

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

5 Date: Wednesday, January 19, 2005
6 Time: 7:00 p.m.
7 Place: South Burlington High School, Cafeteria #1; 550 Dorset Street; So. Burl, VT

8 Present:

9 Bill Keogh, Burlington Jeff McDonald, Charlotte (Vice-Chair)
10 Chris Conant, Colchester Jeff Carr, Essex
11 Dale Arango, Essex Junction Andrea Morgante, Hinesburg
12 Bob Penniman, Jericho (Chair) Virginia Clarke, Richmond
13 Jim Dudley, Shelburne Jim Condos, South Burlington
14 Stan Hamlet, Underhill (7:10) Tom Buckley, Westford
15 George Gerecke, Williston Mike O'Brien, Winooski
16 Polly McMurtry, VTrans

17 Ex-Officio: Chris Jolly, FHWA Garret Mott, CCRPC
18 Aaron Frank, CCTA

19 Speakers: Andrew Bessette, Richmond res. Wayne Senville, Burlington resident
20 Meg Freebern, Richmond resident Doug Dunbebin, Burlington resident
21 Marilyn Sowles, Colchester res. John Dinklage, South Burlington resident
22 Sam Matthews, GBIC Kathleen Ryan, Burlington resident
23 Bryan Osborne, Colchester DPW Al Voegelé, Colchester Town Manager
24 Rep. David Zuckerman, Burl. Dawn Francis, Chamber of Commerce
25 Greg Strong, Burlington resident Elaine Wang, Burlington resident

26 Others: Lou Bresee, South Burlington res. Mary Bushey, Winooski Asst. City Mgr.
27 Clem Bissonette, Winooski Mayor Greg Brown, CCRPC Exec. Dir.
28 Evan Detrick, citizen Rep. Michele Kupersmith, So. Burl.
29 Lisa Yankowski, So. Burl. Res. Lea Terhune, Burlington
30 Deb Sachs, So. Burl. Resident Rep. Helen Head, So. Burlington
31 Rachel Nevitt, Burlington res. Darren Perron, WCAX
32 Dan Sullivan, Hinesburg resident

33 Staff: Bill Knight, Executive Director Peter Keating, Sr. Trans. Planner
34 Christine Forde, Sr. Trans. Planner David Roberts, Sr. Trans. Planner
35 Susan Smichenko, Sr. Trans. Planner Daryl Benoit, Trans. Planner
36 Paul Craven, Project Manager Bernadette Ferenc, Executive Assistant

37
38 The meeting was called to order at 7:05 p.m. by the Chair, Bob Penniman, after determining the
39 presence of a quorum. The chair introduced Garret Mott who is representing CCRPC tonight.
40

41 1. Changes to the Agenda. There were none.

42
43 2. Public Comment Period (for items not on the agenda). There were none.
44

45 3. Action on Consent Agenda. There were two items on the consent agenda: Report from
46 Executive Committee and Report for the Technical Advisory Committee. TOM BUCKLEY
47 MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CHRIS CONANT, TO ACCEPT THE CONSENT
48 AGENDA. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
49

1 4. Approval of Minutes. GEORGE GERECKE MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BILL
2 KEOGH, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 15, 2004, WITH CORRECTIONS
3 IF ANY. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
4

5 5. Public Hearing on 2025 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP).

6 a. The public hearing was opened at 7:11 p.m.

7 b. Peter Keating reviewed the basic contents of the MTP, which is divided into seven chapters.
8 Chapter 1 gives the background and talks about MPOs in general and what is required in a long
9 range plan. Chapter 2 gives the Vision & Goals and public involvement process. It describes the
10 extensive public outreach we did in 2000. Chapter 3 contains information common to any plan –
11 population and employment forecasts; current transportation conditions; transportation analyses;
12 forecast of future transportation conditions. Chapter 4 is the financial analysis. We must base
13 the plan on a realistic estimate of funds available. Chapter 5 is the alternatives analysis and is
14 the part of the process that took the longest. We looked at transportation alternatives using our
15 transportation computer model and we mixed and matched projects. The preferred alternative is
16 listed in the plan. The last two chapters are new since the October 2003 public hearing (Chapter
17 6 - 2025 MTP and Chapter 7 implementation). The first difference –we mapped the system
18 (Figure1-1) we have jurisdiction over (state highways, interstate highways, access to Burlington
19 International Airport, ferry facilities, the transit system, regional network of bikepaths). In
20 December 2002, this board made some decisions of recommended strategies. These included:

