

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

4 DATE: Wednesday, November 9, 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  
7

**Members Present:**

Joss Besse, Bolton  
Eric Vorwald, Winooski  
Larry Lewack, Charlotte  
Cathyann LaRose, Colchester  
Meagan Tuttle, Burlington  
Ravi Venkataraman, Richmond  
Paul Conner, South Burlington  
Cymone Haiju, Milton  
Matt Boulanger, Williston

**Staff:**

Taylor Newton, Planning Program Manager  
Dan Albrecht, Senior Planner  
Melanie Needle, Senior Planner  
Darren Schibler, Senior Planner  
Ann Janda, Senior Energy Project Manager  
Charlie Baker, Executive Director

**Guests:**

Amanda Froeschle, VT Department of Health

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

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

13 **2. Approval of September 14, 2022 Minutes**

14  
15 Eric Vorwald made a motion, seconded by Alex Weinhagen to approve the September 14, 2022 minutes. No further  
16 discussion. MOTION PASSED.  
17

18 **3. Revised 2024 ECOS Plan Schedule**

19 T. Newton stated that the adoption of ECOS will now be delayed back from spring 2023 to 2024. The change in  
20 schedule is primarily to allow time for input of new CCRPC Equity Advisory Committee (EAC). This will misalign  
21 the timing of adoption of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and Comprehensive Economic Development  
22 Strategy (CEDS). The EAC will focus their initial time on reviewing the MTP and CEDS which will both be adopted  
23 in the first six months of 2023. Therefore, there will be no December PAC meeting. The PAC will review the MTP at  
24 the January meeting.  
25

26 **4. Draft West Central VT CEDS Review**

27 T. Newton provided context for the West Central Vermont CEDS project and walked through the current draft of the  
28 document. T. Newton stated that the purpose of the document is to drill down to economic data for a wider  
29 geographic area and encourage collaboration with other regional partners. There is also a goal of creating an  
30 Economic Development District (EDD) to coordinate federal Economic Development Administration (EDA)  
31 funding; regardless, approval of a CEDS is a requirement for obtaining that funding. CCRPC anticipates approval by  
32 EDA in June 2023.  
33

34 J. Besse asked whether the need for the CEDS / EDD is based on pursuing infrastructure funding. T. Newton stated  
35 that an adopted CEDS for a region is required to enable municipalities within that region to apply to EDA funds  
36 (including the EDA Public Works and Economic Adjustment Assistance Program)  
37

38 A. Weinhagen suggested adding more indicators, specifically unemployment levels by race and ethnicity in addition  
39 to business ownership under Goal #2. He also suggested adding graduation rates to Goal #4.  
40

41 **5. ECOS Plan Revised TOD Overlay District**

42 M. Needle reviewed the definition of the Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Planning Area. Comments from the  
43 last PAC meeting concentrated on how the TOD Planning Area was depicted in rural communities with PAC  
44 member suggesting that the Overlay should align with Village planning areas rather than being specific to bus stops  
45 (which aren't always in areas planned for growth and change over time).

1  
2 M. Tuttle asked how language in the TOD Overlay District purpose statement regarding residential density compares  
3 with other growth area designations. T. Newton described that the TOD Planning Area recommends a minimum of 5  
4 units per acre, which is more consistent with Center and Metro, but stated that it depends on the underlying zoning.  
5 At M. Tuttle's question, T. Newton clarified that TOD does not supersede the underlying zoning districts (and won't  
6 have any effect in regulatory proceedings). M. Tuttle asked if the TOD overlay is truly beneficial to municipalities  
7 that can't achieve the desired TOD zoning density; T. Newton stated that he feels that it is still important to consider  
8 from a regional perspective to start conversations about enabling this density (such as through water and sewer  
9 infrastructure).

10  
11 Paul Conner stated that he felt that the TOD Overlay geography that results from the methodology makes it feel  
12 cherry-picked within the Metro planning areas. He stated that Metro planning areas that are not within the TOD  
13 Overlay still have densities within the recommended range, so what does the TOD Overlay District mean for these  
14 areas?

15  
16 T. Newton asked if the residential density cited in the TOD Overlay District purpose statement should be higher (12  
17 units per acre)? M. Tuttle agreed that it should within the Metro areas, but noted that a higher density may not be  
18 achievable in Village areas. D. Schibler suggested that density could be context-specific with the purpose statement.  
19 M. Tuttle suggested that the purpose statement could not include a specific number, but instead could emphasize that  
20 communities should strive for higher density within TOD areas.

21  
22 E. Vorwald asked if the Richmond Park and Ride (as a major transit resource) should be included in the TOD  
23 Overlay District. R. Venkataraman noted that it's a challenging location because it's located away from the walkable  
24 Village area, not served by water and sewer, and therefore doesn't fit with the TOD Overlay very well. Richmond  
25 would encourage CCRPC to consider putting the TOD overlay within the Village area, but understands that this may  
26 not make sense because transit does not serve the area.

27  
28 P. Conner noted that there are some Center planning areas that lie outside the TOD Overlay District– this should be  
29 rectified. For that area in Burlington, M. Tuttle feels it's fine either way (include it in TOD or remove it from  
30 Center). M. Boulanger agreed regarding similar areas in Williston.

