC is engaged in collaboration with its member municipalities and other state and regional partners. On November 19<sup>th</sup>, the CCRPC will issue a call for projects for inclusion in the FY23 UPWP. The UPWP Committee would then meet in January, February and March to review the projects and make recommendations to the CCRPC Board on which projects to fund for FY23. He noted that Ravi Venkataraman and Karen Adams served on the Committee last year.  
*Chelsea Mandigo and Dave Wheeler then volunteered to serve as the two CWAC representatives on the UPWP Committee.*
- 5. Presentation by Chris Dubin, CCRPC on MRGP compliance tracking**  
Chris recapped compliance tracking compiled by the CCRPC for 2021 with a focus on the Non-MS4 towns as their reporting deadline is December 31, 2021. Overall, the towns are making good progress and should meet the required deadlines especially the first one of having 15% of non-compliant segments brought up to standard by 12/31/2022. He also noted that some towns may look like they are underperforming such as Underhill but that is more likely a function of difficulty obtaining data. He stressed the need for municipalities to conduct their own QA/QC on this data as ultimately it is the municipality's responsibility. He will plan to upload data for the non-MS4 towns by the end of the year and by April 1, 2022 for the MS4

towns. It is unclear when the next full inventory of road segments will be conducted. He is curious how road segments that were deemed in compliance in either the 2016 or 2017 inventory are holding up.

**6. Review and action on draft CWAC comments on Draft Lamoille TBP**

After a brief recap by Dan of the proposed comments, *Annie Costandi made a motion, seconded by Ravi Venkataraman to approve the letter and authorize submission to DEC. MOTION PASSED with abstention by Lani Ravin.*

**7. Updates by Staff**

Dan noted he will be pivoting towards Clean Water Service Provider contract work now that the Lamoille TBP is wrapping up. He will send out a reminder that comments on the draft Lamoille TBP are due November 12<sup>th</sup>. Also, remember that he and Chris Dubin can provide support letters regarding any grant applications.

**8. Updates by Members and Guests**

None.

**9. Items for December Agenda**

Appointment of CWAC member (and maybe) alternate to Basin 5 Water Quality Council (BWQC) and possible appointment of CWAC member to BWQC for Basin 7 and 8.

**10. Adjournment.** The meeting adjourned at 11:35 a.m.

*Respectfully submitted, Dan Albrecht*

## **CCRPC Equity Leadership Team**

### **Meeting Highlights**

SEP 15, 2021

#### ***Next Steps***

1. Interviews with Racial Justice & Equity leaders - Emma & Bryan (9/15 - 9/30)
2. Create timeline for work leading up to Nov 6 summit - The Creative Discourse Group (TCDG) (9/20)
3. Revise summit agenda and share with Equity Leadership Team - TCDG (9/18)
4. Create draft invitation and flyer for Nov 6 Summit - Emma & Bryan
5. Reschedule 9/15 learning session for 9/29 or 10/6 - Charlie
6. Schedule one more Equity Leadership Team meeting prior to Nov 6 summit - TCDG, Emma & Bryan

#### ***Meeting Highlights***

##### **1. Equity audit update**

- a. Summary of audit due mid-October
- b. Final pieces to be completed
  - i. Document review
  - ii. Interviews with Racial Justice & Equity leaders around Chittenden County (interviews to be conducted by CCRPC staff member Emma and Bryan)

##### **2. November 6 Planning for Equity Summit**

- a. Summit Design
  - i. Broaden discussion beyond the idea of creating a standing equity committee to a conversation about how CCRPC and Chittenden County can systemize the focus on equity? And how can equity be integrated into the work CCRPC does with towns?
    1. Offer some possibilities for people to discuss, including creating a standing equity committee; hiring staff whose focus is on equity; embed a person on each planning project whose purpose is to focus on equity; appoint additional members to the CCRPC board who bring a racial equity and equity focus to the work;
  - ii. Consider adding an opportunity to discuss roles and partnerships
    1. Could CCRPC serve as a convener to help people discuss and take action to create more equitable outcomes for Chittenden County residents?
    2. How can we support and align various efforts across the municipalities?



