

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

5 Date: Wednesday, June 21, 2006  
6 Time: 7:00 p.m.  
7 Place: CCMPO Offices, 30 Kimball Avenue, South Burlington, VT 05403  
8 Present: Andy Montroll, Burlington Marc Landry, Colchester  
9 Dale Arango, Essex Junction Andrea Morgante, Hinesburg  
10 Bob Penniman, Jericho (Chair) Ken Nolan, Milton  
11 Meg Freeburn, Richmond Alternate Jim Dudley, Shelburne  
12 Jim Condos, South Burlington Marc Maheux, Underhill  
13 George Gerecke, Williston Mike O'Brien, Winooski (V-Chair)  
14 Polly McMurtry, VTrans  
15 Ex-Officio: Chris Jolly, FHWA  
16 Others: Matthew Langham, VTrans  
17 Staff: Scott Johnstone, Exec. Dir.; Peter Keating, Sr. Trans. Planner  
18 Christine Forde, Sr. Trans. Planner Dave Roberts, Sr. Trans. Planner  
19 Susan Smichenko, Sr. Trans. Planner Bernadette Ferenc, Exec. Asst.  
20

21 The meeting was called to order at 7:08 p.m. by the chair, Bob Penniman. He welcomed Meg  
22 Freeburn, the Richmond alternate.  
23

24 1. Changes to the agenda. There was an amendment to add an item 11 i. He needs to appoint  
25 the chair of the MTP committee with approval of the board.  
26

27 2. Public Comment period. There were no members of the public present.  
28

29 3. Action on Consent Agenda. There was one item on the consent agenda for a minor TIP  
30 amendment for I-89 culvert. GEORGE GERECKE MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JIM  
31 DUDLEY, TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA. MOTION CARRIED  
32 UNANIMOUSLY.  
33

34 4. Approval of Minutes. JIM DUDLEY MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES  
35 OF MAY 17, 2006 WITH CHANGES AS APPROPRIATE. MIKE O'BRIEN SECONDED.  
36 The following clarifications were made to page 3: line 20 changed to read... so this creates the  
37 appearance of a large increase that is really not an increase." And line 41 change "this" to  
38 "the budget" would add 2 employees... MOTION CARRIED WITH ABSTENTIONS FROM  
39 MEG FREEBURN, DALE ARANGO AND JIM CONDOS.  
40

41 5. Executive Director's Report. Members received this electronically.  
42

43 6. Public Hearing for FY07 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). Staff prepared an errata  
44 sheet with some minor revisions agreed to by staff and VTrans over the last two days. These  
45 changes include:

- 46 • 3.03.3.1 Safe Routes to Schools – remove this line item from the UPWP. This will take out  
47 \$30,000 (\$24,000 federal and \$6,000 state) from the UPWP budget.
- 48 • Add a line item with \$63,000 (all federal) "below the line" for SR2S. (The staff hours  
49 associated with the above task will also be moved to this line). This will have a net effect on

1 the overall agency budget of adding \$33,000. (We had built the budget thinking 3 schools  
2 would be awarded funds at \$10,000/school and instead the state budgeted \$9,000/school and  
3 7 Chittenden County schools received awards-\$63,000).

- 4 • Task 3.15 Route 15 Corridor Plan – In the text, under Product 2, add the words “and  
5 conducting study” to the original language so that the product will read “Consultant under  
6 contract and conducting study.”
  - 7 • Task 3.17 Preliminary corridor analysis with Addison County – a new product was added to  
8 develop a scope of work before the activity is accomplished.
- 9 Scott Johnstone thought these were pretty straightforward and staff recommends you include  
10 them in the UPWP.

11  
12 The public hearing was opened at 7:15 p.m., but since there were no members of the public  
13 present, it was promptly closed.

