

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

5 Date: Wednesday, September 21, 2005  
6 Time: 7:00 p.m.  
7 Place: CCMPO Offices, 30 Kimball Avenue, Suite 102, South Burlington, VT  
8 Present: Andy Montroll, Burlington  
9 Marc Landry, Colchester  
10 Jeff Carr, Essex (Sec-Treas.)  
11 Dale Arango, Essex Junction  
12 Rick Moulton, Huntington  
13 Bob Penniman, Jericho (Chair)  
14 Virginia Clarke, Richmond  
15 Paul Bohne, Shelburne Alternate  
16 Jim Condos, South Burlington  
17 Tom Buckley, Westford (7:12)  
18 George Gerecke, Williston  
19 Mike O'Brien, Winooski (Vice-Chair)  
20 Dawn Terrill, VTrans Secretary  
21 Ex-Officio: Chris Jolly, FHWA  
22 Chris Cole, CCTA (7:20)  
23 Lew Wetzel, CCRPC  
24 Others: Matthew Langham, VTrans  
25 Polly McMurtry, VTrans  
26 Steve Lawe, Resource Systems Group, Inc.  
27 Melody Zagami, Vermont Times  
28 Staff: Bill Knight, Executive Director  
29 Peter Keating, Sr. Transportation Planner  
30 Christine Forde, Sr. Transportation Planner  
31 Susan Smichenko, Sr. Transportation Planner  
32 Daryl Benoit, Transportation Planner  
33 Bernadette Ferenc, Executive Assistant  
34

35 The meeting was called to order at 7:04 p.m. by the Chair, Bob Penniman. He welcomed Paul  
36 Bohne from Shelburne.  
37

38 1. Change to the agenda. There were none.  
39

40 2. Public comment period. There were no members of the public present.  
41

42 3. Action on Consent Agenda. There were no items on the consent agenda.  
43

44 4. Approval of Minutes. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES OF  
45 AUGUST 17, 2005 AND SEPTEMBER 5, 2005, WITH CORRECTIONS, IF ANY. GEORGE  
46 GERECKE SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED WITH PAUL BOHNE  
47 ABSTAINING.  
48

1 5. Presentation of Transportation Model Update. Steve Lawe of RSG was present to bring the  
2 board up to date on the latest model update. Bob Penniman will ask the board for a motion to  
3 accept the model after Steve's presentation. Mr. Lawe reviewed the history of the CCMPO  
4 model. In 1988 they developed the first planning model for CCRPC/CCMPO. In 1990-92 sub-  
5 area models were created for several towns. In 1993 they updated the model with mode choice.  
6 In 1998 there was a model calibration and new household survey. In 1999 they integrated the  
7 model with DSS and in 2004 sketch calibration for the circ highway. The model needs to be  
8 updated on a regular basis because of changes in conditions, land use and people's behavior.  
9 The Chittenden County model is a landmark model. There is a fair amount of investment in the  
10 model in both money and time. We always had a great staff to be able to work with the model.  
11 This model encompasses an area well suited to modeling, and we can take advantage of state of  
12 the art technology. Work started in 2004 to recalibrate and convert the model to TransCad and  
13 was completed in June 2005. They have since completed the truck model using "Quick  
14 Response Freight Manual" (QRFM). A peer review of the model is ongoing. First review is  
15 expected to be completed in early October. They will have a national model review as well and  
16 that should be completed in November. A one-day training session on model use still needs to  
17 be scheduled. CCMPO and VTrans staffs have been trained. He reviewed new features of the  
18 latest model:

- 19 • It was calibrated to year 2000 AM and PM peak hours. It meets all FHWA standards and  
20 meets or exceeds common national practices.
- 21 • Mode choice model includes auto, shared-ride, walk/bike, bus and rail.
- 22 • Updated with new land use, information from 2000 Census and license plate survey on I-89.
- 23 • Use TransCad – commercially available, common in the industry, features GIS integration.
- 24 • Changed vehicle assignment to state of the art multi-path user equilibrium with interchange  
25 delays (we're only one of two MPOs in the country.)
- 26 • Contains "peak shifting" capability to estimate capacity constrained effects on off-peak. Can  
27 be turned on and off to be used as a scenario. "Peak spreading" is when there is significant  
28 congestion and the period is made longer. "Peak shifting" is the active choice of avoiding  
29 that period, and we can now forecast that. They propose MPO use that as one of several  
30 policies. There are many other behaviors that change because of "peak spreading." You  
31 may choose a different route or a different mode.
- 32 • Estimates truck trips for medium and heavy truck traffic using the Quick Response Freight  
33 Manual (QRFM) published by FHWA. We're able to choose two places in model and decide  
34 which one is using auto vs. truck trips. It's important to look at major routes and cut-off  
35 routes.
- 36 • Land use allocation for future year forecasting integrated into transportation model.

37  
38 When asked what the Quick Response Freight Manual is, Steve Lawe said FHWA put together  
39 guidelines to provide data for areas that chose not to perform their own data collection. We use  
40 national data rather than our own counts. We did have some truck counts on this area and Daryl  
41 Benoit said we've had the capacity to count truck traffic from 2000-2004 and we were able to  
42 make it into 2000 data. When asked how you account for commercial and school buses, Steve  
43 Lawe said it's usually only in the AM peak hours. They have a specific trip (school trip) so  
44 they're able to integrate that. Daryl Benoit said the buses were counted as a medium vehicle in  
45 the data we gave to RSG. This is a forecast tool that allows us to look out 20-25 years. It looks  
46 at major land use improvements, prioritization of projects, looking at region-wide projects. They  
47 always make sure they work with staff to be sure they know the most appropriate uses for the  
48 model. He suggested members talk with staff if they really want to see how the model works.  
49 He had a couple of slides showing various conditions in different areas. It takes a half hour to

1 run the model, but a week or more to evaluate a run. Bob Penniman emphasized the fact that our  
2 model is out front nationally. It's to the credit of the region that we decided to invest in this in  
3 1988. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION THAT THE BOARD ACCEPT THE WORK  
4 PRODUCT OF RESOURCE SYSTEMS GROUP OF THE UPDATED MODEL, SUBJECT TO  
5 THE RESPONSE OF THE PEER REVIEW, FOR USE IN OUR NORMAL PRACTICE AND  
6 TO MAKE IT AVAILABLE TO CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC WHO ARE  
7 ADEQUATELY TRAINED IN IT. MIKE O'BRIEN SECONDED AND THE MOTION  
8 CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

