

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

5 Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2004
6 Time: 7:00 p.m.
7 Place: CCMPO Conference Room, 30 Kimball Avenue, Suite 102, South Burlington VT
8 Present:
9 Voting: Jerry Mullen, Bolton
10 Bill Keogh, Burlington
11 Chris Conant, Colchester
12 Jeff Carr, Essex
13 Dale Arango, Essex Junction
14 Andrea Morgante, Hinesburg
15 Bob Penniman, Jericho (Chair)
16 Jim Manley, Milton
17 Virginia Clarke, Richmond
18 Jim Dudley, Shelburne
19 Jim Condos, South Burlington
20 Stan Hamlet, Underhill
21 Tom Buckley, Westford
22 George Gerecke, Williston
23 Jim Tolley, VTrans Deputy Secretary
24 Ex-Officio: Lew Wetzel, CCRPC
25 Chris Jolly, FHWA
26 Chris Cole, CCTA (8:10)
27 Others: Matthew Langham, VTrans
28 Diane Meyerhoff, Third Sector Associates
29 Steve Lawe, Resource Systems Group
30 Greg Brown, CCRPC Executive Director
31 Mique Glitman, Consultant (7:30)
32 Roslyn Graham, Graham Communications (8:00)
33 Staff: Bill Knight, Executive Director
34 Peter Keating, Sr. Transportation Planner
35 Christine Forde, Sr. Transportation Planner
36 David Roberts, Sr. Transportation Planner
37 Susan Smichenko, Sr. Transportation Planner
38 Daryl Benoit, Transportation Planner
39 Paul Craven, Project Manager
40 Bernadette Ferenc, Administrative Assistant
41

42 The meeting was called to order at 7:05 p.m. after determining the presence of a quorum.
43

44 1. Changes to the Agenda. Jim Condos asked to pull Item C-1 (TAC Report) off the consent
45 agenda, as he has a question. We will add this as item 4a.on the deliberative agenda.
46

47 2. Public Comment Period. There were no members of the public present.
48

1 3. Action of the Consent Agenda. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE CONSENT
2 ITEM C-2 (Report of the Executive Committee). CHRIS CONANT SECONDED AND THE
3 MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
4

5 4. Approval of Minutes. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF
6 OCTOBER 20, 2004 WITH EDITS IF ANY. GEORGE GERECKE SECONDED. Jeff Carr
7 noted a correction on page 3, line 4. His concern was not just with the Circ EIS covering
8 segments A & B, but of going forward with the project if it just included segments A&B. Jim
9 Tolley noted that on page 3, line 35 the \$6,000 over constraint should be \$700,000. MOTION
10 CARRIED TO APPROVE MINUTES AS CORRECTED.
11

12 4a. Report from the TAC. Jim Condos wanted to verify that when we approve the TAC report,
13 we're only approving the TAC report and not the recommendations requested. Bob Penniman
14 assured him that is the case.
15

16 In the item "Crosswalk Guidelines" it was noted that Amy Gamble requested that communities
17 send her a letter when contemplating crosswalks with as much information as possible and that
18 she would provide advice/recommendation on their plans. It was suggested sending a letter to
19 the communities saying this document is available and that VTrans staff is available to help on
20 siting crosswalks, etc. Peter Keating will follow up. TOM BUCKLEY MADE A MOTION TO
21 ACCEPT THE TAC REPORT. BILL KEOGH SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED
22 UNANIMOUSLY.
23

24 5. New Transportation Model – Consultant Presentation. Dave Roberts noted his memo in the
25 board packet gives a background of this project. Steve Lawe of Resource Systems Group
26 distributed a memo giving a history of modeling in general and the MPO model in particular.
27 Computers are getting more sophisticated and allowing us to do much more. All of us as
28 consumers have changed our behavioral patterns. He's been involved with every model since
29 1988. The first one dealt with traffic only. In 1990-1992 we focused on sub areas for several
30 towns. In 1993 they were able to put these all together in one model and address person trips
31 rather than just vehicles. In 1998 we performed a new household survey about how people make
32 trips and that allowed us to recalibrate the model. In 1999 they added more features and made it
33 compatible with the DSS tool. It can operate by itself or with DSS. Recently they did some
34 calibration for the Circ. highway that was not really used. In 2004 we're going through another
35 process to recalibrate and moving to another software package. RSG had built their own
36 software and now they're transferring over to TransCad which is a GIS package. For an MPO of
37 its size, CCMPO has been at the forefront and won awards.
38