- 21 • Transportation Demand Management (TDM) – this is based at employers where they can
22 offer incentives to their employees to carpool, use public transit, etc.
- 23 • Transportation Systems Management (TSM) – efficient improvements primarily at
24 intersections.
- 25 • Transit expansion – CCTA running to other areas and more frequently.
- 26 • Growing the bike/ped network – we adopted a bike/ped plan that expands the number of
27 miles of shared use paths from 33 miles to about 77 miles.
- 28 • Building the full circumferential highway – from Williston to Route 127 in Colchester.
- 29 • Interstate improvements, including new interchanges at Route 116 in South Burlington and
30 W. Milton Road in Milton.
- 31 • Arterial and connector road projects – where we had identified congestion over the next 20-
32 25 years – two new connectors are proposed in South Burlington (Airport Drive to bypass the
33 airport and another to connect Route 116 to Marshall Avenue in Williston.)
- 34 • Assumes maintenance of the existing system and completion of projects in the TIP.

35
36 Peter Keating noted that we divided the county into nine corridors, which he described.
37 Factors that were looked at in each corridor included: primary travel movements (where trips
38 originate, destinations and how they get there); land use (existing and future); major mobility and
39 accessibility issues (assessment of transportation infrastructure in the corridor); corridor
40 strategies and projects (list of everything we recommend within the corridor); and future
41 planning areas and needs (recognition that although we've done a lot of analyses, there are a lot
42 of questions).

43
44 He reviewed the Cross County Corridor (which includes Route 2A from St. George to
45 Colchester and the area around the circ highway) strategies and projects as an example. TDM
46 education efforts are recommended for the Taft Corners area and IBM; and include park and ride
47 facilities at VT Route 2A intersections with VT Route 116 and the circ. highway; at the circ hwy
48 intersections with Mountain View Road, VT Route 117, and VT Route 15; and at Severance
49 Road/US Route 2/7 intersection. We also recommend TSM projects to improve the following

1 Vermont Route 2A intersections: I-89 Exit 12, Mountain View Road; River Cove Road, Five
2 Corners, East Road and US Route 7. Transit expansion – we recommend high frequency service
3 from Essex Junction to Taft Corners. Bike/Ped improvements include: new shared use paths
4 paralleling VT Route 2A from Marshall Avenue to the Five Corners, along the circ highway
5 from VT Route 117 to Vermont Route 2A, and along Kellogg/Severance Roads; on-road bicycle
6 accommodation wherever feasible in conjunction with road rehabilitation or reconstruction
7 projects especially along VT Route 2A and Severance Road; and sidewalk improvements as
8 identified by municipalities and/or the *2003 Regional Bicycle Pedestrian Plan Update*. We want
9 to look at Route 2A south of I-89, as well as Route 116, because there are some congestion
10 problems forecast in the next 25 years.

11
12 Recommended Funding Shares: We estimate \$1.047 billion available through 2025. Looking at
13 our recommendations it would be split as follows: 55% for system preservation (roads and
14 bridges); 14% to complete TIP commitments; 11% for interstate/freeway projects; 8% for arterial
15 and connector roads; 5% for bike/pedestrian projects; 6% for public transportation; and 1% for
16 TDM/TSM.

17
18 The last chapter is new – Plan Implementation. It identifies funding sources; it discusses how
19 the MTP will guide future work programs (UPWPs) and Transportation Improvement Programs
20 (TIPs). This section talks about the critical role of land use (the more you can concentrate land
21 use the better transportation performance you get), the MTP role in Act 250; air quality issues;
22 impacts on adjoining counties; potential future expansion of MPO area and ways to evaluate
23 MTP progress.

24
25 Peter then explained how we developed the plan. Four years ago we developed a steering
26 committee and they met about 40 times. We had extensive public outreach in the beginning to
27 get people’s opinion of what they wanted to see in the plan (vision and goals). CCRPC provided
28 a lot of land use data and is responsible for comprehensive planning which covers everything,
29 including transportation. A draft was prepared in September 2003 and a public hearing was held
30 in October 2003 and we received many comments. That document basically was rewritten in
31 2004. In September 2004, the steering committee passed this on to the MPO Board and then
32 municipalities and we’re here for a public hearing tonight.

