

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

5 Date: Wednesday, January 21, 2009  
6 Time: 7:00 p.m.  
7 Place: CCMPO offices; 30 Kimball Avenue, Suite 206, South Burlington, VT 05403  
8 Present: Andy Montroll, Burlington (8:00) Jim Donovan, Charlotte  
9 Marc Landry, Colchester (Vice-Chair) Jeff Carr, Essex (Chair)  
10 Dale Arango, Essex Junction Andrea Morgante, Hinesburg  
11 Rob Zimmerman, Huntington Alternate Jim Dudley, Shelburne (Sec.-Treas.)  
12 Denis Gravelin, South Burlington Steve Owen, Underhill  
13 Rich Elmore, Westford George Gerecke, Williston  
14 Tom Buckley, Winooski Alternate Amy Bell, VTrans  
15 Ex-Officio: Justin Dextrateur, CCRPC Chris Jolly, FHWA  
16 Chris Cole, CCTA  
17 Others: Matthew Langham, VTrans Garret Mott, CCRPC Exec. Comm.  
18 Charlie Baker, CCRPC Exec. Director Roger Derby, CCRPC Exec. Comm.  
19 Edmund Booth, CCRPC Exec. Comm. Greg Edwards, Stantec Consuling  
20 Juli Beth Hinds, George Schiavone, Shelburne Alt.  
21 Staff: Michele Boomhower, Executive Director Peter Keating, Sr. Trans. Planner  
22 Christine Forde, Sr. Trans. Planner David Roberts, Sr. Trans. Planner  
23 Eleni Churchill, Sr. Trans. Planner Daryl Benoit, Trans. Planner/IT  
24 Bryan Davis, Trans. Planner Jason Charest, Trans. Engineer  
25 Bernadette Ferenc, Executive Assistant  
26

27 The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by the chair, Jeff Carr. Mr. Carr took some time to  
28 remember Mike Flaherty, who passed away this week. Mike had served on this board  
29 representing Vermont Transportation Authority (VTA) and also served in the Vermont House for  
30 several years representing South Burlington.  
31

32 1. Changes to the Agenda. Christine Forde would like to move Consent item C3 to the  
33 deliberative agenda. MARC LANDRY MADE A MOTION TO AMEND THE AGENDA. IIM  
34 DUDLEY SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. We will make this  
35 the new item 11 and renumber the remaining items.  
36

37 2. Public Comment Period. There were none.  
38

39 3. Action on the Consent Agenda. There were 3 remaining items on the consent agenda dealing  
40 with minor TIP amendments. GEORGE GERECKE MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE  
41 CONSENT AGENDA. ANDREA MORGANTE SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED  
42 UNANIMOUSLY.  
43

44 4. Approval of Minutes. Denis Gravelin referenced the Executive Director's update in the  
45 minutes of the November 19, 2009 meeting and wanted to clarify for the record that the South  
46 Burlington City Council's decision not to pursue a condemnation of a parcel of property for  
47 potential access to Interstate 89 – proposed ramp 12B, should not be perceived that the City  
48 Council is no longer interested. The South Burlington City Council continues its support for the  
49 planning and development of the interchange and will help seek appropriate state and federal

1 funding for its construction. TOM BUCKLEY MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE  
2 MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 19, 2008 WITH THAT CLARIFICATION. MARC LANDRY  
3 SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.  
4

5 5. Executive Director's Report. The monthly report was sent electronically yesterday. Michele  
6 noted that she has three more outreach meetings coming up in the next week and she'll have  
7 completed her visits to communities as well as affiliated organizations.  
8

9 6. Blue Ribbon Commission (BRC) – Innovative Finance Recommendations – Public  
10 Informational Meeting. Michele Boomhower noted that essentially staff worked with Diane  
11 Meyerhoff to come up with some phasing options for the BRC findings and recommendations.  
12 We wanted to show who the potential partners would be related to the various recommendations,  
13 and potential time frame of when these steps could be accomplished. We did combine  
14 recommendations 1 & 2 and made a three phase process for a middle of the road option. Jeff  
15 Carr noted that we received comments from VTrans which were very helpful. They had some  
16 issues with items 1-3, but are in agreement with 4-7 that there is room for fleshing them out for  
17 implementation. He feels we do have some work to do on 1, 2 and 3. Dave Dill was concerned  
18 that we were going to go forward too quickly advancing this to the legislature. Jeff Carr said he  
19 hopes this proposal reflects some of the concerns we've received on this report. We asked the  
20 BRC to think outside the box and they did and there are some bold things, such as the RTD  
21 which was less than warmly received by his selectboard. He feels a crisis is a terrible thing to  
22 waste. He asked for further comments.  
23

