

1 Chittenden County Metropolitan Planning Organization  
2 Regular Meeting  
3 Minutes  
4

5 Date: Wednesday, June 16, 2004

6 Time: 6:00 p.m.

7 Place: CCMPO Offices; 30 Kimball Avenue, Suite 206; South Burlington, VT 05403

8 Present: Jerry Mullen, Bolton  
9 Bill Keogh, Burlington (6:15)  
10 Jeff McDonald, Charlotte (Vice-Chair)  
11 Chris Conant, Colchester  
12 Jeff Carr, Essex  
13 John Booth, Essex Junction  
14 Andrea Morgante, Hinesburg  
15 Bob Penniman, Jericho  
16 Virginia Clarke, Richmond  
17 Jim Dudley, Shelburne  
18 Jim Condos, South Burlington (Chair)  
19 Stan Hamlet, Underhill  
20 Tom Buckley, Westford (7:15)  
21 George Gerecke, Williston  
22 Mike O'Brien, Winooski (Sec-Treas)  
23 Patricia McDonald, VTrans Secretary  
24 Polly McMurtry, VTrans Planning Coordinator  
25 Ex-Officio: Chris Jolly, FHWA  
26 Lew Wetzel, CCRPC  
27 OTHERS: Diane Meyerhoff, Third Sector Associates  
28 Kevin Biglin, Citizen Participation Committee  
29 Charles Basner, FHWA District Administrator  
30 Matthew Langham, VTrans  
31 Greg Brown, CCRPC Exec. Dir.  
32 Rep. George Schiavone  
33 Rep. Margaret Hummel  
34 Rep. Sonny Audette  
35 Rep. Frank Mazur, Chair, House Transportation Committee  
36 Debra Sachs, Alliance for Climate Action  
37 Staff: Bill Knight, Executive Director  
38 Peter Keating, Sr. Transportation Planner  
39 Christine Forde, Sr. Transportation Planner  
40 Dave Roberts, Sr. Transportation Planner  
41 Susan Smichenko, Sr. Transportation Planner  
42 Paul Craven, Project Manager  
43 Bernadette Ferenc, Administrative Assistant  
44

45 The meeting was called to order at 6:10 p.m. by the Chair, Jim Condos. We do have a quorum.

46  
47 1. Changes to the agenda. Jim Condos added item 8a. to warn a public hearing on a bylaw  
48 change; added Item 12 a. for a possible executive session to discuss personnel. Mike O'Brien  
49 asked that Item C-3 be separated for action because of a possible conflict of interest. Pat

1 McDonald asked that we separate C-2 (executive committee meeting summary) from the consent  
2 agenda.

3  
4 2. Public Comment Period. Rep. Frank Mazur is Chair of the House Transportation Committee  
5 and represents part of South Burlington. He said there have been comments made as to actions  
6 taken by the House Transportation Committee and they wanted to clarify it from their standpoint.  
7 He said there were some sinister comments that the House is not very supportive of the MPO and  
8 he wants to put that to rest. We are a small state and it is important for all of us to work together.  
9 He said this was a joint effort with the Senate to resolve and neither body had more power than  
10 the other. It was a negotiated settlement about the circ. Based on the minutes he received, he  
11 contacted the legislative council and he read the following prepared statement for the record:

12  
13 “I am writing this in response to the minutes of the MPO’s meeting on May 19, 2004 in order to  
14 clarify the action taken by the General Assembly and signed into law by the Governor in the FY-  
15 05 transportation bill concerning federal funds intended for construction of the Circ.  
16

17 I agree that transportation project decision-making involving federal funds is based on an ongoing  
18 cooperative planning process involving the state and the Chittenden County Metropolitan  
19 Planning Organization, and I believe that the allocation of federal funds intended for the Circ has  
20 been fully in accord with that process and with all applicable state and federal laws.  
21

22 In the fall of 2002, as chair of the House Transportation Committee, I asked Legislative Council  
23 for a legal analysis of the roles and authority of the agency of transportation, the MPO and the  
24 legislature under federal law. A copy of Legislative Council’s legal opinion, dated January 2003,  
25 is attached.  
26