33
34 c. Questions from the Board for clarification only. Tom Buckley noted that in discussions of the
35 plan we talked about appendices, but they’re not listed in the Table of Contents. Peter described
36 the appendices which will include the Regional bike/pedestrian Plan; Park and Ride
37 Prioritization Plan; ITS (Intelligent Transportation Systems) Strategic Plan; Existing conditions
38 report from 2001; and the recommendations from the Burlington/Essex Alternatives Analysis
39 corridor study. When asked if they’re included by reference or if they’re a part of the plan, Peter
40 Keating said they are a part of the plan. Bob Penniman noted that the plan relies heavily on
41 those documents.

42
43 Tom Buckley noted that we mentioned the relationship to Act 250 and that this plan represents
44 the transportation element of the regional plan. His recollection is that the regional plan
45 considers the current transportation plan to be the transportation planning element. He asked for
46 clarification. Bob Penniman said the two organizations have an MOU on this and other issues
47 and the spirit and intent of the MOU is that the LRTP, now the MTP, as approved by the MPO
48 board would go forward and has to be approved by the RPC board as well to be part of the
49 regional plan. Bob Penniman noted that this plan is late by federal statutes. It is our intent that

1 the next version of the MTP will be in sync with the regional plan update in 2006. Garret Mott
2 said it is the RPC's intent to make this all work together more smoothly. Bob said statutorily the
3 MPO is not unlike municipalities and RPC in that the MPO is required to adopt a transportation
4 plan every 5 years. Our plan of record is dated 1997. In 2002 we adopted new sections, which
5 satisfied the feds that we were moving forward.
6

7 d. Comments from the Public. Mr. Penniman asked the audience to state their name, affiliation
8 and town of residence, and to limit their comments to 3 minutes.
9

10 **Andrew Bessette** is a resident of Richmond and commutes into Burlington every day. He
11 attended a meeting in Williston a couple of months ago where they were looking at Exit 12
12 because traffic backs up onto the interstate. He suggested that they put an exit at Hinesburg
13 Road and even possibly south of Brownell Road, so cars can have more places to access Taft
14 Corners, and that would be a better idea than to try to improve Exit 12. Even if they build the
15 circ highway with an exit at Route 2 so that cars going to Essex can have a direct line instead of
16 forcing all the cars to one exit and one road. Williston said they were only looking at Exit 12.
17 He appreciated the opportunity to speak to this group and recommend folks consider additional
18 exits.
19

20 **Wayne Senville** is a resident of Burlington and has two basic comments to make about the plan.
21 The first one is basically encapsulated by Peter Keating's overview of the plan which reflected
22 his concerns about the plan. We spend a lot of time talking about TDM/TSM, transit,
23 bike/pedestrian, etc., but when you take all funding for those elements it was a total of 12%.
24 We're still facing the \$200 M gorilla - the circ. There are few references to the circ benefiting
25 congestion or its land use impacts. The plan has great rhetoric about the land use patterns we
26 want in the county, but there is no analysis in the plan of how these major transportation projects,
27 such as the circ, or the widening of I-89 impact land use. The Burlington Planning Commission
28 prepared a memo showing the disconnect between transportation and land use. He feels it's the
29 same issue that got the circ into trouble in federal court and unless that issue is addressed, this
30 board will be spinning its wheels and we'll be addressing this issue again.
31

32 **Meg Freeburn** is an engineer and lives in Richmond. She is Richmond's rep to the CCRPC and
33 MPO alternate, but speaks as a citizen. She knows the circ highway is highly politicized and
34 people on both sides are extremely polarized, opinions are formed and she's probably not going
35 to change their vote. She's disappointed in the MTP. The regional goals set forth in the MTP
36 described a perfect blend of economic prosperity, vitality, culture and environmental heritage
37 and it's her vision too. The goals are achievable and the plan introduction does focus on them,
38 but the actual design in the plan falls short of meeting them. She feels we're settling for
39 something so average, unimaginative, so anywhere USA and it does fall short of our vision. The
40 goals talk about sustainable land use patterns and growth centers, neighborhood vitality, a plan
41 that enhances the natural and built environment, etc., but the plan misses these things. The single
42 largest factor in determining success is land use and the plan doesn't discuss it. It does consider
43 full build of the circ highway and resulting expansion to current roadways that will affect land
44 use and development patterns. We have the privilege and ability to design and execute a plan
45 that is consistent with the goals.
46

