

Regional Sustainability Steering Committee

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

Date: March 16, 2011
Time: 7:00 am
Place: The Sheraton Hotel and Conference Center, South Burlington, VT

1. Breakfast and Networking.

2. Call to Order and Introductions. The meeting began at 7am. Penrose Jackson and Sandy Miller, Co-Chairs of the Steering Committee, welcomed everyone and thanked them for coming and participating in the process. All attendees introduced themselves [attendees listed at end].

3. Agenda review. No changes.

4. Project Background. Charlie thanked everyone and said he was humbled by the response. One of 45 grants awarded nationally, this extraordinary opportunity from the federal government for our region enables us to have a conversation about sustainable communities. Charlie was impressed with how much planning work has gone on in Chittenden County and in Burlington. We were well-positioned to win this grant in the category of implementation.

The purpose of this project is to align our goals and examine how we measure progress, which requires coordination and communication. David Raphael, LandWorks, was hired to do public outreach; the biggest challenge to progress is communication. Another perspective when applying for the grant was a shared notion of accountability and overlapping and shared objectives. CCRPC, CCMPO, GBIC and the City of Burlington have committed to take the work that comes out of this effort to update their official planning documents: the Regional Plan, the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy and the Burlington Legacy Plan. Our application also included the idea fiscal sustainability.

Charlie reviewed what we will accomplish this morning: 1) determining the addition of other groups to the Steering Committee; 2) walking through the draft Steering Committee Agreement (a federal requirement to agree to work together); and, 3) talking about the process (David Raphael will lead that discussion). Our contract began February 1. The Steering Committee Agreement needs to be in place by June 1 or the grant goes away. That's why our next meeting is at the end of May.

5. Draft Steering Committee Agreement. This is part of the open process. Please review the agreement with the organization that you represent. Please provide any changes or comments by April 15th, but Charlie is happy to take them here. David will speak about #8, Public Engagement.

1. Introduction: This is a three-year project beginning February 1.

2. Objectives: Define the Vision statement, develop indicators, prioritize and implement actions. All involved organizations have missions with shared goals and enjoy an interdependence to achieve our missions; the biggest challenge is prioritization. There are funds to implement actions and additional funds for multi-municipal actions. We have indicated to HUD, DOT and EPA that we will set goals, determine priorities, and then invest in those actions.

3. Membership. Charlie asked the Steering Committee members to make suggestions of other organizations that should be added to the group. Following were the suggestions:

Erik Filkorn – telecommunications
 Marty Illick - Gund Institute
 Irene Wrenner - Vermont Sustainable Heating Initiative
 Jim Dudley – AARP
 Rachel Batterson - Association of Africans Living in Vermont; a private non-profit housing developer
 Bob Kiss – race and diversity
 Jim Brangan – museums/cultural institutions – Vermont Preservation Trust
 Sandy Dooley – high school/college students
 Erik Filkorn – working landscape of Lake Champlain
 Barry Lampke = Vermont Center for Independent Living
 Tom Torti – the homeless/disenfranchised population
 Travis Marcotte – Vermont sustainable Jobs fund
 Charles Russell – Vermont Farm Bureau – energy producers (GMP, VELCO) – libraries
 Andrea Morgante – Vermont Land Trust

Charlie responded that he will do further outreach. He explained that the structure of the project has different levels: members and a cc list for interested parties who want to follow the project. There will also be working groups formed that can include other participants. Many on the Steering Committee wear multiple hats and there may be ways to bring in additional facets of representation without making the group larger. Erik suggested that the group participate in a survey monkey with a full list of categories for members to check.

4. Benefits: These sections are from HUD guidance and include eligibility for implementation funding.

5. Responsibilities: Attend nine quarterly meetings (investing 70 hours), check in and on-going communication; participation in subgroups, utilizing results for plan updates. We are also looking for work between the meetings, bringing products as drafts with 45 days for review.

6. Decision-making. The objective is to achieve consensus but if that is not possible, we will use a majority vote. This idea may need some revision based upon early comments.

7. Supporting Partner Agencies. CCRPC, Burlington City Arts, CCMPO, UVM Center for Rural Studies, GBIC, City of Burlington, VHFA, CVOEO, Vermont Legal Aid, VEIC, Smart Growth Vermont.