27 A critical part of the federally mandated cooperative planning process is an evaluation and  
28 determination of the relative priority of proposed projects in the MPO area compared to proposed  
29 projects in the rest of the state in order, in the language of the federal law, “to develop estimates  
30 of funds that are reasonably expected to be available” for proposed projects in the MPO area. 23  
31 U.S.C. §134(h)(1)(C). Once a preliminary estimate of federal funds for MPO area projects is  
32 determined, it is the job of the MPO to decide, by prioritizing projects in its TIP, how that  
33 aggregate estimate of funds should be spent. The MPO, therefore, has exclusive control over  
34 which projects are listed in the TIP but as described in the federal law, the TIP is just “a priority  
35 list of *proposed* federally supported projects” which goes back to the state, which includes the  
36 executive branch and the legislature, for a final decision on funding. 23 U.S.C. §134(h)(2)(A).  
37 Whether or not a project which is proposed for funding in the TIP is actually selected to receive  
38 funding is a decision made by the executive branch and the General Assembly through the  
39 legislative process. 23 U.S.C. §134(h)(5)(A).  
40

41 This cooperative planning and decision-making process was followed with respect to the  
42 proposed funding of the Circ. As the Circ project moved forward towards planned construction  
43 starting in fiscal year 2004, the MPO included the project in its TIP, the executive branch  
44 recommended funding of the project to the legislature and the General Assembly authorized and  
45 appropriated construction funds for the Circ. That decision by the General Assembly represented  
46 a determination by the legislature that construction of the Circ was a high priority of the state and  
47 needed to be funded in preference to and in lieu of other state priorities. When the legislature  
48 authorized and appropriated \$11.5 million for Circ construction in the FY-04 transportation bill,  
49 that authorization extended to the Circ only and did not represent an allocation of \$11.5 million  
50 for MPO area projects in general to be replaced by a fresh \$11.5 million when the Circ was ready  
51 for construction. That policy judgment was made explicit in §77 of the FY-04 transportation bill  
52 which states that if the Circ is delayed for any reason, funds authorized for the project shall not be

1 reallocated without the approval of the General Assembly and any “proposed reallocation of  
2 funds shall endeavor to optimize the use of funds to advance or complete the highest priority  
3 projects in the state which are not funded or which require additional funds.” Act 56, Sec. 77  
4 (2003 Session).

5  
6 When the Circ project was put on hold by court order, the question of relative priorities was  
7 squarely raised. What are the highest priority projects in the state, within and outside the MPO,  
8 that were passed over in order to advance construction of the Circ? In terms of sound policy, that  
9 is where this money should go and that, in essence, is what the legislature directed the agency to  
10 determine in the FY-05 transportation bill. Section 3(8) of the FY-05 transportation bill (Act 160,  
11 2004 Session), which reallocates the federal Circ funds is, in the opinion of Legislative Council,  
12 perfectly consistent with federal law. Section 3(8) allocates \$3.7 million to continue the Circ  
13 project, \$6 million for the Winooski downtown project, \$3 million for other MPO area projects  
14 and the remaining funds to projects outside the MPO area. The section represents a determination  
15 by the legislature, as subsequently approved by the Governor when he signed the bill into law, of  
16 the relative priority and optimum use of these federal funds on a statewide basis.

17  
18 Pursuant to federal law and as explicitly provided for in the state’s MOU with the MPO and, as a  
19 matter of state law after the Governor’s enactment into law of the FY-05 transportation bill, the  
20 agency now has a legal duty to advise the MPO that the preliminary estimate of federal funds  
21 reasonably expected to be available for MPO area projects is going to be less than the initial  
22 estimate. Once the final projects are selected to receive the reallocated funds, in a process  
23 detailed in Act 160, Sec. 3(8), the agency has a duty to amend the STIP and present these  
24 decisions to FHWA for approval.

25  
26 In taking these actions the state is not amending the TIP and is not telling the MPO which  
27 projects to prioritize within its TIP. The TIP remains under the exclusive control of the MPO.  
28 The only action taken by the state is to revise the estimate of total federal funds which are  
29 expected to be available for MPO area projects in the next 3 federal fiscal years; and that revised  
30 estimate was determined through the democratic legislative process in which the interests of all  
31 the citizens of Vermont were represented.

32  
33 Under federal law the MPO now has a duty to revise its TIP so that it is fiscally constrained and  
34 consistent with the revised total of federal funds expected to be available for MPO area projects.  
35 This is how the system is supposed to work under federal law, from bottoms up input from RPCs  
36 and the MPO regarding the project priorities in their regions to an assessment and reconciliation  
37 of these regional priorities within the constraints of available funding by the executive and  
38 legislative branches from a state-wide perspective.”

