

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

5 Date: Wednesday, April 18, 2007  
6 Time: 7:00 p.m.  
7 Place: CCMPO Offices; 30 Kimball Avenue, South Burlington, VT 05403  
8 Present: Andy Montroll, Burlington Jeff McDonald, Charlotte  
9 Jeff Carr, Essex (Sec-Treas.) Dale Arango, Essex Junction  
10 Andrea Morgante, Hinesburg Rob Zimmerman, Huntington Alt.  
11 Bob Penniman, Jericho (Chair) Ken Nolan, Milton  
12 Virginia Clarke, Richmond Jim Dudley, Shelburne  
13 Tom Buckley, Westford George Gerecke, Williston  
14 Mike O'Brien, Winooski (Vice-Chair) Amy Bell, VTrans Planning Coor.  
15 Ex-Officio: Chris Jolly, FHWA  
16 Others: Matthew Langham, VTrans Dr. Lisa Aultman-Hall, UVM UTC  
17 Ken Robie, VTrans Special Projects Rich Tetreault, VTrans  
18 Staff: Scott Johnstone, Executive Director Peter Keating, Sr. Trans. Planner  
19 Dave Roberts, Sr. Trans. Planner Susan Smichenko, Sr. Trans. Planner  
20 Eleni Churchill, Sr. Trans. Planner Daryl Benoit, Transportation Planner  
21 Bernadette Ferenc, Exec. Assistant  
22

23 The meeting was called to order at 7:10 p.m. by the Chair, Bob Penniman.  
24

25 1. Changes to the Agenda. There were none.  
26

27 2. Public Comment Period. There were none.  
28

29 3. Action on Consent Agenda. There were four items on the consent agenda: 2008 UPWP  
30 update; TIP amendment for CCTA buses; TIP amendment for new enhancements; and Project  
31 Prioritization Update. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY GEORGE  
32 GERECKE, TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA. MOTION CARRIED  
33 UNANIMOUSLY.  
34

35 4. Approval of Minutes. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JIM DUDLEY,  
36 TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MARCH 21, 2007 WITH CORRECTIONS IF ANY. A  
37 clarification was made to line 44 on page 1 – change “while still can at reasonable cost” to  
38 “which still can be done at a reasonable cost.” MOTION CARRIED WITH JERICHO,  
39 SHELBURNE AND ESSEX JUNCTION ABSTAINING.  
40

41 5. Executive Director’s Report. The report was sent electronically yesterday. Scott distributed a  
42 chart showing the steps we’ve outlined for CCMPO/CCRPC facilities planning. Scott also noted  
43 that there are a lot of projects being completed in various communities.  
44

45 6. Presentation – Lisa Aultman-Hall, University Transportation Center (UTC). Bob Penniman  
46 described the uniqueness and the catch we made with the designation of UVM as a UTC and  
47 after a very exhaustive search, to obtain Dr. Aultman-Hall as the Executive Director. He noted  
48 that she is also well respected internationally in the biking community. Dr. Aultman-Hall gave a

1 slide presentation beginning with a short history of the UTC and the status of staffing and  
2 fellows. UVM UTC is one of only 10 centers with \$16 M and we have to think of that as seed  
3 money for something bigger. She described how the UTC functions in a multimodal  
4 transportation system. They want it to be a multidisciplinary hub as a research center. USDOT  
5 requires a theme which was chosen before she arrived – “Sustainable systems and advanced  
6 technologies for Northern Communities.” They’ve decided instead of doing many small  
7 projects, they’d do a few larger projects that will make an impact. They’ve decided on four  
8 signature projects:

- 9 1. Integrated Transportation and Land Use Models: Complex systems approaches and  
10 advanced policy applications.
- 11 2. Emissions and Performance of Alternative Vehicles in Northern Climates.
- 12 3. Sustainable Transportation for Tourism.
- 13 4. Non-motorized Transportation, Livability and Isolation in Northern Climates.

