1 CENTRAL VERMONT REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION **MINUTES** 2 3 February 11, 2020 4 5 Commissioners: × Barre City Janet Shatney × Moretown Dara Torre, Secretary Heather Grandfield, Alt. Joyce Manchester, Alt ■ Northfield Barre Town **Byron Atwood** Laura Hill-Eubanks, Chair × ☑ Orange George Clain, Alt. Lee Cattaneo × Plainfield Berlin Robert Wernecke **Bram Towbin** × Karla Nuissl, Alt. Paula Emery, Alt. ☐ Roxbury Cabot **Amy Hornblas** Jerry D'Amico × Calais John Brabant × Waitsfield Don La Haye Harrison Snapp, Alt. Jan Ohlsson, Alt. × □ Warren Duxbury Alan Quackenbush Alison Duckworth E. Montpelier Julie Potter J. Michael Bridgewater, Alt. × **☑** Washington Jack Pauly, Alt. Peter Carbee ■ Waterbury Fayston **Carol Chamberlin** Steve Lotspeich, Vice-Chair × Marshfield **Robin Schunk** ☐ Williamstown Richard Turner Middlesex Ron Krauth □ Williamstown Jacqueline Higgins, Alt. Montpelier **⊠** Woodbury Marcella Dent Michael Gray, Treasurer Mike Miller, Alt. **⊠** Worcester Bill Arrand 6 7 Staff: Bonnie Waninger, Nancy Chartrand, Clare Rock, Pam DeAndrea 8 Guests: Danielle Owczarski, VT Department of Environmental Conservation; Charlie Baker, Mike O'Brien, 9 and Eleni Churchill, Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission; Rob ???, Berlin resident 10 11 Call to Order 12 Chair Hill-Eubanks called the meeting to order at 6:32 pm. Quorum was present to conduct business. 13 14 Adjustments to the Agenda 15 None 16 17 **Public Comments** 18 None 19 20 **Draft Basin 14 Tactical Basin Plan** Hill-Eubanks introduced Danielle Owczarski, Vermont Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC). 21 22 Owczarski advised this is a 'pre-draft', which allows additional time for commenting. This Basin 14 plan 23 impacts the headwaters in the towns of Orange and Washington. She provided detail of the existing 24 natural resources that affect the watershed as well details on past storm events and damage done. She 25 reiterated that mitigating the impacts of climate change is an overarching goal of the 2020 Basin 14 26 Tactical Basin Plan. She advised of the State's Climate Change webpage. A link will be included on

CVRPC's website. Pollutants that may end up in streams as result of major storm events (items stored in garages and basements) also were discussed.

Owczarski provided details regarding the draft, how it is organized, and sectors (agriculture, developed lands – stormwater, developed lands – roads, wastewater, and natural resource restoration). Plan targets and priorities for Orange and Washington were highlighted. Discussion on protection ensued and the town's role in identifying how it wants specific waters protected, and how waters may fall on the scale when and if reclassified. There was question if DEC reviews municipal plans for consistency with the basin. Owczarski said DEC looks to RPC's to assist with to ensure there are no conflicts. There was question if the basin plan affects DEC's issuing of permits for the spraying of whey and manure. She advised these plans do not affect permitting, and discussed opportunities and challenges to address these types of issues between DEC and the Agency of Agriculture.

There was a question raised on the status of floodplain maps. Many are outdated and municipalities need them for regulatory maps. It was confirmed that the maps are updated by FEMA and that they are working on updates for some areas of Vermont.

The basin plan timeline was provided. A final draft is anticipated by the end of March at which time public meetings will be scheduled. The completion date is anticipated to be the end of June.

Interstate 89 2050 Study

Charlie Baker, Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission, advised that they are in the first round of public meetings for the I-89 2050 Traffic Study. He outlined participants involved in this study. He noted they are seeking input at all levels – Board, municipality, and individual.

Eleni Churchill provided additional details on the project outlining the tasks. Currently, they are working on corridor vision and goals (Task 3) with a timeline to provide a final report by November 2021. There will be extensive public outreach through the project, which includes the entire I-89 corridor in Chittenden County (37 miles and 7 interchanges). She provided details on the different areas that are being taken into consideration - capacity, safety, deficiencies, resources, connectivity.

Input was then requested from members related to their experiences with I-89. Multiple topics were raised including potential impact from climate refugees, mass transit considerations, housing affordability, dispersing economic activity outside of Chittenden County into other areas that need growth, interaction between municipal and regional energy and transportation plans and addressing the 90% by 2050 renewable energy goals, as well as feasibility of tolls on the interstate.

The 2050 Vision for the I-89 Corridor through Chittenden County is an interstate system (mainline and interchanges) that is safe and resilient and provides for reliable and efficient movement of people and goods in alignment with state, regional, and municipal plans.

