

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

5 Date: Wednesday, March 19, 2008
6 Time: 7:00 p.m
7 Place: CCMPO Offices; 30 Kimball Avenue, Suite 206; So. Burlington, VT 05403
8 Present: Andy Montroll, Burlington Jim Donovan, Charlotte Alternate
9 Marc Landry, Colchester Dale Arango, Essex Junction
10 Andrea Morgante, Hinesburg Mary Houle, Richmond
11 George Schiavone, Shelburne Alt. (8:00) Steve Owen, Underhill
12 George Gerecke, Williston Michael O'Brien, Winooski
13 Amy Bell, VTrans
14 Ex-Officio: Justin Dextrateur, CCRPC (7:15)
15 Others: Matthew Langham, VTrans
16 Staff: Scott Johnstone, Executive Director Peter Keating, Sr. Trans. Planner
17 Christine Forde, Sr. Trans. Planner David Roberts, Sr. Trans. Planner
18 Eleni Churchill, Sr. Trans. Planner Daryl Benoit, Trans. Planner/IT .
19 Bryan Davis, Trans. Planner Jason Charest, Trans. Engineer
20 Bernadette Ferenc, Exec. Assistant
21

22 The meeting was called to order at 7:08 p.m. by the Vice-Chair, Marc Landry. He welcomed
23 Andrea Morgante back after her injury in January. Ms. Morgante noted that she gained
24 experience as someone wheelchair bound and also dependent on others for rides.
25

26 1. Changes to the Agenda. Although we had a quorum based on voting power to conduct
27 business, we also need 10 communities voting in favor in order to approve the major TIP
28 amendments. We will postpone the public hearing until later in the meeting and if necessary
29 take a poll vote on the amendments.
30

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

33 3. Action on Consent Agenda. There were three minor TIP amendments regarding SSTA,
34 CCTA and Hinesburg. MIKE O'BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MARY
35 HOULE TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
36

37 4. Approval of Minutes. MARY HOULE MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES
38 OF JANUARY 16, 2008, WITH CORRECTIONS, IF ANY. JIM DONOVAN SECONDED.
39 Amy Bell asked to clarify Matthew Langham's statement on page 4, line 42 from "This project
40 will be in construction for next year," to "This project will have construction funds for next
41 year." The intent is to go to construction in that year, but that doesn't always happen. MOTION
42 CARRIED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS CORRECTED. ANDREA MORGANTE
43 ABSTAINED.
44

45 5. Executive Director's Report. Scott Johnstone noted that he sent out his monthly report
46 electronically. He did note that Williston and Milton have just voted to join CCTA and
47 Shelburne passed a \$1.1 million bond for sidewalk and bike path expansion. After a brief
48 discussion, it was agreed that we should put the Executive Director's report on our website in
49 addition to the full monthly progress report

1
2 7. Substantial Regional Impact (SRI) Transportation Definition for Regional Plan. Peter
3 Keating noted that there is a memo in the packet giving background. Under state planning
4 regulations, the RPC needs to develop SRI criteria to determine when the regional plan, rather
5 than a municipal plan, needs to be used in Act 250, Criterion 10. CCRPC asked the CCMPO to
6 help with the SRI for transportation. He noted that staff developed a very basic policy and
7 presented it to the TAC. They were not happy with it and asked a subcommittee to deal with
8 this. Peter noted that they developed criteria that would trigger a traffic impact study. They
9 agreed that a percentage would be better than an actual number. He further described rationale
10 for these criteria. Peter then reviewed the proposed language for the transportation SRI:

11 *A proposed development, including a new or upgraded transportation facility, that results in an*
12 *increase in the peak hour motor vehicle trips on one or more roadways of the Metropolitan*
13 *Transportation System (MTS) that meets or exceeds the thresholds of i. AND ii. of this*
14 *subsection.*

15 *i. An increase of*

16 *(a) 125 or more peak hour motor vehicle trips, if the affected MTS-roadway is located in an area*
17 *that has been designated under 24 VSA Chapter 76A to be a Downtown Development District,*
18 *Village Center District, New Town Center Development District, or Growth Center, or*

19 *(b) 75 or more peak hour motor vehicle trips, if the affected MTS roadway is located outside of*
20 *an area specified in i. (a) of this subsection.*

21 **AND**

22 *ii. An increase of five or more (5+%) percent in the peak hour motor vehicle trips on an MTS*
23 *intersection located in a municipality other than the municipality where the development is*
24 *proposed to be located*