14  
15 Scott Johnstone made it very clear that the version of the UPWP in the meeting package is the  
16 version that we may move to in future years. The one we’re voting on is the public hearing draft  
17 dated May 18, 2006. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION THAT THE FY07 ANNUAL  
18 WORK PLAN (UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM) PUBLIC HEARING DRAFT  
19 DATED MAY 18, 2006, BE AMENDED CONSISTENT WITH THE ERRATA SHEET  
20 PROVIDED AT OUR PLACE THIS EVENING AND COVERING MODIFICATIONS TO  
21 THE TEXT AND BUDGET OF THE WORK PROGRAM ITEMS INCLUDING SAFE  
22 ROUTES TO SCHOOLS, THE ROUTE 15 CORRIDOR STUDY AND THE PRELIMINARY  
23 CORRIDOR ANALYSIS WITH ADDISON COUNTY. GEORGE GERECKE SECONDED  
24 THE AMENDMENT. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

25  
26 MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT THE FY2007 ANNUAL WORK PLAN  
27 (UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM), PUBLIC HEARING DRAFT DATED MAY 18,  
28 2006 AS AMENDED, AND TO DIRECT THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO WORK WITH  
29 THE VERMONT AGENCY OF TRANSPORTATION TO PUT IN PLACE APPROPRIATE  
30 CONTRACTUAL INSTRUMENTS NECESSARY TO IMPLEMENT THIS PLAN. JIM  
31 DUDLEY SECONDED. VOTE:

32 Bolton - absent	Burlington – yes (4)	Charlotte – absent
33 Colchester – yes (2)	Essex Jct. – yes	Essex town – absent
34 Hinesburg – yes	Huntington – absent	Jericho – yes
35 Milton – yes	Richmond – yes	St. George – absent
36 Shelburne – yes	So. Burlington – yes (2)	Underhill – yes
37 Westford – absent	Williston – yes	Winooski – yes
38 VTrans – yes		

39 THE MOTION CARRIED WITH 18 OF 24 VOTES AND 12 OF 18 COMMUNITIES  
40 VOTING IN FAVOR. Six votes and six communities were absent.

41  
42 Jim Dudley noted that the process was different this year with public involvement and he feels  
43 the change was significant and favorable.

44  
45 8. FY07-10 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The action tonight would be to warn a  
46 public hearing for the TIP. Christine Forde reviewed a powerpoint presentation reminding  
47 members what the TIP is, what it does, and how it’s developed. She then described the  
48 information in the TIP document itself. She then referenced Table 1 in the meeting package  
49 which compares the FY06-08 TIP with the preliminary draft of the FY07-10 TIP. Table 2 lists

1 the comments from VTrans. There are three items that need to be discussed as VTrans disagrees  
2 with us. 1) I-89 Exit 12B. VTrans requests that all funding be removed. South Burlington  
3 requests we leave it. 2) VTrans then requested that the Burlington/Essex Passenger Rail and  
4 Feeder bus service be removed. 3) Williston Park and Ride – in the original draft of the TIP, we  
5 had presented ROW in FY08 and CON in FY09. The TAC made a motion to move funding for  
6 ROW and CON to FY07. Scott Johnstone noted that because there was disagreement on these 3  
7 items, we took them to the Executive Committee for their views. They feel it was not timely for  
8 the region to remove the funding for Exit 12B. Since there was no funding provided for the  
9 Burlington/Essex passenger rail and feeder bus service, we would like to maintain the  
10 opportunity to follow up on this after the Route 15 study. On the Williston Park and Ride, they  
11 felt the TAC was too aggressive in moving it all up into FY07, but that ROW in FY07 and CON  
12 in FY08 would show some aggressiveness, but be more realistic.

13  
14 Christine Forde distributed a memo for two items that just came up that we propose to add to the  
15 public hearing draft of the TIP. The first is to add \$126,000 in FY07 for implementation of  
16 Federal Safe Routes to School projects in Chittenden County. This will be funded with 100  
17 percent federal funds. The second is to add \$378,142 for CON in FY07 for Traffic Signal  
18 Improvements at the VT 15/VT 128 intersection. This is for additional pedestrian signals and  
19 construction of sidewalks and crosswalks in the intersection area.