24 Rich Elmore asked if the middle of the road option is the recommendation from staff. Michele  
25 said no. He then asked if staff had a recommendation and Michele said no because of all the  
26 feedback. We could assist in shaping a recommendation for the Executive Committee and the  
27 board, but have not done so to date. This had not been a staff-driven project, but a BRC project.  
28

29 Chris Cole said we offer phase 1 and then phase 2 as options and then the middle of the road  
30 option. Would you do #3 funding with either Option 1 or 2? Jeff Carr said the original charge to  
31 the BRC was funding and they went a little further and thought of transportation systematically  
32 and institutionally. He feels if we just deal with funding and not the rest, we may not be  
33 successful. He feels we've studied the funding to death and we just seem to keep reworking the  
34 same ideas; and, the BRC should be given credit for going beyond it.  
35

36 Chris Cole asked if we pick the middle of the road option, do we still keep going through  
37 recommendations 3-7. Michele said we could pursue items 4-7 independently without 1-3.  
38 There are steps you can take with either 1 or 2 or middle of the road option that could be done as  
39 preliminary steps to moving toward an entity with revenue generating authority, and we could  
40 get some activities done with #3. Maybe the state would continue to hold the reins on the  
41 funding. Jeff Carr said feedback from VTrans and the Secretary indicates they are most  
42 concerned about #3 because of the precedence it might be setting for other parts of the state. He  
43 assured the Secretary that we were trying to do what was best for our region.  
44

45 George Gerecke took the middle of the road option not so much as an alternative to 1 & 2, but as  
46 a stop gap to bridge 1 & 2 without reorganizing the world but not as a permanent alternative.  
47

48 Rich Elmore asked for clarification between phase 2 regarding levying and collecting user fees  
49 or taxes and phase 3 for sustainable funding. How are they different? Michele noted they are

1 all revenue generating ideas, but wasn't sure how they're different. Jeff Carr explained the  
2 difference between levying user fees and property taxes on a vehicle or local option gas tax.  
3 When you issue a bond it's usually a twenty-year obligation and has a different level of fiduciary  
4 responsibility.

5  
6 It was noted that 1.1.4 should read "The formation of the RTD merges the CCMPO and CCRPC,  
7 rather than just CCMPO.

8  
9 Andrea Morgante said this is going back talking about our transportation projects. Are we really  
10 just talking about funding on our TIP (federal and state funding), if we have to create this  
11 different source. We're not talking about changing ownership of roads in the county. If we're  
12 picking up money for state and federal roads in our county, how will it impact on the other  
13 funding issues, such as state aid for other class roads in the communities. She's concerned that  
14 more and more local roads are being used regionally. The roads connect us all so shouldn't we  
15 add arterial roads that serve those functions?

16  
17 Andrea Morgante said the governance issue struck her. Right now the MPO and RPC board  
18 members are appointed by selectboards. This new board will be making decisions about  
19 spending money and she thinks we're getting removed from the voters. In a sense, we do that  
20 now at the MPO, but it's planning dollars we're spending with recommendations for the TIP.  
21 Has there been thought how that board would be appointed or elected or how it would happen  
22 and what the relationship is to the general public? She feels in the local communities road  
23 funding is very high expenditure of their budget and what will our responsibility be to the voters  
24 and not just the governing board that appointed us. Jeff Carr has supported the MPO having  
25 elected officials because of the funding issues we deal with. He agrees we ought to be  
26 accountable to the citizens. Chris Cole said governance and taxation are intrinsically linked..  
27 With this funding from the region one would think the representation on the regional body would  
28 lend itself to that flavor. He said the MPO does that by having proportional voting. Jeff Carr  
29 could see this regional body have to have their budget approved by the voters of each community  
30 before being accepted. He suggested the Solid Waste District model could be used.