- a. Different communities are in different places (lots of energy in Burlington and Winooski, some of the other municipalities are in a very different place).
    - b. Story of S. Burlington transportation plan (S. Burlington and CCRPC are both working on plans - how do we avoid that sort of duplication when it comes to equity work?)
  - 3. When we say “marginalized” or “underrepresented” be specific about who we are talking about.
  - 4. Offer specific strategies that could be helpful
- iii. Participants
  - 1. Staff & Board 30 - 40
  - 2. Partners 30
  - 3. Municipal equity committee leaders 10
  - 4. Underrepresented informal community leaders 30
- iv. Outreach
  - 1. Email/Flyer to CCRPC staff and partners (Emma and Bryan to create first draft)
  - 2. For community members
    - a. Mailings (translated simple flyer)
    - b. Phone calls
    - c. Hiring translators for the summit
- v. Accessibility plan
  - 1. Zoom access
    - a. Offer call in option
    - b. Partner with libraries to offer wifi and computer access for zoom
  - 2. Work with AALV to provide Translation
    - a. Need RSVP two weeks in advance so we know language needs, etc.
  - 3. Offer options for people who aren't able to participate on Nov 6
    - a. Survey & offer to talk with people by phone about summit
    - b. Simple questions
      - i. What is happening in your town
      - ii. Share key guiding questions and key themes from Summit
      - iii. Ask for ideas for how to operationalize
    - c. We could provide notes and action items to translators after the summit so they can translate those after the meeting and provide them to participants/others who couldn't make it - could schedule several phone calls with translators after the fact

#### 4. Offer Stipends of \$100

### 3. September 15 Learning Session

- a. This was inadvertently scheduled during Yom Kippur. The session was moved to one hour earlier to avoid meeting after sundown. However, after some discussion, the Equity Leadership Team agreed to reschedule the session altogether and to be mindful about scheduling future events during important holidays. Nadia shared a link to UVM's [interfaith calendar](#) as a resource for scheduling future events.

- 

- Sometimes exclusionary practices can be cloaked in the guise of environmental protection

# Chittenden County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan Update

## Kick-off Meeting Minutes

Date: June 22, 2021

### Participants

#### Representing Chittenden County Communities

\*Amy Glover- Town Clerk Bolton

\*Dan Albrecht- Senior Planner Chittenden County RPC

Ron Hoague

\*Steven Locke- Fire Chief/EMD City of Burlington

Dennis Lutz

Dean Pierce

\*Matthew Boulanger- Planning and Zoning director for Town of Williston

\*Christine Forde

\*Michaela Foody- Public Safety Director, Town of Milton

\*Sharon Murray- FAICP Front Porch Community Planning and Design CCRPC (Board rep)

\*Jim Jutras- Water Quality Superintendent, Village of Essex Junction

\*Ravi Venkataraman- AICP Town planner for the Town of Richmond

\*Paul Conner- AICP Director of planning and zoning City of South Burlington

\*Caroline Massa- State Hazard Mitigation Planner

#### Representing IEM

Leroy Thompson, Project Manager

Elizabeth Burnett- Junior Planner

Meeting started on time at 10:05 am eastern time and ended at 11:00 am eastern time.

#### **Introduction:**

Mr. Thompson introduced himself and stated that the meeting is being recorded. He provided an overview of the agenda and what will be covered in the presentation. Mr. Thompson will be working hand in hand with each of the jurisdictions throughout the planning process and the participants are encouraged to reach out to him as needed with questions or concerns and provide feedback. He then asked Ms. Burnett to conduct the roll call.

Ms. Burnett conducted a roll call going down the list of potential jurisdictions that have shown some interest in participating in the plan update process.

### **Hazard Overview**

Mr. Thompson proceeded to provide the FEMA definition and overview of hazard mitigation, mitigation planning and the mitigation related grants. He also provided an overview of the story of Noah and the Ark as being one of the greatest examples of hazard mitigation planning. In this case there was potential for a great flood (hazard), potential loss of life and property (risk), activities early warning and build shelter (mitigation actions), plan implementation and hazard avoided. This is the similar planning process that will be followed in updating the Plan.

### **Project Background/Objectives**

Mr. Thompson continued and discussed the project background as well as the project objectives. These discussions included why the city needs to update its current 2004 hazard mitigation plan (HMP) to a new 2021 hazard mitigation plan. He also discussed the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (DMA2K) as being the primary reason to be moving forward in updating this plan, and the benefits of having an up-to-date plan. In order to be eligible for FEMA Hazard Mitigation Assistance (HMA) funds a community must have a FEMA approved hazard mitigation plan. A current FEMA approved HMP will allow the participating jurisdictions to be eligible for grants/funding to address some of the mitigation actions/projects that will result from our planning process.

