

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

5 Date: Wednesday, March 16, 2005  
6 Time: 7:00 p.m.  
7 Place: CCMPO Offices, 30 Kimball Avenue, So. Burlington, VT 05403  
8 Present: Bill Keogh, Burlington Jeff McDonald, Charlotte, Vice Chair  
9 Chris Conant, Colchester Tom James, Essex Alternate  
10 Dale Arango, Essex Junction Andrea Morgante, Hinesburg  
11 Rick Moulton, Huntington Virginia Clarke, Richmond  
12 Jim Dudley, Shelburne Jim Condos, So. Burlington  
13 Stan Hamlet, Underhill Tom Buckley, Westford  
14 George Gerecke, Williston Mike O'Brien, Winooski, Sec-Treas.  
15 Polly McMurtry, VTrans Planning Coordinator  
16 Ex-Officio: Chris Cole, CCTA Chris Jolly, FHWA  
17 Others: Matthew Langham, VTrans Gina Campoli, VTrans  
18 Paul Wishinski, VT Dept. of Environmental Conservation  
19 Harold Garabedian, VT Dept. of Environmental Conservation  
20 Melody Zugami, Vermont Times  
21 Greg Brown, CCRPC Executive Director  
22 Deb Sachs, Alliance for Climate Action  
23 Staff: Bill Knight, Executive Director Peter Keating, Sr. Trans. Planner  
24 Christine Forde, Sr. Trans. Planner Dave Roberts, Sr. Trans. Planner  
25 Susan Smichenko, Sr. Trans.Plan. Daryl Benoit, Transportation Planner  
26 Paul Craven, Project Mgr. (8:00) Bernadette Ferenc, Exec. Assistant  
27

28 The meeting was called to order at 7:05 p.m. by the Vice Chair, Jeff McDonald.  
29

30 1. Changes to the Agenda. There were none.  
31

32 2. Public Comment Period. There were no members of the public present.  
33

34 3. Action on Consent Agenda. There were two items on the consent agenda – Report from the  
35 Executive Committee and Report from the Technical Advisory Committee. BILL KEOGH  
36 MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA. CHRIS CONANT  
37 SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.  
38

39 4. Approval of Minutes. JIM CONDOS MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES  
40 OF FEBRUARY 16, 2005 WITH CORRECTIONS IF ANY. JIM DUDLEY SECONDED AND  
41 THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.  
42

43 5. Air Quality in Chittenden County. Gina Campoli is the Environmental Policy Manager in  
44 VTrans Policy and Planning Division and Harold Garabedian is the Assistant Director of Air  
45 Quality Program with ANR. They're here to discuss air quality issues in Chittenden County.  
46 They have a website ([www.anr.state.vt.us/air](http://www.anr.state.vt.us/air)) He noted that the Clean Air Act (CAA) is almost  
47 as complicated as the tax laws. Air pollution control in Vermont has noted three "problems":  
48 "criteria" air pollutants; air toxics; and climate change/greenhouse gases. They have a camera  
49 on Old Mill that shows atmosphere over Lake Champlain which updates every 15 minutes and

1 the measurements are recorded. Air quality monitoring stations are located at South Winooski  
2 Avenue/Main Street and on the Zampiere State Office Building in Burlington. They also  
3 measure at Proctor Maple Research Center in Underhill. Other monitoring sites around the state  
4 include Rutland, Brattleboro, Manchester and Bennington. He described National Ambient Air  
5 Quality Standards. There are six air contaminants: carbon monoxide; sulfur dioxide; lead;  
6 nitrogen dioxide; particulate matter and ozone. He described what each of these pollutants does  
7 to damage health. Section 109 of the CAA states "...to protect human health..." States are  
8 obligated to measure for these pollutants. In "attainment" means you are at or below those  
9 standards. "Non-attainment" means you've exceeded them. There are only two states east of the  
10 Mississippi that are in attainment - Florida and Vermont, so it's important for the two agencies to  
11 work together on all transportation projects in Vermont to make sure we stay in attainment.  
12 Vermont has been in attainment except in 1977 when we were in non-attainment for carbon  
13 monoxide, particulate matter and ozone. When asked what happened to have us go into non-  
14 attainment, Mr. Garabedian said new regulations. They have ability to regain attainment by  
15 putting standards on things. Changes in plants in the Midwest have helped Vermont. He then  
16 reviewed data for ozone. They have ozone monitor stations in Bennington and Underhill and he  
17 showed three-year averages. We're right at the edge. When Polly asked if Bennington station  
18 goes out of attainment what does that do to Chittenden County, Harold said there is nothing  
19 automatic, but there is a system and then the Governor makes a decision.  
20