25
26 Peter then described two actual Act 250 cases that happened in Chittenden County and how this would
27 have affected them. The Committee recommended 3%, but after considerable discussion at the TAC,
28 they decided to use 5%. Because of this threshold it would seldom be used. The only time it could
29 happen is if the regional plan and the town plan had a conflict AND the 5% was met, the regional plan
30 would take effect. Andy Montroll wondered what the point of doing this is if it would never really
31 happen. George Gerecke noted that this discussion took more time than any other item ever on their
32 agenda. The 5% was a compromise number. Scott Johnstone said one of the major reasons is probably
33 because of Vermont's historical perspective of wanting local control rather than having regional plan rule
34 a project. George Gerecke said another factor is that the transportation rarely triggers Act 250. Justin
35 Dextradeur said the onus is on the RPC because they have to approve each town plan so they should
36 address any issues of potential conflict. Andrea Morgante wondered whether this should have happened
37 at the board level since it's a policy decision. She's not sure the TAC should have been the one to deal
38 with it. Justin Dextradeur said the RPC is appreciative of the time the TAC put into this and feels it does
39 help them come up with the SRI that they're required to do. George Gerecke said Peter Keating and Eleni
40 Churchill did most of the work on this and deserve a round of applause. MICHAEL O'BRIEN MADE A
41 MOTION THAT WE APPROVE THE LANGUAGE FOR SIGNIFICANT REGIONAL IMPACT AS
42 PRESENTED. MARY HOULE SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED WITH VTRANS ABSTAINING.
43

44 8. Corridor Study Results. Scott Johnstone noted that we've been doing corridor studies for
45 awhile and we thought it was important for you to know why corridor studies are important and
46 why we do them. Eleni Churchill talked about concepts of corridor management planning which
47 is a process where mutually supportive strategies are identified to achieve specific land
48 development and transportation objectives along a corridor. The process is collaborative
49 (involving state and regional agencies, local governments, institutions, stakeholders and public-
50 at-large); comprehensive (understanding of the dynamics of transportation and all interacting
51 influences within the corridor) and proactive (addressing present and future transportation needs
52 – usually up to 20 years. Ms. Churchill described what a corridor is; what a corridor

1 management study is; what a corridor management plan is and why we do them. Corridor
2 planning consists of 5 steps: 1) Get organized; 2) Analyze existing and future conditions; 3)
3 Develop vision, goals and strategies; 4) Develop an implementation plan; and, 5) Implement and
4 monitor progress.

5
6 The Route 2 Corridor Study covered the area from South Willard Street in Burlington to North
7 Williston Road in Williston, and was completed last summer. She reviewed the vision statement
8 and goals of this study. Existing issues included:

- 9 • Lots of previous plans and recommendations.
- 10 • Diverse mix of land use types and roadway character.
- 11 • 60-70% of travel generated by corridor land use.
- 12 • Multi-modal corridor but: gaps in pedestrian and bicycle facilities; and lack of direct US 2
13 transit service.
- 14 • Existing congestion, access management problems and high crash locations.

15
16 Ms. Churchill then reviewed a few of the short term (less than 5 years); medium term (less than
17 10 years) and long term (more than 10 years) strategies for both highways, transit and pedestrian.
18 Estimated costs for implementation of the strategies:

19 \$11.6 million for short term
20 \$25 million for medium term
21 \$55-70 million for long term

22 The full report for the US 2 Corridor Study is on our website.

23
24 The Route 15 Corridor Study is nearing completion. Ms. Churchill reviewed the goals of this
25 study and reviewed preliminary corridor functions; an example of highway strategy for mobility
26 near the Camp Johnson entrance; and land use strategies to concentrate development in “growth
27 nodes.” She reviewed conceptual plans for VT 15 at Spring Street in Winooski and for VT 15 at
28 the Champlain Valley Exposition.

29
30 Andy Montroll asked if traffic lights are also looked at in these corridors. Eleni Churchill noted
31 that timing of signals, etc. is reviewed and can make it into short term strategies. When asked if
32 access management gets driven by local zoning or by the state since this is a state highway, Eleni
33 Churchill noted that if it’s a town highway it’s up to the municipalities. We do look at access
34 management, especially in the mobility areas.

35
36 6. Public Hearing. – major amendments to the FY08-11 Transportation Improvement Program
37 (TIP). These amendments are major because they are new to the TIP.

- 38 • US 7 paving in Burlington. Add \$224,000 for construction in FY08 to re-seal and repair
39 concrete pavement joints and minor paving on US 7 from So. Burlington town line (app.
40 Swift Street) to US 7 MM 0.197, including I-189 off ramps. MM 0.197 is the point where
41 US 7 changes classification from National Highway System (NHS) to town highway. Also
42 to add \$224,000 for construction to re-seal and repair concrete pavement joints and minor
43 paving on US 7 from MM 0.197 to MM 0.441 (app. Hadley Road).
- 44 • Exit 15 Safety Project in Winooski. Add \$160,000 in federal funds in FY08 for scoping and
45 design of safety improvements at Exit 15. These funds will come from MPO fiscal constraint
46 limit. Numerous safety issues have been identified at I-89 Exit 15. This project will evaluate
47 possible solutions. Construction funds to be added following completion of design.

1 The chair opened the public hearing at 8:14 p.m. There were no members of the public present.
2 MICHAEL O'BRIEN MADE A MOTION TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 8:15 P.M.
3 ANDY MONTROLL SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4
5 Andrea Morgante asked what this does to our fiscal constraint. Christine Forde said there is
6 plenty of money. Andy Montroll said as you continue north it's really bad with major potholes
7 up to the rotary. Why isn't it continuing another half mile? Scott Johnstone noted that it's a
8 Class 1 town highway so it's Burlington Public Works' problem. GEORGE GERECKE MADE
9 A MOTION TO APPROVE THESE MAJOR AMENDMENTS TO THE FY08-11 TIP.

