

# REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

Wednesday, February 16, 2022 – 6:00 p.m.  
Remote Meeting Only



Join Zoom Meeting: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84202671154>

One tap mobile: +16468769923,, 84202671154#

Dial in: +1 646 876 9923 Meeting ID: 842 0267 1154

## CONSENT AGENDA –

- C.1 Transportation Safety Performance Measures
- C.2 FY20TIP Amendments

## 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 (see above) \* (MPO Action; 1 minute)
4. All Hazard Mitigation Plan Update, Leroy Thompson, IEM\* (Discussion; 20 minutes)
5. Transit Financing Report, Steve Falbel, Steadman Hill Consulting\* (Discussion; 20 minutes)
6. I-89 2050 Study – Transportation Climate Actions analysis\* (Discussion; 45 minutes)
7. Appointees to Basin Water Quality Councils\* (Action; 5 minutes)
8. Chair/Executive Director Report (Discussion; 5 minutes)
  - a. FY23 UPWP update
  - b. FY2023 Transportation Capital Program\*
  - c. Legislative update
  - d. Equity and Engagement Manager hiring update
9. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports (Information, 2 minutes)
  - a. [Executive Committee \(draft minutes February 2, 2022\)](#) \*
    - i. Act 250 Sec 248 letters
  - b. [Transportation Advisory Committee \(draft minutes February 1, 2022\)](#) \*
  - c. [Clean Water Advisory Committee \(draft minutes February 1, 2022\)](#) \*
  - d. [MS4 Subcommittee \(draft minutes February 1, 2022\)](#) \*
  - e. [Planning Advisory Committee \(draft minutes January 12, 2022\)](#) \*
  - f. [Long Range Planning Committee \(final minutes January 11, 2022, draft minutes February 8, 2022\)](#) \*
10. Future Agenda Topics (Discussion; 5 minutes)
11. Members' Items, Other Business (Information, 5 minutes)
12. Adjourn

\* Attachment

The February 16, 2022, Chittenden County RPC Board meeting streams LIVE on YouTube at:

[https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLlJLfn4BZd2O0l4hJU\\_nJ9q0l3PdQR0Pp](https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLlJLfn4BZd2O0l4hJU_nJ9q0l3PdQR0Pp).

The meeting will air Sunday, February 20, 2022 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 virtually:

- Unified Planning Work Program Committee – Wednesday, February 23, 2022, 5:30pm
- Transportation Advisory Committee – Tuesday, March 1, 2022, 9am
- Clean Water Advisory Committee - Tuesday, March 1, 2022, 11am
- CWAC MS4 Subcommittee - Tuesday, March 1, 2022, ~12:30pm
- Executive Committee – Wednesday, March 2, 2022, 5:45pm
- Long Range Planning Committee - Tuesday, March 8, 2022, 7pm
- Planning Advisory Committee – Wednesday, March 9, 2022, 2:30pm
- CCRPC Board Meeting - Wednesday, March 16, 2022, 6:00pm
- Unified Planning Work Program Committee – Wednesday, March 23, 2022, 5:30pm
- Hazard Mitigation Committee - TBD

Tentative future Board agenda items:

March 16, 2022	All Hazard Mitigation Plan adoption Warn public hearing on FY23 UPWP and Budget for May 18 Meeting Charge to Board Development Committee for FY23 Nominations CEDS Update? ECOS Annual Report, if ready?
April 20, 2022	Draft FY23 UPWP and Budget Board Development Committee Recommendation for FY22 Nominations Transportation Resilience Planning Tool?
May 18, 2022	Public Hearing Final FY23 UPWP and Budget I-89 2050 Study draft recommendations?
June 15, 2022 Annual Meeting	Election of Officers and Executive Committee FY23 Meeting Calendar Warn Public Hearing for FY23-26 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
July	Public Hearing for FY23-26 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Park and Ride Plan



**CCRPC Board**

**February 16, 2022**

**Consent Agenda Item: C1**

**Safety Performance Targets for the Metropolitan Planning Area**

**Background:** The Federal Transportation Acts (MAP-21 and FAST Act) placed considerable emphasis on system performance and directed State Departments of Transportation (DOTs), MPOs and Transit Providers to evaluate how well the transportation system is doing. At the national level, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) have established a Transportation Performance Management (TPM) program, a strategic initiative designed to achieve national transportation performance goals. The intent is to measure progress against the national goals through a reliable data-driven process. FHWA has established measures in the following areas: Safety, Infrastructure Condition (Pavement & Bridges), Congestion, System Reliability (NHS Performance), Freight Movements (Interstate), and Environmental Sustainability. Once the *measures* were established, it was up to state DOTs and MPOs to set quantifiable *targets* to gauge progress towards national goals. The schedule to establish targets, varies by measure. Federal regulations generally have state DOTs set performance targets in various categories (safety, asset condition, system performance, etc.) and then give MPOs another 180 days to either adopt the State targets or establish their own.

**Safety Measures and Targets**

Targets for the Safety Measures tabulated below are established every year by VTrans, in collaboration with the CCRPC. The TAC and the Board have reviewed and accepted these targets annually, beginning with the first statewide safety targets established in the summer of 2017 and reported to FHWA in the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) report. The CCRPC is asked again to review and take action on the statewide targets set in the 2021 HSIP annual report.

Under federal regulations the CCRPC can either:

1. Accept the state targets for each performance measure and support them through programming; or
2. Define their own quantifiable targets for the MPO area.

The CY 2020, 2021 and 2022 statewide safety measures and targets are listed below:

<b>VTrans Safety Performance Measures</b>	<b>2020 Targets (5 Year Average)</b>	<b>2021 Targets (5 Year Average)</b>	<b>2022 Targets (5 Year Average)</b>
<b>Number of Fatalities</b>	58	58	58
<b>Fatality Rate (Fatalities per 100M VMT)</b>	0.82	0.82	0.82
<b>Number of Serious Injuries</b>	275	275	260
<b>Serious Injury Rate (Serious Injuries per 100M VMT)</b>	3.70	3.65	3.70
<b>Total Number of Non-motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries</b>	36	36	35

**TAC and Staff  
Recommendation:**

***The TAC and CCRPC Staff recommends that the Board accepts the 2022 VTrans statewide safety targets, as reported in the 2021 HSIP Annual Report, for the metropolitan planning area.***

The factors considered to reach this recommendation are listed below:

1. The regional level data on fatalities and injuries fluctuates (sometimes wildly) from year to year making it difficult to establish a clear, reasonable data-driven target.
2. There are no practical policy or financial consequences for the CCRPC to set regional targets.
3. Safety is important and the CCRPC is committed to incorporate the federal safety performance measures into the ECOS/MTP report (together with other transportation measures) and track and report regional safety data annually as part of the ECOS Scorecard.
4. The CCRPC will have an annual opportunity to review the statewide targets and set its own quantifiable targets for the MPO area if it chooses to do so.

**Staff contact:**

Sai Sarepalli, [ssarepalli@ccrpcvt.org](mailto:ssarepalli@ccrpcvt.org)



## **Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission**

**February 16, 2022**

**Agenda Item 3: Consent Item**

### **Transportation Improvement Program TIP Amendments**

**Issues:** Make the changes listed below to the FY22 year of the TIP. The FY2022-2025 TIP has not yet been approved by FHWA so these changes will apply to both the FY2020-2023 TIP, which remains in effect, and the FY2022-2025 TIP. These projects will be funded outside of CCRPC's fiscal constraint limit.

#### **Resurfacing VT2A, Colchester-Essex (Project HP156, Amendment FY22-17)**

**Description of TIP Change:** Add a new project to the TIP in FY22 for resurfacing VT Route 2A from the Class 1 limit north of North Street, in Essex, to US Route 7, in Colchester. Work will also take place on VT Route 127, between its intersections with US Route 7 and VT Route 2A.

Add \$1,795,072 for construction in FY22. Preliminary engineering for this project was funded under regional project Design Scoping Projects (OT006).

This project is being funded outside of CCRPC's fiscal constraint limit. Adding a non-constrained project is defined as a Minor Amendment according to CCRPC's TIP Amendment Policy.

Note that this project will be advertised as a composite contract with the Essex NH 033-1(26) project, which will pave VT Route 289 (see below).

#### **Resurfacing VT Route 289, Essex (Project HP157, Amendment FY22-18)**

**Description of TIP Change:** Add a new project to the TIP in FY22 for resurfacing VT Route 289, from VT Route 117 to VT Route 2A. Work under this project will also include the VT Route 289 on- and off-ramps.

Add \$2,979,197 for construction in FY22. Preliminary engineering for this project was funded under regional project Design Scoping Projects (OT006).

This project is being funded outside of CCRPC's fiscal constraint limit. Adding a non-constrained project is defined as a Minor Amendment according to CCRPC's TIP Amendment Policy.

Note that this project will be advertised as a composite contract with the Essex-Colchester STP 0207(4) project, which will pave VT Route 2A (see above).

**GMT Capital – Federal (Project TR003A, Amendment FY22-19)**

**Description of TIP Change:** Increase the amount of federal funds in FY22 from \$50,000 to \$200,000.

GMT receives FTA Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Funds each year that are divided between two separate projects -- Capital (Project TR003A) and Operating (Project TR002). GMT proposed to increase the amount to Capital (TR003A) to cover necessary preventative maintenance activities. Note that GMT anticipates additional 5307 funds may be available in FY22 so we are not proposing to reduce funding in project TR002 at this time.

**GMT Capital – Facility and Bus Heavy Repairs (Project TR078, Amendment FY22-20) and GMT Preventative Maintenance, Safety, and Equipment Replacements (Project TR046, Amendment FY22-21)**

**Description of TIP Change:** Add CMAQ as a funding source, along with STP Transfer, to both of these projects. This change will increase funding flexibility for these projects.

**East-West Alternative Transportation Crossing, South Burlington (Project BP117, Amendment FY22-22)**

**Description of TIP Change:** Add a new project to the TIP in FY22 for an East-West Alternative Transportation Crossing in South Burlington. Add \$240,000 in federal funds for PE in FY22.

South Burlington was awarded a RAISE (Rebuilding American Infrastructure with Sustainability and Equity) grant of \$9,768,834 to construct an Alternative Transportation Crossing of I-89 near Exit 14.

**Lindenwood Dive Closed Drainage System and Stormwater Treatment, South Burlington (Project OT046, Amendment FY22-23)**

**Description of TIP Change:** Advance \$96,610 from FY21 to FY22. This amendment changes the FY20 TIP to match the FY22 TIP, which was approved by the CCRPC Board on July 21, 2021. This project will be constructed in 2022.

**VT128 Culvert BR1 Carrying Alder Brook, Essex (Project BR060, Amendment FY22-24)**

**Description of TIP Change:** Move \$400,000 in federal funds for construction from FY21 to FY22 and add \$60,000. This project did not advance to construction in FY21 but will be constructed in 2022.

**Exit 16 Improvements, Colchester** (Project HP102, Amendment FY22-25)

**Description of TIP Change:** Change the FY20-23 TIP to match FY22-25 TIP as follows – increase federal funds for construction in FY22 from \$2,965,140 to \$4,000,000, add \$6,090,000 in FY23, and add \$2,997,712 in FY24. The project is scheduled to begin construction in 2022.

**Stormwater System Retrofit with Infiltration Systems and Stabilized Outfalls for Three Cul-de-sacs, Essex** (Project OT040, Amendment FY22-26)

**Description of TIP Change:** Change the FY20-23 TIP to match FY22-25 TIP as follows -- move \$189,104 from FY20 to FY22. This project is scheduled to be constructed in 2022.