21 He described what makes ozone (smog). He described sources of air contaminants in 2002 -  
22 VOC (Volatile Organic Components), Area (such as gas stations) 25.2%, on-road motor vehicles  
23 46%, non-road engines (lawn mowers, generators, etc) 24.9% and industrial 3.9%. In 2002 NOx  
24 (Nitrous Oxides) showed 68.6% on road; 13.3% non-road; 8% industrial and 10% area. Jim  
25 Condos wondered whether we should relook at auto inspection and perhaps require emissions  
26 testing. Harold said vehicles manufactured prior to 1996 have visual checks to be sure things  
27 like catalytic converters are in place. Vehicles from 1996 on are required to have air pollution  
28 control devices working.  
29

30 What happens if Vermont goes non-attainment for 05? Unhealthy air quality; development of  
31 State Air Quality Implementation Plan (SIP). The SIP must include mandatory measures to meet  
32 standards including "conformity" review of all major highway projects. If we do not submit a  
33 SIP, sanctions can be applied to the state, such as withholding federal highway funds or  
34 moratorium on permits for major "industrial" projects. Christine Forde noted how this would  
35 affect the TIP. Bill Knight noted in Toledo they were in non-attainment and a good portion of  
36 their time and money was spent monitoring the TIP projects. We would have to analyze every  
37 project in the TIP and the MTP. Mr. Garabedian said ANR and VTrans have decided how to  
38 work together to prevent us from going into non-attainment. It was noted that we've cleaned up  
39 cars over the past few decades, but we've also added cars. EPA approves the SIP. There are no  
40 federal standards for air toxics, but we do have state standards for toxics and they monitor for  
41 them (e.g. benzene which is highly carcinogenic for leukemia). They're now focusing on diesel  
42 engines because diesel smoke is noxious, toxic, carcinogenic and very small. He then discussed  
43 climate change/greenhouse gases which are 44% transportation related and 38%  
44 residential/commercial/industrial.  
45

46 In summary, Vermont has history of 40 years of controlling air pollution; in that time air quality  
47 has improved, from a time when national health standards were exceeded to now when these  
48 standards are met; we need to be vigilant for levels to remain below the health-based standards;  
49 emissions of NOx are crucial to this end. They will be focusing on levels of airborne toxics and

1 diesel engine exhaust. In 1996 Vermont adopted California auto emissions standards which are  
2 more aggressive than the federal standards. They're working on another set of standards to deal  
3 with greenhouse gases and how they'll incorporate those into their rules. All New England,  
4 except New Hampshire, have adopted California standards. When asked how we deal with the  
5 pollutants that come from the Midwest and New York, Mr. Garabedian said it's clearly  
6 recognized and is being worked on. Bill Keogh hoped the 10% Challenge is recognized as  
7 reducing air pollution.  
8

9 6. Warn for Public Hearing on Amendment of FY04-06 TIP. GEORGE GERECKE MADE A  
10 MOTION TO WARN A PUBLIC HEARING. MIKE O'BRIEN SECONDED. Christine Forde  
11 noted that this is for paving the southbound lanes of the interstate from Bolton to I-189 in South  
12 Burlington. This was added at the TAC meeting because we didn't have the request before the  
13 package went out. We have made it a major amendment because of the size of the project and  
14 that amount has changed (to add \$4,149,00 in federal funds). The additional cost is for more  
15 detailed design, which led to lengthening the southbound entrance ramp at I-189 (Exit 13) to  
16 meet standards; lengthening the Exit 12 southbound exit ramp to meet standards; and adding an  
17 additional left turn lane on the Exit 12 southbound exit ramp to reduce potential for traffic  
18 backups onto I-89. This stretch of pavement is rapidly deteriorating. This was paved in 1996  
19 with an experimental pavement and performed well for the type of pavement. As this was going  
20 on there was a study being done to study the exit ramp at #12 because queue was backing up  
21 onto the interstate and \$500,000 is for construction of additional turn lane on Exit 12 exit ramp.  
22 Virginia Clarke asked if a roundabout were installed at Exit 12 how would this work. Polly  
23 McMurtry said this is a short-term fix and is being done since the roadway is being paved  
24 anyway. Chris Jolly said the purpose of the project was to address safety at this exit ramp.  
25 Long-term this entire interchange has to be rebuilt. VTrans is taking advantage of the existing  
26 paving project to get it done this construction season rather than taking two years. There are  
27 larger issues out there to be addressed. Tom Buckley said the 1993 traffic model showed the  
28 problem happening. Since Maple Tree Place was developed traffic projections have been  
29 exceeded by 75% and they're only ¾ of the way through it. Jim Condos asked if safety is the  
30 issue, why not reduce the speed limit in that area. When Exit 14 and 12 were being scoped, both  
31 studies were moving along at the same speed. He feels the potential hazard is just as high at Exit  
32 14 because of the hill. VOTE ON MOTION TO WARN A PUBLIC HEARING CARRIED  
33 UNANIMOUSLY.  
34