10 ANDREA MORGANTE SECONDED. VOTE:

11	BOLTON - ABSENT	BURLINGTON - YES (4)
12	CHARLOTTE- YES	COLCHESTER - YES (2)
13	ESSEX JCT. - YES	ESSEX TOWN - ABSENT
14	HINESBURG - YES	HUNTINGTON - ABSENT
15	JERICHO - ABSENT	MILTON - ABSENT
16	RICHMOND - YES	ST. GEORGE - ABSENT
17	SHELBURNE - YES	SO. BURLINGTON - ABSENT
18	UNDERHILL - YES	WESTFORD - ABSENT
19	WILLISTON - YES	WINOOSKI - YES
20	VTRANS - YES	

21 MOTION CARRIED WITH 15 OF 24 VOTES AND 10 OF 18 COMMUNITIES VOTING IN
22 FAVOR.

23

24 9. Committee Reports.

- 25 a. Executive Committee. Draft minutes from the March 5, 2008 meeting were included in the
26 packet.
- 27 b. Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC). The February TAC report was included in the
28 packet. George Gerecke reported that at the March TAC meeting they discussed the
29 Significant Regional Impact (SRI) and had a report on the VTrans Capital Plan.
- 30 c. Public Transportation Committee. Peter Keating reported that they met twice since our last
31 board meeting. They've discussed Transit Oriented Development (TOD) where you try to
32 encourage more density in transit corridors. They're working on model bylaws to help with
33 that. The state is about to take short range transit plans and review how to improve service.
34 Chris Cole came to the last meeting and presented a peer review of CCTA. They compare
35 positively in costs, fares, etc. The only negative was the state participation in funding.
- 36 d. Finance committee. Andy Montroll noted that they reviewed the budget for FY09 and they'll
37 meet again on April 1st to continue this review. They continue to look at the current budget
38 and things are following through.
- 39 e. UPWP Committee. Scott Johnstone noted that the UPWP is the work plan for our fiscal
40 year. The committee has gone through a review of CCTA and CCRPC for this year and what
41 they propose for next year. They went through the ups and downs of the budget and
42 reviewed input from the public. Most fit in existing programs. What will dominate the work
43 program next year are two things. Funding will be concentrated in writing a new MTP
44 (Metropolitan Transportation Plan) which we need to complete by January 2010. So in FY09
45 we will need to do the heavy lifting so the budget will be about \$225,000 (including work
46 done by CCRPC). The second is creating a new transportation model that will be day-based
47 so we can be ready to model for air quality. We are just under the new limit just announced
48 by EPA. The new limit is .075 and we're about .07. We really want to use this time to see
49 how we can avoid non-attainment. We can fit both of these in this work program. Scott

1 Johnstone noted that we reviewed the local match that we've collected over the years vs.
2 what we've used and determined that there is some match available. Once we discovered we
3 were really going to spend down our current budget, FHWA got concerned about whether
4 we'd have money for the first quarter of our fiscal year since it's the 4th quarter of the federal
5 fiscal year and the FY09 federal funds will not be available until October 1st. So, we put
6 money aside for that eventuality. There are still several hundred thousand dollars that will
7 now be available because of money left from previous appropriations. We can't match those
8 funds so we proposed to put a Transportation Action Grant to communities to provide 20%
9 match to see what communities could come up with. We're still working out the details.
10 This would be a one-time thing because the money won't be there in the future. He did note
11 that this could only be used for planning projects.

- 12 f. CCRPC. Justin Dextrateur noted that the Executive Committee is interviewing the first of
13 four candidates for the final round of interviews for a new Executive Director. There will be
14 a joint Executive Committee meeting on April 1st to review the RFP for possible relocation.
15

16 10. Members' Items. Amy Bell noted that over the past few months members have requested
17 specific information. She brought copies for everyone of VTrans critical culvert list – there are
18 only a few in Chittenden County. These include:

- 19 a. Hinesburg – VT 116 - 3.4 miles north of the junction of VT 2A.
20 b. Jericho – VT 117 - 4.9 miles east of the junction of VT 15.
21 c. South Burlington – I-89 - .7 miles north of Exit 14.
22 d. Richmond – I-89 - 1.2 miles north of Exit 11.
23 e. Williston – I-89 - 2.5 miles south of Exit 12.
24 f. Colchester – I-89 - 2.7 miles south of Exit 17.
25 g. Essex – VT 128 – 0.1 miles north of the junction of VT 15
26 h. Essex – VT 2A – 2.3 miles north of VT 15.
27

28 She also brought a report of the funds expended from the Enhancement Program between 1995-
29 2007.
30

31 MIKE O'BRIEN MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN AT 8:38 P.M. MARY HOULE
32 SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
33

34 Respectfully submitted,
35
36
37

38 Bernadette Ferenc, Executive Assistant