

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
18 Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony
19