9  
10 6. Prioritization - including Earmarks. Bob Penniman said last month we had a long discussion  
11 about the methodology used in the prioritization of projects, and some of its flaws. At VTrans  
12 request there was another run of trying to prioritize the earmarks that showed up in  
13 reauthorization. The TAC took a look at it and they recommended we look for clarification on  
14 some of these dollars. The Executive Committee said we need to take a cut at the prioritization  
15 of just the earmarks and forward those to VTrans. Jeff Carr said the proviso is that we forward  
16 these 7 projects to VTrans provided they are a part of the fiscal constraint, and if not, there is no  
17 reason to be prioritized. Christine Forde said these are not all of the earmarks, but only those  
18 projects that were on the TIP before. We used the same methodology as we did the last time.  
19 The recommendation of the TAC for the stormwater projects was because the methodology  
20 caused local road projects and CWD project to score lower and they wanted them to be higher.  
21 She reviewed the seven earmarks and how they scored in the whole list of projects. Dawn Terrill  
22 said the reality is that VTrans doesn't have an unlimited pool of federal dollars either. So that's  
23 why they wanted to see where everything falls because they're all competing statewide. The  
24 earmarks will be a certain percentage of the available dollars each year. So she suggested that  
25 the earmarks also be included so that it's communicated to VTrans and the legislature. It was  
26 noted that all the money can't come at once. Rick Moulton said the small rural towns are left out  
27 of the loop in terms of getting projects prioritized and he again suggested we figure out a way to  
28 include other factors that would have the rural towns come out higher on the list. Christine  
29 Forde noted we are working on a new prioritization process. When asked if we know whether  
30 earmarks are in the constraint or out of it, Dawn Terrill said she assumes that all of them are out  
31 of it except for earmarks for projects that are already in the TIP. Sec. Terrill didn't follow the  
32 logic that projects outside the constraint shouldn't be prioritized. There are only so many dollars  
33 available each year and she wondered what the harm is in prioritizing everything. Discussion  
34 continued. Chris Jolly said what they've seen in the past when we've received earmarks was that  
35 money was assigned to that project until it was expended. With all of these earmarks the money  
36 is being doled out each year of the bill. There was a brief discussion about advance construction,  
37 meaning that the communities could borrow funds to pay for construction in anticipation of  
38 funding in the future. Chris Jolly said there are two different lists of earmarks and they're all  
39 handled differently and they're still trying to sort this out. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION  
40 THAT WE ACCEPT THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION AND SLOT THESE 7  
41 ADDITIONAL EARMARK PROJECTS IN THE LIST WE APPROVED LAST MONTH  
42 EVEN THOUGH IT'S THE INITIAL ATTEMPT AND JUST LIKE LAST MONTH'S  
43 MOTION THAT WE WILL STRIVE TO IMPROVE THE PRIORITIZATION PROCESS FOR  
44 SUBSEQUENT LISTS, WITH THE PROVISION THAT THESE 7 PROJECTS ARE  
45 SUBJECT TO FISCAL CONSTRAINT AND IF NOT, THEY DO NOT HAVE TO BE  
46 INCLUDED IN THE PRIORITIZED LIST. JIM CONDOS SECONDED. ANDY MONTROLL  
47 OFFERED A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT TO ADD SECOND TAC RECOMMENDATION  
48 "TO IDENTIFY WAYS TO STREAMLINE THE USE OF THE UNIQUE, NON-  
49 TRANSPORTATION, STORMWATER FUNDS THROUGH A SINGLE MANAGEMENT

1 STRUCTURE. (I.E. NOT BOTH ANR AND VTRANS).” JEFF AND JIM ACCEPTED THE  
2 FRIENDLY AMENDMENT. MOTION CARRIED WITH THE SECRETARY AND RICK  
3 MOULTON ABSTAINING.

4  
5 7. SAFETEA-LU Presentation. a. Secretary Terrill said she is focusing on implications for  
6 Vermont from a funding standpoint. SAFETEA-LU is the name of the bill and stands for “Safe,  
7 Accountable, Flexible, Efficient, Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users.” The bill  
8 contains annual apportionments and earmarks. She addressed state funds pressures which  
9 include: match for increased federal funding; state funds for budget growth pressures (i.e. salt,  
10 fuel prices, etc); and state funds for needs gap – available funds vs. total needs. Current needs  
11 gap is estimated at over \$80m and the shortfall could grow to \$130m by 2009. Federal Highway  
12 funds are based on Annual Apportionments, which are the amounts authorized by the bill, not yet  
13 appropriated; Earmarks, which are amounts designated for specific projects; and Obligation  
14 Limitation which are the amounts available to spend. This is based on appropriations, and  
15 historically we only received about 90% of the annual apportionment and earmarks appear to be  
16 subject to the same 90% limitation. Tom Buckley noted that there is pressure to open up the bill  
17 and reduce the 90% to help with Katrina rebuilding. The Secretary noted that by law, the  
18 transportation trust fund cannot be tapped into for more than \$100m for any single emergency  
19 event. The Secretary then showed a chart showing the estimated FHWA obligation limitation for  
20 the life of the bill for Annual Formula (\$5.6m/year average); High Priority earmarks;  
21 Transportation Improvements earmarks; and Bridge Discretionary earmarks. That means a total  
22 annual increase of \$61m FHWA, which would require an additional \$11.5m in state match  
23 annually. Are these earmarks, pork? Sec. Terrill said if these were already a project, the  
24 earmark is not pork. If a project receives earmark funds, she can take her base dollars and apply  
25 them elsewhere. A summary of SAFETEA-LU earmarks shows:

- 26 • High Priority Projects - \$137.8 m total over 5 years (FY05-FY09); 30 projects; \$24.8m/yr  
27 obligation limitation @ 90%. Examples in Chittenden County include: Church Street  
28 improvements; Waterfront improvements, Colchester Campus Road; Essex Junction  
29 downtown transportation; US Route 2/I-89 interchange improvements (right turn lane in  
30 front of Staples); I-89, Exit 14 upgrades to southbound off ramps; improvements to US 7 in  
31 Charlotte.
- 32 • Transportation Improvements - \$120 m total over 5 years (FY05-09); Total allocations vary  
33 each year (10%-2005; 20%-2006; 25%-2007; 25%-2008; 20%-2009); \$21.6 m/yr average  
34 obligation limitation @90%. Examples: \$10m for improvements for VT interstates; \$30m  
35 for western corridor rail improvements; \$6.5m for Bennington welcome center; \$6.5m for  
36 Hartford rest areas; \$30m for 28 Vermont small bridges; \$6.2m for 8 Vermont covered  
37 bridges. The bridge projects are spread around the entire state.
- 38 • Bridge Discretionary - \$50 m total over 4 years (FY06-09); \$11.25m/year obligation  
39 limitation; \$18m for Missisquoi Bay Bridge; \$32m for nine state maintained bridges  
40 (includes several Town Highway bridges). There was \$100m nationally in this category.
- 41 • FTA Earmarks - \$4.6m
  - 42 ○ Brattleboro Intermodal Center - \$1m
  - 43 ○ CCTA bus, facilities and equipment - \$2m
  - 44 ○ Statewide bus, facilities and equipment - \$1.6m
- 45 • Research Earmarks (direct to recipient)
  - 46 ○ UVM - \$17m – National University Transportation Center
  - 47 ○ New England Transportation Institute - \$1m

48 There are 9 or 10 regional University Transportation Centers nationwide. There are universities  
49 in almost every state that receive federal dollars for transportation research.

1  
2 This is a very good bill for Vermont, but we have to prepare for the next transportation bill  
3 knowing we will get less. Key outstanding issues: actual obligation limitation (historically -90%)  
4 still uncertain; several earmark projects now have less federal participation than before (80/20  
5 instead of 90/10); local participation in matching funds; state match availability. She did note  
6 that it is way too early to suggest that earmarks will be sent back to Washington because we  
7 can't match these funds.

8  
9 State funding challenges:

- 10 • Match for increased federal money (\$12.3m FY07; \$14.6m- FY08; \$14.4m – FY09 and  
11 \$11.5m in FY10). There is no discussion of increasing local match at this point.
- 12 • Base transportation needs are growing faster than the transportation fund so even with the  
13 new bill we have a shortfall each year;
- 14 • Unmet needs - the total FY06 budget is \$342m; the current need is \$464m and estimated  
15 need in FY09 is \$531m;

16  
17 Sec. Terrill has been meeting with joint fiscal committee as well as the transportation committee  
18 chairs. For FY06 they recommend \$5m of state dollars to match \$20m in federal funds. It'll  
19 allow VTrans to advance other projects in the spring. Conversations are just beginning about  
20 where the state match will come from. There will not be any gas tax; DMV fee bill is due to be  
21 up-so there will be dollars from that; she expects a hybrid of solutions; is it time for disincentives  
22 for gas guzzler purchases (only for future purchases). When asked if there is discussion for  
23 possibility of expanding the bond bank, Sec. Terrill feels bonding will not work. It's a loan but  
24 you need the revenue to pay it back. Bonding only helps do it sooner. She also noted that we  
25 have to be sure we can handle the construction of these not only with personnel at VTrans, but  
26 construction community. Chris Cole noted that FTA regulations allow public transportation  
27 entities to use other federal funds, such as Medicaid, as eligible match to draw down federal  
28 funds. It was noted that this is one of the only times you can use federal dollars to match federal  
29 dollars.