39 He then reviewed the current capabilities which include AM and PM peak hour estimation; travel
40 modes (auto drive alone, auto rideshare, bus, etc.); sample of model outputs (person trips, vehicle
41 trips, transit trips, congestion, vehicle miles traveled, vehicle hours traveled); Land use allocation
42 capability sensitive to travel time; peak shifting sensitive to delay (induced/suppressed demand);
43 and GIS analysis and presentation capabilities. He then reviewed the best uses of CCMPO's
44 model which include – long term forecasting future demand; analyzing impact of regionally
45 significant projects; and performing policy sensitivity tests (low cost form of testing to see what
46 might happen in certain circumstances).
47

1 They plan to be done with the tool by the end of January. Then they'll be ready to do some
 2 forecasting and some tweaking. Steve Lawe noted that we're engaging in a public outreach
 3 program so that we can let people know what the model should and should not be used for.
 4 Diane Meyerhoff is handling the public outreach and will be contacting municipalities regarding
 5 the model. Steve Lawe then fielded questions from members.

6
 7 6. Public Hearing on Major Amendments to the FY04-06 TIP. We're amending FY05 to release
 8 \$13 million to the state. JEFF McDONALD MADE A MOTION TO OPEN THE PUBLIC
 9 HEARING AT 7:55 P.M. JEFF CARR SECONDED AND MOTION CARRIED
 10 UNANIMOUSLY. There were no members of the public in attendance. GEORGE GERECKE
 11 MADE A MOTION, DULY SECONDED, TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 7:57 P.M.
 12 MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

13
 14 Bill Keogh asked VTrans why the funds needed to be moved from the circ. highway and to
 15 others. Jim Tolley said because of the court decision on the circ highway they were unable to
 16 apply the funding for the circ and it made funds available for other applications. They worked
 17 collaboratively with MPO about how these could be reallocated. When Mr. Keogh questioned
 18 how the collaboration worked between VTrans and staff to make these adjustments, Bob
 19 Penniman said in the past four months VTrans and FHWA have worked with us and allowed us
 20 to stay with FY04-06 TIP. We spent a lot of time in August/September working on amendments
 21 to the FY04 year, and now we're amending FY05. We've exhausted our ability to spend more
 22 money in FY05 so for all intents and purposes we need to release the balance of the circ money.
 23 Mr. Keogh said the MPO was not consulted in the initial stages of the legislative action. He feels
 24 this could have been resolved by the Secretary and the MPO. He feels we should use the funding
 25 as best we can in the county and continue to work with VTrans. Jeff Carr said we've discussed
 26 this many times and in deference to the legislature, there can be a case made that we had a
 27 significant bump up in funding in anticipation of the circ; and because it can't be built, we have
 28 to give the money back. We've all postponed projects so funding could be available for the circ,
 29 and if it comes up again we'll put projects aside again. He doesn't like it but he'll support it
 30 because of the legislature's action. Jim Condos agrees with Essex and doesn't like it but will
 31 support these amendments. He thanked VTrans because he does think they worked with us in
 32 the legislature. He noted that the Senate tried to give the Secretary discretion to use the funds
 33 wherever appropriate and instead the house insisted that it had to be outside of Chittenden
 34 County. This was never about the money itself, but about MPO's authority. Jim Manley
 35 wondered how these numbers came about. Christine Forde said we solicited information earlier
 36 this year when we began to put together the FY05-07 TIP. When that didn't happen, we were
 37 still able to use this information to determine funding needs for FY05. When he questioned why
 38 \$240,000 was being moved in Milton project, Christine Forde noted that the project is just in
 39 design and these are construction funds. Christine noted that the numbers here indicate our latest
 40 information about what was actually needed for projects. If a project moves more quickly, we
 41 can amend the TIP. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION THAT WE APPROVE THESE
 42 AMENDMENTS TO THE FY05 YEAR OF THE FY04-06 TIP. GEORGE GERECKE
 43 SECONDED. George Gerecke added that since Chittenden County does not yet control the
 44 legislature, it took a great deal of support from outside Chittenden County in the legislature to
 45 get the funding in there to begin with. He feels it's advisable to release the funds to the state
 46 because it'll be easier to get the support in the future when we may need it. VOTE