20  
21 Jim Condos questioned page 14, and the interstate projects at Exit 14 where we say funding  
22 schedule to be determined. He thought they were 90/10 funding split. Discussion ensued that  
23 the funding for SAFETEA-LU earmarks was 80/20 split. This needs to be resolved because  
24 some feel interstate projects should not have any local funding. Staff will review the minutes of  
25 the special executive committee meeting with the secretary as to how we'll fund these Exit 14  
26 projects. It was explained that federal funds programming is always less than what is in the  
27 legislation – for example it was 85% in FY05, and 87.5% in FY06, so there is no way to know  
28 what that'll be for FY07, so we used 85%. Chris Jolly said the earmarks under high priority  
29 program are 80/20 rather than 90/10. The transportation improvement earmarks were funded at  
30 the program level they were put into. Scott Johnstone clarified that Jim Condos' concern is that  
31 whether it's 10 or 20%, it should be state funds and not local funds.

32  
33 Ken Nolan questioned whether moving Williston Park and Ride to FY07 will affect anything  
34 else. Christine Forde said it may affect FY07 because we had funding in there for FY09. When  
35 Bob Penniman noted this project has been on the books for many years, Ken said Milton has had  
36 projects in there for 10 years and he'd hate to see this jeopardize those. Christine Forde said the  
37 state did say that a site had not been selected. George Gerecke said the town is doing its own  
38 study to come up with a site before the TIP public hearing. He would argue to leave it in FY07  
39 although he feels that construction in FY08 might be more realistic. He'd like to warn the TIP  
40 as its worded now (\$150,000 for ROW and \$850,00 for construction). We could always change  
41 it in July.

42  
43 JIM CONDOS MADE A MOTION TO WARN FOR PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE JULY  
44 MEETING THE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR FY07-10, BOARD  
45 REVIEW DRAFT DATED JUNE 21, 2006 AND INCORPORATE THE MEMO OF JUNE 21,  
46 2006 TO THE BOARD ON SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOLS AND ROUTE 15/128  
47 IMPROVEMENTS. GEORGE GERECKE SECONDED. When Ken Nolan asked if that would  
48 include Williston Park and Ride with ROW and CON in FY07 as TAC voted or as executive  
49 committee recommended, Christine Forde said it includes the TAC recommendation. Board

1 members requested information on the two Exit 14 projects ahead of the hearing. It was noted  
2 that we'll warn this document and have information clarified for the hearing and then make  
3 changes on the night of the hearing. Scott Johnstone feels the Exit 14 projects are listed as  
4 SAFETEA-LU and are consistent with dialog we had with the Secretary. The note section might  
5 change to provide more clarification. VOTE: MOTION CARRIED WITH MILTON  
6 ABSTAINING.

7  
8 9. Prioritization of Projects. Christine Forde made a presentation about why prioritization is  
9 important and what the legislative requirement is. Two years ago the legislature required VTrans  
10 to prioritize every single project. The legislation states that prioritization must consider:

- 11 • The impact of the project on congestion and mobility conditions in the region.
- 12 • The availability, accessibility and usability of alternative routes.
- 13 • The functional importance of the highway or bridge as a link in the local, regional or state economy.
- 14 • The functional importance of the highway or bridge in the social and cultural life of the surrounding  
15 communities.
- 16 • Conformance to the local and regional plans.
- 17 • Local support for the project.