14  
15 Scott Johnstone noted that we have been welcomed by Lisa to work right along with them at the  
16 UTC. We’re co-hosting workshops this year that will help both groups: Innovative Financing in  
17 June and a TDM workshop in September. Dave Roberts has been involved in the transportation  
18 modeling project and we already work with them on a weekly basis. We’ll have the benefit of  
19 being the playground for the models that’ll be tried out in our region, and we will benefit greatly.  
20 Dr. Aultman-Hall answered questions for members. There was a brief discussion about  
21 matching these funds and she noted that they have agreed that they won’t let the match drive the  
22 research. For more information, people can go to their website at

23 [www.uvm.edu/transportationcenter](http://www.uvm.edu/transportationcenter)  
24

25 7. Presentation – Ken Robie, VTrans, Circ-Williston Update. Rich Tetreault, Director of  
26 Program Development, said some of the feedback they’ve gotten on this project is that they need  
27 to come here and let us know where they are on this project. He described some of the activities  
28 the Agency has been working on with this EIS. Silence can be deadly in creating rumors and  
29 hearing bits and pieces as it’s been delivered through the Road to Affordability and the STIP  
30 process, which may generate some concerns through interpretation. He wanted to make it very  
31 clear that the Agency and FHWA are very committed to this project. There is a need. The  
32 Purpose and Need has been outlined and it is critical for them to build a bulletproof decision on  
33 what the best treatment for that Purpose and Need will be; and they’re working hard on it. He  
34 likened the EIS process to a science project. As you get into it, the more you uncover and as  
35 you’re working on it the original timeline and the level of investment get expanded. This  
36 Agency is doing a real good job in leading the way and making sure we have a bulletproof  
37 decision when it comes. During this process they’ve been getting legal interpretations and input  
38 not only from their Agency, but from FHWA. There are things here they need to review closely  
39 before they roll it out there and that was the reason they were quiet.  
40

41 Ken Robie is the Project Manager for the Circ Highway. They came out of the screening with  
42 eight alternatives, plus the no-build. They completed design workshops in February 2006. Then  
43 they took that information to get detailed analysis of each alternative. In the process they created  
44 two more alternatives – an interchange at US Route 2 and interchange reconfiguration at  
45 Mountain View Road. They created technical reports for all 11 alternatives. A cumulative  
46 impact workshop was held in September 2006. They had hoped to hold additional workshops in  
47 November, but did not have the necessary information. They have that information now. They  
48 hope to have additional public information workshops to discuss the results of the technical

1 reports by the end of May. Shortly after that they hope to have a draft EIS out for public review  
2 and comment. They're unsure how long it'll take after the Draft EIS until a final decision. Rich  
3 Tetreault said when it comes to the review process, it's important for all stakeholders (EMS,  
4 public safety, business community, municipalities, etc) to put their comments on letterhead,  
5 which will be very useful when they're trying to deliver their position for the record of decision.  
6 Ken Robie said folks should not assume anything, even though it's been around for a long time,  
7 so all comments and opinions should be included. When Jeff McDonald asked for ballpark  
8 dates, Ken Robie said they hope to hold the public meetings at the end of May and issue the  
9 Draft EIS a month or two after that. Once the Draft EIS is issued, there is a 45-day review  
10 period and depending on how long it takes to address the comments, it could take two weeks or  
11 six months. The process for the final EIS is where they determine the preferred alternative; and  
12 there is a somewhat shorter process for FHWA to give us a Record of Decision, which then  
13 memorializes that decision for the EIS. They hope by a year from now, it'll be wrapped up.  
14

15 When Virginia Clarke asked if the final EIS always contains one alternative, Ken Robie said yes  
16 to his knowledge. Chris Jolly said a question at the last TAC meeting was "Will the draft EIS  
17 that goes out to the public for comment have a preferred alternative?" His understanding is that  
18 the draft may not, but the final EIS document has to have a preferred alternative identified.  
19 Virginia Clarke asked if they're hoping from the draft, which has several alternatives, that the  
20 responses somehow get down to one. Chris Jolly said yes. The preferred alternative will be one  
21 of those in the draft that goes out for public comment. He said there are other EIS's in the state  
22 that did have the preferred alternative listed in the Draft EIS. Bob Penniman said typically there  
23 is a short list at the draft level, not eleven. Ken Robie noted that normally a short list of  
24 alternatives may be 3 or 4 and this one had 8-10. There is the potential that some of the  
25 alternatives that were short listed may be determined that they don't meet the Purpose and Need  
26 and it would be stated in the draft that they would not be considered further. Ken Nolan said  
27 his understanding is that the Draft EIS will not have a preferred alternative and that it'll take up  
28 to a year to get to a short list, and then VTrans would have to process it. Ken Robie said this is  
29 the short list, albeit a long short list, so all these alternatives would be presented and compared to  
30 one another and to the no build alternative in the draft. Only one of those will go in the final  
31 EIS. When Ken Nolan suggested that when VTrans issues the Draft EIS, they will know what  
32 their preferred alternative is, Ken Robie said no. Ken Nolan said if you can turn it around in two  
33 weeks after receiving comments, presumably you already know what the answer is, subject to  
34 people telling you different information. Ken Robie said they know what all the facts are, but  
35 the public comments play an important role and the public is not just John Smith, a neighbor, but  
36 the MPO, RPC, Town of Essex, Town of Williston, etc. Andy Montroll asked what process  
37 VTrans will follow to get it down to one. Ken Robie said they'll look at which one best meets  
38 the Purpose and Need, reduces congestion, improves mobility, improves safety, reduces truck  
39 traffic on local roads in project area and isn't outweighed by the negative impacts.  
40

