



Steering Committee Meeting Minutes  
October 26, 2011  
**DRAFT**

1. **Breakfast and Networking.**
2. **Call to Order & Introductions.** Penrose called the meeting to order at 8:06am and welcomed the new Steering Committee members. All members introduced themselves. Sandy Miller then presided.
3. **Approval of Additional Steering Committee Members.** Catherine Dimitruk moved, seconded by Chris Cole, to approve the new members. No discussion. The vote carries.
4. **Quick Review of Project Status & Documenting Efforts.** Charlie updated members on the project from the Goals through the Action phases. He explained the sign-in sheets, which were being circulated. Two requests were on the sign-in sheet: to document the in-kind hours since last meeting, how many people were talked to about the goals, and also about the organizations hosting a kiosk. If this format works, this will be done at each meeting. Charlie thanked members for all their efforts.
5. **Approval of May 25, 2011 Meeting Summary.** Garret moved, seconded by Ginny, to approve the meeting summary. There were no additions, deletions or corrections. Vote carries. Jim Dudley abstained.
6. **Approval of Goals.**
  - a. **Summary of comments received.** Charlie thanked those who reviewed the goals, which went out for comment mid-July. Public workshops were held in Burlington and Williston in September. Something that came out of the goals review is that the goal statements were not full-bodied enough. In the revised version, there is more to the goal structure: vision, mission, principles. There were many comments on how to knit the whole process together, and we are carrying forward work from the CEDS process showing how everything is connected. A report on the comments can be found on the ECOS website. These are not *new* goals; these originated from your 60 planning documents and were synthesized.
  - b. **Action on revised goal statements. A motion to approve the revised goal statements was made by Ed Booth, and seconded by Garret Mott.** Judy Dow questioned Principal #5 and spoke not only of not depleting resources as sustainable, but leaving things better for future generations; Sandy asked for suggested language. Garret suggested "meet the needs of today while maintaining and improving ..." Jim Fay spoke about the Built Environment and that water supply should include wastewater and should say, 'insure adequate water and wastewater needs.' Charlie Baker suggested differentiating drinking water and wastewater. Marty Illick suggested changing #3 under Built Environment to 'Insure adequate future water and wastewater for all users.' Should we also add something about storm water? Ginny Lyons said wastewater brings up the topic of infrastructure as well as ground water and stormwater and thinks 'Insure adequate infrastructure for wastewater treatment and adequate future water quality and supply for all users.' Tom Buckley suggested breaking that into two goals. Many people agreed. Charlie said he will revise #3 and

break into two thoughts, and pointed out that infrastructure can also be found under Economic Infrastructure. Rachael Batterson questioned the phrase ‘now and future’ and thought ‘future’ should be replaced with ‘on-going’ care. Sandy asked for consensus and clearly a majority present agreed; **this will be incorporated before we make a motion.** Other discussion included Melanie Needle referring to what Judy mentioned about the principle, and agreed that we borrowed those principles from ICLEI and perhaps we might add that statement but not change the principle. **Sandy said this group is here to advance these principles/goals and make them as current as possible.** Leslie Pelch said she would suggest changing the attribution to “adapted from.” David Raphael responded to Ms. Dow’s recommendation that we include ‘and improve’ under Natural Systems #1. Rachael said that Social Community speaks a lot about health goals and nothing about diversity and integration; Charlie responded that that language moved to the principles. Sara Martinez de Osaba thought Economy #5 should include improving workforce education and training, and to delineate academic and workforce training. Martha Maksym noted that education is separate under Social Community, which cites life-long learning and providing social supports. Leslie said this seems appropriate for this level of document. Sandy reminded members that these goals are intended to be broad and work tasks will be under them. Rachel said she thought there should be a new #7 in Social Community to “expand housing choice for people of all incomes, races and ethnicities.’ Debbie Ingram wants to add ‘and ethnic neighborhoods’ to Built Environment #5 and a majority of members present agreed. Ginny agrees with the last comment: that integration of the social community should be based on race, age, and ethnicity, which is different from housing. Garret suggested ‘increase opportunities ... ‘regardless of race, ethnicity or age’ or ‘mixed income, ethnically, racially and demographically diverse.’ Pablo Bose said he is not sure he would want that changed and does not think this is a broad principle. Tom Buckley reminded members that it says “all types;” Charlie agreed that that was the intent and thinks the idea is captured. Larry Kupferman said this sounds like a small group effort, and is thinking about the time: this would be good for those who expressed interest to work on and to provide for future consideration. Asked by Sandy if ‘all types’ or ‘mixed’ works, John Lajza disagreed and wants to continue to work on this; also to apply the same concept to Social Community, and senses we need an additional goal. **Ginny offered a straw vote. Add another goal: Integrate diverse cultural racial and ethnic groups into the social fabric and activities of the County. Vote: Approved to add as #14.** Judy feels that in Built Environment #12 ‘respect and interpret’ is a contradiction for her people, and wishes to take out ‘interpret.’ Leslie said we need more of an explanation and Jim Brangan strongly believes that is essential to interpret our heritage and that it remain in that goal. Sandy will refer this back to the Committee. **Kurt thinks this is valuable discussion, and moved to call the question to approve the revised broad goals with the idea that the Committee will reconvene to work on the revisions to the goals, seconded by Jim Dudley. The vote carries.** Leslie asked members to avoid wordsmithing and to bring up major concerns that will then be passed to the Committee.