18 As part of this, VTrans required all RPCs and the MPO to prioritize the projects in their regions  
19 by program categories: roadway; traffic operations and safety; paving; interstate bridge; state  
20 bridge; town highway bridge; bike and pedestrian facilities; and park and ride facilities. VTrans  
21 prioritization considers technical factors such as traffic volumes, cost, sufficiency ratings and  
22 pavement condition (each category has specific criteria). CCMPO used slightly different  
23 scoring categories so we wouldn't double count the state's factors. These included economic  
24 vitality; safety and security; accessibility, mobility and connectivity; environment, energy and  
25 quality of life; preservation of existing system; and efficient system management. We'll provide  
26 our scores to VTrans and they'll count it as 20% of the total score. Christine Forde then  
27 presented the checklist format the committee developed for each project to be rated; and the  
28 scoring used. She noted that projects that scored highly using this methodology were:

- 29 • Projects that access regional activity centers, airport, tourism facilities.
- 30 • Projects that improve safety in a location with a documents safety problem.
- 31 • Bicycle/pedestrian facilities making intermodal or regional connections.
- 32 • Reconstruction projects with critical need.
- 33 • Improving corridors with significant congestion.

34  
35 When Ken Nolan asked where the first project that's in a community outside of the core is, it  
36 was noted that there are different categories, so it varies. Scott Johnstone noted that both the  
37 committee and the TAC recognize and agree that one thing that cannot be handled well in a  
38 prioritization system is the way its spread over the region. Through this process we have to set  
39 policy to artificially move a project from a more rural area up. The committee said we should  
40 have the system be what it will be, but have the board policy deal with the issues of disparity  
41 between urban and rural projects. The executive committee agreed it's an evolving process and  
42 we'll continue to refine it. Discussion continued. Christine Forde said the last couple of slides  
43 lay out how this might work in future years: In February the prioritization committee perform  
44 the initial scoring; March – scoring sheets distributed to towns through their TAC reps for  
45 comment and revision; April – preliminary prioritized project list presented to the TAC and  
46 Board with review by the prioritization committee; May – draft prioritized list presented to TAC  
47 and then board for endorsement. We are asking the board to endorse the FY07 prioritized  
48 project list, with any changes you feel appropriate, for submittal to VTrans; and, to endorse the  
49 methodologies in concept, acknowledging that further refinement will be made in future years.

1  
2 Jim Dudley asked if we turn this in as it's prioritized right now, does it affect our TIP or the  
3 work plan. Polly McMurtry said this is basically part of the state's capital budgeting process.  
4 George Gerecke said that one way to approach the conflict between rural and urban towns is a  
5 cost-benefit ratio. One of the things this prioritization does is deal with qualitative only because  
6 VTrans uses technical data in their evaluation and ours only counts for 20% of the score. He  
7 feels ultimately we ought to have a prioritization that includes both and send qualitative to the  
8 state but also have one that incorporates both technical and qualitative issues. Ken Nolan said  
9 Milton has a 10 year old project that is their #1 priority and it shows up last on our list. He  
10 asked that when we do this process next year that we send something to the towns to let them  
11 know when the committee will meet because his TAC rep only heard about it once list was done.  
12 Bob Penniman feels there is a project in Jericho and Underhill (Pleasant Valley Road) that  
13 doesn't sugar out either. He's feeling uncomfortable with this prioritization and feels we have  
14 time to work on it since it's only June. Polly McMurtry said VTrans asked for the list in June  
15 and every other region has submitted it. They start their budgeting process in the summer.  
16 Matthew Langham said it was left to the regions how to do the scoring. Discussion ensued about  
17 how the scoring was done. Scott Johnstone said the staff took a first shot at it and the committee  
18 and TAC reviewed it and many changes were made. Mike O'Brien said the Exec. Comm. had a  
19 discussion about the timing, but felt this will get something to the state now, and we'll work to  
20 get better for next year. We had discussed things like rural projects scoring lower and we have  
21 to decide how to handle them. Some members felt this methodology is significantly better than  
22 last year, but has a way to go. Others noted this will never be a perfect system. There will  
23 always be a discussion about urban vs. rural and we shouldn't get into that now. It's improved  
24 over where it was, but is not where it needs to be. JIM CONDOS MADE A MOTION THAT  
25 WE ENDORSE THE 2007 PRIORITIZED PROJECT LIST AND SUBMIT IT TO VTRANS.  
26 MARC LANDRY SECONDED. A very lengthy discussion ensued with some members  
27 concerned that if we send the list out as is, folks outside the region who have not had the benefit  
28 of this dialog would presume these are our priorities, rather than our TIP. Some felt it was better  
29 to be late and right rather than be on time and wrong. JIM CONDOS WITHDREW HIS  
30 MOTION. It was agreed to have staff review the scoring and add a column that would give  
31 points to projects in the TIP (those with momentum), as well as for where it falls in the TIP and  
32 whether there is funding associated with it, and bring it back for the July board meeting.