39  
40 He thinks it’s important that this is put in the record to clarify any misconceptions we may have.  
41 The intent of the House is to follow the spirit of the law. They rely on the Agency to prepare the  
42 priorities in the state that they are to fund, but then their recommendations come to the  
43 legislature. The legislature may disagree with those priorities in some cases. Jim Condos said  
44 the Senate wanted to state that the Secretary be allowed to decide where funds are spent, but the  
45 House refused and then mandated that the language remain that the money be spent outside of  
46 Chittenden County.

47  
48 Virginia Clarke stated that with the language in there to spend money outside of the MPO area it  
49 doesn’t appear to allow the Secretary to make priorities. Frank Mazur said that was the  
50 agreement made between the Governor’s office and the conference committee. When it was  
51 noted that the MPO was not involved, Frank Mazur said Bill Knight was in on that discussion,  
52 but he made it clear that any decisions would have to be made by his board.

1  
2 Mike O'Brien said the language in that bill does not allow the Secretary to prioritize Chittenden  
3 County projects for that \$19M as you say was the intent and he feels Chittenden County was  
4 penalized. Frank Mazur said that was the agreement made with the political parties there  
5 because all of them had needs and priorities in their areas. Lengthy discussion continued. Frank  
6 said there was a crisis there and everyone wanted to be sure their crisis was addressed.  
7

8 Jim Condos said 1) we do have an MOU with the state and we consider it very important to us  
9 and the administration; 2) MPOs were formed specifically to take away what happened in the  
10 legislature this year (to take the politics out of the picture). He was pretty disappointed to see  
11 how things went down in the legislature on both sides this year. We never demanded the \$33M  
12 out of \$33M. We're concerned about the ability and the authority of the MPO to prioritize the  
13 projects in Chittenden County. Frank Mazur said whatever agreement the Agency has with the  
14 MPO is good, but the legislature doesn't have that agreement with the MPO. They look to the  
15 Administration to come back to them with their recommendation and he's not sure what process  
16 the Secretary will use. Jim Condos noted that the legislature doesn't prioritize the projects in  
17 Chittenden County. Frank Mazur said the 2<sup>nd</sup> point Jim raised about why MPOs were formed,  
18 the federal language was intentionally vague to let states work out whatever agreement they  
19 could. Frank noted that as far as the MPO not wanting the \$33M he had reporters come up to  
20 him and quote from folks who did want that.  
21

22 Bill Keogh gave his take on what happened with the negotiations and said in his opinion, the  
23 state violated the part of federal law regarding cooperation with the arbitrary decision by the  
24 legislature. Taking money from the MPO is not cooperation.  
25

26 John Booth said 1) we've debated long and hard about what the definition of the state is as to  
27 who has the authority. We here always felt it was the Agency and the Administration. 2) The  
28 TIP becomes a document once it's been signed by the Governor (delegated to the Secretary).  
29 The MOU states when the state votes for the projects at this table, it's understood that the  
30 Administration supports that project. Despite what the legislative says, we have to focus on  
31 satisfying the administration and continue that cooperation.  
32

33 Bill Keogh said there is a legal opinion on the definition of state agreed to by the US Attorney,  
34 state's attorney and MPO attorney. He will get additional copies for members. Under federal  
35 law the "state" is the Agency of Transportation.  
36

37 Virginia Clarke said it is disappointing for her to find that there is so much politics in deciding  
38 on the priorities. That should be made by VTrans. We work hard on how projects should be  
39 prioritized in the County. We send our priorities to the state level to compete. Then professional  
40 transportation planners decide priorities in the state and to have that undone by the legislature is  
41 disappointing. Frank Mazur feels her comment went too far. They rely on Agency to give them  
42 priorities and they pretty much follow their recommendations and the process works. Frank said  
43 he'll try to stay for the work session. Jeff Carr thanked Rep. Mazur for coming to explain the  
44 House position, but it confirms his worst fear.  
45

46 Rep. Margaret Hummel of Underhill hadn't planned to address this at this time, but as a member  
47 of the house she disagrees with the direction the conference committee took. She voted against  
48 the Transportation Bill which she was loathe to do. She feels that it is in conflict with federal  
49 law 23 CFR 450.324 based on ISTEA law of 1991. That regulation requires the MPO to take an