9. Termination of Agreement.

10. Please get authorization from your organizations to sign this agreement in May. The May meeting, however, is not yet scheduled.

8. Public Engagement: David Raphael, from LandWorks, introduced himself. He will help orchestrate the public engagement process by developing and conducting activities that will inform goals and implementation. As well, David will help develop the indicators involving a broad constituency within the county and beyond.

6. Public Engagement Discussion. Public engagement tools include a Steering Committee Retreat after the agreement has been signed to get everyone back together and move forward with visioning and project development. At the Retreat, the Committee will break out into small groups or roundtables. Hopefully we will bring in other experts to further the visioning process, identify issues and challenges and create indicators. Members should also document their own outreach efforts, have some fun and inject life into the process. There may be a few regional events. Burlington's Legacy

project will have events as well. We will try to reach students and engage our next generation with art events and projects. Doreen, of Burlington City Arts, is creating interesting, fun and engaging events to learn what folks have to say. LandWorks has a professional experienced in developing on-line engagement tools who will be creating a website in order to maintain open communication 24/7. Speakers will be brought in and the project is evolving. David said he would like to hear ideas from committee members. Groups like this can change Chittenden County one step at a time.

Branding: This is extremely important. By virtue of the knowledge and brainpower of the folks around the room, we know that this is a very special opportunity. The project should have life of its own and we may give it a name with Regional Sustainability Project as a basis for describing the project, or a name or graphic feel may emerge in time with a logo and stamp on project elements and products.

Discussion Questions: We've identified constituencies we need to reach and now we are interested in other thoughts people have. One concern is the size of group and the challenge of subsets to work efficiently. David is very excited about Doreen's organization's role, as art and creativity can be an important part of visioning

7. Next Steps:

- Revisions to Draft Agreement by April 15th - members have a month to make suggestions
- Obtain approval to enter into agreement by next meeting - May is time to sign the agreement, with a Steering Committee Retreat in May. Then we will start to move forward with individual meetings with various groups

Contact Information: David Raphael [davidr@landworksvt.com], Charlie Baker [cbaker@ccrpcvt.org]. LandWorks has a staff of nine people. Also included in the public engagement team are experts in on-line engagement, who have worked with the Orton Foundation, as well as an economist, Jeff Carr.

Discussion: Rachael Batterson commented the importance of HUD's definition of sustainability which includes equity, diverse communities and integration, a central role of this program. Andrea Morgante followed said that we need to be sustainable in our ability to work as a group. The concept of consensus will be helpful as we develop and use identifiable means and ways of working with each other; there models and David asked Andrea to share them. Garret Mott said his two biggest questions are energy and a true public transportation network for the region. Dave Tilton commented that considering the budget (\$1M grant, with \$250K for implementation), he would like to be able to explain the budget to his constituents the other \$750K. Charlie referred to the last page of the packet to give a better sense of scope and investments being made in the project. There is an additional increment of what HUD is calling leverage (match). Primarily, CCRPC and CCMPO have committed to spend an additional \$1.2M of effort (as well as what is already underway by various organizations) by rolling the Regional Plan and the MTP into this effort. He reviewed the schedule and tasks:

- 1) Draft Agreement is match time. Of the \$1M, approximately 10-15% is going into public engagement regionally and into the City of Burlington's Legacy and sustainability efforts;
- 2) Vision and Goals – We identified and examined 51 regional, state and municipal planning documents applicable to our region; staff time is match (we will talk about this in May);
- 3) Data – the meat of the budget in terms of grant dollars, going to supporting partner agencies (sub grantees): Housing Needs Assessment - \$75K goes to VHFA, with 8-9% to CVOEO and VT Legal Aid to assist; Economic Indicator Report (CEDS) - about 10% of grant funds for an economic

consultant; Energy Analysis - 5-6% to VEIC; Energy/Air Quality/Climate Action Analysis – RPC and MPO are already working on this (no grant funds); Natural Resources Analysis – working with ANR (no grant funds); Land Use Planning Areas Scenarios - work related to CCRPC and MPO work, (no grant funds); Transportation Analysis - MPO work (no grant funds); Sustainability indicators – Center for Rural Studies, approximately 30-40% of budget.

4) Task 4 work (Updating the Regional Plan and MTP) is the only grant-funded work; (2-3%) to Burlington for supplemental work around the Legacy Plan.