**US2 Paving, Bolton-Richmond** (Project HP148, Amendment FY22-27)

**Description of TIP Change:** Change the FY20-23 TIP to match FY22-25 TIP as follows -- \$962,838 in FY22, \$7,308,000 in FY23, and \$6,593,440 in FY24. This project is scheduled to begin construction in 2022.

**US7 Paving, Charlotte-South Burlington** (Project HP149, Amendment FY22-28)

**Description of TIP Change:** Advance construction from FY23/24 to FY22/23 as follows -- \$4,000,000 in FY22 and \$3,879,517 in FY23. This change results in an increase in construction cost of \$728,474 which is a 10% increase. This project is scheduled to begin construction in 2022.

**TAC/Staff**

**Recommendation:**

Recommend that the Board approve the proposed TIP Amendments.

**For more information contact:**

Christine Forde  
cforde@ccrpcvt.org or 846-4490 ext. 113

**Chittenden County  
Multi-Jurisdictional All-Hazards Mitigation Plan**

**Executive Overview**

**February 18, 2022**

The 2022 Chittenden County Multi-Jurisdictional All-Hazards Mitigation Plan (MJAHP) outlines the County and its jurisdictions strategy to implement practices, improvements, and programs to lessen community impacts from natural and man-made hazard events. At the outset of the hazard mitigation planning process, a Hazard Mitigation Committee (HMC) was formed composed of Jurisdictional staff, Chittenden County Regional Planning Council staff and other key stakeholders, whose task it was to prepare a plan pursuant to the federal Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (DMA2K). This 2022 plan outlines how the HMC addressed the following for each hazard identified during the planning process as having the potential to impact the local population, built and natural environment, and the economy:

- Developed a complete hazard profile.
- Described the extent of the risks posed by the hazard.
- Discussed each jurisdiction’s vulnerability to each hazard.
- Created mitigation strategies (mitigation actions) to be implemented by each jurisdiction to mitigate or reduce the hazard’s impact.
- Updating the Chittenden County MJAHP.

The MJAHP is a comprehensive update to the current 2017 Chittenden County Plan. Since the initial plan was developed, the jurisdictions within the County have significantly improved community resiliency because of mitigation programs and activities implemented by the various jurisdictional departments, agencies, and stakeholders. The goals and objectives outlined in the 2017 plan were refined in 2022 to reflect changes in community priorities, and to enhance integration among community planning mechanisms. The plan’s vision is aligned with the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission’s 2018 CCRPC ECOS Plan mission.

The 2022 MJAHP discusses nine main natural hazards of concern and other technological and societal hazards; includes information about the impacts of climate change; and describes the adverse consequences resulting from each natural hazard. The risk and vulnerability assessments for all natural hazards of concern were updated using best available data and a more robust risk assessment platform.

Significant revisions and enhancements were made to the action plan, including the identification of implementation parameters aimed at enhancing transparency and accountability.

## Who Participated in the Planning Process?

The MJAHP update is a result of a collaborative effort between 18 of the 19 county jurisdictions agencies, residents, the private sector, and regional and state organizations. Public and stakeholder participation and input were critical to develop goals and action items that will be implemented by a person or position whose technical expertise qualifies them as the best individual or agency to be responsible for implementing each mitigation action.

Three virtual meetings with the HMC were held as well as several other one-on-one meeting with jurisdictions as requested. Additionally, we hosted several virtual Open Office Meetings/Sessions to provide an opportunity for any jurisdiction that was having problems or needed assistance in providing any information requested could join the call and drop off as their issues or questions are addressed. The HMC guided the plan development from the outset through plan completion. The HMC included representatives from:

### 2022 Chittenden County MJAHP Hazard Mitigation Steering Committee (HMC)

Name	Title	Agency/Organization
Amy Grover	Town Clerk & Treasurer	Town of Bolton
Jake Perkinson	Gore Supervisor	Buels Gore
Norm Baldwin	City Engineer	City of Burlington

Name	Title	Agency/Organization
Larry Lewack	Planner	Town of Charlotte
<del>Colchester</del>	<del>Not participating in this plan</del>	<del>Not participating in this plan</del>
Chief Ron Hoague	Chief of Police	Essex Police Department
Chief Ron Hoague	Chief of Police	Essex Police Department/Essex Junction
Todd Odit	Town Administrator	Town of Hinesburg
Darlene Palola	Resident appointed by Town	Town of Huntington
John Abbott	Town Administrator	Town of Jericho
Michaela Foody	Director of Public Safety	Town of Milton
Ravi Ventkataraman	Town Planner	Town of Richmond
Neil Boyden	Town Clerk & Treasurer	Town of St. George
Lee Krohn	Town Manager	Town Shelburne
Paul Conner	Director of Planning & Zoning	City of South Burlington
Brad Holden	Town Administrator	Town of Underhill
Kate Lalley	Administrative Officer	Town of Westford
Matt Boulanger	Planning Director	Town of Williston
John Audy	Fire Chief	City of Winooski

## Plan Development Approach

MJAHMP Development encompassed broad participation from a cross-section of stakeholders. This strategy was designed to foster development of a plan that produced specific initiatives that would enable the participating jurisdictions to reduce the adverse impacts from natural hazards in the county through actions embraced by both elected officials and the citizens of the county. The planning process was accomplished in eight phases:

### 2022 Chittenden County MJAHMP Planning Process

Phase	Activity
Phase 1	Organize resources and review the prior plan.
Phase 2	Update the hazard identification and risk assessment.
Phase 3	Review and update the plan mitigation strategy.
Phase 4	Review and update the plan maintenance strategy (pending).
Phase 5	Assemble the updated plan (pending).
Phase 6	Initiate and complete plan review and adoption.
Phase 7	Implement the approved, adopted plan (pending).

Concurrent with plan development, the jurisdictions assessed natural hazard risks for each jurisdiction's Critical Facilities and reclassified them using the FEMA Community Lifeline designations. Results of this assessment are incorporated into the plan document as appropriate.

## Updating the Risk Assessment

Risk assessment is the process of measuring the potential loss of life, personal injury, economic impact, and property damage resulting from natural hazards. The risk assessment was used to rank risk and to gauge the potential impacts of each hazard of concern on each jurisdiction. Based on the risk assessment, hazards of concern were ranked for the risk they pose to the overall planning area.

### 2022 Chittenden MJAHMP - Summary of Jurisdictional Ranking by Hazard

Jurisdiction		Natural Hazards																				
		CCRPC	Bolton	Buel's Gore	Burlington	Charlotte	Colchester	Essex	Essex Junction	Hinesburg	Huntington	Jericho	Milton	Richmond	St. George	Shelburne	South Burlington	Underhill	Westford	Williston	Winooski	
Dam/Levee Failure		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Flooding			H	L	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	H	L	M	L	H		M	M	L
Fluvial Erosion			H	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	H	L					L	L	
Human Infectious Disease			M	L	M	L	M	M	M	M	L	M	M	M	M	M	M		M	M	M	
Invasive Species			M	L	L	M	M	M	L	M	L	L	L	L	L	L	L		L	L	L	
Severe Thunderstorm Winds			H	M	H	M	M	M	M	H	M	M	H	L	H	H	H		M	H	H	
Severe Winter Storm			H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	M	M	H		H	H	H	
Wildfire			M	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	M	M	L	M		L	L	L	
Jurisdiction		Technological Hazards																				
		CCRPC	Bolton	Buel's Gore	Burlington	Charlotte	Colchester	Essex	Essex Junction	Hinesburg	Huntington	Jericho	Milton	Richmond	St. George	Shelburne	South Burlington	Underhill	Westford	Williston	Winooski	
Hazardous Materials			L	L	H	L	L	M	M	L	L	L	M	L	L	M	M	L		L	H	M
Major Transportation Incidences			M	M	M	M	M	M	M	L	L	L	M	H	L	M	M	L		L	M	M
Multi-structural Fires			L	L	H	M	L	M	M	M	M	L	M	L	M	M	M	M		L	M	M
Natural Gas Loss			L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	M	L	L	L	M	L	L		L	L	L	
Other Fuel Loss			L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	M	L	L	L	L		L	L	L	
Power Loss			H	L	L	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	H	L	L	H		L	L	H	
Sewer Service Loss			L	L	L	L	M	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	M	L		L	M	M	
Telecommunication Loss			M	L	L	M	L	M	M	M	M	L	L	L	M	L	L		M	M	L	
Water Pollution (algal bloom, etc.)			L	L	M	M	L	M	M	L	L	L	L	L	M	M	L		L	L	L	
Water Supply			L	L	L	L	L	M	M	L	L	L	L	M	M	M	M		L	L	L	
Jurisdiction		Societal Hazards																				
		CCRPC	Bolton	Buel's Gore	Burlington	Charlotte	Colchester	Essex	Essex Junction	Hinesburg	Huntington	Jericho	Milton	Richmond	St. George	Shelburne	South Burlington	Underhill	Westford	Williston	Winooski	
Civil Disturbances			L	L	M	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L		L	L	L	
Crime			L	L	L	M	M	L	L	L	L	M	M	M	L	L	L		M	M	M	
Economic Recovery			L	L	L	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	L	M	M	M		M	L	M	
Key Employer Loss			M	L	L	L	L	M	M	L	L	L	M	M	L	L	L		L	L	M	
Terrorism			L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	M	M	L		L	L	L	
Note: Dam /Levee Failure was not assessed																						

## Estimates of the Cost of Potential Damage

Data research and scenario development determined that the costliest type of hazard event in terms of dollar losses would result from Flooding, which could result in estimated damages of \$24 billion, in a worst-case countywide incident.

## Develop and Implement a Public Engagement Strategy

The HMC developed a public engagement strategy based on a review of best practices, interviews with community members, and input from technical experts contracted to assist with development of the equity lens, which is a deliberately inclusive element of organizational decision making for the planning process and for generating mitigation action outcomes. The implemented strategy will promote cooperation between each jurisdiction’s government and community organizations. The planning process encouraged public participation during plan development, and the MJAHP identifies how the HMC will facilitate continued engagement with residents after the plan is adopted.

- We received 258 responses to a public survey designed to secure community input about hazards that affect them.
- Draft plan will be posted on each jurisdiction’s website for a 15–30-day public comment period.

Feedback received from the public engagement strategy was used throughout the plan update process, especially in mitigation actions identification and selection.

## Mitigation Strategies and Goals

The following Strategies from the 2018 CCRPC *ECOS* Plan have been revised for the 2022 MJAHP update and will guide the plan implementation activities over the next five years:

### 2022 Chittenden County MJAHP Regional Strategies

<b>Category A</b>	Assist municipalities with development of plans, policies, and zoning regulations
<b>Category B</b>	Promote municipal participation in development and implementation of Tactical Basin Plans
<b>Category C</b>	Assist municipalities to develop & improve infrastructure
<b>Category D</b>	Assist municipalities in protecting people, buildings, and facilities where development already exists
<b>Category E</b>	Assist municipalities in promoting growth in appropriate locations and with transportation infrastructure planning
<b>Category F</b>	Assist municipalities in meeting standards to minimize required municipal share towards FEMA Public Assistance project costs

The HMC reviewed and updated the goals from the 2017 MJAHP and developed a set of supporting objectives identified by municipalities. The goals were selected to support the regional strategies, as well as the vision and mission identified in each jurisdiction’s Comprehensive Plan. The 2022 goals are presented below:

### 2022 Chittenden County MJAHP Regional Goals

<b>GOAL 1</b>	Protect existing and planned municipal infrastructure.
<b>GOAL 2</b>	Protect life and residential and business properties from natural and manmade hazards.
<b>GOAL 3</b>	Promote and enhance opportunities for public education about hazard mitigation.
<b>GOAL 4</b>	Encourage municipalities to formally incorporate their local all hazards mitigation plan into their comprehensive plan, as well as incorporate proposed mitigation actions into

	various bylaws, regulations and ordinances, and municipal operating and capital improvement plans.
<b>GOAL 5</b>	Promote appropriate planning for growth with a focus on changing climate and resiliency.