41 Jeff Carr said if you say you know the facts now, what is prohibiting you from putting forth a  
42 preferred alternative, which would at least direct the discussion so you wouldn't have to wait 6, 9  
43 or 12 months to come to a preferred alternative. Rich Tetreault said when the information is  
44 presented in the draft document, you'll have a matrix of the impacts, and by observation you'll  
45 be able to see higher levels alternatives and ones that'll likely come through. During that period  
46 all the stakeholders can look at those indicators and provide input and you'll be able to evaluate  
47 by the process which can really trickle through. Jeff Carr still doesn't see why, if you have all  
48 the facts, you can't pick a preferred alternative to set a tone for the discussion so it doesn't go for

1 a year. Ken Robie said the process would be the same whether they're stated in the draft or the  
2 final EIS. The information is there and the public needs to see everything they created to date.  
3 They can't make a final decision until the Final EIS regardless.

4  
5 Virginia Clarke asked who will be doing the analysis from draft to final. Ken Robie said the  
6 consultant, FHWA, VTrans and other cooperating agencies (CCMPO, CCRPC, Corps of  
7 Engineers, etc) will be analyzing comments and develop the responses. When asked how the  
8 MPO will be involved, Ken Robie said through the MPO's comments and then through  
9 representation on the Process Management and Technical Advisory Committees for the project..  
10 Bob Penniman said one of the things we're struggling with is the Draft EIS coming out with 11  
11 alternatives, as opposed to someone taking accountability for shortlisting that down.. When  
12 asked if there are many draft EIS's that have that many, Chris Jolly was not sure, but said there is  
13 no requirement that a draft have a preferred alternative. There's been a lot involved in this and  
14 he feels decisions have been made to go forward with those 11 alternatives. He hasn't been  
15 involved personally, but he knows it wasn't done lightly. Ken Robie noted the original list of  
16 alternatives was 60, the long list was 23 alternatives and the short list is 8 (now 10). He noted  
17 that Louis Berger has done a lot of these EIS's across the country and they've never had this  
18 many alternatives. This project is under extreme scrutiny and you have to have a good reason to  
19 throw an alternative out. You can't just look at it arbitrarily and eliminate it. They may pare it  
20 down before the draft EIS, but they have to document when they eliminate an alternative. Ken  
21 Nolan asked if there is an analysis that goes on after the draft EIS other than review the  
22 comments. Ken Robie said it depends on the comment. When they put out the draft it's their  
23 feeling that it's the best. Ken Nolan said if you've done all of your analysis, you must have  
24 framed a hierarchy of what is the best and the lowest and why you're leaving 11 out there for  
25 them is just inviting another 2-3 years of debate on the 11 alternatives. It seems as though there  
26 ought to be some guidance from the people doing the work as to what they think the decision  
27 ought to be and not open Pandora's box. Ken Robie said the process after the Draft EIS will be  
28 the same whether they have a preferred alternative or not. The information is the same If they  
29 put out a preferred alternative that'll be criticized and others will be promoted the same as if they  
30 don't It might focus the report but it's the same information. Rich Tetreault said all the  
31 alternatives are still on the table even if they pare it down. Ken Nolan said what he's hearing is  
32 that the consultant doesn't want to take responsibility for the work. They want the public to  
33 make the decision. Ken Robie said ultimately it's FHWA and VTrans decision and it's the  
34 consultant's job to give them the facts. The whole intent of the EIS is to inform the decision  
35 makers. Bob thanked them for coming.