5) Consolidation - consolidation of the MPO and CCRPC in order to become more effective in providing services to the region.

6) Implementation Activities - \$250K and another \$30-40K for multi-jurisdictional efforts, subject to approval from the group. We would like to do two rounds (early actions at the end of this year and a second round at the end of 2012-2013). This strategy came out of conversations with RPC and MPO municipal representatives. Charlie reviewed the schedule: goals will be in place by summertime; background analysis – understanding data and other issues like public health and an understanding of the challenges and perspectives of the project so by the end of the calendar year everyone is on the same page about goals, data; next year the focus will be on policy discussion. By the end of 2012, implementation actions should be agreed upon. Summary of the grant dollars: 15% on engagement, 30% on implementation and the remainder for analyses and priority development;

Sandy Miller commented that this was a great narrative of how the money will be spent but an actual budget would be helpful. He requested that the budget be sent to the Steering Committee. Charlie will send this out or post it on the web as well as today's PowerPoint. Jim Dudley asked about recipients of this grant program. This was a \$100M undertaking of HUD/EPA/DOT of which 25% went to small regions (under 500,000 people); the largest were \$5M to St. Paul and Salt Lake City. Of several hundred applications, 45 were awarded. The maximum size for our region was \$1M; we received \$995K.

Noelle MacKay referred to data collection and said she wants to encourage broad working groups. At the state level, she is seeing many questions being asked about data transparency. A good example is Sarah's piece in the Burlington Free Press reporting that numbers can be pulled out in terms of housing needs and what vacancy rates really mean. The State is looking at doing some economic cluster analysis and perhaps this process can serve as a model. Noelle said she would encourage not only putting the usual folks in a room to look at collecting the information, but taking a robust look at all the pieces from energy, transportation and natural resources - bring in business folks, the homeless, our veteran population. Examining this holistically, outside the box, might help inform the process. Then, when the data comes up, people feel that the numbers are grounded.

Sandy Miller asked if we can talk about the structure of the groups and how the Steering Committee, the Coordination Group and the working groups will work together at the Retreat in May. That might help us understand how this work will be integrated properly so everyone gets what they need from this process. Around thoughts and strategies for engagement, Martha Maksym asked if Charlie can put together a check list for the group to make sure we are asking questions about accessibility – is the location accessible? On a bus route? Is the meeting space comfortable (hotels may not work for all)? Does the time work for parents with children? Will we need interpreters? Who is our audience? These are important fundamental questions. Perhaps there could be a reminder or checklist that every group could refer back to. Also, Martha referred to the digital divide, saying there is a significant number of people in our community that can't afford to stay connected, so we need other engagement strategies. Chip Sawyer echoed those comments and asked us to consider those who do not have

access to online tools and rural communities without sufficient internet connections. Chip encouraged discussion with Front Porch Forum, which is building a good deal of social capital throughout the state and to discuss their customizing specific interfaces to funnel conversation with input into this effort – and to build upon what they’ve already built. Charles Russell said that many older people in Charlotte do not have computers and use libraries and senior centers, which are not represented here. Heather Danis understands that the RFP requires bringing in partners that have not traditionally been part of planning efforts, and a mechanism that will help us talk to each other.

Retreat: David discussed the idea of having a retreat and is looking at alternative settings. We may need an hour or so to address the agreement, another few hours to follow up on today’s questions. He’d like to kick off the process by engaging members in themes and focus areas, examining visions and goals and discussing interconnectivity, identifying issues, strengths, weaknesses. The retreat may be an afternoon, or late afternoon – evening session, breaking into subcommittees and reconnecting with the larger whole. Within the working groups, we probably want to identify outreach, engagement and learning opportunities and reach out to non-traditional, underserved groups. How do we communicate with those folks – radio, go to the schools, libraries, senior centers? Charlie suggested the week before Memorial Day (5/23, 5/24, 5/25) from 4 – 9pm for the retreat. As child care is an issue, it might be good to schedule some meetings during the day, some at night and the morning to be fair. Rachel suggested sending a Doodle with time choices. For partners not at the table, we might initiate an informal buddy system, giving members a chance to see what non-regular partners do, helping with transparency and learning each others’ languages.