1 action to amend its TIP to reallocate dollars from the circ to some other purpose. Since there  
2 was no time in the very constrained time frame they were dealing with, she feels it was  
3 premature and incorrect of the legislature to act the way they did. She's very concerned about  
4 the cooperative planning process Section 23 CFR 450.328. She feels the spirit and the letter of  
5 the cooperative planning process were violated by the action the legislature took. At the very  
6 least it was not respectful of the cooperative planning process. At worst it could lead to some  
7 difficulty with FHWA down the line, which she hopes does not happen Her time on the  
8 Transportation Committee predates Rep. Mazur but she does have as much experience as he  
9 does. She's been concerned over the last several years at the chipping away of the MPO rights  
10 and responsibilities by the legislature and she thinks this is the time for the MPO to be clear  
11 about its rights and responsibilities. Jim Condos said a Senate resolution was passed about  
12 recognizing the authority of the MPO and we'll send it out when we get it.

13  
14 3. Action on Consent Agenda. C-1. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY  
15 GEORGE GERECKE, TO ACCEPT CONSENT AGENDA ITEM C-1 (report of the TAC).  
16 MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

17  
18 C-2. Secretary McDonald asked that the minutes from the June 2<sup>nd</sup> Executive Committee be  
19 taken off the agenda and tabled for the next meeting. She would like to clarify things she said.  
20 PAT McDONALD MADE A MOTION TO TABLE THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
21 MINUTES UNTIL THE JULY BOARD MEETING. JEFF CARR SECONDED AND THE  
22 MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

23  
24 C-3. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BOB PENNIMAN, TO APPROVE  
25 CONSENT AGENDA ITEM C-3, MINOR TIP AMENDMENTS. MOTION CARRIED WITH  
26 MIKE O'BRIEN ABSTAINING.

27  
28 4. Approval of Minutes. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O'BRIEN,  
29 TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MAY 19, 2004. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.  
30 Chris Conant abstained.

31  
32 5. Citizen Participation Committee Presentation. Bill Knight introduced Diane Meyerhoff who  
33 is the consultant responsible for the Citizen Participation Committee. Diane reported that they  
34 are a group of 9 people appointed by this board, including Jim Manley from the MPO board and  
35 Christine Forde from MPO staff. She acts as facilitator and secretary of the committee. Their  
36 charge was to create a comprehensive process for public involvement activities in cooperation  
37 with the Public Involvement Plan we adopted last year. They mostly talked about tools and  
38 techniques available to be used and they looked into practices around the country. They decided  
39 to wrap up their work for the year and have worked up a list of recommendations, which are in  
40 your package. Kevin Biglin summarized the list of recommendations. The committee believes it  
41 has met its charge. Each MPO project should have a public involvement plan and in order to do  
42 this responsible staff should review the form before starting. The committee members will be  
43 available to review the completed forms. After the project is completed the committee will be  
44 available to review and analyze what has been done successfully and what can be done for future  
45 projects. When asked whether this would be done for every project, Diane Meyerhoff said yes  
46 for the planning portion, but the extent would vary. When asked if this would delay projects,  
47 Diane Meyerhoff said public involvement might take longer in planning, but can save time in a  
48 project in the long run. Christine Forde said all the projects have public involvement and this  
49 will help define it and make it happen more quickly. This will also provide documentation for

1 the records. Discussion continued. When Sec. McDonald asked if this would help solidify the  
2 purpose and needs process, Diane Meyerhoff said it should. Jim Dudley said when you look at  
3 the form there is an inclination to check everything so you don't miss anything. Diane said staff  
4 realized that not every technique is appropriate for every project. We made the list  
5 comprehensive on purpose but your staff will choose what is appropriate for each project. Jim  
6 Condos noted that no action is needed at this time.