36  
37 8. Strategic Planning Proposal. Virginia Clarke said in the packet members received  
38 organization chart and proposed updates to the bylaws. In 1998 when the MPO and RPO joined  
39 together and prepared new bylaws, they envisioned a five-year review of the structure to see if  
40 all was working. In 2005 they began the process. In May 2005 they started with stakeholders  
41 and staff interviews and held a retreat for board and staff in June. The Strategic Planning  
42 Committee then worked with this information. The goal was to take that information and come  
43 up with things that would help us develop a better organization, etc. Some things that came out  
44 of this happened naturally with changes in staff, etc. We did adopt a vision and mission last  
45 year, which she hopes will be put on our website. They then looked at updating the bylaws and  
46 looking at the structure of the organization. She reviewed some of the comments that came up in  
47 the retreat and interviews. One comment was that we were reactive rather than proactive, so we  
48 developed a Regional Initiatives Committee (RIC). With the new structure we felt we'll be more

1 proactive. Eighteen out of 28 stakeholders listed more emphasis on public transportation if  
2 money was not an object. We have since formed the Public Transportation Committee that now  
3 meets monthly. The committee structure had comments all over the place. Some felt there were  
4 too few; others felt there were too many. What we ended up with looks like more committees,  
5 but they're much better defined with job descriptions and we are hoping to involve all board  
6 members on these committees. We've reduced board meetings from 12 to 9 to better use  
7 members' time, and to use the committees more effectively. Having board members on the  
8 committees will allow us to improve development of documents, such as UPWP. The role of the  
9 TAC had been debated, and it has been determined that the TAC serves a very useful purpose.  
10 We renamed it the "Transportation Advisory Committee" rather than "Technical". We want to  
11 create more communication between the TAC and the board so we recommend a board member  
12 be appointed to the TAC to represent the board's interests rather than a particular community's  
13 interest. Some things they didn't work on were education and orientation for board members.  
14 She feels that will fit in with new staff efforts under the auspices of those committees. We need  
15 to continue to work on our relationships with VTrans, the legislature, CCRPC, etc. Public  
16 engagement was another area we didn't really come up with a fool proof method. Each  
17 committee with staff support will do public outreach. Communication between board members  
18 and TAC members and their towns should be ongoing as part of the reinvigoration of board  
19 members. Weighting of votes was looked at but we feel there were many more ramifications,  
20 and at this point it was not an easy question to deal with and nothing was so seriously out of  
21 balance that we couldn't wait until the next Census.

22  
23 Scott Johnstone said we didn't want to surprise board members or the communities so we  
24 decided to present this tonight and have you talk with your communities and then next month we  
25 can have a discussion and decide whether we want to warn these for a public hearing in June. He  
26 noted that we eliminated the appendices – we incorporated them into the body of the bylaws.  
27 The Finance Committee needs to be removed from the org chart as a standing committee because  
28 it serves at the pleasure of the Executive Committee.

29  
30 Ken Nolan said he has had discussions with his board about these changes and Milton has  
31 thought long and hard about the changes. He raised the voting issue two years ago and waited  
32 patiently for the strategic planning process and is now being told to wait another 3 years. He  
33 said this is not acceptable to them. He sat on the RPC and has seen how the committees work.  
34 He feels this will dilute the Board's ability to take action. He feels this is unacceptable and if we  
35 go forward with them, Milton will vote no. He will likely have a proposed amendment for the  
36 voting structure when we take this issue up. Bob Penniman said members need to review this  
37 document with the selectboards. Members were asked to submit comments at least a week prior  
38 to the next meeting, so we can have a document on the table.

39  
40 9. Western Corridor Study Resolution. Scott Johnstone said members have a draft resolution in  
41 from of them that we are asking the RPCs along the Route 7 corridor (Franklin/Grand Isle;  
42 Addison; Rutland; Bennington) to sign. Through the earmark for the Gateway Rural  
43 Improvement Project there is an analysis for the corridor required to understand how to best  
44 maximize the use of the Route 7 corridor and the rail corridor as if they were one to move freight  
45 and people on the western side of Vermont. The regions were asked to play the lead role with  
46 CCMPO to project manage it. We wanted to make sure all the parties that were in the study  
47 were in it to stay, so he developed a resolution to make sure all seven organizations understood  
48 a) that the project is going on; b) the organizational structure; and c) what role they'll play.