Sandy reviewed that we will send a Doodle for a meeting a week before Memorial Day. A number of suggestions made today by David and Charlie will be included in retreat discussion.

Charlie added that any comments or concerns with the agreement be brought to light. There is a month from April 15th to check in with your organizations and get their approval to sign it. If we don’t execute the agreement, we won’t be moving forward. Charlie said he is looking forward to getting comments and will disseminate the comments to the group with an online discussion if necessary. Jim Dudley noted that Item 4 talks about members of the Steering Committee being eligible to submit projects and urged Charlie to think about how many members to have on the Committee and perhaps to submit projects through the Committee. Charlie wants to encourage partnership. Noelle commented that if we add to the size of group, there are going to be difficult decisions and fleshing them out in the decision making process will be important. Catherine McMains asked how time invested will be monitored. Charlie responded that he is trying to document the \$1.5M leveraged match through professional staff. The sign-in sheet will be the primary mechanism for documenting meeting and prep time, including on-line work and organizational hours of staff or planning commissioners. Charlie will provide a template for members to use between formal meetings and will send that out with the budget. Sue Minter asked if we can add ways to carpool to the website. Charlie doesn’t believe we will have a hard time getting to the match point, but it is also a way to document engagement and get some sense of the level of community efforts. We will try to make this as simple as possible. Marty Illick asked if there needs to be more content regarding the development and approval of sustainability indicators; also decision-making around the approval of the implementation projects. The thought was that the Committee will actively review and participate on all work products including selecting implementation actions, deciding on goals and indicators.

With no other questions, Sandy thanked everyone for coming and he looks forward to seeing all in May. The meeting adjourned at 8:58am.

Respectfully submitted,



Leslie Bonnette, Communications Coordinator

March 16, 2011 Regional Sustainability Steering Committee Attendees

Robert Vallie, Bolton
Leslie Pelch, Bolton
Garret Mott, Buel's Gore
Bob Kiss, Burlington
Larry Kupferman, Burlington
David White, Burlington
Bill Keogh, Burlington
Charles Russell, Charlotte
Marty Illick, Charlotte
Marc Landry, Colchester
Linda Myers, Essex
Irene Wrenner, Essex
Deborah Billado, Essex Junction
Andrea Morgante, Hinesburg
Ed Booth, Huntington
Catherine McMains, Jericho
Erik Filkorn, Richmond
Jim Dudley, Shelburne
Sandy Miller, South Burlington
Sandra Dooley, South Burlington
Kari Papelbon, Underhill
Dave Tilton, Westford
Doreen Kraft, Burlington City Arts
Jan Demers, CVEOE
Kevin Stapleton, CVOEO
Jim Fay, Champlain Water District
Bernie Lemieux, Champlain Water District
Peter Keating, CCMPO
Elaine Pinckney, Chittenden County School Superintendents
Jon Moore, CCTA
Penrose Jackson, Fletcher Allen Healthcare
Frank Cioffi, GBIC
Curt Carter, GBIC
Seth Bowden, GBIC
Thom Jagielski, IBM
Travis Marcotte, The Intervale
Jim Brangan, Lake Champlain Basin Program
Tom Torti, LCRCC

Chapin Spencer, Local Motion
Nicole Dehne, NOFA
Beth Ann Finlay, Northern VT Resource Conservation & Development Council
Catherine Dimitruk, Northwest Regional Planning
Matha Maksym, United Way/Champlain Initiative
Joe Speidel, UVM
Chip Sawyer, UVM
Noelle Mackay, ACCD
Jane Helmstetter, VT Agency of Human Services
Peter LaFlamme, VT Agency of Natural Resources
Sue Minter, VTrans
Heather Danis, VT Dept. of Health
John Vowles, VT Dept. of Labor
Mike O'Neil, VT Dept. of Emergency Mgmt.
David Barash, VEIC
Sarah Carpenter, VT Housing Finance Agency
Debbie Ingram, VT Interfaith Action
Rachel Batterson, VT Legal Aid
Denise Lamoureux, VT State Refugee Coordinator
Pablo Bose, VT State Refugee Coordinator
Yumiko Jakobcic, Winooski Valley Park District
Jeff Munger, Senator Bernie Sanders' Office
Brent Raymond, Representative Peter Welch's Office
Jennifer Green, Burlington Legacy Project
Barry Lampke, United Way