## Recommended Actions

The MJAHMP’s action plan will present a number of mitigation initiatives designed to reduce or minimize losses from hazard events. Each jurisdictions selected mitigation actions after reviewing a variety of resources, including a mitigation best practices catalog; HMC and other stakeholder recommendations; the results of the risk assessment and issues identified therefrom; public input; other plans and programs; the results of the capability assessment; and actions identified in the 2017 MJAHMP.

## Action Evaluation and Prioritization

In developing and prioritizing the 2022 mitigation actions, the HMC elected to use the FEMA recommended STAPLEE evaluation criteria tool as outlined in the *FEMA Local Mitigation Planning Handbook* (March 2013). As part of the mitigation strategy, details for each action included the lead agency or position responsible for implementing each action, and a timeline for completion. A qualitative benefit/cost review was conducted.

## Initiate and Complete Plan Review and Adoption

A draft copy of the MJAHMP will be submitted to VEM and FEMA Region II for review and approval. The approved final MJAHMP will be presented to, and adopted by, each jurisdiction’s administrative body.

## Implement the Approved, Adopted Plan

The plan will be implemented over the next five years as the lead agencies begin to implement the actions identified therein. The HMC included in the plan implementation and maintenance strategy to guide plan implementation. This phase was designed by, and requires commitment from, each jurisdiction’s agencies, elected officials, stakeholders, and county residents to reach each jurisdiction’s goal of natural hazard risk reduction.

## Continued Public Involvement

Chittenden County and its jurisdictions are dedicated to involving the public directly in the continual review and updates of the MJAHMP. Copies of the Plan will be catalogued and made available at Jurisdiction Town Halls and the Public Libraries. Public comments related to the Plan will be kept with each Jurisdiction’s Administrative Office. In addition, copies of the Plan and any proposed changes will be posted on each jurisdiction’s website. This site will also contain an email address and phone number to which people can direct their comments, recommendations, and concerns.

## Current Status of Draft Plan

Draft Plan Section	Percent Completion
Base Plan	80%
Section 1-Introduction	100%
Section 2-Planning Process	75%
Section 3-County Profile	90%
Section 4-Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment	85%
Section 5-Capability Assessment	90%
Section 6-Mitigation Strategy	80%
Section 7-Plan Maintenance Process	95%

## Remaining Tentative Schedule:

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Estimated Dates</b>
Submitting draft plan to VEMA and other key stakeholders for technical review	February 7, 2022
Release for review by Planning Team (HMC) for review	February 18, 2022 (tentative)
Release for review by neighboring communities	February 25, 2022
Release for public comment	March 3, 2022
Submitting draft plan to VEMA and other key stakeholders for technical review	March XX, 2022



## **Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission**

**February 16, 2022**

**Agenda Item 7: CCRPC Board Action Item**

### **Appointments to Basin Water Quality Councils**

**Background:** Act 76 established a system of Clean Water Service Providers (CWSP) for each of the six Lake Champlain Basins plus the Lake Memphremagog basin to work to identify & prioritize, develop, implement, and maintain non-regulatory water quality projects to help meet required Total Maximum Daily Load allowances for phosphorus. Each CWSP shall empanel a Basin Water Quality Council (BWQC) to assist especially with identification & prioritization and reviewing proposed projects. Each BWQC has nine members allocated as follows: Land Conservation Organizations – 1 seat; Municipalities - 2 seats; Natural Resource Conservation Districts - 2 seats; Regional Planning Commissions – 2 seats, and Watershed Protection Organizations – 2 seats

There are three basins within Chittenden County:

- Northern Lake Champlain Direct Drainages (Basin 5),
- Lamoille River (Basin 7) and
- Winooski River (Basin 8).

The respective CWSPs for each of these Basins has determined that CCRPC is eligible to appoint one member and one alternate for each basin. Staff solicited nominations from late December through late January. BWQC members are appointed from among persons knowledgeable on clean water topics. Below are the people who have volunteered to date. If we are able to find a second person for Basin 7, that appointment will be brought to the CCRPC Board at that time.

**Staff Recommendation:** Basin 5: Member-Karen Adams (Colchester), Alternate-Miles Waite (Environment/Conservation)

Basin 7: Member-Kate Lalley (Westford)

Basin 8: Member-Darlene Palola (Huntington), Alternate-Garret Mott (Buels Gore)

**For more information contact:**

Charlie Baker, [cbaker@ccrpcvt.org](mailto:cbaker@ccrpcvt.org), 802-735-3500

Dan Albrecht, [dalbrecht@ccrpcvt.org](mailto:dalbrecht@ccrpcvt.org)

**FY2023 VTrans Transportation Capital Program -- Governor's Recommended Budget  
Chittenden County Projects Listed in the "Front of the Book"**

Project	Vtrans Number	Funding in State FY23 (7/1/22 - 6/30/23)				Construction Year (State Fiscal Year)
		State	Federal	Local	(fed+state+local)	
<b>Paving - State Paving</b>						
Burlington Resurface Class I	NH PC22-(1)	\$756,800	\$3,243,200		\$4,000,000	SFY22/23/24
Charlotte-South Burlington Resurfacing US7 from south of Ferry Road to Swift Street	PS22(2)	\$756,800	\$3,243,200		\$4,000,000	SFY23/24
New Colchester-Essex Resurface VT15	NH PS24(11)	\$9,460	\$40,540		\$50,000	SFY24/25
New Essex Resurface VT289	NH 033-1(26)	\$600,595	\$2,573,798		\$3,174,393	SFY22/23
New Essex-Colchester Resurface VT2A	STP 0207(2)	\$371,580	\$1,592,373		\$1,963,953	SFY22/23
New Hinesburg-South Burlington Resurface VT116	STP PS25(8)	\$9,460	\$40,540		\$50,000	SFY25/26
Richmond-Bolton Resurface US2	STP 2924(1)	\$1,040,600	\$4,459,400		\$5,500,000	SFY23/24/25
Winooski Resurface Class I Routes	NH PC22(2)	\$289,918	\$1,242,420		\$1,532,338	SFY22/23
<b>TOTAL PAVING</b>					<b>\$20,270,684</b>	
<b>Interstate Bridge</b>						
Colchester Exit 17	NH 028-1(31)		\$171,282		\$171,282	SFY24/25/26
Richmond BR29 on US2	IM 089-2(52)	\$239,432	\$2,154,891		\$2,394,323	SFY23/24/25
<b>TOTAL INTERSTATE BRIDGE</b>					<b>\$2,565,605</b>	
<b>State Bridges</b>						
Essex VT128 Culvert BR1 Carrying Alder Brook	BM19501	\$115,000	\$460,000		\$575,000	SFY23
<b>TOTAL STATE BRIDGE</b>					<b>\$575,000</b>	
<b>Town Highway Bridges</b>						
Huntington BR32 on Camel's Hump Road	BP 1445(38)	\$107,240	\$857,920	\$107,240	\$1,072,400	SFY22/23
New Jericho BR15 on FAS 0209	BF 0209(10)	\$7,500	\$60,000	\$7,500	\$75,000	SFY25/26
<b>TOTAL TOWN HIGHWAY BRIDGE</b>					<b>\$1,147,400</b>	
<b>Roadway</b>						
Burlington Champlain Parkway	MEGC M 5000(1)	\$340,980	\$10,797,700	\$227,320	\$11,366,000	SFY22-SFY27
New Burlington Railyard Enterprise	BREP (3)	\$37,910	\$344,590	\$42,500	\$425,000	SFY25/26/27
New Charlotte-South Burlington Replace/Rehabilitate Culverts on US7	NH CULV(82)	\$24,200	\$103,707		\$127,907	SFY22/23
Colchester Prim/West Lakeshore Dr	STP 5600(20)	\$224,825	\$963,488		\$1,188,313	SFY22/23/24
New Essex Stormwater Retrofit at VT289/VT15	NH SWFR(4)	\$16,082		\$68,918	\$85,000	SFY23/24
Susie Wilson Road Corridor and Intersection Improvements, Essex	STP 5400(11)		\$50,000		\$50,000	SFY24/25
Essex Junction Crescent Connector	STP 5300(13)	\$810,102	\$3,471,619		\$4,281,721	SFY22/23/24
Richmond US2 Culvert at MM 2.25	STP CULV(58)	\$8,514	\$36,486		\$45,000	SFY24/25
New Richmond-Bolton Rehabilitate/Replace Culverts on US2	STP CULV(86)	\$10,601	\$45,430		\$56,031	SFY22/23
New South Burlington Stormwater Retrofit in Four Locations on I-89	IM SWFR(3)	\$8,500	\$76,500		\$85,000	SFY24/25
New Williston Exit 12 Phase I	NH 5500(18)	\$243,240	\$1,042,384		\$1,285,624	SFY22/23
Williston US2/Industrial Ave	STP M 5500(7S)	\$392,750	\$1,683,096		\$2,075,846	SFY22/23/24
<b>TOTAL ROADWAY</b>					<b>\$21,071,442</b>	
<b>Safety and Traffic Operations</b>						
Burlington Shelburne St Roundabout	HES 5000(18)		\$4,281,946		\$4,281,946	SFY22/23
Colchester Exit 16	HES NH 5600(14)		\$5,909,764		\$5,909,764	SFY23/24/25
Colchester Exit 16 Utility Work	MJ 5600(14)C/1		\$1,806,379		\$1,806,379	
Colchester Severance Corners	STPG 5600(17)		\$800,000		\$800,000	SFY25/26/27
Colchester-Essex Signals	NHG SGNL(58)		\$95,000		\$95,000	SFY25/26
Essex VT117/North Williston Road	STP 5400(10)		\$549,407		\$549,407	SFY23/24
Essex VT15/Sand Hill Rd	STPG 030-1(22)		\$70,730		\$70,730	SFY24/25
Milton US7/Middle Rd/Railroad St	STP 5800(3)		\$129,312		\$129,312	SFY23/24/25/26
South Burlington - Exit 14 Signal Upgrades	STP SGNL(53)		\$421,383	\$105,346	\$526,729	SFY24/25
Williston - VT2A/Industrial Ave	STP 5500(17)		\$174,423		\$174,423	SFY24/25
Williston US2/Trader Ln	STPG 5500(14)	\$420,000			\$420,000	SFY22/23
<b>TOTAL SAFETY AND TRAFFIC OPERATIONS</b>					<b>\$14,763,690</b>	
<b>Park and Ride</b>						
Williston South of Exit 12	CMG PARK(29)		\$3,012,785		\$3,012,785	SFY22/23
<b>TOTAL PARK AND RIDE</b>					<b>\$3,012,785</b>	

**FY2023 VTrans Transportation Capital Program -- Governor's Recommended Budget  
Chittenden County Projects Listed in the "Front of the Book"**