31  
32 M. Needle reminded the PAC that there is limited time to workshop changes to the TOD Overlay District boundaries  
33 since it needs to be included in the MTP. CCRPC staff hopes to finalize the draft MTP in January. A final discussion  
34 with PAC will happen at the January PAC meeting.

### 35 36 **6. ECOS Plan – Local Known and Possible Environmental Constraints Review**

37 M. Needle reminded the PAC that this issue is being reviewed because of the update to the energy section of the  
38 ECOS Plan. She noted that at the September PAC meeting the PAC recommended consistency in constraints for all  
39 types of development, not just energy generation. CCRPC staff removed all the possible constraints that were not  
40 natural resource related from local constraints lists. M. Needle explained that CCRPC staff felt like this was OK  
41 because of the siting policies in the ECOS Plan. P. Conner suggested rephrasing siting policy (policy v) to emphasize  
42 infill development is preferred in areas planned for growth instead of ground-mounted renewables generation.

43  
44 M. Tuttle asked if municipalities have greater opportunity for comment on §248 applications if a proposed facilities  
45 impact a constraint area. T. Newton said not directly within the review process; however, having these constraints  
46 included in a municipal enhanced energy plan does provide the higher legal standard of "substantial deference." M.  
47 Tuttle stated that she is concerned that removing these constraints from the regional plan would reduce their weight  
48 in PUC proceedings. There was consensus that if constraints are removed that the siting policies need to be tightened  
49 up to be more specific about siting in areas planned for growth. E. Vorwald said that he will send Winooski's  
50 proposed local constraints to M. Needle.

51  
52 T. Newton reviewed CCRPC's Act 250 / §248 policies and how they affect CCRPC's review of applications. He,  
53 emphasized that CCRPC does not consider local constraints since these are covered by zoning for during RPC  
54 reviews Act 250 applications. However, this is different for §248 because there is no local zoning review for these

1 projects. Therefore, CCRPC does specifically review and comment upon local constraints in correspondence with the  
2 applicant during Section 248 reviews.

### 3 4 **7. Updated Regional and Municipal Energy Data and Maps**

5 M. Needle stated that she did not have an update because VT Department of Public Service has not provided a  
6 timeline for release of LEAP data to RPCs (and therefore disaggregation to the municipal level), but it is likely that  
7 data should be provided to the RPCs by January 2023. For municipal comprehensive plans currently coming due for  
8 reapproval, CCRPC will clarify whether the updated energy data will need to be included in those plans based on  
9 timing).

### 10 11 **8. CCRPC Plan Review Guidelines – Initial Town Plan Reviews**

12 PAC members discussed the best method of delivery of Initial Town Plan Reviews to PAC members. M. Tuttle asked  
13 why the policy was changed to include PAC input on the initial reviews. M. Needle suggested it was likely to get  
14 early input from the PAC to ensure any deficiencies were corrected at the final review. A. Weinhagen suggested that  
15 prior to formation of the PAC, neighboring municipalities formed a committee to provide feedback directly to the  
16 municipality reviewing its plan. He suggested keeping the policy in place but sharing the initial reviews informally  
17 with PAC. J. Besse noted it would also help municipalities get consistent expectations from both staff and the PAC,  
18 rather than different input at different stages in the process. M. Tuttle agreed it was fine as long as the reading  
19 material was not too onerous. Future initial reviews will be linked from the agenda for members to review at their  
20 discretion.

### 21 22 **9. Members Items Open Forum**

23 There were no comments.

### 24 25 **10. Regional Act 250/Section 248 Projects on the Horizon.**

26 PAC members should email Taylor and Darren any Act 250/Section 248 updates.

### 27 28 **11. Other Business**

- 29 i. Need UPWP Committee representative from PAC: These meetings will be virtual. Need to know by mid-  
30 December. PAC alternates are eligible.
- 31 ii. MPGs due 12/1: Reach out to CCRPC for letters of support or help with scoping projects / budgets.
- 32 iii. VT BGS Municipal Energy Resiliency Grant Program: grant agreement is expected in the next few weeks,  
33 money will flow to the RPCs and grant applications will be available in January.
  - 34 • Alex: can RPC help municipalities track all the federal money flowing into towns (ARPA, CARES,  
35 Infrastructure)? CCRPC plans to update Funding Opportunities webpage and will e-mail PAC list  
36 serve information about any particularly larger grant opportunities that become available.
- 37 iv. All Hazard Mitigation Plans – Burlington, Winooski, and St. George are still outstanding.
- 38 v. FEMA Flood Maps are being updated. CCRPC will be available to assist municipalities to update bylaws to  
39 be in conformance with the new maps and NFIP minimum standards.
- 40 vi. Building Homes Together Dashboard has been updated. Main CCRPC Housing Dashboard (which includes  
41 all data, not just BHT timeframe) is also updated now and can be accessed through the CCRPC GIS hub.
- 42 vii. US Department of Transportation and Housing and Urban Development's Thriving Communities Grant. Two  
43 different grants with the same name, but both support rapid planning processes as long as there's an equity  
44 nexus. No local match is required.
- 45 viii. VT Statewide Housing Conference – November 16, 2022
- 46 ix. VT Development Conference – November 17, 2022

### 47 48 **9. Adjourn**

49 The meeting adjourned at 4:00pm. The next meeting will be on January 11, 2023.

50  
51  
52 Respectfully submitted, Darren Schibler