30  
31 In summary, SAFETEA-LU increases Vermont's FHWA funding by about \$61m per year; state  
32 funds needed for increased federal funds and base budget growth needs averages about \$19m per  
33 year for the next four years; transportation needs far exceed available funds. There are just not  
34 enough dollars to fund everything we need, and this is not unique to Vermont.

35  
36 Bob Penniman noted that he found a publication called "Financial Planning for Small and  
37 Medium MPOs" and he had copies made for each member.

38  
39 7. b. Bill Knight presented a four-page document that gives planning issues for MPOs in  
40 SAFETEA-LU. This bill builds on the last one so a lot of the language didn't change. For work  
41 underway, we can keep doing what we're doing, but if we do adjust to the new bill we have to  
42 adjust to everything. The TIP and STIP will now be four-year documents (instead of 3 years).  
43 Transportation plans now have to consider environmental mitigation. We must also consult 'as  
44 appropriate' state and local agencies responsible for land use management, natural resources,  
45 environmental protection, conservation, and historic preservation. Some may require new  
46 regulations. There must be consistency of plan with planned growth and development plan. One  
47 could argue that is the regional plan. Public participation: our general feeling is that the Public  
48 Participation Plan we adopted two years ago is broad enough to meet requirements, but we'll  
49 need to do something specific for the 2030 MTP. We are now required to use visualization

1 techniques in plans and TIP development and we must publicize on the world wide web, which  
2 we already do. Section 1007 says that states must reimburse MPOs within 30 days. This has not  
3 been a problem for us. Page 4 money issues. FHWA – funding for MPOs sent from 1% to  
4 1.25%. FTA formula is complicated so he didn't discuss that.

5  
6 He included a chart that shows the planning funds we'll expect over the period of the bill. We'll  
7 get more planning dollars, but will have trouble with annual local match. A lengthy discussion  
8 ensued about this being the time when members need to approach their elected officials about  
9 increasing the local match. We've been overly cautious about increasing them over the years.  
10 We should emphasize the fact that our local dollars are used to leverage federal dollars and  
11 present a case to the communities. This is also the time where the MPO may want to set policies  
12 about where they spend these planning dollars – on the communities or affiliated organizations.  
13 Jeff Carr said there is a finance committee meeting next Tuesday and we'll try to come up with a  
14 strategy for FY07 local match issue. Bill Knight is working on some scenarios to get to the  
15 Finance Committee for next week.

16  
17 It was noted that Christine Forde left everyone the official copy of the FY06-08 TIP.

18  
19 Bob Penniman noted when we approved the TIP, at FTA's request, we zeroed out dollars for  
20 preventative maintenance for CCTA pending reauthorization. We will make the administrative  
21 amendment when those dollars are known. Chris Cole said one of the upward pressures they are  
22 feeling is the recent increase in fuel prices. Two weeks ago they were buying diesel at  
23 \$2.30/gallon and they are looking at a \$321,000 deficit in their fuel budget (it was \$1.41/gallon  
24 when they developed the budget). The funding Bob was talking about is in the capital bill,  
25 \$500,000 would be preventative maintenance. We have two options to provide this funding, 1) if  
26 the constraint level is raised for the MPO or 2) a project on the current TIP slips and the MPO  
27 can then administratively change that. They need to get that funding soon, or they may have to  
28 cut back service on some of the routes.