Project	Vtrans Number	Funding in State FY23 (7/1/22 - 6/30/23)				Construction Year (State Fiscal Year)
		State	Federal	Local	(fed+state+local)	
<b>Bike and Pedestrian Facilities</b>						
New Burlington -- North Champlain Bike Lane	ST BP21(1)	\$12,500		\$12,500	\$25,000	SFY22/23
New Colchester -- RRFB Crosswalks	ST BP22(4)	\$5,000		\$5,000	\$10,000	SFY22/23
Hinesburg - Village South Sidewalk	STP BP16(11)		\$206,900	\$51,725	\$258,625	SFY23
Shelburne - Irish Hill Road Pedestrian Bridge	STP BP18(3)		\$351,360	\$87,840	\$439,200	SFY23
New South Burlington Bike Racks	ST BP 18(27)	\$2,481		\$2,481	\$4,962	SFY22/23
New South Burlington RRF Crosswalk	ST BP21(17)	\$25,000		\$25,000	\$50,000	SFY22/23
South Burlington Williston Road Bike/Ped Facility	STP BP17(9)		\$118,362	\$29,590	\$147,952	SFY24/25
South Burlington - Dorset Street	STP BP19(4)		\$40,630	\$10,158	\$50,788	SFY24/25
Winooski	STP BP19(7)		\$160,000	\$40,000	\$200,000	SFY22/23
<b>TOTAL BIKE AND PEDESTRIAN</b>					<b>\$1,186,527</b>	
<b>Transportation Alternatives</b>						
Burlington Schifilleti Park Shared Use Path	TAP TA20(11)		\$18,450	\$4,612	\$23,062	SFY25
New Burlington Lake Street Shared Use Path	TAP TA21(1)		\$40,000	\$10,000	\$50,000	SFY25
Colchester - Stormwater BMPs in the Moorings Stream Watershed	TAP TA18(1)		\$259,200	\$64,800	\$324,000	SFY24
Essex Stormwater Retrofit with Infiltration	TAP TA18(2)		\$185,029	\$46,257	\$231,286	SFY22/23
Jericho - Lee River Road Sidewalk	TAP TA17(1)		\$133,600	\$33,400	\$167,000	SFY23/24
South Burlington- Kennedy Drive Stormwater Pond Expansion	TAP TA18(7)		\$12,000	\$3,000	\$15,000	SFY24/25
New South Burlington Spear Street Shared Use Path	TAP TA21(14)		\$28,000	\$7,000	\$35,000	SFY25
New Williston VT2A Connector Path	TAP TA21(6)		\$22,400	\$5,600	\$28,000	SFY25
Winooski - Gateway Crosswalk Enhancements	TAP TA17(2)		\$209,600	\$52,400	\$262,000	SFY22/23
<b>TOTAL TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES</b>					<b>\$1,135,348</b>	
<b>Rail</b>						
Burlington - King Street Crossing Safety Improvements	STP 2035(27)	\$4,264	\$38,280	\$5,000	\$47,544	SFY21/22/23
Burlington - Improve Maple Street Crossing	STP 2035(28)	\$4,000	\$36,000	\$10,000	\$50,000	SFY21/22/23
Burlington - Improve Intervale Road Crossing	STP 2035(29)	\$15,000	\$135,000		\$150,000	SFY23/24/23
Burlington - Power Switch Installation	VTRY(50)	\$23,030	\$26,970		\$50,000	SFY21/22/23
Burlington - Construct Siding for Amtrak	VTRY(51)		\$373,068		\$373,068	SFY22/23
Burlington - Realign LaValley Lane	VTRY(52)	\$38,373		\$14,208	\$52,581	SFY22/23
Charlotte - Rehab BR252.7 over Thorp Brook on VTR	VTRY(15)	\$68,076	\$272,305		\$340,381	SFY22/23
Shelburne-Burlington Quite Zone Maintenance	SF9043	\$75,000			\$75,000	Ongoing
Winooski Improve Malletts Bay Ave Crossing	STP 5100(14)	\$15,520	\$139,680		\$155,200	SFY22/23
<b>TOTAL RAIL</b>					<b>\$1,293,774</b>	
<b>2023 TOTAL</b>					<b>\$67,022,255</b>	

**Notes**

Highlighted projects are new to the Front of the Book. They may have previously been listed as Development & Evaluation or Candidate projects.

Totals do not include Public Transit or Aviation.

**FY2023 Governor Recommend  
Chittenden County Projects On the Development and Evaluation\* Lists**

Project	Vtrans Number	Funding in State FY23 (7/1/22 - 6/30/23)			
		Federal	State	Local	Total
<b>Interstate Bridge</b>					
Richmond BR53N	IM 089-2( )	\$45,000	\$5,000		\$50,000
Richmond BR55S	IM 089-2( )	\$45,000	\$5,000		\$50,000
<b>State Highway Bridges</b>					
Buel's Gore BR29 on VT17	BF 0200(11)	\$104,000	\$26,000		\$130,000
Williston BR23 on US2	BF 5500(19)	\$160,000	\$40,000		\$200,000
<b>Roadway</b>					
Bolton-Milton	IM 089-2(53)	\$90,000	\$10,000		\$100,000
Colchester - Improve VT2A Corridor	STP 5600(19)	\$200,000			\$200,000
Milton-Georgia US7 Reconstruction	STP 0285(17)	\$40,540	\$9,460		\$50,000
Williston US2 Reconstruction	STP 5500(20)	\$40,540	\$9,460		\$50,000
<b>Traffic &amp; Safety</b>					
New Regionally Driven Projects via VPS2	Burlington - Colchester Ave/Barret/Mill	STP 5000(29)	\$40,540	\$9,460	\$50,000
	Burlington - Colchester Ave/Prospect	STP 5000(30)	\$40,540	\$9,460	\$50,000
	Colchester - Bayside Intersection Roundabout	STP 5600(22)	\$40,540	\$9,460	\$50,000
	Jericho - VT117/Skunk Hollow Road	NH 035-1(3)	\$40,540	\$9,460	\$50,000
	Milton - US7/West Milton Road	STP 5800(4)	\$40,540	\$9,460	\$50,000
	Shelburne - US7/Harbor Road	NH 019-4(34)	\$40,540	\$9,460	\$50,000
	South Burlington - VT116/Cheesefactory Road	STP 5200(23)	\$40,540	\$9,460	\$50,000

\* **Development & Evaluation** - A project moves from the *Candidate* list to the *Development and Evaluation* list when the project is expected to proceed to preliminary plans within 12 to 24 months. Development and Evaluation projects are anticipated to have preliminary engineering and/or right-of-way expenditures during the budget year.

**FY2023 Governor's Recommended Budget  
Chittenden County Projects On the Candidate\*\* Lists**

Project	VTrans Number
<b>Roadway</b>	
Essex VT117 - Safety/Armoring	Not assigned
Williston Mountain View Road	Not assigned
<b>Safety and Traffic Operations</b>	
St. George - VT116/VT2A Intersection	STP 021-1(36)
<b>Park and Ride</b>	
Williston North of I-89	CMG PARK( )
<b>Bike and Pedestrian Facilities</b>	
Burlington Waterfront North	STP SDWK(13)
Colchester - Mill Pond/Severance Road	
Essex VT15 Path -Old Stage Rd to Essex Way	
Williston US2 - Taft Corners to Village	
Williston VT2A Taft Corners Area	
<b>Town Highway Bridge</b>	
Charlotte BR31 on Dorset Street	BO 1445( )
Huntington BR10 on Main Road	BF 0211( )
Underhill BR7 on Pleasant Valley Road	BF 0233( )

\*\* **Candidate** - A project gets on the *Candidate* list after it has completed the planning process and has been accepted by VTrans. Candidate projects are not anticipated to have significant expenditures for preliminary engineering and/or right-of-way during the budget year, and funding for construction is not anticipated within a predictable time-frame. Candidate projects do not have specific funding levels identified.

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

5 DATE: Wednesday, February 2, 2022

6 TIME: 5:45 PM

7 PLACE: CCRPC office and Remote Attendance via ZOOM Meeting  
8

9 PRESENT: Catherine McMains, Chair Bard Hill, at large <5000  
10 Mike O'Brien, Immediate Past Chair Jacki Murphy, at large >5000  
11 Chris Shaw, Vice-Chair (6:17 PM) John Zicconi, Treasurer  
12

13 STAFF: Charlie Baker, Executive Director Regina Mahony, Planning Prog. Mgr.  
14 Eleni Churchill, Trans. Program Mgr. Forest Cohen, Senior Business Mgr.  
15 Emma Vaughn, Communications Mgr. Amy Irvin Witham, Business Office Mgr.  
16  
17

18 1. Call to Order, Attendance. The meeting was called to order at 5:45 PM by the Chair, Catherine  
19 McMains.  
20

21 2. Changes to the Agenda, Members' Items. Agenda Item 5. Socio-Econ Board Seat, Bruce Wilson Has  
22 been removed from the agenda.  
23

24 3. Approval of the January 5, 2022, Executive Committee Meeting Minutes  
25 JACKI MURPHY MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BARD HILL, TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 5, 2022,  
26 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES AS PRESENTED. MOTION CARRIED WITH ONE ABSTENION FROM  
27 JOHN ZICCONI.  
28

29 4. Act 250 & Section 248 Applications. There were none.  
30

31 5. Draft February Board Agenda

32 Charlie reviewed the proposed February Board meeting agenda with members. He noted there will  
33 be a vote on the appointees for the Basin Water Quality Councils and they are still looking for  
34 someone for the Lamoille Basin. Charlie said the State of Vermont has hired a consultant for the All  
35 the All-Hazard Mitigation Plan draft, we hope to have them join the meeting for a discussion. There  
36 was a public meeting held last week and we will review the I-89 2050 Study TDM results. We will  
37 also review the Transit Financing Report. Charlie said we plan to hold an in-person annual meeting  
38 at HULA in June. We will hold the business portion of the meeting virtually as well.  
39

40 6. Chair/Executive Director Report

41 a. FY23-UPWP. Charlie said we received close to 50 applications, which is typical. The total dollar  
42 amount is 1.7 million, although this number will increase. The dollars available are increasing  
43 due to the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act; Chris Jolley, from VTRANS (Vermont Agency  
44 of Transportation) said we will have approximately \$500K. John asked if there is a potential for  
45 new project requests to come in between the first and second meeting? Charlie said no, there  
46 was a hard deadline for the application submissions. Eleni agreed and said there will not be any  
47 more applications, but there may be some refinements to the current projects. Charlie asked

## Meeting Minutes

- 1 members to share any creative ideas they have in terms of generating municipal dues for  
2 match dollars.
- 3 b. Legislative update. Charlie said we may need to ask the State to provide funds to supplement  
4 the match dues. The RPC's statewide are asking for more support. Bard asked if is it mission  
5 redefinition in terms of funding and scope in terms of the municipalities? Charlie said there  
6 have been funds added and subsequently distributed for various needs during this fiscal year,  
7 but we are hoping there will continue to be funding available into the next fiscal year and the  
8 future. Members discussed. Charlie said the housing bill is being discussed in Senate  
9 Committee on Economic Development, Housing and General Affairs. Regina said she thinks this  
10 is stemming from Omnibus Bill. She explained there are three separate bills that will likely be  
11 merged. It can be expensive to figure out the funding for programs and making improvements  
12 across the board. It is also looking into changing *Chapter 117: Municipal and Regional Planning  
13 and Development*, which dictate municipal zoning regulations. There are multiple items on the  
14 table, and it is too soon to tell exactly how things will end up. Charlie said there is a bill coming  
15 out on the climate and energy front and on the transportation side, there are similar themes as  
16 the TDM (Transportation Demand Management) work we have been doing with the I-89 study.  
17 He said we also joined VTRANS for testimony on the prioritization system that was recently  
18 updated. Regina said we will communicate with any updates on the Broadband changes.  
19 Catherine said since the ARPA (American Rescue Plan Act) flexibility has changed. She  
20 requested a meeting with Charlie and Regina to discuss further.
- 21 c. Equity and Engagement Manager hiring update. Charlie said after the recent board approval for  
22 hiring an Equity and Engagement Manager, we posted the position to various outlets. Emma  
23 said she will share the posting with the Board members and Alternates. Charlie explained we  
24 engaged with Creative Discourse to help refine the wording in the job description. The  
25 application deadline is February 25<sup>th</sup>. Mike said he read the posting but wonders if there is too  
26 much focus on race, since the position is about being more inclusive, we do not want to  
27 exclude anyone from applying. Bard said he struggles with this as well. Bard also said he wants  
28 to ensure we are not stating anything as a fact if it is a hope. John said we cannot let perfection  
29 get in the way of progress.
- 30
- 31 7. Other Business: John said he will not be at either of our March meetings, however, Jeff Carr will  
32 likely be appointed as a new Shelburne selectboard member and may be able to sit in for him as the  
33 Shelburne alternate. Mike said he wants Charlie and Emma to know he really appreciates the efforts  
34 in terms of our Racial Equity efforts and Equity Leadership team.
- 35
- 36 8. Executive Session: There was none.
- 37
- 38 9. Adjournment: JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JACKI MURPHY, TO ADJOURN THE  
39 MEETING AT 6:27 PM. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