47	Bolton	yes	Burlington (4)	no	Charlotte	absent
48	Colchester (2)	yes	Essex Jct.	yes	Essex Town	yes

1	Hinesburg	yes	Huntington	absent	Jericho	yes
2	Milton	yes	Richmond	yes	St. George	absent
3	Shelburne	yes	So. Burl. (2)	yes	Underhill	yes
4	Westford	yes	Williston	yes	Winooski	absent
5	VTrans	yes				

6 MOTION CARRIED WITH 16 OUT OF 24 VOTES, AND 13 OUT OF 18 COMMUNITIES
7 VOTING IN FAVOR. Bob Penniman thanked VTrans and FHWA for their cooperation in all of
8 this.

9
10 7. Presentation of Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). Bob Penniman said Mike Flaherty
11 could not be here tonight, but he wanted to be sure that Peter Keating was recognized as the
12 force behind this new plan. Lew Wetzel, Andrea Morgante and Tom Buckley all echoed that.
13 Peter Keating gave a history and content of the MTP draft. In Chapter 1 we made major changes
14 and Figure 1-1 is the Metropolitan Transportation System (MTS) and includes all modes. Not all
15 roads are on this map, but it does include everything on the TIP. Peter Keating reviewed the
16 recommendations and strategies from 2002 and noted these are still the basis of the plan:
17 TDM/TSM; transit expansion; growing the bike/pedestrian network; building the full circ; key
18 interstate improvements; arterial and connector road projects. The plan assumes maintenance of
19 existing system and completion of all projects in the TIP. We have a new chapter on
20 transportation corridors. It's an easy way to describe to the general public how transportation
21 system works. For each corridor they address primary travel movements; land use (existing and
22 planned); major mobility and accessibility issues; corridor strategies and projects; future plan
23 issues. He showed the region core as the example tonight. He then showed a pie chart of the
24 recommended funding shares for the \$1.047 billion, which is a graphic interpretation of Table 7-
25 4. Jim Condos noted that these percentages are over the life of the plan rather than in any given
26 year of the TIP and feels we should put that disclaimer on the table as well as in the text. Peter
27 then reviewed the plan implementation section and noted that all projects and programs are
28 included on Table 7-5. It talks about the importance of land use on transportation. Other key
29 issues discussed include MTP role in Act 250; DSS; air quality; impact on adjacent counties;
30 potential future expansion of the MPO area; project prioritization; method to evaluate MTP
31 progress.

32
33 He then reviewed changes from steering committee draft which included about 75 comments
34 from committee members and municipal officials –majority were minor: tie to 1997 plan; MTS
35 and Act 250; bridge discussion; HAL update; circ discussion; transit maintenance funding;
36 “drawing the line” on arterial projects. He reviewed each critical comment.

37
38 The review and approval process will include steering committee final comments; board, RPC
39 and member community review (one month to flag substantive issues); board discussions and
40 public hearing warned; public review and comments; public hearing in early 2005; revisions;
41 potential further public hearings; board adoption. Bob Penniman said we really want major red
42 flags within the next month so we'll know whether we should warn for public hearing. Chris
43 Jolly said we really need to get an approved plan and significant issues need to be worked out. It
44 was noted that once this is adopted we will begin work on the next iteration. The Executive
45 Committee wants to be sure that all board members work with their communities to understand
46 the plan. Bill Knight said when we call for public hearing, the draft plan will be sent to adjacent
47 counties and other interested parties, but we wanted to wait until this board was comfortable with
48 it. Peter fielded questions.

- 1 • Virginia Clarke is confused about regional significance question when you look at corridors.
2 Peter Keating said the arterial road projects are based on model output and communities need
3 to review the projects in their communities.
- 4 • Peter doesn't have any information about bridge deficiencies. We have set aside 55% of
5 funding for maintenance that would include bridges.
- 6 • Virginia Clarke questioned whether we should acknowledge the circ EIS process going on.
7 Chris Cole feels that this is a long term plan and you wouldn't necessarily list the EIS
8 because it's part of the process.
- 9 • When asked what happened to the ANR representative, Peter Keating said the person left
10 ANR and no one replaced her. Chris Jolly noted that there were lots of interest groups on the
11 original committee who just stopped coming.
- 12 • Jeff Carr asked how the \$1.047 billion was arrived at because he needs to know whether
13 they're constant dollars, etc. Peter Keating will research this
- 14 • Discussion ensued about RPC committee review of the draft plan. Some members felt we
15 should allow them more time. Others felt the RPC board members should be working with
16 their municipalities like the MPO board members. . Still others feel RPC role is critical
17 because the MTP does become part of the regional plan and we've stated that land use
18 significantly impacts transportation and they deal with land use Jim feels if the RPC wants
19 to have a say they should have special meeting in December.