This was followed with a discussion of the project objectives which included assuring that at the end of the planning process the participating jurisdictions will have a FEMA approvable plan. This includes identifying hazards of concerns, greatest opportunities to reduce risk and fulfill public input requirements. Mr. Thompson also stressed that it is the participating jurisdictions plan, IEM staff is working on and making sure it is your plan not IEM plan when it's completed. Mr. Thompson also stated we want to make sure the planning requirements are met and will be beneficial to the participating jurisdictions moving forward.

### **Plan Section**

Mr. Thompson proceeded and open a discussion on the planning process to include 5 planning phases/tasks. These phases/tasks include planning process, hazard identification and risk assessment, mitigation strategy, plan maintenance, final draft plan. He continued to review the steps and related activities that will be completed under each of the identified plan phases/tasks.

#### **Phases/Tasks 1- Planning Process**

Mr. Thompson discussed activities that will addressed under this phase to include building the team, document how the plan is being updated, determine an outreach strategy, identify the capabilities assessment to include plans, programs policies regulations that can impact each jurisdiction's ability to implement hazard mitigation program (what already exists). He also highlighted this part of the process will be data intensive and cross over the entire planning cycle.

- Establish a formal planning process
- Build the Team-Participation from a broad range of stakeholders
- Documentation of planning activities
- Meetings (group, virtual, one-to-one)
- Input from Planning Committee and Stakeholders
- Integration with other state planning efforts
- Create an Outreach Strategy

- Capabilities Assessment - Existing policies, studies, plans, programs, etc.)
- Data Reviews and Collection

Mr. Thompson stated a virtual engagement strategy will be sent out for review on how to get the public involved and other meeting schedules.

**Phases/Tasks 2- Hazards Identification and Risk Assessment-** Mr. Thompson provided that the activities include a discussion on identifying and profiling hazards and the completion of a detail risk assessment. Hazards Identification: Mr. Thompson discussed the need to identify and profile each hazard that can impact each jurisdiction. He also reviewed the hazards identified in previous 2017 plan.

Risk Assessment: Mr. Thompson discussed the elements to be included in the risk assessment to include critical facilities and updating capabilities assessment, impacts of changes in development, impacts of climate change and estimated losses.

- Critical facilities-lifelines includes a review and assessment of each jurisdiction critical facilities and infrastructures and their vulnerable to identified hazards as well as vulnerable populations. This will also include a discussion of NFIP repetitive loss properties.
- Capabilities assessment will include a review of current regulations, that will support or hinder mitigation actions; Administration or government support; Education and outreach- is there a process to educate them or a way to disseminate information to them
- The final section of the risk assessment will include a summary of potential losses.

**Phases/Tasks 3- Mitigation strategy-** Mr. Thompson provided that the risk assessment forms the foundation to this task. He reviewed the various steps involved in developing mitigation strategy and the mitigation action plan. The Mitigation Strategy will include:

- Goals and objectives- see if the old goals and objectives are still relevant or what needs to be removed or added
- Review a comprehensive range of mitigation actions and projects
- How to mitigate the hazards and repetitive loss structures,
- Development of the mitigation action plan, what are we vulnerable to, what are the risks, prioritizing the projects, who is responsible, time frame for completion of those projects,
- Work with them on the top 2 actions to give them an idea of how this works and needs to be completed.

Mr. Thompson also discussed the need to develop a strategy to address repetitive loss properties stating that FEMA is concern when it comes to flooding

He discussed the mitigation action plan to include all of the actions or projects that are considered important to the community and put them in a prioritized order to include time frame for completion, who is responsible for action and funding source.

#### **Phases/Tasks 4- Plan Maintenance**

Mr. Thompson discussed the plan maintenance process to include monitoring, evaluate and update the plan. This section will include maintaining and updating the plan as well as tracking and reporting the status mitigation actions/projects.

#### **Phases/Tasks 5- Draft Plan and Review Process**

Mr. Thompson reviewed the process for developing the draft plan, approval by the planning committee and then to the State. If comments come back, we will handle them and then send it back up to the state. and then to FEMA and back again if is necessary. After final approval the community approves it

then you get the final approved paperwork from FEMA. Ms. Massa reminded the group that VEMA is one of a few States that have worked with FEMA and streamlined process and the State has the power to approve the plan with minor concurrence from FEMA.

### **Roles and responsibilities**

Mr. Thompson informed the participants that the Planning Coordination Team will include each jurisdiction Point of Contact and IEM's Point of Contact Leroy Thompson. He briefly discussed the roles and responsibilities- who will be doing what or be involved in what, and who they might want to invite to provide feedback, as well as including the public. As part of this discussion it was recommended that each jurisdiction consider forming an in-house jurisdictional team to advise the overall to assist in ensuring that the plan reflects the community and its needs.