40  
41 Respectfully submitted,  
42 Amy Irvin Witham

1 CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
2 TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
3 MINUTES  
4

5 DATE: Tuesday, February 1, 2022  
6 TIME: 9:00 a.m.  
7 PLACE: Virtual Meeting via Zoom  
8

9 **Members Present**

10 Amanda Clayton, Colchester  
11 Amy Bell, VTrans  
12 Ashley Atkins, VTrans  
13 Matthew Langham, VTrans  
14 Bob Henneberger, Seniors  
15 Deirdre Holmes, Charlotte  
16 Sam Andersen, GBIC  
17 Barbara Elliott, Huntington  
18 Andrea Morgante, Hinesburg  
19 Sandy Thibault, CATMA  
20 Josh Arneson, Richmond  
21 Ravi Venkataraman, Richmond  
22 Nicole Losch, Burlington  
23 Kurt Johnson, Underhill  
24 Kirsten Jensen, Milton  
25 Bruce Hoar, Williston  
26 Mary Anne Michaels, Rail  
27  
28

Tom Dipietro, South Burlington  
Joss Besse, Bolton  
Chris Damiani, GMT

29 **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  
Chris Dubin, Senior Transportation Planner  
Marshall Distel, Senior Transportation Planner  
Sai Sarepalli, Senior Transportation Planning Engineer

30 **Guests**

Stephen Falbel, Steadman Hill  
Costa Pappis, VTrans  
Jon Olin

31 1. Barbara Elliott called the meeting to order at 9:01 AM.

32 **2. Consent Agenda**

33 Item 2a TIP Amendments: BRUCE HOAR MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE TIP  
34 AMENDMENTS, SECONDED BY SAM ANDERSEN. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.  
35 Item 2b Safety Performance Targets: SAM ANDERSEN MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE  
36 SAFETY PERFORMANCE TARGETS, SECONDED BY AMY BELL. THE MOTION PASSED  
37 UNANIMOUSLY.

38 **3. Approval of December 7, 2021 Minutes**

39 Barbara asked for any changes, which there were none. BOB HENNEBERGER MADE A MOTION TO  
40 APPROVE THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 7, 2021, SECONDED BY SANDY THIBAUT. THE  
41 MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.  
42

43 **4. Public Comments**

44 No comments from the public.  
45

46 **5. Transit Finance Study**

47 Marshall Distell introduced the Transit Finance Study which analyzed innovative approaches to financing  
48 public transportation in Vermont. Consultant Stephen Falbel of Steadman Hill gave a presentation of the  
49 study process, alternatives evaluation and recommendations from the study. He noted the presentation has  
50 been given to the Senate and House Transportation Committees, as well as the GMT Board of  
51 Commissioners, and will be delivered to Central Vermont RPC. The project goal was to find sustainable  
52 source of revenue to maintain current service levels and leverage new federal funds to increase transit  
53 access for all Vermonters. Currently only a third of Vermont towns are served by a bus route. All  
54 Vermont towns have access to demand response service, but there are eligibility requirements. We all pay

1 a little (WAPAL) principle implies an expansion of rural service so that all Vermonters have access to  
2 transit service. This differs from the Someone else pays (SEP) principle. Non-riders already pay for  
3 transit service through property taxes and transportation fund (T-fund) sources including gas/diesel taxes,  
4 purchase and use tax on vehicles, registration and license fees. The total transit funding target amount is  
5 \$21 million annually. A new funding source would mostly replace existing transit funding streams and  
6 therefore reduce pressure on property taxes and the T-fund. Increasing cost of driving would have  
7 marginal impact on transit funding. Conversion to mileage-based fee is anticipated due to fleet conversion  
8 to electric vehicles. Taking transit out of T-fund frees up those dollars for other uses. Existing funding  
9 sources likely aren't sufficient to maintain even current level of service indefinitely or service expansion.  
10 Alternatives considered include sales tax, payroll tax, business revenue, county property tax, income tax,  
11 utility fee, property transfer tax, mortgage recording tax. Stephen reviewed the alternative evaluation  
12 matrix and scoring, showing the utility fee scoring highest followed by the county property tax.

13  
14 Discussion ensued. Sam asked how was the utility fee rate decided, using the \$21 million budget need?  
15 Stephen said yes but note that rate would be less for industrial users, this was based on residential and  
16 commercial users. Sam could see this being an issue for high electric users so thanks for clarifying.  
17 Andrea asked why there wasn't analysis of the cost of transportation that goes everywhere, namely school  
18 busses, has anyone looked at what people pay for this through property tax for education, could we bring  
19 all public transportation under one umbrella? Stephen said this has been looked at in other reports but not  
20 in this particular study. Andrea noted understanding all the problems with this concept but why can't we  
21 recognize the possibilities and when will someone look at it in depth. Sandy said that GMT will be  
22 reinstating fares in July, the legislature is discussing transit, are any options being considered so fares  
23 remain free? Stephen said it's in the hands of legislature to decide. In spite of what the legislature does,  
24 GMT may decide it's worthwhile to raise fare revenue so if the legislature provides funding and GMT  
25 receives income from fares, then they could expand services. Charlie made two comments: 1. There's a  
26 lot of cash flowing right now so I don't expect the legislature to take action this session, but I think it's  
27 likely they will take it seriously starting next year because statewide we're going to have an issue drawing  
28 down federal funds without more local ability to provide match. 2. With regard to fare free, I wouldn't be  
29 surprised if, based on the numbers Stephen shared to make the rest of the state fare free, they could do  
30 that but not support Chittenden County to be fare free. Chris Damiani from GMT says their Board  
31 approved reinstating fares for the urban system and leaving rural system fare free in Central Vermont, and  
32 Franklin and Grand Isle Counties. Kurt asked if any other states besides Oregon have tried the utility tax.  
33 Stephen said it's only in the City of Corvallis rather than the state, and he's not aware of any statewide  
34 utility fees. Jason asked what offering fare free did to ridership, and what reinstating it might do. Stephen  
35 said the pandemic had a greater effect on ridership. Section 20 report from last year looked at research on  
36 what happens when you drop fares, historically you see an increase of about 30%. People who used to  
37 walk or bike take transit, or current riders take transit more. Most people riding transit were not  
38 necessarily getting out of cars. He's not sure how reinstating fares will affect ridership. When fares are  
39 reinstated in July, ridership will potentially more likely be impacted by a new COVID variant or  
40 something else. Jason asked if the Section 20 report looked into the types of riders who took transit more  
41 often when fares were free. Stephen said it was talked about in the report but there's another report from  
42 the Transit Cooperative Research Program cited in the Section 20 report which reviewed fare free  
43 experiments and talks about those experiences and where new riders came from. [Section 20 of Act 59  
44 (2019) of the Vermont Legislature directed the Agency of Transportation to develop a report on methods  
45 to increase the use of public transit in Vermont. Section 20 report:  
46 <https://legislature.vermont.gov/assets/Legislative-Reports/Section-20-Report-01-07-20-FINAL.pdf>] Joss  
47 asked what changes might be required for government structures for transit authorities. Charlie's sense is  
48 these different revenue sources wouldn't require different governance structures. Stephen added it partly  
49 depends on whether fees are imposed on a statewide or regional basis, and how fee decisions are made in  
50 those regions, and who has the authority to decide those amounts. Joss asked who is making questions  
51 about routes in different areas with those changes, would there be way for broader participation. Stephen  
52 said currently the service providers and state make those decisions as part of two-year grant and service  
53 agreements, and they might look at transit development plan, outreach efforts to communities, or other  
54 ways. Charlie said *IF* the legislature enacted one of the new revenue sources, and it replaced a current

1 model like GMT's membership model, and in the new model all towns had an equal say, then there may  
2 be need for conversation about Board membership, etc.

3  
4 Kurt asked what kinds of things would be considered with \$5 million for rural expansion? Stephen said it  
5 relates to things such as in the Tri Town Study, concept is volunteer based microtransit service, using  
6 smartphones and other traditional ways to request a ride. If this is to be part of a climate solution, then we  
7 don't want internal combustion engine vehicle driving all over the rural areas to provide rides. Using  
8 electric vehicles supported by solar recharging would have a better environmental impact. Since Vermont  
9 is so rural, traditional transit service isn't possible or effective.

10  
11 The presentation is posted on the [TAC webpage](#) and the full transit financing report is here:  
12 <https://studiesandreports.ccrpcvt.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/Final-Funding-Report-11-23-21.pdf>.

### 13 14 **6. Vermont and the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act**

15 Costa Pappis, VTrans, presented the highways component of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act  
16 (IIJA) and what it means for Vermont. Key transportation provisions are that it provides five years of  
17 authorization and funding levels for the next five years, it replaces the previous federal transportation  
18 authorization called the FAST Act, and Vermont is anticipated to receive \$1.645B in highway funding  
19 over next five years. It increases overall funding by \$570.5 million (53%) over the FAST Act and adds  
20 carbon reduction program and resilience formula program but there isn't a lot of information yet since  
21 they are new. IIJA includes 26 competitive grant programs (including 20 new ones) worth approximately  
22 \$100 billion with a focus on highway and bridge, downtown revitalization, healthy streets, active  
23 transportation, carbon reduction, resilience, etc. Since these are new programs, we're waiting for guidance  
24 from FHWA. Note that there will likely continue to be a matching fund requirement. Provisions specific  
25 for municipal governments include surface transportation block grant program off-system bridge set-  
26 aside; general fund bridge program off-system bridge set-aside; and competitive grant programs.  
27 Next steps: 1. Congress needs to make appropriations for certain highway programs funded from the  
28 Highway Trust Fund. 2. Need US DOT to issue guidance on new programs. Risks in implementation IIJA  
29 provisions: still need full Congressional Appropriations since we're still operating under a Continuing  
30 Resolution. Also concerns about inflation since transportation is sensitive to labor and commodity prices.

31  
32 Matthew Langham clarified that "off-system" means off the federal aid system. Some local bridges may  
33 not be on the state system but could be on the federal aid system. Christine said the state is starting year 2  
34 of the VPSP2 program which will focus on bridges. We'll likely talk more about this at the next TAC  
35 meeting.

36  
37 The presentation is posted on the [TAC webpage](#).

### 38 39 **7. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports**

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

### 42 43 **8. CCRPC Board Meeting Report**

44 The Board did not meet in December. In January the Board reviewed the Equity Assessment Report from  
45 consultant Creative Discourse, approved the FY22 UPWP Mid-Year Adjustment and Budget, heard a  
46 presentation on Vermont's Climate Action Plan and the draft 2022 Comprehensive Energy Plan, and  
47 reviewed the legislative priorities.

### 48 49 **9. Chairman's/Members' Items**

- 50
- 51 • **2021 Complete Streets reporting due by Feb 9**, please send this form for each project to  
52 [bdavis@ccrpevt.org](mailto:bdavis@ccrpevt.org).
  - 53 • **VT Walk Bike Summit** scheduled for May 6, 2022 in Middlebury. Call for proposals and award  
nominations due Feb 4. More information at <https://vtwalkbikesummit.com/>.