1 Eleni Churchill will project manage it on our side. All the executive directors and VTrans have  
2 worked this out. It probably doesn't have any legal standing, but it does raise awareness of the  
3 project. Six teams have sent in proposals on the project. It does cover the entire corridor from  
4 Canadian border to the Massachusetts border. There are a lot of issues in the corridor but it'll  
5 take what we've done on Route 2 and Route 15 and do it on a 125 mile corridor. JIM DUDLEY  
6 MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY KEN NOLAN, TO APPROVE THE DRAFT  
7 WESTERN CORRIDOR STUDY PARTICIPATION RESOLUTION.

8  
9 Tom Buckley was curious as to what the deliverable will be. Scott said the deliverable will be a  
10 corridor study that prioritizes what improvements will be necessary for rail and highway  
11 corridors along the distance. He gave some examples of what that might include, such as  
12 transload facilities along the corridor. It'll include transit, truck, rail, economic, and natural  
13 resource issues as well. It'll contain a whole suite of next steps and ventures both  
14 organizationally and project driven of different sizes and types. Bob said the spirit of the  
15 reauthorization was not just a rail focus and he feels this will bring equity to modes in there for  
16 movement of people, goods and services. Scott said in our scope of work we had some discrete  
17 areas of work and the proposals give suggestions on how to do that. We won't know much  
18 more until the proposals are reviewed on May 1<sup>st</sup>. The reason to have the RPCs engaged is to  
19 make sure all types of folks get involved and engaged. Andy Montroll said it'll be an important  
20 study for the state, especially for rail, but he also sees this as a huge project for the CCMPO to  
21 take on. Do we have the ability to do a project of this magnitude without it having an impact on  
22 other projects? Scott is comfortable we can pull this off. We are still trying to hire a new  
23 engineer to help with safety analysis, etc. and if we do that we'll be fine. Jeff Carr noted that  
24 this position is specific for this project and when it's done there is no guarantee there'll be more  
25 work. Jim Dudley asked if there are issues and differences that'll tear us apart. Scott said there  
26 will be differences of opinion, but our job is to make sure the consultant will do their job and  
27 make recommendations. We're just managing the project, so that's why we have RPCs involved  
28 because we don't want to get involved in public meetings in Pittsford, Brandon, etc. We'd rather  
29 have the individual RPCs deal with their regions. When Andrea Morgante asked if bike/ped will  
30 be noted, Scott said all modes, people, goods and services. VOTE: MOTION CARRIED  
31 UNANIMOUSLY.

32  
33 10. GRIP – Memorandum of Agreement (MOA). Scott Johnstone gave a brief history. We  
34 have six proposals to review on our western corridor study. It happens to go through the Rutland  
35 region. VTrans has just received proposals to build some infrastructure and GRIP is a partner  
36 under one of the proposals. These two projects are distinct and our project will assume these  
37 four projects are constructed. So, to avoid the appearance of a conflict of interest, we will table  
38 action on the MOA until next month. JEFF MCDONALD MADE A MOTION TO TABLE  
39 THE RESOLUTION. MIKE O'BRIEN SECONDED. Jeff McDonald said the CCMPO should  
40 be referred to as CCMPO in all instances. He also said GRIP should be defined at the beginning  
41 of the document. When it was noted that GRIP just stands for GRIP – nothing else, Andrea  
42 Morgante suggested we define who they are even if we just add Rutland before it. VOTE:  
43 MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY TO TABLE ACTION ON THE MOA.

44  
45 11. Pedestrian/Bicycle Committee Charter. Scott Johnstone said our bike/ped plan is five years  
46 old and it's time to update it. Peter Keating said the committee of probable people has met and  
47 we prepared a charter as we do for other committees. The main focus is to oversee the update of  
48 the bike/ped plan. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE PEDESTRIAN/

1 BICYCLE COMMITTEE CHARTER. TOM BUCKLEY SECONDED. Ken Nolan wouldn't  
2 change the committee structure, but feels we need to include municipal planners in the process.  
3 There was a brief discussion about why this committee would report to the TAC rather than the  
4 RIC. Scott noted that since the proposed bylaws are not approved, this is the only plan it fits  
5 right now. George Gerecke wondered if we shouldn't have some flexibility in the membership  
6 and Scott suggested adding the word "generally" so it'll read "the members shall generally be as  
7 follows:" GEORGE GERECKE MADE A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT TO ADD THE WORD  
8 "GENERALLY". JEFF AND TOM AGREED. Amy Bell wondered if the VTrans planning  
9 coordinator and FHWA should be included on the committee. It was agreed that the amendment  
10 would cover that. VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THE  
11 AMENDED MOTION.