## 7. Preview Draft Analysis Reports

- a. **Economic – GBIC.** Seth Bowden introduced members of Garnet Consulting Group: Jeff Blodgett, Bill Frederick and Mark Waterhouse. Mark explained that first phase is economic research and then, an economic development action phase. He referred to the three documents, which all



feed into the action plan: the Economic Base Analysis, a Competitive Assessment and they all fed into a Target Industry Assessment, which feeds into an action plan. Jeff Blodgett summarized the key findings: since the 1950's Vermont has had the second best job growth in New England, but private job growth has been flat since 2000 except for some growth in government sector, federal and military. There has been an increase in a younger population, more likely to rent; our population also experiences higher wages and income in this area. The GDP in the Burlington MSA is much higher in the public sector in Vermont. Insurance costs in the private sector are up over 50% in short period of time. Vermont has escaped the bulk of the downturn in housing prices and still retains higher housing costs. The high unemployment rate and lack of job creation remain challenging. The Competitive Assessment review highlights the strengths and challenges. The growing younger population is favored by employers, with median income above the national average; 47% of the population possesses at least a four-year degree. We have a well-diversified economy with a growing tech and entrepreneurial base – one of the leaders in the country. The workforce is outstanding, according to Garnet's survey of employers. Mark Waterhouse explained that the Competitive Assessment found that we have a good supply of available buildings; Chittenden County is easy to get to by road and air, but not so good by rail. Looking at the challenges vs. the assets, Bill is pleased to report, from their perspective, that the assets outweigh the challenges. Key is the tightness of the skilled labor force with labor demand outstripping supply in a year; we have lower wages and salary than the national average (excluding IBM). Tech operations cannot get the labor they are looking for so are expanding elsewhere. IBM is skewing our data and we have, otherwise, high retail employment. There is a perception of a regulatory environment (Act 250) and a short supply of real estate on which to build. Mark said he has heard of a need for intra-regional roads and also about an inadequate telecommunications network. There is an impending need for road improvements and obtaining permits and financing are issues. The Chittenden County brand is not well-defined, with a neutral image, and we need to promote ourselves and develop recognition in the marketplace to attract talented labor. There is a lingering perception that GBIC is motivated for land development for factories, which is not true. There is a need for improving economic development programs for prospective and existing businesses. Target Clusters are economic targets of intent and of opportunity. Mark showed a preliminary list of twelve targets that will feed into the economic development action agenda.

- b. **Housing – VHFA.** Leslie Black Plumeau presented. The FHFA, together with CCRPC and CVOEO, looked at four areas of housing needs: housing choice fairness, affordability, characteristics and location of homes and growth needs. Summarizing highlights of the analysis report, Leslie said there are approximately 500 homeless people each night in Chittenden County. She cited their limits regarding affordability and access, which is true for non-white, disabled and single-parent households whose populations are growing. Many county residents spend more than 50-60% of their incomes on rent or mortgage payments, utilities and property taxes. Chittenden County renters occupy older housing stock, built around 1940. A good portion of workers commute 25 miles or further each day. Growth expected among owners will be met easily with homes in the planning stages; the rate of production will easily meet demand. For renters, production should be increased to meet demands over the next five years.

- c. **Land Use/Transportation – CCRPC.** Melanie Needle presented a summary of land use changes from 1950 – 2005, and used an animated map to show that growth took place from the Burlington area out to the eastern portion of the County, comprised mostly of large-lot single family homes. A study was done between 1990 and 2008 showing 70% land consumption. Melanie showed the Chittenden County Regional Plan Planning Areas with spatial designation of the County in areas similar in development and land use goals: Center, Metro, Suburban, Village, Enterprise and Rural. This is an important factor in gauging progress and where we are developing over time. The Center Planning Area encompasses the state's Smart Growth program including new town centers in Williston and Colchester and Winooski. The graphs are a combination of dot maps and planning areas and shows growth and a trend of moving into suburban and rural planning areas. She showed current residential densities (1 – 3 dwelling units per acre). Planners ask if this is sustainable in terms of energy, air quality and environmental impact. Peter Keating spoke about the tools that help answer that question. Peter exhibited maps that show scenario planning over the last 50 years which, given growth parameters, where might houses and jobs go and at what densities. It is the first look at trends by type. CCRPC conducted workshops several years ago asking the public how they might see future development; they traded for higher density development and cluster development around the County. Then, CCRPC created a bookend future scenario based on ½ the housing and jobs placed in Burlington and Winooski. They looked at the scenarios in the context of the Transportation Demand Model (TDM), which produces information on land, environment and transportation. Then this was presented to the public in an on-line survey and showed a strong preference by over 800 survey-takers to change the trend from single large-lot dwellings, and cluster jobs and housing in the centers. Recently, they shifted gears and asked if land use remained static, but switching out different transportation scenarios; the group is now analyzing three scenarios (details are in the report). In the preliminary analysis, one is based on congestion and shows that no matter what transportation strategy is used, growth will increase congestion. They will be analyzing the cost for selecting one of these scenarios. These scenarios and creation of other transportation scenarios will be mixed and matched and brought back to this group, getting into more specifics in the future.
- d. **Energy – VEIC. Bill Bowman.** Bill said the Energy group wanted to define sustainability at the outset, and that there are two sides to the energy equation: how much raw energy do we use, and how and where do we get it? If we use more than we really need, we are wasteful and not sustainable; if we produce energy by damaging our planet, it is not sustainable. Utopia is in sight. Vermont believes in conservation and efficiency. We have an efficiency utility (VEIC) and in electrical consumption, we flat lined; consumption per capita is going down in Vermont (we are one of the few states). Bill exhibited the Energy Team goals, which are broad, and achievable. Maybe in our children's time, we can have the energy we need to sustain and improve our lifestyle without destroying the environment. There has been good energy planning in Chittenden County at the municipal level and the state level, with the refreshment of the Vermont Comprehensive Energy Plan. Draft 1 is available in the Energy Report and is required reading. The Energy Planning and Implementation Guidebook for Vermont Communities is also required reading. What is missing? Where are we, where do we want to go? As we progress, we