- 1 • Reminder that **VT Clean Cities Coalition** can perform a free fleet analysis as described by Peggy  
2 O'Neill-Vivanco at the December TAC meeting ([Peggy.ONeill-Vivanco@uvm.edu](mailto:Peggy.ONeill-Vivanco@uvm.edu)). Her  
3 presentation is posted [here](#).
- 4 • **Town Highway Structure and Roadway Grant** Program announced, further guidance can be  
5 found in the Grant Season Cover Letter. Deadline for grant applications will be **April 15<sup>th</sup>, 2022**.
- 6 • Marshall announced that the **Park & Ride Plan Update** is getting underway, CCRPC has  
7 contracted with RSG to update the plan. During the previous plan CCRPC asked for a TAC  
8 representative on the project committee but this time we're proposing that we'll bring plan  
9 updates and various approvals to the TAC on a regular basis.

10

11 **The next TAC meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, March 2, 2022 due to Town Meeting.**

12

13 BRUCE HOAR MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN, SECONDED BY BOB HENNEGERGER,  
14 UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED. THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 10:17 AM.

15

16 Respectfully submitted, Bryan Davis

DRAFT

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

DATE: **Tuesday, February 1, 2022**  
 SCHEDULED TIME: 11 a.m. to 12:15 p.m.  
 PLACE: In-person at CCRPC office and ONLINE VIA ZOOM  
 DOCUMENTS: Minutes, documents, and presentations discussed accessible at:  
<http://www.ccrpcvt.org/meetings/clean-water-advisory-committee/>

<b>Committee Members in Attendance</b> (all online unless otherwise noted)		
Bolton: Joss Besse	Hinesburg: Merrily Lovell	St. George:
Buels Gore:	Huntington: Darlene Palola	Underhill:
Burlington: James Sherrard	Jericho: Katherine Sonnick	Westford:
Charlotte:	Milton: Kirsten Jensen	Williston: Christine Dougherty
Colchester:	Richmond:	Winooski: Ryan Lambert
Essex: Annie Costandi, co-chair	Shelburne: Chris Robinson (11:26 pm_	VAOT: Jennifer Callahan (11:35 pm)
Essex Junction: Chelsea Mandigo	South Burlington: Dave Wheeler, Tom DiPietro	VANR:
Burlington Airport: Catie Calabrese (EIV)	University of VT: Lani Ravin	CCRPC Board:
Friends of the Winooski River:	Lewis Creek Assoc: Kate Kelly, Andrea Morgante	Winooski NRCD: Remy Crettol
<b>Other Attendees:</b> DEC: Danielle Owczarski <b>Other:</b> Dean Pierce (Northwest RPC), Grace Vinson (Central VT RPC), Shayne Jaquith (The Nature Conservancy)		
<b>CCRPC Staff:</b> Dan Albrecht (at CCRPC office), Sai Sarepalli, Chris Dubin		

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 11:05 a.m.
2. **Changes to the Agenda and public comments on items not on the agenda** None.
3. **Review and action on draft minutes of December 7, 2021** After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, *Dave Wheeler made a motion, seconded by Annie Costandi to approve the minutes as drafted. MOTION PASSED.*
4. **Update on Clean Water Service Providers for Northern Lake Champlain, Lamoille & Winooski Basin and Act 76 Implementation** Dan Albrecht, Grace Vinson and Dean Pierce provided brief updates on the start-up operations for the CWSPs they administer, Basin 5, Basin 8 and Basin 7, respectively. They are working on setting up project tracking tools and internal policies as well as working on empaneling their Basin Water Quality Councils. Funding for projects would begin to flow in FY23.
5. **Implementation of Municipal Strategies in Basin 7 TBP** Danielle Owczarski noted the recent approval of the 2021 Lamoille River (Basin 7) Tactical Basin Plan. Details can be found at: <https://dec.vermont.gov/water-investment/watershed-planning/tactical-basin-planning/basin7> She has been holding regular regional coordination meetings with staff of RPCs, WNRCs and watershed groups. Eventually, she will also be working with the Basin 7 Water Quality Council as well. The actions endorsed by the Plan are found in the Strategies (Chapter 4) and the Implementation Table (Chapter 5). Municipal responsibilities are mostly found in the realm of compliance with the Developed Lands sector. She noted that schools falling under the 3-9050 permit will benefit from signing up for the Green Schools Initiative. She also noted that the Lamoille River Paddlers’ Trail is a local group that is improving unstable river access and developing camping and portage opportunities along the Lamoille River.
6. **Planned update to Basin 8 TBP**

1 Karen Bates noted she is starting the update process for the Winooski River (Basin 8) Tactical Basin Plan.  
2 The goal is to have a draft completed by June 2023 with final signature by the ANR Secretary in  
3 December 2023. She will again rely on the CCRPC to update data on municipal water quality protections,  
4 what exists and what is needed, etc. and she will again seek to gather information from CWAC members  
5 on their communities' issues & concerns. Like Danielle, she is working with RPCs, NRCs, as well as the  
6 Friends of the Mad River and Friends of the Winooski River. She will also work with interested  
7 conservation commissions, land trusts, business groups and school/teacher groups. For outreach tools she  
8 will use online surveys, story maps, presentations, facilitated discussions. It would be great if you can  
9 assist with refining these tools or let me know if you would like to partner on these tools. One particular  
10 piece of information she would like is what surface waters need improvement.

11  
12 Overall, she is looking for the CWAC members to assist in collecting input that will go into the plan. She  
13 provided a list of questions (see slides) that CWAC members could address with municipal staff and any  
14 municipally supported commissions or boards. Dan will schedule subsequent meeting with Winooski  
15 Basin towns to review information collected and draft strategies (this spring?). In the fall, she would plan  
16 on presenting draft strategies to the group for continued discussion. She closed asking the following: in  
17 terms of the next several months, to address her request, do you need additional information to collect  
18 information requested? When should the spring meeting be held to allow for sufficient time to collect  
19 information? Do you feel comfortable collecting the information (is there someone else in town that would  
20 be more appropriate to collect this information)? Dan noted that she is always welcome to meet with the  
21 CWAC. Dan felt in general that municipal concerns have been incorporated into the plans in no small part  
22 due to the funding support provided by DEC via the TBP Support grants to RPCs.

23  
24 Darlene Palola noted that new survey/assessment work is needed at homes along the Huntington River  
25 with significant erosion is occurring. Karen said she would plan to meet with her and other residents soon  
26 in Huntington and then have a broader discussion about the health of the Huntington River both from a  
27 hazard perspective and a water quality perspective. Christine Dougherty thanked Karen for her  
28 presentation and said she would need more time to process it with her team and then she will get back to  
29 her. Karen thanked her and said she will tidy up the slides and send them out. Dan suggested she get  
30 copies of the Phosphorus Control Plan and Flow Restoration Plans to see planned projects for MS4s and  
31 conversely municipalities should let Karen know when projects are done because if they are done solely  
32 with municipal funds, she may not know about it. Karen concluded noting that she will provide a  
33 mechanism to Dan to provide to the members for data collection and then meet with the CWAC. Dan  
34 offered to organize a work session with just the members from Basin 8. Lastly, Karen encouraged  
35 members to [review the existing 2018 plan and story map](#)

- 36  
37 **7. Updates by Staff** Dan noted the CCRPC received several proposals related to Water Quality were  
38 received for consideration in the FY23 Unified Planning Work Program. Chris Dubin noted that all the  
39 data for non-MS4 towns was uploaded to DEC by the 12/31/21 deadline and he will work with the MS4  
40 towns to finalize the upload for their hydrologically-connected assets by the April 1, 2022 deadline. As far  
41 as a new inventory effort, Jim Ryan of DEC is staying to sit tight on that until potential changes are made  
42 to the original MRGP which was adopted in spring 2018. As that operates on a 5-year cycle, a required  
43 new inventory is not likely in the 2022 field season.
- 44  
45 **8. Updates by Members and Guests** None.
- 46  
47 **9. Items for March 2<sup>nd</sup> Agenda** No items identified at this time. If members have items they would  
48 like addressed to please reach out to Annie or Don or to Dan.
- 49  
50 **10. Adjournment.** The meeting adjourned at 12:08 p.m.

51  
52 *Respectfully submitted, Dan Albrecht*

CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
**MS4 SUBCOMMITTEE**  
 OF CLEAN WATER ADVISORY COMMITTEE – **DRAFT** MINUTES

DATE: **Tuesday, February 1, 2022**  
 SCHEDULED TIME: 12:15 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.  
 PLACE: Hybrid: In-person at CCRPC office and ONLINE via Zoom  
 DOCUMENTS: Minutes, documents discussed, ad presentations accessible at:  
<http://www.ccrpcvt.org/meetings/clean-water-advisory-committee/>

<b>Committee Members in Attendance (all attending online unless otherwise noted)</b>		
Burlington: James Sherrard	Burlington Airport: Catie Calabrese	Williston: Christine Dougherty
Colchester:	Milton: Kirsten Jensen	Winooski: Ryan Lambert
Essex: Annie Costandi, co-chair (in-person)	Shelburne: Chris Robinson	VAOT: Jennifer Callahan
Essex Junction:	South Burlington: Dave Wheeler	Univ. of VT: Lani Ravin
DEC:		
<b>Other Attendees:</b> Pluck: Dave Barron; WNRCD: Kristen Balschunat; Stone Environmental: Dave Braun, Meghan Arpino DEC: Jim Pease; LC Sea Grant & DEC: Jillian Sarazen; Fitzgerald Environmental: Joe Bartlett		
<b>CCRPC Staff:</b> Dan Albrecht (at CCRPC office), Sai Sarepalli		

**1. Call to Order, Changes to the Agenda and Public Comments on Items not on the agenda:**

The meeting was called to order at 12:08 p.m. Co-chair Costandi authorized Albrecht to facilitate the meeting. No changes to the agenda nor public comments were made.

**2. Review and action on draft minutes of January 4, 2022**

After a brief recap by Albrecht, *Sherrard made a motion to approve the minutes for the January 4<sup>th</sup> meeting, the motion was seconded by Wheeler. The motion was approved unanimously.*

**3. Review and action on approval of Calendar Year 2021 Minimum Control Measures #1 and #2 reports**

After a brief recap by Barron of the MCM#1 report, *Robinson made a motion to approve the 2021 MCM#1 Report, the motion was seconded by Ravin, and the motion was approved unanimously. Ravin then made a motion to approve the 2021 MCM#2 Report, the motion was seconded by Sherrard, and the motion was approved unanimously.*

**4. Dave Braun & Meghan Arpino of Stone Environmental: Recap of 2020 Stream Gauge Results and plans for 2022 season; draft 2020 Annual Report**

Braun & Arpino summarized the last five years of stream gauge operations from 2016 thru 2020. They applauded the work of their partner, Fitzgerald Environmental, for their field services. Key points in the 2020 report were as follows:

- Gauging stations were constructed on all 11 streams classified as stormwater impaired in Chittenden and Franklin Counties, Vermont.
- In all 11 study watersheds, the location selected for the gauging station is quite close to the downstream end of the stormwater impaired reach.
- The primary recording gauge installed at each station is a vented (gauge) pressure transducer.
- Discharge measurement locations and methods are determined at each site according to the flow conditions present at the time of the measurement. Low flow measurements obtained using a pygmy current meter are best suited for cross-sections with a narrow channel and relatively smooth bottom. High flow measurements using an AA Price current meter are best made at cross-sections with laminar flow and minimal flow disturbance from large rocks or other channel features.
- The 5-minute stage record, 5-minute precipitation record, and annual reports and deliverables are posted on the public website (<http://vt-ms4-flow.stone-env.com/FlowDev/index.html#>); data files contain raw data-, corrected data, and flags and comments describing any corrections made to the data.
- Outside of the winter period, gaps in the stage data record are generally infrequent and short, on the order of five minutes to a few hours in length.