29  
30 When asked if ridership has increased since fuel prices have risen, Chris Cole said dramatically.  
31 The LINK express to Montpelier has increased 108% since August 19<sup>th</sup> so that they have  
32 standees, which is not good on a 55mph route. There are standees on many of the routes right  
33 now. On October 17<sup>th</sup> they'll be starting service to St. Albans, using a grant from VTrans.  
34 However, it's only one bus and they already have 200 inquires from St. Albans. All long  
35 commuter bus service they offer has doubled since gas prices have increased. Chris Cole said  
36 when they planned the St. Albans route they couldn't use the St. Albans or Georgia park and ride  
37 lots because they were full. They have to lease space at the Highgate Shopping Center at Exit 20  
38 and Collins-Perley at Exit 19 so commuters can park. There is room at the commuter parking lot  
39 at Exit 17. Discussion continued about gas prices going up.

#### 40 41 8. 2030 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Advisory Committee Operating Procedures.

42 This is for discussion only. Peter Keating has prepared operating procedures for the MTP  
43 Advisory Committee. He spoke to members in July about the timeline for that process. We  
44 envision 18 months to completion. In the operating procedures we are proposing a committee of  
45 12 vs. 20. There are some changes because of the new Transportation Bill, but they're pretty  
46 minor. We will have extensive public involvement like last time. We'll have several meetings  
47 with interest groups that are not represented on the advisory committee. This is definitely an  
48 update of our 2025 MTP. Tom Buckley congratulated staff on the name change of the  
49 committee because it had been a self-fulfilling prophecy last time. Jeff Carr said the board has to

1 have more ownership of the plan this time too. Bill Knight asked members to give comments to  
2 Peter Keating and we'll take it to the Joint Executive Committee meeting to discuss this with the  
3 RPC.

4  
5 9. CCMPO Annual Meeting. The annual meeting will be held on October 19, from 6-9 p.m.  
6 with registration at 5:45 p.m. at the DoubleTree Hotel. We put an announcement in the last  
7 newsletter. And will do a concentrated mailing with RSVP in the next week or so. We'll focus  
8 on our legislators and Congressional delegation. This will be a celebration with a very brief  
9 business meeting. We're looking for suggestions for an entertaining keynote speaker. There will  
10 be a cash bar, with heavy hors d'oeuvres. We'll need folks to RSVP and there will be a \$10 per  
11 person charge.

12  
13 10. Strategic Plan. Virginia Clarke reported that it's proceeding slowly. We need to finalize the  
14 material we received already and the committee members are reviewing the document and trying  
15 to extract information and come up with draft vision, mission and goals, and then decide where  
16 to proceed from there. The expanded committee hasn't really met yet, but hopefully we'll  
17 continue soon.

18  
19 11. Executive Director Search Update. As everyone knows, we hired Scott Johnstone as the  
20 new Executive Director beginning the first week of October. Bill Knight will stay through  
21 December for a transition. They'll meet next week to see who should be doing what.

22  
23 12. Executive Director's Report. Bill Knight emailed his report two days ago.

24  
25 13. Committee Reports. There were none.

26  
27 14. Other business. There was nothing brought up.

28  
29 15. Members' Items. Rick Moulton noted that it is important for the UVM Transportation  
30 Center and the CCMPO to work together. Bob Penniman said the University and Sen. Jeffords  
31 worked very hard to get UVM to be chosen as one of the ten National Transportation Centers  
32 and it'll position the university for bigger and better things. The Volpe Center at MIT had been  
33 carved out as a direct recipient of U.S. DOT funds. There are many universities doing research  
34 at different levels. Sec. Terrill said VTrans has already talked to people at the university about  
35 this and they will continue to speak with new MPO director about this.

36  
37 JIM CONDOS MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN AT 9:18 P.M. JEFF CARR SECONDED  
38 AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

39  
40 Respectfully submitted,

41  
42  
43  
44 Bernadette Ferenc, Executive Assistant