35 7. 2025 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Document changes. Peter Keating said as a  
36 result of last month's motion to reexamine some information, staff is recommending a change to  
37 Table 5-7 for the cost for refined alternative A to be raised from \$387M to 417.4M. This was  
38 brought about because there was a question from Marilyn Sowles about the freeway alternative  
39 costs in Table 5-4. We had found those costs underestimated and he changed them from \$122 M  
40 to \$198M. He reviewed data for Tables 5-5, 5-6, 7-4 and 7-5 and found them to be accurate.  
41 Because it was not clear, a note was added to the list of projects that form the basis of the  
42 preferred alternative on page 45 that the full Circumferential Highway recommended here is  
43 two, not four, lanes. TOM BUCKLEY MADE A MOTION, DULY SECONDED, THAT THE  
44 BOARD ACCEPT THE CHANGES STAFF RECOMMENDS AND THAT A LETTER OF  
45 THANKS BE SENT TO MARILYN SOWLES FOR BRINGING THIS TO OUR ATTENTION.  
46 George Gerecke commended Peter Keating for his work on this. Virginia Clarke wondered if we  
47 should send this out to those at the hearing and the towns because people may have been  
48 confused by it. Bill Knight said we'll send it to the Steering Committee, etc. and alert them. Jim  
49 Condos said it is important to note that the changes we're making are on alternatives that were

1 not chosen. Had we corrected these it would have reinforced our decision to not choose them.  
2 VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

3  
4 8. Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Plan. Susan Smichenko reported that the original  
5 plan, done in 2000, was developed to respond to FHWA National Architecture. In 2001 FHWA  
6 came up with a new set of architecture. We've been working with a consultant, IBI Group, and  
7 the plan is complete. We had a large stakeholders group including municipalities, DMV,  
8 VTrans, FHWA, CCTA and private industry. There's a lot of activity coming up in ITS and  
9 having a new plan is important. The plan is on our website. The strategic plan is still being  
10 developed and we're working closely with the State of Vermont to meet an April 8, 2005  
11 deadline. The framework is most important and the strategic plan will come shortly after that.  
12 We felt it was important to talk about it at this meeting because of the timing. There are items in  
13 the plan that do not exist today, but may in the future. JIM CONDOS MADE A MOTION  
14 THAT WE APPROVE THE RESOLUTION TO ACCEPT THE REPORT ENTITLED  
15 "REGIONAL ITS ARCHITECTURE FOR CHITTENDEN COUNTY, DATED FEBRUARY  
16 2005. GEORGE GERECKE SECONDED. When asked how often this has to be updated,  
17 Susan Smichenko said there is a recommendation to keep this document dynamic and have a  
18 committee that would keep an eye on this. Chris Jolly said any project FHWA authorizes after  
19 April 8, 2005 must comply with this plan before it can be approved. FHWA is still reviewing  
20 this plan, but we worked with a responsible consultant and they don't anticipate any problems.  
21 We're trying to make this a part of the transportation planning process which is important for  
22 Chittenden County.

23  
24 Rick Moulton noted we've been talking about Route 15 since 1999, what about money for  
25 implementation? Susan said on Route 15 CCTA is actively hiring a consultant to deal with ITS.  
26 ITS is not a high ticket item and as we move forward it'll be obvious that interconnecting signals  
27 might cost a couple hundred thousand dollars vs. several millions. When asked if there will be  
28 any financial implications for municipalities, Susan said the equipment must be compatible but  
29 you don't have to go out and buy all new equipment. When asked if MPO has final approval for  
30 this plan, Susan said it's a good idea to have it approved by the board because it shows support,  
31 but FHWA has final say on the document. Chris Jolly said the MPO plan has to be in place, but  
32 FHWA doesn't take formal approval action on it. Susan said this is a reference for projects.  
33 Chris Cole said CCTA has an ITS earmark and in order for them to spend that, the region has to  
34 have an architecture plan in place. This is part of the federal process. They don't want you  
35 investing in technology for the region until you all agree on the type of technology you're going  
36 to use. JIM CONDOS MOVED THE QUESTION. VOTE: MOTION CARRIED  
37 UNANIMOUSLY.

38  
39 9. House Bill H.322 regarding Vermont Rail Authority. The meeting package included a  
40 recommendation from the Executive Committee to not support H.322, as currently written, and a  
41 letter did go out to a number of folks. On Monday we received a proposed amended H.322. The  
42 Executive Committee asked staff to review it and see how it lines up with our rail resolution.  
43 Bill highlighted in yellow the revisions he received and blue are those from the City of  
44 Burlington. He reviewed the three concerns the Executive Committee had:

- 45 a. It has the potential to fragment our transportation system.
- 46 b. It works against intermodal operations; and
- 47 c. It clearly does not support the CCMPO's rail priorities as listed in the resolution adopted  
48 in December 2004.