- 1 • The development of the stage–discharge rating is one of the fundamental tasks in computing a flow  
 2 record.  
 3 • A network of precipitation monitoring stations was installed to provide representative and unique  
 4 precipitation data for each of the eleven stormwater-impaired watersheds in Chittenden and Franklin  
 5 Counties.  
 6 • Flow duration curves for each gauged stream were generated from combined 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020  
 7 daily mean flows using the hydroTSM package in R (Zambrano-Bigiarini 2017) (Figures 20-30). The  
 8 0.3% and 95% daily mean flow exceedance values are shown in Table 10. The precipitation monitoring  
 9 network includes ten gauges installed and operated by Stone and FEA.  
 10 • The 0.3% and 95% daily mean flow exceedance values were compared to the corresponding TMDL  
 11 modeled and attainment values. However, **this is not an apples-to-apples comparison because the**  
 12 **stream gauge flow exceedances are calculated using daily data and the attainment and modeled**  
 13 **values are calculated using hourly data.** The option of re-running the stream gauging site analysis using  
 14 hourly data to obtain more accurate comparisons was discussed.

	From Daily Data	From Hourly Data	From Hourly Data	From Daily Data	From Hourly Data	From Hourly Data
Stream	2017-2020 Q 0.3% (cfs/mi <sup>2</sup> )	Modeled Q 0.3% (cfs/mi <sup>2</sup> )	Attainment Q 0.3% (cfs/mi <sup>2</sup> )	2017-2020 Q 95% (cfs/mi <sup>2</sup> )	Modeled Q 95% (cfs/mi <sup>2</sup> )	Attainment Q 95% (cfs/mi <sup>2</sup> )
Allen	14.53	11.74	11.27	0.02	0.20	0.22
Bartlett	8.93	11.35	10.27	0.05	0.20	0.22
Centennial	8.70	16.04	7.96	0.24	0.19	0.23
Englesby	8.42	15.46	11.53	0.00	0.19	0.21
Indian	11.54	11.64	11.53	0.10	0.21	0.21
Morehouse <sup>1</sup>	5.41	16.88	8.14	0.09	0.19	0.22
Munroe	15.73	12.01	11.27	0.00	0.20	0.22
Potash	10.34	12.24	10.27	0.08	0.20	0.22
Rugg <sup>2</sup>	28.29	11.32	8.87	0.01	0.20	0.25
Stevens <sup>2</sup>	14.29	11.91	8.87	0.00	0.20	0.25
Sunderland	7.59	8.25	7.96	0.27	0.22	0.23

1. Morehouse Brook watershed is DEC's boundary—does not exclude stormwater diversion to Winooski River

2. High flow diversion from Stevens to Rugg Brook above the gauges not considered in watershed areas

Table 10. 0.3% and 95% exceedance values for 2017-2020 daily mean flows

Stream	2017/2018/2019/2020 Q 0.3% (cfs/mi <sup>2</sup> )	2017/2018/2019/2020 Q 95% (cfs/mi <sup>2</sup> )
Allen	14.53	0.02
Bartlett	8.93	0.05
Centennial	8.7	0.24
Englesby	8.42	0.00
Indian	11.54	0.10
Morehouse	5.4	0.09
Munroe	15.7	0.00
Potash	10.34	0.08
Rugg	28.29	0.01
Stevens	14.29	0.00
Sunderland	7.59	0.27

- By definition, stream flows exceed the 0.3% high flow targets for 0.3% of the year, so approximately one day (actually 26 hours).
- Low flow targets need to be reassessed as they seem unrealistic depending upon underlying geology. All streams except Centennial Brook and Sunderland Brook have much lower 95th percentile flow exceedance values than the modeled or attainment values (i.e., low flows are lower than modeled). Braun speculated this result primarily arises because the representation of groundwater flow in the TMDL modeling exercise was poor; while impervious surfaces reduce groundwater recharge, the degree of departure seen likely has more to do with the hydrogeologic setting of these small streams than stormwater management practices.

Members thanked Mr. Braun and Ms. Arpino for their presentation. Braun indicated he would be sending a proposal to the towns for funding in the neighborhood of \$20,000 to develop more accurate calculations by re-running the flow exceedance analysis using hourly mean flow data and excluding the winter data.

##### **5. Staff and member updates as needed**

Albrecht noted he debriefed leadership and equity staff here at CCRPC regarding the WVMT advertising discussion at the January meeting. CCRPC does not have any official policy regarding advertising. In the case of WVMT, they agreed with the solution of running the ads during the locally-oriented morning programming. In general, CCRPC is in favor of advertising so as to engage with the target audience of the given project/program.

Balschunat noted that she is taking a job with the Vermont Youth Conservation Corps as a Water Quality Project Manager effective later this month. Her last day with WNRCD will be February 18<sup>th</sup>. She thanked the Committee for the opportunity to work with them these past few years. Members thanked her for her service to the communities.

##### **7. Items for March 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting agenda**

Update on Adopt-a-Drain program; Discussion of new state regulation within the 3-9050 permit going to effect on 7/1/22 that will regulate a discharge from new development or redevelopment equal to or greater than ½ acre;

##### **8. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 1:25 p.m.

*Respectfully submitted, Dan Albrecht*

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

4 DATE: Wednesday, January 12, 2022  
5 TIME: 2:30 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.  
6 PLACE: Virtual Meeting via Zoom with link as published on the agenda and in Main Conference Room at  
7 CCRPC (no one attended in person)  
8

**Members Present:**

Joss Besse, Bolton  
Eric Vorwald, Winooski  
Owiso Makuku, Essex  
Ravi Venkataraman, Richmond  
Meagan Tuttle, Burlington  
Larry Lewack, Charlotte  
Alex Weinhagen, Hinesburg  
Paul Conner, South Burlington  
Cathyann LaRose, Colchester  
John Alden, Essex Junction  
Katherine Sonnick, Jericho

Adele Gravitz, Shelburne  
Darren Schibler, Essex

**Staff:**

Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager  
Melanie Needle, Senior Planner  
Taylor Newton, Senior Planner

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

12 Joss Besse called the meeting to order at 2:33 p.m.  
13

14 **2. Approval of December 8, 2021 Minutes**

15  
16 Eric Vorwald made a motion, seconded by Paul Conner, to approve the December 8, 2021 minutes. No further  
17 discussion. MOTION PASSED.  
18

19 **3. Housing Draft for 2023 ECOS Plan**

20 Regina Mahony walked through the draft housing section for the 2023 ECOS Plan update that was included in the  
21 PAC packet. Regina explained that while the Long Range Planning Committee is responsible for this work, input  
22 from the PAC on key topic areas will be very helpful.  
23

24 PAC comments/questions included:

- 25 • Alex Weinhagen asked if there will be more goals; and remarked that the need for more affordable housing is  
26 lost and the need should be elevated in some way. Some of the actions seem inadequate with regards to  
27 affordable housing as well. Regina stated that it's a great point and we can bring greater emphasis to the  
28 actions; but we are unlikely to add another goal. Owiso Makuku suggested that a statement could be added to  
29 the end of the goal to indicate that additional focus is needed for affordable housing.
- 30 • Paul Conner asked for consistency in terms – in particular the goal at the top without a target, and the  
31 Building Homes Together goal with a target is confusing to the reader.
- 32 • Ravi Venkataraman asked if there would be housing targets established by Town. Ravi added there is a lack  
33 of clarity at the local level when there is just one large county level goal. Regina stated that we intend to  
34 include additional information as a guide at the local level. This may include a table of facts: total homes by  
35 town; % of county total; affordable by town; % of county total, etc. CCRPC also intends to take a look at this  
36 from a planning area and transit corridor perspective. Regina added that we likely land short of targets, but  
37 we are open to feedback on this. Darren Schibler stated that he is in favor of having the facts; and added that  
38 maybe we don't have targets as much as set an expectation of the overall goal and an understanding that not  
39 every municipality is like to help meet the goal in the exact same way. Katherine Sonnick supported Ravi  
40 and Darren's comments.

- 1 • In the chat Meagan Tuttle asked “would the share of housing by town be related to the population projections  
2 that the RPC prepared a few years ago?” Regina stated that the forecast is based on historic growth and we  
3 haven’t been growing enough; so the Building Homes Together target is likely higher than the future  
4 forecast. However, staff will look at that.
- 5 • Ravi Venkataraman asked if we can add a lens of municipal growth capacity (e.g. sewer capacity) as part of  
6 this presentation on how the Building Homes Together targets break-down to the municipal level. Regina  
7 remarked that she wasn’t sure how to elevate these towns over others, but that it is a good point.
- 8 • Paul Conner stated that the overall housing need is helpful and important; but what about including needs in  
9 terms of type and # of bedrooms? Paul added that a lot of studios and 1 bedrooms are being built, but not so  
10 much for families in the small a affordable category. Form doesn’t matter as much as “is the housing being  
11 built meeting the demographic needs of the community?” Alex Weinhagen agreed and pointed out that the  
12 Housing Needs Assessment is really thin on this, but it would be great if CCRPC can figure out how to  
13 answer this question. Meagan added in the chat: “Great point Paul-- however, I think some of this might be  
14 highly variable by muni, and based on land area available for growth within each.” Regina stated that  
15 CCRPC will talk with VHFA about this question.
- 16 • There was a discussion about what the short term rental data includes. Regina stated that this data comes  
17 from the Housing Needs Assessment, and they used AirDNA. Melanie Needle provided this link in the chat:  
18 <https://www.airdna.co/airdna-data-how-it-works>. Meagan Tuttle added in the chat “We've looked into this in  
19 BTV: AirDNA is both VRBO and Airbnb, which is about 90% of STRs.”  
20

21 Additional comments specific to the Strategy/Actions included:

- 22 • Ravi Venkataraman suggested inclusion of first time homebuyer programs.
- 23 • Darren Schibler stated that the actions appear to cover all things planners need to do but doesn’t address  
24 other big challenges to housing construction and affordability such as labor and materials. Including actions  
25 regarding workforce development is important particularly in making it clear that zoning isn’t the only  
26 challenge. Also perhaps there should be a better connection to the housing – employment connection here.  
27 Regina stated that these are great points. Regina added the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy  
28 is also being updated and will be incorporated into the ECOS Plan update. These issues will be addressed in  
29 other sections, but also CCRPC hopes to use a HUB Site for the plan to better make these cross-connection  
30 issues clear.
- 31 • Alex Weinhagen suggested changing action item #5 title from Housing Affordability to Housing Proximity.
- 32 • Comments from Meagan Tuttle in the chat: “love the idea of the plan as a hubsite!” and “A small note I  
33 noticed about the Building Homes together targets- 1000/year is 2026 as a goal year.”  
34

35 **4. Legislative Items**

36 Regina briefly mentioned a few items, and pointed folks to the VPA legislative committee’s weekly update.

- 37 • Budget Adjustment Act for current fiscal year (22-0441) – There were some asks to make an early budget  
38 adjustment to fully fund all MPG and Bylaw Modernization grants applied for this fall; not clear if this is  
39 going to happen.
- 40 • The Covid-19 Municipal Annual Meeting bill (S.172) is in the Governor’s hands and will likely be signed  
41 into law this week. It provides municipalities with very similar flexibility to what was granted to  
42 municipalities during the COVID state of emergency with regard to annual meetings – i.e. to hold town  
43 meetings via Australian ballot or to delay the in-person meeting to a later date. Regina added that there is  
44 also a bill to extend the open meeting law hybrid options to January of 2023. The RPCs are also interested in  
45 making virtual meetings permanent as these meetings are attended by folks throughout the County (or  
46 counties in the case of other regions).
- 47 • Act 250 Reform – There are a few bills on the table already.
- 48 • There is also a proposed bill on the creation of the Municipal Fuel Switching Grant Program (H.518). This is  
49 intended to provide municipalities with funding for weatherization and electrification of thermal systems in  
50 municipally owned buildings.  
51

52 **5. Members Items Open Forum**

1 Alex Weinhagen asked others what they are doing with their ARPA funds as it appears challenging to clearly  
2 determine eligibility. A few towns mentioned that they've been gathering public input in a variety of ways. Regina  
3 added the Treasury issued final rules last Thursday; and there may be an avenue for using all funding under the lost  
4 revenue category (up to \$10 million of your award, and only Burlington has a bigger award than this) AND this may  
5 mean that these funds can be used in a very flexible manner including use of these funds as match for other federal  
6 funds. VLCT is suggesting that municipalities pause for a moment while the financial requirements of using the  
7 funds in this way can be clarified.