47 **Doug Dunbebin** is a resident of Burlington and echoed Wayne's concern. Having been on the
48 City Council, he understands the effort that goes into a plan. His concerns are based on two
49 things: inconsistencies on funding for public transportation with the rhetoric that is so positive

1 on it; and he's concerned about lack of land use. He quoted from movies. "Show me the
2 Money." He's concerned about only 12% funding for TDM/TSM, bike/ped and public
3 transportation, vs. 33% for building roads. When you see where the money is going, it makes
4 sense why people don't use public transportation. "If you build it, they will come." If you
5 devote all that money for building additional roads, of course people will use them and fill them
6 up. He is a flatlander and grew up in Washington, D.C. He saw first hand that when you rely on
7 building roads to solve congestion, it causes folks to move further out. The plan hasn't come up
8 with a magic solution of how more roads will make Vermont any different from any other state.
9 If you can come up with a magic solution, he would be happy to support more roads. Without it,
10 he'd put money elsewhere.

11
12 **Marilyn Sowles** is a resident of Colchester. There is a lot that is positive in the MTP. It's great
13 to see a lot of the thinking in there, but it breaks her heart to see the dinosaur of the circ. in the
14 middle of it. It blocks all the good you're intending to do in the plan. The circ is the most
15 expensive project in the plan, and has the biggest impact. She referred to land use comment
16 about concentrated development from page 45. Often you can take a statement and reverse it
17 and have it be true. She would say that's a great statement in the plan, but what needs to be
18 along with it is that the single most important component to moving forward to a land use pattern
19 based on concentrated land use is to have a transportation system that will give you that and not
20 based on ring roads or circ. Anywhere around the country, in large cities or small towns, when
21 you have a ring road you move away from concentrated development. She sat on Colchester
22 selectboard for a couple of years and even well-meaning boards cannot resist development
23 pressures that come with highways. She noted that the plan does not mention that the circ EIS
24 requires the impact of the circ on land use to be looked at and you need to address that. Under
25 freeway expansion, you talk about a 4 lane circ, we're using 4 lane traffic numbers, are you using
26 4-lane dollars? Peter Keating said the cost figures include two lanes and analysis is two lanes.
27 One of the alternatives discussed four lanes, but that was dismissed. It was noted that this should
28 be clarified in the plan.

29
30 **John Dinklage** is on the DRB in South Burlington. He asked where the northbound entrance to
31 the interstate from Dorset Street/Kennedy Drive was. Jim Condos said if you make changes to
32 an interchange, FHWA requires a full interchange and it's cost prohibitive, so the City Council
33 decided not to focus on that issue. Now their focus is on Route 116 interchange. John just
34 wanted to raise an objection as he feels we still need that interchange.

35
36 **Sam Matthews** is vice president of GBIC which is the regional development corporation for
37 Chittenden County. GBIC wishes to reiterate its continued full bodied support for MPO to adopt
38 this MTP. Over four years of work have taken place, with great public participation and
39 solicitation. Comments were made about land use and she reminded everyone that although it
40 should be mentioned in the MTP, this is the responsibility of CCRPC. The circ has been brought
41 up as being a dinosaur and they beg to differ on that opinion. Regardless of what we say here
42 tonight, the circ has been supported by two governors, the legislature, CCRPC, CCMPO and all
43 the host communities. She would be remiss if she didn't express their concern about the
44 inappropriateness of a resolution passed by the Burlington City Council last night where they
45 have instructed their MPO representative to vote against adoption of the MTP. They're confused
46 because on January 3rd the City Council passed a resolution supporting it. The city cites they
47 would like analysis of land use impact of the major transportation projects. GBIC would note
48 that those land use impacts are always done when permits are sought. GBIC supports this draft
49 and Burlington's sudden actions are puzzling to them.