Commission Appointments

Hill-Eubanks advised Commissioners that Janet Shatney had agreed to chair the Nominating Committee; and Michael Gray and Richard Turner have indicated a willingness to serve on the Committee.

R. Wernecke moved to appoint Janet Shatney, Michael Gray and Rich Turner to the Nominating Committee; P. Carbee seconded. Discussion ensued regarding the process. It was concurred it was the correct one. Motion carried.

Central Vermont Regional Plan Amendment

Rock advised the Regional Plan Committee is proposing two amendments to the Regional Plan - one to the housing chapter with removal of the Housing Distribution Plan and an amendment to the future land use map with regard to a regional center boundary.

With regard to removal of the Housing Distribution Plan, it is recommended due to the projected forecast being outdated and no longer relevant. The requirement is no longer applicable to local efforts. Municipalities seeking plan approval are no longer asked to meet this regionally-imposed requirement.

Lotspeich spoke in support of the amendment.

With regard to the future land use map, the amendment is being recommended as the *Regional Center* planning area around Montpelier doesn't align with the new State-designated growth area. Alignment will ensure compatibility of future planned development between the Regional Plan and the City of Montpelier Plan and the goals of the State Growth Center Program.

The impetus behind this change goes back to when Montpelier renewed its State growth center designation. CVRPC staff reviewed the regional center in the Regional Plan and discovered there was not an alignment. Criteria was outlined for why this amendment was considered and what the current boundary vs. the proposed boundary is for Regional Center.

Significant discussion ensued regarding the boundaries and if there was consideration of environmental impacts. It was confirmed there are currently some undeveloped areas that are designated as areas identified for accommodating new growth into the future. This does not negate any of the policies in the Regional Plan natural resources section. The Regional Plan Committee determined the permitting process and review of the Project Review Committee would still require that any proposed development would be in alignment with other policies. There was also discussion as to why there are boundaries in the Regional Plan that go outside Montpelier's growth center boundaries. Rock said those boundaries had previously been designated in the Regional Plan as appropriate for regional growth. It was also confirmed that Montpelier's growth center was approved by the State.

Waninger explained that Vermont statute envisions an iterative process with plans. Local plans must be in conformance with regional plans, and regional plans when being changed must be in conformance with local plans. Neither needs to exactly reflect each other as municipalities are planning at a local level and the Commission at a regional level. A municipality may determine a large area is for growth, but different kinds of growth. Plans include maps and narrative used in conjunction with the maps. There are no narrative descriptions being recommended for change, only the map.

 Rock clarified that there was no request from Montpelier to make this change. She clarified that the action requested was to approve moving the amendments to the public hearing process for public comment. Consideration of adoption would occur after the hearing and any response to comments.

B. Arrand moved to approve amendments to the 2016 Regional Plan as recommended by the Regional Plan Committee and set public hearing date for the amendment process; D La Haye seconded. Significant discussion ensued regarding adoption vs. approval to move to public hearing. It was confirmed that this vote did not approve the amendments, but rather d them forward for the public hearing process. Additional discussion ensued on the housing element and if additional changes would be incorporated following the 2020 Census. It was confirmed this would be addressed in the process of updating the Regional Plan. Additional clarification of the language being moved was requested. The motion was read back "to approve the amendments to the Regional Plan as recommended by the Regional Plan Committee and set public hearing date for amendment process". After additional discussion, a friendly amendment was suggested by J. Brabant which was ultimately framed as the Board "approves the amendment as recommended being advanced to public hearing". B. Arrand and D. La Haye accept the amendment. A vote was called, and the motion as amended carried.

Waninger further advised there need to be two public hearings. Hearings for a plan amendment must be warned for 30 days. The first hearing will be held in April. The second hearing may be held in May.

Meeting Minutes

R. Wernecke moved to approve the minutes as prepared; D. La Haye seconded. Motion carried.

Reports

Waninger advised that the GMT Board has voted to send public transit service changes to public hearing. She will forward additional information to affected communities. Proposed service changes identified are:

27 identified a 28 • Rou

- Route 2 Commuter service moving from GMT to RCT. Both provider currently runs service
- City Commuter (Barre-Montpelier) service reduction to eliminate the first and last runs of the day due to low ridership.
- Barre Link and Waterbury Commuter service will combine two busses back to one bus.
- Additional volunteer recruitment will be pursued for drivers and service efficiencies are expected to be achieved by right-sizing the fleet to actual ridership.

She advised these changes will be put in CVRPC's e-news and notices will be sent to municipalities.

- Adjournment
- 37 D. La Haye moved to adjourn at 9:01 pm; R. Wernecke seconded. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

42 Nancy Chartrand, Office Manager