### **Timeline/Schedule**

Mr. Thompson reviewed the project schedule and timeline noting that they are tentative and can change. He also reviewed noted the potential timeline for completion of each task and the submittal of final draft plan document for review and approval. The current plan expiration date is March 2022.

### **Next Steps**

Mr. Thompson stated that we will attempt to reuse as much data as possible from the 2017 plan and see what is still current and what needs to be updated. He additionally, he provided we will be doing a series of one on one discussions with each jurisdictional team members to assist in our data collect efforts. He also recommended that each jurisdiction create their own local team assist in collecting local based data that can be feedback up to the regional plan. He also stated we will be sending out several data collection forms within the next few weeks. These forms will include:

- review of list of hazards;
- a survey of critical facilities self-assessment form on community capabilities to implement hazard mitigation activities;
- a survey of critical facilities that are in the 2004 plan and requesting assistance in updating information.

Mr. Thompson reminded the group that Chittenden County MJHMP is a good plan we do not want to do any harm to the plan, just update what has happened since the last plan update.

Mr. Albrecht followed with an overview of the current plan and recommended that the jurisdictions formalize themselves with the current plan and their respective jurisdictional annexes. He provided the following a link ( <https://www.ccrpcvt.org/our-work/emergency-management/hazard-mitigation-plan/>) to the plan. He also walked the group through the Town of Bolton jurisdictional annex to illustrate the format of a jurisdiction annex and detailed how the action items dovetail with ongoing Town operations such as road work or stormwater work.

The floor was open for questions and comments. Mr. Thompson provided final comments thanked everyone for participating, provided contact information. The meeting was closed.

---

Throughout the presentation the following questions were asked:

### **Questions/Statements:**

**Jim Jutras-** will we be emailing the schedule presented or the presentation to us with any follow up at the next steps?

Thompson- Yes, we will email a copy of meeting minutes, slide presentation and tentative schedule to each Team member and jurisdictional representative.

**Sharon Murray-** will we be following the format of the current plan (county plan with local annexes)?

Thompson- Yes, we will follow that format unless the jurisdictions agree to a different one. The format will include a base plan with all general information and separate jurisdictional annexes with more jurisdictional specific information.

**Paul Conner-** in terms of IEM's role is the team largely focused on the regional effort or more one on one with the local jurisdictions?

Thompson- We will focus on the one on one, to make sure each community is represented in the planning process and this will be reflected in the jurisdictional annexes.

**Conner-** will we have one on one jurisdiction meetings?

Thompson- We anticipate having one on one jurisdictional meeting depending on need and/or desire of each jurisdiction.

**Conner-** does the schedule state when it would happen if they want one?

Thompson- No, the schedule is tentative and open for adjustment. In the draft virtual engagement that we are developing we have included time for jurisdictional meetings and identify times as TBD based on need.

**Caroline Massa-** noted that we are just look at formatting, but also what has changed with the hazards, climate change, COVID and other changes that you have noticed over the last 5 years.

## Chittenden County Multi-Jurisdictional All Hazards Mitigation Plan (MJAHP)

### Plan Update Committee Meeting [VIRTUAL]

October 13, 2021, 2pm eastern

Meeting Attendees		
Name	Jurisdiction	Title/Position
Dan Albrecht	Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission	Senior Planner
Brad Holden	Town of Underhill	Town Administrator
Darlene Palola	Town of Huntington	Volunteer
Barbara Elliott	Town of Huntington	Town Administrator
Chief Audy	City of Winooski	Fire Chief
Michaela Foody	Town of Milton	Public Safety Director
Ron Hoague	Essex and Essex Junction	Police Chief
Ravi Venkataraman	Town of Richmond	Town Planner
Christopher Davis	Town of Charlotte	Charlotte EMD
Caroline Massa	State of Vermont	State Hazard Mitigation Planner
Matthew Boulanger	Town of Williston	Planning Director
Kail Romanoff	Town of Underhill	Zoning Administrator
Karina Warshaw	Town of Charlotte	Charlotte EMC
Larry Lewack	Town of Charlotte	Town Planner
Melissa Manka	Town of Westford	Town Planner
Dean Bloch	Town of Charlotte	Town Administrator
Norm Baldwin	City of Burlington	P.E. City Engineer
Paul Conner	City of South Burlington	Director of Planning and Zoning
IEM Team		
Leroy Thompson	Senior Planner/ Project Lead	
Nancy Freeman	Senior Planner	
Elizabeth Burnett	Jr. Planner	

The meeting was called to order at 2:05 p.m. by Leroy Thompson, IEM.