1
2 **Kathleen Ryan** is a resident of Burlington and member of the city planning commission. She's
3 speaking on her own. Most everything has been said by others, but she does believe that there is
4 a major disconnect between the rhetoric of the goals from the projects proposed in here and they
5 don't reflect the broader public. She is very concerned about the circ and the fact that not all the
6 alternatives to the circ have been explored well. She can't believe there isn't another way to
7 accomplish almost all of what the circ is supposed to do. It reminded her that this will become
8 the transportation element of the regional plan that really in itself has a major impact on
9 development because you are by definition providing the infrastructure for development out
10 there and it'd make it hard for Act 250 to deny anything on transportation grounds given the fact
11 that this is built and would approve sprawl that this highway would generate. The Burlington
12 folks do have concerns about broader Chittenden County and all Vermont and she hopes we'll
13 read their memo and take it to heart.

14
15 **Bryan Osborne** is the Director of Public Works in Colchester. He wanted to make a general
16 comment that the MPO, and particularly Peter Keating, is to be commended for an excellent job
17 in developing the MTP and building consensus among the key stakeholders of the plan. The
18 plan is thorough and comprehensive and is strongly supported by the Town of Colchester, and
19 he'd recommend adoption. Some key features that were important to Colchester's support
20 include: the plan is focused on the benefit of the county, including each and every member
21 community. The corridor approach built stakeholder consensus, and placed no priority on any
22 specific project. The plan used land use scenarios based on the CCRPC regional plan to evaluate
23 impacts of the preferred alternative. The plan uses sound planning concepts to identify specific
24 projects and needs, recognizing that an assessment of project impacts is an important subsequent
25 step within the project development process. He was happy to see it limited to 11% of funding
26 for new highway construction. He thanked members and encouraged them to adopt the plan.

27
28 **Albin Voegelé** is the Town Manager of Colchester. He wanted to reaffirm Bryan's comments,
29 but spoke on behalf of the entire town and encouraged us to adopt the plan as written.

30
31 **Rep. David Zuckerman** from Burlington thanked members for the public hearing. He
32 apologized that he has not been more involved over the past few years, but wanted to point out
33 some major thoughts. The transportation plan is the largest social and policy driver of land use
34 development for the future and the soul of what Chittenden County and northwest Vermont will
35 be over the next 40-50 years. We need to think about what Chittenden County should look like.
36 We need to look at things like the circ highway and widening of roads that lead to broader
37 development and sprawl. Is that what we really want? He knows we've talked about this going
38 to the RPC and they'll look at adopting it and fitting it in. They probably won't change it all that
39 much. What do we really want Chittenden County to be? His understanding is that the circ
40 would bring more cars to Burlington - more roads, wider roads, more traffic, more congestion.
41 So while there are some resources for improved mass transportation, biking or other methods of
42 transportation, he feels we're not doing enough to get folks out of their individual cars. The
43 other issue is how much oil will be available in the next 20-25 years. Perhaps we need to not
44 waste our money on roads we may not be able to use. We need more public transportation.

45
46 **Dawn Francis** represented the Lake Champlain Regional Chamber of Commerce (LCRCC),
47 which has 2600 members and 1700 businesses throughout the county. Twenty years ago she was
48 a planner for the Town of Essex and one of her first tasks was to review the draft of the circ.
49 highway EIS. As a result of that process, it opened a watershed in terms of techniques that have

1 been adopted by communities such as rezoning, down zoning, growth centers, ag land
2 preservation, acquisition of development rights, sewer service boundaries, phasing policies for
3 residential development, impact fees, etc. RPC and MPO should be commended for working
4 together to create connection between land use and transportation. It's a critical part of the
5 overall transportation network to assume that we have a circ highway to connect the Southern
6 Connector, the northern connector in Colchester and throughout the county. It'll act as a vehicle
7 by which we can all access public transportation, the multi-modal centers etc. It also is a key
8 component of the overall transportation network and all of those different components will work
9 together. The future economic vitality of the region relies on the transportation system and the
10 LCRCC supports this plan as currently written.