20

21 In the month before the board meets again, we want substantial issues sent to us. Virginia Clarke
22 said we really want each community to weigh in on this that they've looked at the plan and agree
23 or not. Chris Conant said we highly recommend that each community sign off. We will let the
24 towns know we want red flags by December 8th and we want a sign off by the public hearing.
25 We need board members to talk to their elected officials.

26

27 8. Circ. EIS.update Bob reported the consultants were in town for second round of meetings.
28 We're all realizing this is a complex project. At Executive Committee suggestion we put a
29 button on our website with the press release. There haven't been any major decisions. The
30 project manual has been developed as the first work item. After the formal meetings the
31 consultant met with MPO/RPC staff. His sense is that this is not happening as fast as the
32 consultant may have thought. For the fact gathering phase the consultant will be meeting with
33 all municipalities and even some outside the county. The consultant will come back to the MPO
34 when they have any reports. Dave Roberts said there is one technical committee with 3
35 subcommittees, so it'll take a considerable amount of his time and we'll need to reflect that in
36 work program changes. One of the first pieces will be public involvement plan and the creation
37 of a website is at the top of the list. Jim Tolley said the Louis Berger Group is a premier firm in
38 NEPA process and secondary and cumulative impacts. He feels their ability to come up with a
39 plan and come up to speed on the project shows their experience. He's happy they're taking
40 their time to make sure they know the issues. The website should be up by the end of the year.

41

42 9. Public Transportation Task Force Recommendation. Micque Glitman is here instead of Mike
43 O'Brien because he became ill on his way over here. Micque said the Public Transportation
44 Task Force began meeting monthly in February 2004, and formed two subcommittees that met
45 regularly. She reviewed the history and noted that they went out to communities and other
46 groups with the assumption that folks had a common knowledge of public transportation. They
47 soon found this not to be true and they embarked on a public information campaign in an effort
48 to engage the public in dialog. The committee did come up with proposed legislation, which did

1 not get very favorable reception. The committee feels we need to identify unmet needs other than
2 the broad information from the Census data. Once the survey is completed and data collected
3 we'll be able to take this to the communities. The governance structure met with similar
4 resistance. Everyone agrees that there needs to be changes in funding from property tax, but
5 there was not consensus on the method. Once you have a proposal, discussion can begin. The
6 task force met again on November 1st and supported a recommendation to support a climate for
7 expanding public transportation services. Task force has dissolved itself and gave
8 recommendation about what they feel should happen next. They want to take a more
9 deliberative process and move more slowly. Anticipating this would take more than a year, we
10 did budget for Mique's time, Bill Knight and CCTA for this year. It was agreed that this board
11 not take action tonight and that Mique Glitman, Chris Cole and Bill Knight develop specific
12 task and budget for what they'd like to do.

13
14 10. Executive Director's Report. a. The staff will be reviewing the current work program in
15 January and board should see a revised work program/budget for this year in February. The Circ
16 EIS is one component but we have traditionally made mid-year adjustments anyway.
17 b. Bill has started to put together a committee for the FY06 UPWP which he'd like to get up and
18 running by the end of the year.
19 c. We just finished the FY05 amendments and it has been suggested that we leapfrog and go to
20 FY06-08 TIP rather than spending time on FY06 years of the FY04-06 TIP or creating an FY05-
21 07 TIP.

22
23 11. Finance Committee. The Finance Committee reviewed the first quarter report and have
24 asked for changes in the reporting format..

25
26 JIM CONDOS MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY GEORGE GERECKE, TO ADJOURN
27 AT 10:15 P.M.

28
29 Respectfully submitted,

30
31
32
33 Bernadette Ferenc, Administrative Assistant