#### 9 **6. Regional Act 250/Section 248 Projects on the Horizon.**

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

#### 12 **7. Other Business**

- 13 a. Melanie Needle will be sending out the request for development activity for 2021 by the end of January.  
14 This request asks for residential and commercial development that received an approved CO and for  
15 Bike/Ped infrastructure built in calendar year 2021.
- 16 b. The FY23 UPWP Applications were sent out before Thanksgiving. They are due on Friday, January 21,  
17 2022. Please let Staff know if you have any questions or want to discuss any potential projects.
- 18 c. VNRC Applications for the Small Grants for Smart Growth special round will be due on January 17th!  
19 Applications are due January 17th, 2022. VNRC's Small Grants for Smart Growth program includes a  
20 special round of seed funding: To support the ability of communities to implement the smart growth  
21 recommendations included in the recently released Vermont Climate Action Plan, Small Grants for Smart  
22 Growth is offering one larger grant of \$5,000 in a competitive grant round for affordable housing,  
23 sustainable transportation, or climate resilience/adaptation solutions that meet smart growth criteria.  
24 Applications for awards of up to \$1,500 will still be accepted on a rolling basis. Learn more at  
25 <https://vnrc.org/small-grants-for-smart-growth/>.
- 26 d. VT Bond Bank Capital Planning Contest – the intent is to develop a catalogue of good capital plans. They  
27 are also planning to host a Capital Plan Forum in April.
- 28 e. Upcoming Fair Housing Workshop: Removing Barriers to Strengthen Communities: Affordable Housing  
29 and Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing at the Local Level DHCD training on Jan. 25:  
30 <https://accd.vermont.gov/housing/events>
- 31 f. The Cannabis Control Board will be holding its public hearing for the purposes of hearing comment on its  
32 first two proposed rules. Members of the public are welcome and encouraged to join either in person, or  
33 via Microsoft Teams. When: Friday, January 14, 2022 at 11am ET. [More information and link to join.](#)
- 34 g. [AIAVT Affordable Housing Charrette Call for Submissions - AIA Vermont](#)

#### 36 **9. Adjourn**

37 Meeting adjourned at 4:00pm.

38  
39 Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony

1 CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
2 LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE - MINUTES  
3

4 DATE: Tuesday, January 11, 2022  
5 TIME: 7:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.  
6 PLACE: Virtual Meeting via Zoom with link as published on the agenda; and a Physical location at 110 West  
7 Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski VT  
8

**Members Present:**

Annie Costandi, CWAC Rep from Essex  
Dana Hanley, Alt Board Rep from Charlotte  
Bob Henneberger, TAC Rep  
Eric Vorwald, PAC Rep from Winooski  
Andy Watts, Board Rep from Williston

**Staff:**

Jason Charest, Senior Transportation Engineer  
Eleni Churchill, Transportation Program Manager  
Marshall Distel, Senior Transportation Manager  
Christine Forde, Senior Transportation Planner  
Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager  
Melanie Needle, Senior Planner  
Charlie Baker, Executive Director

9  
10 **1. Welcome and Introductions**

11 Regina Mahony welcomed everyone at 7:02pm. All attendees introduced themselves.  
12

13 **2. Approve November 30, 2021 Minutes**

14 Eric Vorwald made a motion, seconded by Andy Watts, to approve the November 30, 2021 minutes with one edit –  
15 Dana is not the Alternate Representative from Charlotte. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.

16 **3. Review the DRAFT Housing Section**

17 Regina walked through the draft housing section that was included in the meeting packet.

18 **Goal & Key Issues** comments from the LRPC:

- 19 • This section would benefit from a reference to VT as a place for refugees, and we should be prepared to  
20 house them and train them for the workforce.
- 21 • If it isn't too in the weeds make mention of Accessory Dwelling Units as a helpful means for additional  
22 homes.
- 23 • Change served-enriched housing to supportive housing.
- 24 • Check the citation on bullet 2.
- 25 • Bullet 6 – should this be two separate issues/bullets? Starting at “location” maybe start a new bullet;
- 26 • Bullet 7 – Short term rental data. Explain what this data includes and where it is from. Regina stated that this  
27 is from AirBnB DNA, not municipally regulated units.
- 28 • Clean up language such as remove “a lot of”.  
29

30 **Indicators** – Regina did not review these in detail, but described how to access these if the LRPC members would  
31 like to.  
32

33 **Strategy & Actions:**

- 34 • There was a discussion about the strategy and whether there will be two strategies - land use & housing or  
35 just one? Regina explained that in the current plan there is one smart growth strategy (80% of growth in areas  
36 planned for growth) and the land use, housing, energy and transportation actions are all underneath it. Staff is  
37 thinking about breaking these out into different strategies, but trying to figure out how to maintain  
38 connection to the overall smart growth concept for all of them. This is still being worked out.
- 39 • There was a recommendation to add the Regional Development Corporations to 2c as well as the other  
40 organizations listed.
- 41 • There was a question on how we might educate the public more broadly about the need for more housing.  
42 Regina stated that there was an effort a few years ago to start a YIMBY campaign (yes in my backyard v.  
43 Not in my backyard). Perhaps a specific marketing campaign would help.
- 44 • Edit fair housing 4.c – there are two “accommodations”. Remove one.

- 1 • 1.b: separate out fee waivers or other development review. Redundancy is one piece; while fees associated  
2 with review is another.
- 3 • 1.f: regarding the state rental registry program it is important to acknowledge that some municipalities  
4 already do this locally and these programs should continue to stand on their own.
- 5 • 2.a: this refers to new funding programs that may need to be spent in the coming years. Does it make sense to  
6 include these in this long-term plan?
- 7 • 2.d: there was a suggestion to include other groups beyond BIPOC. Regina added that staff will take a look at  
8 this. She added that we want to be clear that we want to address all protected classes; but we should bring  
9 specific attention to BIPOC because the actions may be different.
- 10 • Regarding housing affordability under #5: Eric Vorwald mention that “something we've been talking about  
11 in Winooski is using City specific economic indicators to determine affordability. Using the metro area can  
12 skew this number to where the incomes in Winooski are still not able to afford the housing within the 30%  
13 parameter.” Perhaps this plan should acknowledge those local income differences.
- 14 • Last sentence in #5: acknowledge that some folks don't want to live in the City, and they'll choose to travel.  
15

16 Regina then showed the LRPC how to navigate the Building Homes Together dashboard.  
17

#### 18 **4. Adjourn**

19 Regina stated that the agenda had the incorrect next meeting date. The next meeting is set for February 8, 2022. The  
20 meeting adjourned at 8:11pm.

21  
22 Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony  
23

1 CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
2 LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE - MINUTES  
3

4 DATE: Tuesday, February 8, 2022  
5 TIME: 7:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.  
6 PLACE: Virtual Meeting via Zoom with link as published on the agenda  
7

**Members Present:**

Annie Costandi, CWAC Rep from Essex  
Dana Hanley, Alt Board Rep from Charlotte  
Bob Henneberger, TAC Rep  
Eric Vorwald, PAC Rep from Winooski  
Tracey Delphia, Alt Board Rep from Essex

**Staff:**

Jason Charest, Senior Transportation Engineer  
Eleni Churchill, Transportation Program Manager  
Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager  
Melanie Needle, Senior Planner  
Charlie Baker, Executive Director

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

11 Regina Mahony welcomed everyone at 7:03pm.

12  
13 **2. Approve January 11, 2022 Minutes**

14 Eric Vorwald made a motion, seconded by Bob Henneberger, to approve the January 11, 2022 minutes. No further  
15 discussion. MOTION PASSED.

16 **3. Review the DRAFT Water Quality Section**

17 Regina went over the draft schedule to show where other sections of content will come into play. Regina then walked  
18 through the draft water quality section that was included in the meeting packet.

19  
20 **Goal & Key Issues** comments from the LRPC:

- 21 • Why is this section in bullets? The content is lengthy and seems like it should be broken up more.
- 22 • Preference for goals to be written as the result of what you are aiming for. The suggestion is to re-word the
- 23 goal as “Healthy native species habitats, water quality and quantity, and air quality through conservation,
- 24 protection and improvements.”
- 25 • Regarding the regulation bullet, there is likely still a disconnect between the Comprehensive Plans and the
- 26 zoning regulations; but either way, it would be helpful to emphasize more actionable and implementable
- 27 plans in this bullet.
- 28 • Include incentives for forest and agricultural preservation outside of the Current Use program; farmers
- 29 sometimes have no other option than to sell their land for development when they want to retire.
- 30 • While the state includes alternative septic systems for larger developments, there is little available for single
- 31 family homes. Alternative systems should be accepted rather than “under investigation” or not mentioned at
- 32 all.
- 33 • The data points are sometimes lost within the large paragraphs of text.
- 34 • In the river corridor bullet there is mention of 74% of Vermont’s rivers channelized; what is the Chittenden
- 35 County data?

36  
37 **Indicators** – Regina did not review these in detail, but explained that the impaired waters data is a GIS dataset and  
38 will be updated on a map and summarized in the data when we get to the mapping. Comments from the LRPC:

- 39 • Regarding the land cover conversion data, do we know where these conversions are in the County,
- 40 particularly in comparison to our areas planned for growth? Melanie explained that the data comes from a
- 41 dashboard that has been created; in order to do a GIS analysis we’d have to download all the GIS data. There
- 42 may be other data sources to get at this more easily. This would be helpful data. CCRPC staff stated that they
- 43 will look into it.

44  
45 **Strategy & Actions** – provided an overview of each of strategy and the actions. Comments from the LRPC:

- 1 • Action 1.b – is there a minimum standard bridge and culvert infrastructure should be built to for aquatic
- 2 passage? If so, the standard itself could be referred to in the action. Regina stated that it might be more place
- 3 based, but she will ask Lewis Creek Association if there are standards to reference.
- 4 • Action 1.f.i & ii – suggestion to footnote the “see constraint tables...” language.
- 5 • Action 2.b – there is a lot in this action, perhaps it should be broken into two? Regina added that one solution
- 6 could be to reconfigure this with 2.d as some of the text seems to be redundant.
- 7 • Action 3 – seems very different than 1 & 2. There doesn’t appear to be an action association with #3.
- 8 • Overall the actions are hard to follow with too much descriptive text.
- 9 • Regarding infrastructure actions, does it make sense to integrate ARPA funds in the plan? While only
- 10 relevant for 1 or 2 years it may make sense to discuss it; and it may make sense to incorporate the
- 11 infrastructure funds too as they might have a longer timeframe.
- 12

#### 13 **4. Adjourn**

14 The next meeting is set for March 8, 2022. We are planning to discuss the Economy Strategy, and four associated  
15 goals and key issues: Economy, Household Financial Security, Working Lands and Art, Culture and Recreation. The  
16 meeting adjourned at 7:51pm.

17 Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony  
18  
19