11
12 **Greg Strong** is a resident of Burlington. At the risk of being redundant, he wants to echo some
13 comments made at this point. There is much positive in the plan and he appreciates the effort
14 that's been made. He is happy to see all the non-car based consideration that's been made for
15 public transportation and bike paths. He's concerned about the plan's reliance on the circ and
16 the continued recommendation for the circ. He's concerned it'll lead to not solving congestion
17 problems we have. Study after study show that when you widen roads and build more, people
18 buy more cars, etc. We need to pursue alternatives to road building. Secondly, he's concerned
19 it'll lead to dispersed low density development patterns– sprawl. Chittenden County and
20 Vermont as a whole, is one of best last places. We've all been to other areas to see where ring
21 roads have attributed to sprawl. We need to consider mass transit, bike transit and pedestrian
22 pathways. He urged the board not to adopt the plan and to continue to consider alternatives to
23 the circ.

24
25 **Elaine Wang** lives in Burlington. Most of her concerns have been addressed. In a 25-year plan
26 how can you not address the possibility for non-attainment of air quality? It only took State of
27 Vermont six years to get in non-attainment from 1999 to present. You'd think you'd use
28 strategies to try to mitigate sprawl and commuting.

29
30 There being no further comments from the audience, JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION TO
31 CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 8:20 P.M. CHRIS CONANT SECONDED AND THE
32 MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

33
34 f. Presentation on Matrix of changes from Municipal Comments. Bob Penniman commended
35 Peter Keating for collating all the comments and addressing each one. Rather than review them
36 one by one, Peter reacted to specific questions on the matrix. Pages 1-7 are comments received
37 prior to the December board meeting, which members had already received. Pages 8 -13 are
38 those received since then. He noted that most comments were pretty minor. In some cases he
39 recommended we ignore them and why or recommended how to deal with them.

40
41 Jeff McDonald questioned how we'll deal with the comments received tonight, since they're not
42 addressed in the matrix. It was noted that they'd be addressed in any motion.

43
44 Garret Mott said he did not notice any comments from the RPC. Peter Keating said there were
45 no specific recommendations in a note from the chair, other than there were no red flags and they
46 would have a further review. Some of the changes discussed at committee meetings have
47 already been incorporated. Tom Buckley left that meeting thinking that the comments were to be
48 contemplated by the full commission.

1 JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY GEORGE GERECKE, THAT WE ADOPT
2 THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN (MTP) WITH THE CHANGES
3 OUTLINED IN THE MATRIX AND INCLUDE A CLARIFICATION OF THE 4-LANE CIRC
4 ALTERNATIVE AT STAFF'S DISCRETION AND INCLUDE THE APPENDICES:
5 BIKE/PED PLAN, PARK AND RIDE PRIORITIZATION PLAN; ITS STRATEGIC PLAN,
6 EXISTING CONDITIONS REPORT, AND THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE
7 BURLINGTON TO ESSEX PLAN ALTERNATIVES, PHASE I.

8
9 After considerable discussion, the following friendly amendments to the suggested language in
10 the matrix and/or plan were agreed to by Jeff Carr and George Gerecke:

- 11
- 12 • Page 2 of the matrix, regarding **Section 4.3.1, page 31** of the plan. The suggested change
13 states "The Vermont Legislature, based on input from VTrans, allocates..." Jim Condos
14 proposed a **friendly amendment** to change language to read "VTrans, based on input from
15 the administration, allocates..." Polly McMurtry would stand on record that the legislature
16 has some say in how the money is spent. After some discussion all agreed to change the
17 sentence to read "**The state allocates** federal money to projects and programs based on local
18 priorities and needs."
 - 19
20 • Jeff McDonald said the Town of Charlotte feels the comment on Shelburne Village Bypass
21 on page 4 of the matrix is inappropriate. It was suggested that we eliminate that item
22 altogether and add language on page 6, referring to the widening of Shelburne Road... add to
23 Peter's suggested language "examine the traffic impacts to Shelburne Village following the
24 completion of US 7 reconstruction, **as well as examine future long term needs and**
25 **alternatives to mitigate the impact of increasing Route 7 traffic through the village.**"

26
27 Page 1 of Matrix and page 33 of the MTP. Polly McMurtry wanted it put on the record that
28 VTrans still has concerns that the numbers on Table 4-2 are not totally accurate. The amount of
29 money contributed by the state appears to be understated. However, this is not a red flag in
30 terms of voting against the MTP. No changes were recommended by staff.