7  
8 6. Warn for Public Hearing on Circ and Winooski Amendments to the FY04-06 TIP. Christine  
9 Forde said this amendment would bring the TIP in line with what was decided by the legislature.  
10 Amendments are:

- 11 ? Winooski Downtown Redevelopment - to advance \$5.5 M in federal construction funds from  
12 FY07 to FY04.  
13 ? Circumferential Highway PE & ROW – increase PE funds in FY04 by \$1.8M (fed) in FY04  
14 (\$.5M for additional environmental work & \$1.3M to cover previously committed  
15 environmental and engineering cost for Segments A&B); and \$1.5 M (fed) in FY05 (for  
16 additional environmental work required by federal court decision). Funding from these two  
17 projects will come from Circ. Highway Segment A.  
18 ? Circumferential Highway, Segment A. Move \$7,282,412 from FY04 to FY07 and \$1.5M  
19 from FY05 to FY07.  
20

21 The money moved out of the Circ is enough for these amendments. The remaining amount for  
22 the Circ will still be there.  
23

24 Jeff Carr feels that we haven't really ironed out the issues on the remaining dollars and perhaps  
25 we should have had the work session before this. Virginia Clarke feels that the board should  
26 discuss an item before we put forth an amendment for a hearing so board members can hash  
27 these things out before the public hearing. Bill Knight said we're trying to put the "easy" issues  
28 out front first because the state wants to take care of getting the Winooski funding in order and  
29 pay the bills incurred on the circ. We don't have the whole picture, but we do have some pieces.  
30 GEORGE GERECKE MADE A MOTION TO WARN A PUBLIC HEARING FOR JULY.  
31 GERARD MULLEN SECONDED.  
32

33 VIRGINIA CLARKE PROPOSED AN AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION ON THE FLOOR  
34 WITH THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE. She would like to add to the warning the following  
35 resolution:

- 36 1. "That the use of any money for the circumferential highway designated in the FY04-24  
37 amendment to the 2004-2006 TIP shall include, and shall be limited to, the payment of already-  
38 incurred debt for the project, the identification and evaluation of the environmental impacts of the  
39 project, and the formulation and comparison of a full set of alternatives to the project, including  
40 multimodal options, in terms of their relative ability to improve performance of the transportation  
41 system and minimize adverse environmental impacts.  
42 2. That the outcome of the alternative studies shall not be pre-selected in any way, and that the  
43 consultants chosen to carry out the studies shall not be given either explicit or implicit  
44 instructions that will bias their conclusions in favor of the project as it is currently configured in  
45 terms of ability to improve the transportation system and minimize adverse environmental  
46 impacts. Moreover, that the alternatives studies will generate actual strategies that could be  
47 selected, further advanced through the scoping process and pursued to completion.  
48 3. That the CCMPO, the CCRPC, and the environmental and planning communities shall be closely  
49 involved with VTrans at every stage of the process of selecting and utilizing consultants for these  
50 studies; and that a balanced committee of members of both boards and representatives of

1 environmental organizations, in addition to VTrans, shall be given an oversight role for the  
2 duration of the studies.

- 3 4. That adequate opportunities for public input shall be provided throughout the process, including  
4 during the design of the studies and the selection of the consultants.”

5 GERARD MULLEN SECONDED.

6  
7 A very lengthy discussion ensued about process. The chair ruled that the resolution is not  
8 germane to the warning of the public hearing and therefore out of order. Members feel these  
9 points can be addressed during or after the public hearing. Pat McDonald said the decision on  
10 how we proceed with the circ is left with FHWA and they will get additional instruction from the  
11 Justice Department. VTrans will then work with FHWA. MPO will be involved but she cannot  
12 support this resolution because it is too definitive. JEFF CARR CALLED THE QUESTION.  
13 VOTE: MOTION CARRIED TO CALL THE QUESTION.

14  
15 VOTE ON MOTION TO WARN THE PUBLIC HEARING AS ORIGINALLY PRESENTED  
16 CARRIED WITH HINESBURG AND RICHMOND VOTING NO.

17  
18 7. FY05 Unified Planning Work Program. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED  
19 BY GEORGE GERECKE, TO WARN A PUBLIC HEARING ON THE FY05 UPWP FOR  
20 THE JULY BOARD MEETING. Mike O'Brien said the Finance Committee has reviewed the  
21 budget and issues raised about balancing the budget and reprioritizing the work program and  
22 recommends warning for public hearing. When asked what happened that we have so much less  
23 money in the UPWP, Bill Knight noted that in 2001 he was instructed to use up backlog of  
24 federal funds. We have put money into local scoping, technical studies, RPC and others who  
25 could match it. We even agreed to use it for abutting regions. We have now spent down that  
26 money and there is no new federal transportation bill yet. We ended up looking into old grants  
27 that had a few hundred dollars here and there to come up with what we found. If and when a  
28 new federal transportation bill is passed we included an Appendix A that lists priorities to be  
29 funded. Bill Knight said once you agree to warn the public hearing he'll make the specific  
30 changes in the text of the UPWP. Jeff Carr commended staff and the UPWP committee for  
31 getting things in order under constrained timeframe and budget. VOTE: MOTION CARRIED  
32 UNANIMOUSLY TO WARN THE PUBLIC HEARING.