## 12. Committee Reports.

- 14 a. Executive Committee. The draft minutes of the April 4, 2007 meeting were included in the  
15 packet.
- 16 b. Technical Advisory Committee. Peter Keating briefly reviewed the written report. Scott  
17 explained that we really want to have a verbal TAC report at each board meeting rather than  
18 relying on just minutes, to improve communication between the two bodies. George Gerecke  
19 added that the last item on the report is that Mike Coates asked Tom Moreau of the  
20 Chittenden Solid Waste District to come and talk about the transportation impacts of hauling  
21 trash. Scott noted that the reason we asked VTrans to talk about the Circ EIS was because  
22 the TAC was really frustrated with the lack of communication.
- 23 c. Strategic Planning Committee. Discussed earlier.
- 24 d. Public Transportation Committee. Tom Buckley said the committee has decided to meet  
25 monthly rather than every six weeks. They've taken up the topic of TOD which is one way  
26 we can understand the implications of how land use and transportation are linked, and how  
27 planning in towns happens at the infrastructure level. Tim Fluck of the CCRPC came to talk  
28 to them. The other thing they did was review what CCTA is doing to upgrade their buses.  
29 And, finally while the legislature was meeting, Sonny Audette kept them updated.
- 30 e. Finance Committee. Jeff Carr noted that members received February income statements. A  
31 couple things on their agenda includes helping staff with considering project management  
32 software to make sure our overhead dollars result in more activity by our consultants to get  
33 more work product. We continue to struggle with the issue of how to develop a fund balance  
34 to deal with months where our funds get very low, without putting undue burden on the  
35 towns. We look for input from board members.
- 36 f. CCRPC. We will be scheduling a joint executive committee meeting shortly.
- 37 g. MTP Advisory Committee. Ken Nolan said the committee is on hiatus. Since VTrans  
38 announced the Road to Affordability, we don't know if there are implications on funding  
39 assumptions for the 20-year window. Since this was an update, would a change in funding  
40 end up being a rewrite. Amy Bell will have the answer by the end of April. When asked  
41 what the question is, Scott noted the question of funding levels to assume for the timeline of  
42 the MTP.

## 43 13. Members' Items:

- 45 a. Virginia Clarke brought up park and ride lots, and the Richmond lot in particular. VTrans  
46 recently entered dialog with the town about the expansion without involvement of the  
47 CCMPO. In the MPO study done in 2004 that laid out the process, the expansion of  
48 Richmond did not happen until lots were built in Williston, Colchester and Burlington.

1 Richmond does not want to be the parking lot of Chittenden County. There is very limited  
2 land for development there and they'd rather not use it for a parking lot. Scott reported that  
3 the MPO is initiating a Williston/ VTrans meeting on the Williston park and ride issue. Both  
4 parties agree it's time to get back together and we're trying to play a convener role. He  
5 hopes the meeting will take place in 2-3 weeks. The Senate Transportation Committee tried  
6 to hold a hearing on the Williston park and ride, but it was held on February 15 so it was  
7 sparsely attended because of the Valentine's Day storm. Bob noted that CATMA has empty  
8 buses coming back from Milton. There is room in the Grand Union lot, but the zoning  
9 bylaws say they have to maintain so many spaces. Scott said Daryl is putting together a  
10 parking inventory of the entire county. Then we'll do an analysis to see where there may be  
11 excess parking and help communities change zoning to use it for leased lot park and rides. It  
12 was noted that each year we try to include one park and ride lot for scoping. Bob feels Exit  
13 14 will be defined by the Route 2 study.  
14

15 JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN AT 9:15 P.M. MIKE O'BRIEN SECONDED  
16 AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.  
17

18 Respectfully submitted,  
19

20  
21  
22 Bernadette Ferenc  
23 Executive Assistant

DRAFT