1 Jim Condos said when this was first introduced he looked to see who introduced it and felt the  
2 MPO needed to look at it. The reaction to our letter was immediate and there are changes being  
3 proposed. Rick Moulton said the Rail Council hasn't taken a position on this bill, but they have  
4 testified on deterioration of rail statewide, which he elaborated on. Bill Knight suggested the  
5 CCMPO support the concept and give authority to Executive Committee and the Executive  
6 Director to continue negotiation in that direction. Members brought up several issues:

- 7 • This bill appears to have the new VRA (Vermont Rail Authority) assuming only specific  
8 projects get built.
- 9 • This board does not have enough information to respond to this, but if this becomes a  
10 defining document about the Western Vermont Corridor, these changes are important. We  
11 still need to be sure language is there even if bill goes down in flames.
- 12 • These assets are being taken from the state and put into hands of an authority that would like  
13 to bond and do it all at once.
- 14 • One thing that bothers VTrans is that this would include bonding against future federal  
15 money and it is somewhat like borrowing Peter to pay Paul.
- 16 • You're shifting one mode away from other modes.
- 17 • Another concern is that we really need to look at improving our rail infrastructure statewide
- 18 • The reason the State isn't taking all this state property to use for leverage to bond, is because  
19 it'd impact Vermont's credit rating. That really needs to be looked at.
- 20 • On page 30 of draft bill on line 16, they talk about using federal highway funds to secure  
21 special obligation bonds. It has a lot of details that would be troublesome whether you're  
22 supporting it or not.
- 23 • This isn't very high on the list at the House Transportation Committee, so we shouldn't take  
24 a lot of stock in it.

25  
26 Bill Keogh recommends that we table this and keep the resolution we have approved and let the  
27 Executive Committee keep track of this legislation, if it goes anywhere. It was noted that it was  
28 not intended that the board would vote in support of the bill as proposed, but that we should  
29 continue to monitor.

30  
31 10. FY06 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Update. In the meeting packet Bill had  
32 updated members as of the status last week. The UPWP committee will meet on March 21<sup>st</sup>.  
33 Tomorrow we'll put a new UPWP in the mail which they will discuss, evaluate, etc. for a  
34 recommendation to the TAC and this board so we can call for a public hearing. When this went  
35 out we were over budget by about \$350,000. Today we balanced the budget and are including  
36 anticipated new federal dollars to tie up state dollars if it does come through. This is a very  
37 rough year because it's a smallest budget we've had in a few years. Bill Knight said if the  
38 Federal Transportation Bill passes, we are expecting roughly \$20 M more for the State of  
39 Vermont, or \$200,000 for the CCMPO and we're using \$150,000 since it's ¾ of the federal fiscal  
40 year.

41  
42 11. Sidewalk Program. Peter Keating said in 1999/2000 there was an effort to get line item on  
43 the TIP for sidewalks. Just in the past year we got the sign off from VTrans and we've set up a  
44 grant program to allow communities to apply. This year we're making money available for PE  
45 on the sidewalk because we only have \$100,000. A grant application is on the web site.  
46 Applications are due April 1, 2005. We'd like to give out grants for 3-4 projects of \$25,000  
47 each. Bill Keogh thanked VTrans for doing that. If a project hasn't been scope they need to  
48 apply through our UPWP.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

12. Executive Director's Report. Bill Knight emailed his Executive Director's report last Friday. He received a letter late today regarding our TIP fiscal constraint.

13. Committee Reports.

a. Finance Committee.

- FY04 Audit. Mike O'Brien said members received and reviewed the audit, their questions have been answered and they recommend acceptance of the audit. JIM CONDOS MADE A MOITON, SECONDED BY CHRIS CONANT, TO ACCEPT THE FY04 AUDIT. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- January Financial Report. The Finance Committee had reviewed it.

b. Ad Hoc Public Transportation Committee. Nothing this month.

c. CCRPC – no report this month.

d. Circ EIS. The first public meeting was held last night in Jericho and there were about 45 people there. The second meeting is tonight in Williston (Paul Craven said there were about 135 people there) and the final meeting will be tomorrow evening in Contois Auditorium in Burlington. Polly McMurtry said the effort the last few weeks as been on the workshops. There will be additional public meetings as needed. Chris Conant noted that he and Stan Hamlet were at the meeting last night and he felt the public seemed to like the way it was done. You can go on the Circ EIS website before April 7<sup>th</sup> to add comments.

14. Other Business. There was none.

MIKE O'BRIEN MADE A MOTION, DULY SECONDED, TO ADJOURN AT 9:20 P.M.  
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc  
Executive Assistant