31
32 Jim Condos questioned Page 10, Section 5 – for the record he wanted it clearly stated that the
33 City Council and he thought this was saying that they were recommending Exit 13 full build out
34 and that's not what we're doing. Peter Keating has explained to him that this is the alternatives
35 analysis and that Exit 12A is actually what is recommended and that satisfied his concern, but he
36 does want it on the record.

- 37
- 38 • Jeff McDonald noted that Figure 6-8 showing park and ride lot at Route 7 and Ferry Road is
39 not correct as the lot is actually at the rail station. He'd like the dot moved to the actual
40 location.
 - 41
42 • Jeff McDonald suggested a change on page 71 to add "**and southern**" to the language about
43 locating and establishing a new park and ride toward the northern end of the corridor.
 - 44
45 • Jeff McDonald also made a friendly amendment to **section 6.3.8.1 Primary Travel**
46 **Movements in Southern Corridor**. He asked that "**and Charlotte**" be added to line 6 in
47 the first paragraph. .
- 48

- 1 • Virginia Clarke would like to add a footnote on the page where we first mention the Circ.
2 Hwy. (page 45) that says, **“The circumferential highway, sections A&B, is currently (as**
3 **of January 2005) being analyzed in a formal EIS process. The process includes a full**
4 **assessment of other alternatives, including the no build alternative, that may meet the**
5 **transportation needs described by the federal notice of intent.”**
6

7 Tom Buckley noted that we’ve heard comments tonight and many of them we’d heard in the
8 past. He dealt with this when he was on the RPC and the four years on the steering committee.
9 Because of the huge distance moved from the last plan and because we’re going to begin this
10 process again, Westford strongly supports this plan. Even though the comments have not led to
11 more changes here tonight, they will be considered in the next amendment. Bob Penniman said
12 we’re required to document all the public comments.
13

14 Jim Condos said a common theme we heard tonight was issue of land use. He wanted it to be
15 clear that as he understands it, the land use plans of local communities and RPC were used in
16 developing this plan. So this plan was not devoid of land use plans, but the regional plan is what
17 deals with land use. We have to be very wary of the demographics we’re facing. It’s estimated
18 that there’ll be a 45% increase in population; 51% increase in housing and 53% increase in
19 employment. He noted that the five fastest growing counties are the five counties surrounding
20 Chittenden County. This is a transportation plan that takes into account all modes. He also
21 noted that every 1% in this plan equals \$10 million. .
22

23 Polly McMurtry added to land use discussion. A complete land use impact analysis is done
24 during the NEPA process at the project development stage. The place for the full analysis is not
25 in the MTP, but further along in project development.
26

27 Andrea Morgante took that as a lead to strongly disagree with that analysis because there is an
28 underlying assumption. She wants to go on record to say she believes that the underlying
29 assumption in all of this is that land is a commodity and that we consume land and the highest
30 and best use is to build houses and factories, but land is a finite resource. If we’re using these
31 investments that build more roads and disperse the population, we’re squandering the resources.
32 We don’t make more land. The land provides our food, etc, and we cannot continue to consume
33 the land.
34

35 Bill Keogh said when Burlington supported the TIP they came forward to support A&B of the
36 circ highway. Along with that was support of alternative funding of public transportation.
37 (From City Council Resoluton - At that time “City Council expressed concern over the lack of
38 adequate environmental, land use, and economic studies to understand and mitigate the impacts
39 of the full build out of the circumferential highway. The draft MTP places priority on
40 completing the full build of the circ hwy but contains no mention of the Federal District Court
41 ruling, and no analysis of the impacts of the full build out of the circ hwy and similarly contains
42 no analysis of the land use impacts of other major highway projects proposed in the draft plan,
43 including widening I-89 to six lanes between Colchester and Williston, and development of
44 additional interchanges along I-89. The Burlington Planning Commission has noted that the
45 draft plan places great emphasis on the importance and benefits of a concentrated pattern of land
46 use in Chittenden County, but that the plan fails to consider which combination of transportation
47 investments would result in the best overall land use and development pattern. The Burlington
48 Planning Commission has pointed out that 70% of the new investments proposed in the draft
49 plan would be dedicated to new highway construction, including the full build out of the circ

1 hwy, and that many of these new investments do not appear to support the plan's policy
2 recommendation of a concentrated land use pattern." He has been advised to vote against the
3 plan, which he will do.