Elizabeth Burnett, IEM, requested that participants enter their name, jurisdiction and title/position into the chat box for verification of participation in the meeting.

### Introductions and Welcome

- Mr. Thompson introduced the IEM team and Dan Albrecht, Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission.
- Mr. Thompson welcomed all participants to the virtual Chittenden County MJHMP Update Risk Assessment meeting. He provided an overview of the meeting agenda and stated copies of the PowerPoint presentation and minutes from the meeting will be provided to all participants and will be available for any planning committee members who were not able to attend meeting.



- Ms. Burnett conducted the roll call for attendees and requested they place their positions/title in the chat box as this information will be needed as part of final project documentation.
- Minutes from the previous Kick-off meeting were approved by the Planning Committee.
- Mr. Thompson congratulated the Town of Saint George for joining the National Flood Insurance program and mentioned this is a great accomplishment which will afford their residents the opportunity to purchase flood insurance.

### Planning Process and Schedule

- Mr. Thompson provided a general overview of the planning process and what will be happening as we progress through the steps in the process, including who will be taking the lead at various points. This included a discussion on the process of updating the risk assessment from the previous plan and a review of new data to be included as part of the update. He discussed several changes that we would like to make to current plan format to be more aligned with the FEMA Local Mitigation Plan Review Tool.
- This was followed by a review of the project schedule. We will make every attempt to stay on schedule.
- There was discussion about scheduling the next meeting sometime in late November. Mr. Thompson emphasized the importance of continuing to hold the one-on-one meetings with each jurisdiction in order to better understand the needs and issues of each jurisdiction and provide technical assistance to them during the planning process.

### Public Outreach

- Ms. Burnett provided an overview of the Public Hazard Survey has been distributed to the jurisdictions with the assistance of the CCRPC. Mr. Thompson thanked Mr. Albrecht and the staff at the Regional Planning Commission for invaluable assistance in posting and getting the work out to the public regarding the availability and completing the survey.

### Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

- The lists of critical facilities from the 2017 plan were sent to each jurisdiction for review and revision. Critical facilities will be categorized in the 2022 plan in the format of FEMA's Community Lifelines as the plan becomes more integrated with updated FEMA planning guidance. The Community Lifelines categories include; safety and security, food and water, health care, medical, energy, communications, transportation, and hazardous material. Additionally, there is not a true designation for schools as they are treated as shelters, more so that we'll be looking at schools as critical facilities. The update will include a review of facilities identified in the previous plan and see if they are still valid or new ones have been brought on-line since the last plan update.
- Mr. Albrecht mentioned the F-14 planes that are flying in the area of a few jurisdictions, and home buy outs over time, and what the importance of covering this issue would be.

- Paul Conner, South Burlington, asked if it would be beneficial in this plan to have it in the plan, and then what about taking a step back and look at having a populous airport for civilian and military in a populous area in general.
- Mr. Thompson raised a question regarding military facilities and the role they play in the MJAHMP, and when it comes to critical facilities, we are would be only be concentrating on the ones for which your jurisdiction has authority, and that those facilities that are supported by feds are mentioned but not technically locally owned.
- Mr. Thompson stated in a conversation with Town of Bolton regarding governmental facilities and military, the Town Official was supportive of not including these facilities as part of their critical facilities, since they have no jurisdiction. As a result of these discussions, we're looking at some options or how to how to better do that, how to better address the issue? Government- or military-owned facilities could be mentioned as such in the plan with the explanation of who has authority.
- Nancy Freeman followed with a discussion of the natural hazards that are in the current plan and some potential realigning of the hazard profiles to be consistent with the FEMA Local Plan Review Tool. She explained why we are recommending that Dam failure be treated as a separate hazard due to the emphasis on High Hazard Potential Dams, and moving epidemic (now human infectious disease) and invasive species into the natural hazards. This included a discussion of each of the natural hazards individually, to provide data and information updates since the 2017 plan.
- Paul Conner, South Burlington, asked about the lack of recording for drought conditions, and if it meant that it was not an issue for the county even though near drought conditions have been recorded in the State. Ms. Freeman replied that although NCEI does not capture that information, other sources would be used to document information if any was recorded. In follow-up, Mr. Conner asked if there are parts of the planning area that are in a drought or pre drought conditions, what the findings show are not nearly as severe in Chittenden County, so it could come off the list. Ms. Freeman confirmed that we also look at current conditions to see about future impact and what other parts of the state or neighbors have or are going through, and what may be currently developing even though there might not be enough information to make the best estimation, in order to justify why the hazard is included or excluded from the plan.
- Mr. Thompson posed a question about Dam and Drought information. Mr. Albrecht responded that those were not done, yet.
- Norm Baldwin, City of Burlington, stated they are near a lot of water and have seen an increase in storm events and slope erosion, and they have development that is inappropriately placed on a slope. Is there a way to buy out or enforce ordinances that prevent inappropriate construction on slopes for public safety or property damage purposes? Mrs. Freeman responded, short answer is yes, there are different kinds of events, landslides and slope failure are parts of it, and identifying funding can be found in the Mitigation Strategy. Action Items could be developed that look at how the hazard impacts the community, where it occurs, and what can be done about it. Alternate solutions should be identified to select the most effect way to low the hazard's impacts to help the community become safer. Mr. Baldwin stated it has been in excess of \$5,000 to