33  
34 8. Nominating Committee Report/ Election of Officers. Bill Keogh reported that he met with  
35 Jeff Carr and Tom Buckley and discussed candidates and they recommend the following slate of  
36 officers: Chair: Bob Penniman; Vice-Chair: Jeff McDonald; Sec-Treas.: Mike O'Brien; At-  
37 Large: Chris Conant and Virginia Clarke. They also recommend a bylaw change to provide that  
38 a past chair of the board be a voting member on the Executive Committee. BILL KEOGH  
39 MADE A MOTION THAT THE SLATE OF OFFICERS BE PRESENTED TO THE BOARD  
40 FOR CONSIDERATION. JEFF CARR SECONDED. The Chair asked for any other  
41 nominations.

42  
43 BILL KEOGH MADE A MOTION TO CLOSE NOMINATIONS. JEFF CARR SECONDED  
44 AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

45  
46 VOTE ON MOTION TO ACCEPT THE SLATE OF OFFICERS CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

47  
48 b. By-law amendment. BILL KEOGH MADE A MOTION THAT WE CALL A PUBLIC  
49 HEARING ON A CHANGE IN BYLAWS TO INDICATE THAT A PAST CHAIR, IF STILL

1 A MEMBER REPRESENTATIVE OF THE MPO, BE ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.  
2 JEFF CARR SECONDED. A lengthy discussion ensued about the wording so that it would be  
3 clear that it was intended that the position would be held by the immediate past chair for  
4 continuity, but that if that person couldn't serve, another past chair could serve. There was also a  
5 question about the limitation of five consecutive years on the Executive Committee and members  
6 felt this position should be exempt from that restriction. There were numerous friendly  
7 amendments and the final motion is as follows: THAT WE CALL A PUBLIC HEARING ON A  
8 CHANGE IN BYLAWS TO INDICATE THAT THE IMMEDIATE PAST CHAIR, IF STILL A  
9 MEMBER, OR IF UNAVAILABLE, THE MOST RECENT PAST CHAIR WHO'S STILL A  
10 MEMBER OF THE BOARD, BE ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE; AND THAT THE  
11 STATEMENT LIMITING SERVICE ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BE AMENDED  
12 TO STATE "NO ONE INDIVIDUAL SHALL SERVE MORE THAN A TOTAL OF FIVE  
13 YEARS ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF SOMEONE  
14 SERVING IN THE CAPACITY OF IMMEDIATE PAST CHAIR." MOTION CARRIED  
15 UNANIMOUSLY.

16

17 9. Executive Director's Report. Bill Knight noted financially we're still in good shape.

18

19 10. Committee Reports.

20 a. Public Transportation Task Force. Bill Keogh said they meet the first Monday of the month.  
21 The Governance and finance Committees have been working hard and will give reports to the  
22 PTTF in July and this board in August.

23

24 11. Other Business.

25 a. John Booth has asked the Village not to reappoint him to the board and he wanted to thank  
26 members for their tolerance of his comments over the years. He's enjoyed working on the board,  
27 but retirement has set other priorities and he's moving on. Members thanked John for all he's  
28 done for the board over the years; that his comments were valued by all; and that he would be  
29 missed. Bill Keogh hopes the MPO will get plaques to thank members who leave the board.

30

31 b. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION TO GO INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION TO DISCUSS  
32 PERSONNEL ISSUES. MIKE O'BRIEN SECONDED AND THE BOARD WENT INTO  
33 EXECUTIVE SESSION AT 7:50 P.M.

34

35 ON A MOTION FROM JERRY MULLEN, SECONDED BY JEFF CARR, THE BOARD  
36 CAME OUT OF EXECUTIVE SESSION AT 8:02 P.M.

37

38 CHRIS CONANT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JERRY MULLEN, TO ADJOURN  
39 AT 8:04 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

40

41 Respectfully submitted,

42

43

44

45 Bernadette Ferenc, Administrative Assistant