4
5 George Gerecke said in response to Burlington, the reference to the circ alternative is now in
6 there. He also pointed out that although the TSM/TDM have lower percentage, they give a
7 bigger bang for the buck and will have a strong impact.

8
9 Virginia Clarke noted that if there is so much bang for the buck why not do more of that rather
10 than road building. We've kind of put ourselves behind the eight ball being two years behind
11 schedule, and she will support the plan. We've come a long way. We are starting to look at
12 things differently, and not just build new roads. We need to get this passed so we can get the
13 next iteration. We need to really take the next couple of years to go even further. We need to be
14 strong proponents of doing the right thing.

15
16 Bob Penniman spoke to the seemingly small percentages for TDM and TSM. With TDM there
17 are significant amounts of private sector (employers) dollars involved and federal and state
18 dollars are very small - only 10-15% of the cost of running the program. e.g. IBM staggers
19 work hours to decrease the peak hour traffic at Five Corners. TSM comes out of development
20 process where developer(s) might agree to pay for part of intersection improvements. The
21 percentage of bike/ped is small, but that is only for stand alone bike/ped projects. We include
22 bike/ped in all major construction projects.

23
24 **VOTE ON MOTION TO ADOPT THE MTP WITH THE FRIENDLY AMENDMENTS AND**
25 **MATRIX:**

26	Bolton	Absent	Burlington (4)	No	Charlotte	Yes
27	Colchester (2)	Yes	Essex Jct.	Yes	Essex Town	Yes
28	Hinesburg	No	Huntington	Absent	Jericho	Yes
29	Milton	Absent	Richmond	Yes	St. George	Absent
30	Shelburne	Yes	South Burlington (2)	Yes	Underhill	Yes
31	Westford	Yes	Williston	Yes	Winooski	Yes
32	VTrans	Yes				

33 Motion carried with 15 of 24 votes; and 12 of 18 communities voting in favor.

34
35 **6. Legislative Priorities. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION TO TABLE, SECONDED BY JIM**
36 **DUDLEY. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

37
38 **7. Circ. EIS Update.** Bill Knight distributed a list of those who are being interviewed by the
39 consultant. Bob feels the consultants are doing a great job. It's moving slowly, but they're being
40 very thorough. Current time line to start the public process is March with workshops for public
41 involvement on March 15-17. These will be held in Burlington, Williston and Jericho/Underhill.
42 In February, leading into this, the resource agencies (ANR, EPA, MPO & RPC) will meet to
43 discuss their input and what they're looking for from the process as well. Dave Roberts noted
44 that the list is not a final list. They're adding to the list as they're doing the interviews.

45
46 **8. Report on Study of Local Match Requirements authorized by General Assembly.** Peter
47 Keating sat on a summer study committee to look at how they could vary the local share so
48 federal and state dollars could go further. They looked at State of Maine where they do
49 something similar. The state would pay 100% for core projects. If you tack on amenities, they'd

1 tack on higher percentage of match. They went through about a dozen projects and analyzed
2 them and calculated what savings might have been made for last year's program. They found
3 that there might actually be a loss to the state because the state would pay 100% of certain
4 projects. This has been turned over to the legislature. Based on the final report he's seen, Peter
5 would not be surprised if the legislature asked for more information. They did make
6 recommendation to put amenity cap on projects where they would limit the amount the state
7 would pay for amenities and locals would have to pay the rest. Bob feels that although this was
8 authorized by the legislature and Peter's memo said *that VTrans in consultation with VLCT,*
9 *RPCs and CCMPO shall develop a system of local match funding requirements based on the*
10 *principle of functional necessity*, it's the first we've heard of it.

11
12 9. Executive Director's Report. Bill Knight sent out a monthly report and had nothing more to
13 add to it.

14
15 10. Other Business. Polly stated there are apparently typos in the list distributed today and she
16 will take any corrections people have to the consultant.

17
18 JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN AT 9:35 P.M. CHRIS CONANT
19 SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

20
21 Respectfully submitted,

22
23
24
25 Bernadette Ferenc
26 Executive Assistant