fix 5 properties and it's not a part of the standard to fix those issues, and if this would even be worth funding to keep them or buy them out, especially with the ones that have people living in them still. Mr. Albrecht answered that to some extent there is new data for landslide with three jurisdictions since 2017 plan, and now there is a more comprehensive analysis to look at, and what might be available to help with that hazard.

- Mr. Thompson discussed the list of Technological and Societal hazards that could or have affected the county/jurisdictions. He stated that several of the technical hazards such as loss of electrical service, sewer service, water service and gas service will be combined into a single category, titled "Loss of Key Services". Additionally, he stated there will not be a detailed profile of each of the technical and societal hazards to the level that will be completed for the natural hazards.
- Mr. Thompson reviewed several maps that will be updated as part of the planning process to include land development maps, critical facility maps in the river corridor, and floodplain maps.

### Capabilities Assessment

- Mr. Thompson discussed the capabilities assessment which will start as a self-assessment/gap-analysis reviewing each jurisdiction's strengths and weaknesses as it relates to the planning and regulatory, administrative, and technical, financial, and educational and outreach programs that support implementation of the community's mitigation plan. He explained that we are not writing a new plan. We're updating the existing plan, so one of the tools that will be used as part of this update is to look at what is in the existing plan, what you've identified as your community's capabilities and we will place that information in a format and send it to each jurisdiction for you to review and update as needed. This will be sent in the next week. This assessment provides for local self-assessment of your community's capabilities to implement the mitigation actions identified in the local hazard mitigation plan.
- Mr. Albrecht followed and stated that the jurisdictions can review the capabilities assessment information in the current plan. He reminded the jurisdictions of location of the current plan and their respective jurisdictional annexes. He provided the following link ( <https://www.ccrpcvt.org/our-work/emergency-management/hazard-mitigation-plan/>) to the plan.

### Mitigation Strategy

- Mr. Thompson stated that our next major activities moving from the risk assessment will be the update of the mitigation strategy. This will include reviewing the goals and objectives in the current plan and determining if they are still valid or need to be updated; have the jurisdictions' priorities changed. We'll start with the regional goals and look further to individual jurisdiction goals.
- This will be followed with a review of the status of mitigation actions from the previous plan and the development of new mitigation actions for inclusion in the 2022 Plan update. Mr. Thompson referred to Mr. Baldwin's conversation earlier regarding the potential landslide type activities as an example of potential mitigation actions.

- Mr. Thompson reemphasized the project timeline and the need to speed up on the activities as the current plan expires in March of next year. We would like to have the draft plan completed by the end of the year. He stated after the strategy updates, we will start working on the draft plan, but again, this is just a snapshot of a timeline and the State will appreciate getting at least some type of draft by early next year at least, probably January.

### Meeting Summary

- Feel free to call or email of any our team for clarification, technical assistance, or other support. We're available to assist you in in updating the plan.
- Mr. Thompson closed by stating we want to sure this is your plan and not IEMs, or the regional planning commission's plan, so we want make sure to include information that reflects the hazard risks and vulnerabilities you face as well as your community's goals, objectives, and priorities.
- Mr. Thompson thanked all attendees for their participation and opened the floor for additional questions or comments. Mrs. Freeman also thanked the participants and reminded them to give us a call to set up a jurisdiction meeting at any time that's convenient.

Meeting concluded at 3:05 p.m., EDT