need metrics, and the Energy Group is working on this now with the Center for Rural Studies; as well, we need to develop tools to measure priorities and risk management devices.

- e. **Natural Resources – LandWorks.** David Raphael described the purpose of the group’s work. The content of the analysis identifies data sets and highlights the trends, documents map sources, identifies other analyses and references and establishes some preliminary recommendations. This work was made possible by the Natural Resources Working Group, which identified four key areas to focus on: water quality, forest fragmentation, working landscape and scenic resources. After analyzing the information, the group came up with a preliminary conclusion. Three quarters of Chittenden County is in private ownership; our culture and landscape is not static. Chittenden County is reverting to land area, with smaller farms; however, 25% of the core forest has been lost. The specter of climate change is cast over all these studies and having a significant impact on the quality of natural resources. All town plans highlight the importance of natural and scenic resources, but a lack of regulatory standards for preservation. The key elements to grapple with are how and where we develop, the nature and extent of the working landscape, integrity of natural resources and the synchronicity of plans and bylaws from town to town, creating regional approach.
  - f. **Social – Champlain Initiative/DOH/Fletcher Allen.** Heather Danis said the report is mostly placeholders to be contained in the final report. This is a self-formed work group and Heather invited anyone interested to join. The group spent 20 hours over the summer, and is now working on the data analysis report. If you’d like to learn more about these concepts, there is an upcoming ‘Building Healthy Communities’ training. Health care only contributes 10% to our health; the remaining factors are behavior and environment. The top three threats are tobacco, poor diet and physical activity, and alcohol. Heather highlighted some data points and concluded that behavior subscribes to social environment.
6. **Next Steps /Engagement Efforts.** Larry Kupferman explained that there should be a timeline for receiving additional input from those who participated today. He invited new members to join the work groups and Sandy will make sure that that happens. Charlie thanked everyone for coming and to those who presented today. He emphasized to members that all reports are Draft #1, and not to invest too much time reviewing these reports. There will be Draft #2, published by November 15<sup>th</sup>. Look for an email with revised reports in a few weeks and to please get comments in by the end of the calendar year; as well, additional comments about the goals statements. Elizabeth Reaves, with CRS, will help us with the indicators. To help you with reviewing these with your organizations, Charlie will provide tools such as PowerPoints, a press release to use in local papers and/or an email or Facebook message. The website is the best place to collect comments. If anyone wants someone to come to one of their meetings to discuss the reports, please let him know. David is working on public engagement activities and beginning to get into the schools. They are doing intercepts, video interviews and handing out surveys; there are also kiosks for public input that can be placed at your organization. ECOS is on the campus of Champlain College and will be at UVM and CCV in the coming week as well as the high schools. The Speaker Series will be announced in the near future. The ECOS website will continue to be reorganized. In summary, this process is about trying, through the


engagement effort, to garner public input, promote a dialog, taking the comments and plugging them into the goal statements and, in the future, into action, so we benefit from this input.

- a. Review Draft Analysis Reports with your organization
  - Contact LandWorks/CCRPC to attend your meeting
  - Submit Comments on Draft Analysis Reports by December 31
- b. LandWorks Report on Public Engagement Efforts

Ginny Lyons commented that she thinks we should be looking at a land use capability map for our County, and how to make that a firm commitment to use our natural resources and land going forward. The Economic Development section excluded free trade agreements, which can affect our branding and the Trans Pacific Agreement that is coming forward will change our capacity to brand as Vermont. Mark responded that that will be in the Action Plan.

7. **Adjournment.** The next meeting will be January 25, 2012. Meeting adjourned at 10:003am.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Leslie Bonnette".

Leslie Bonnette  
Executive Assistant