33  
34 10. Sidewalk Grantee's. Peter Keating reported that we have \$250,000 in federal funds  
35 available to the sidewalk program in FY 07. We received four applications for grant funds and  
36 the committee recommends that Shelburne – US Route 7-village to LaPlatte River Bridge  
37 (\$130,417) and Milton – Checkerberry Village to town core area (\$100,400) be fully funded.  
38 JIM CONDOS MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE SIDEWALK PROGRAM  
39 RECOMMENDATIONS AS PRESENTED BY STAFF. GEORGE GERECKE SECONDED.  
40 MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

41  
42 11. Committee Reports.  
43 a. Executive Committee. Draft minutes of the June 7, 2006 meeting were in the packet.  
44 b. Technical Advisory Committee. Meeting notes from June 6, 2006 were in the packet.  
45 c. Strategic Planning Committee. The committee is working on bylaws and structure.  
46 d. Public Transportation Committee. They've presented a draft policy for the board to review,  
47 but the Executive Committee ran out of time at their meeting.  
48 e. Finance Committee. We meet June 28, 2006 to continue work on benefits review and salary  
49 structure.

- 1 f. CCRPC. Tomorrow evening is the first public hearing on the regional plan.  
2 g. Regional Plan Review Committee. Nothing new to report.  
3 h. Nominating Committee. Jim Condos reported that Marc Landry and Dale Arango served  
4 with him on the nominating committee and they recommend that because of the many issues  
5 in front of us in the next year, like the MOU, that we continue with the officers currently  
6 serving: Bob Penniman, Chair; Mike O'Brien, Vice-Chair; Jeff Carr, Secretary-Treasurer;  
7 Virginia Clarke and Rick Moulton, At-Large. JIM CONDOS MADE A MOTION,  
8 SECONDED BY KEN NOLAN, TO ELECT THE SLATE OF OFFICERS AS PROPOSED.  
9 MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Bob Penniman noted that Scott has already  
10 proposed reducing the number of board meeting for FY07 and we've also talked about  
11 moving our meetings around to the communities again.  
12 i. Metropolitan Transportation Plan Advisory Committee. The committee will meet for the  
13 first time next week. The chair needs to appoint the committee chair, with board approval.  
14 Bob Penniman appointed Ken Nolan as chair. JIM DUDLEY MADE A MOTION TO  
15 APPROVE THE APPOINTMENT OF KEN NOLAN AS CHAIR OF THE MTP  
16 ADVISORY COMMITTEE, JIM CONDOS SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED  
17 UNANIMOUSLY.

18  
19 12. Members's items.

- 20 a. Andrea Morgante asked if we could begin a discussion on state road standards and whether  
21 the CCMPO has a role to play in looking at those and whether they really accomplish what  
22 we want as far as new ways of looking at transportation in our communities. Hinesburg  
23 would really like to do new things on Route 116, but all state standards go against everything  
24 they want to do to maintain their village. They want to make it pedestrian friendly, but  
25 everything has to maintain the speed and safety of the vehicles. She thinks it would benefit  
26 the whole state for the MPO to take on this task.

27  
28 MIKE O'BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MARC LANDRY, TO ADJOURN  
29 THE MEETING AT 9:20 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

30  
31 Respectfully submitted,

32  
33  
34 Bernadette Ferenc, Executive Assistant  
35