31  
32 Chris Cole said part of the BRC recommendation started off as a funding issue because we  
33 recognize our county has needs and federal and state funding is insufficient and he understands  
34 why it was started. Phase 1 you can find examples around the country where RPCs and MPOS  
35 have merged and take a strong role in managing projects. CCTA and GMTA have been looking  
36 into legally combining the two entities to provide a five-county area authority to get some  
37 regional funding. He sees public transportation in our proposal taking place in 2012. His only  
38 concern is that this could somehow inadvertently impact the CCTA/GMTA work they've done to  
39 date and working with the legislative process. He knows the MPO has been working for over 15  
40 years to try to get sustainable funding for public transportation. He appreciates being included in  
41 the working groups. They feel they're in a good place with their proposal because both of his  
42 boards have taken ownership of their work. His boards don't have enough information on the  
43 BRC proposals yet and he would like a presentation by the CCMPO on this process so they can  
44 understand it better. Jeff Carr said several members of the BRC wanted this to be a package and  
45 are disturbed that we'd want to break it into these phases, etc. He understands their frustration,  
46 but we have to recognize the reality. He feels we have a lot more education to do on this with  
47 our constituent groups, including speaking to the CCTA board.

48

1 Rich Elmore did meet with the Westford Selectboard and their first reaction was that the  
2 recommendations are good and they support them. But they really want to understand equity in  
3 governance and funding and how it would work. They're concerned about streamlining the  
4 permitting process because residents of Westford take the environmental concerns very seriously  
5 and they want to be sure nothing gets short shrifted. He feels the middle of the road option  
6 would be the best.

7  
8 Tom Buckley appreciates the discussion of moving more slowly because in November it  
9 sounded like we wanted to hurry up and move legislation along and we do need much more local  
10 discussion before we move this to Montpelier for legislation. He has a foot in each world as a  
11 CCTA commissioner and chair of the MPO's public transportation committee. That committee's  
12 charge is finding funding for public transportation. He has the same concern that Chris Cole  
13 expressed because this could be misunderstood and taken as more than regional public  
14 transportation funding. We're contemplating dealing with governance issue that we can deal  
15 with before the funding issues. Jeff said it was clear from listening to the board meeting that the  
16 board did not want to move forward quickly on this. This document reflects what this board  
17 indicated they wanted done. Some BRC members are disappointed because they wanted to make  
18 progress. With all the feedback from the board and communities, we decided we had to go  
19 slowly.

20  
21 Jim Donovan said Charlotte shares the concern of funding for smaller communities. But because  
22 this has to be reviewed by communities, VTrans and legislature, and things will get much more  
23 middle of the road, they are in favor of 1 and 2 even if for no other reason than it gets others  
24 thinking outside the box and Charlotte recommends moving forward.

25  
26 Jim Dudley asked Tom if we should really look at public transportation funding as step 1 rather  
27 than everything. It's been on the table every since he was on the selectboard. Tom is stopping  
28 short of recommending that, but his statement is that we shouldn't impede the progress that's  
29 been made by CCTA/GMTA for regional governance and funding for public transportation.  
30 This could be the leading edge for this larger issue, but this could confuse issues in Montpelier.

31  
32 Andrea Morgante said there is a dynamic that pits public transportation against roads and she  
33 feels we really can't separate these two in funding because they are linked in a system and  
34 maybe that drives it home that we have to fund them both because we can't have one without the  
35 other.

36  
37 Jim Dudley said whenever we talk about bonding for highways it gets a lot of attention. On the  
38 other hand, if you talk about funding public transportation that has been a problem over a long  
39 period of time, selectboards have heard this year after year. Maybe that's something that  
40 becomes more palatable at least initially, than the whole thing.

41  
42 Justin Dextrateur said the RPC Executive Committee looked at the draft report and they are  
43 more than willing to discuss and look into merger of the CCMPO and CCRPC as a part of this.  
44 They also agreed that we need more feedback from our member communities. Michele will be  
45 coming to the RPC board meeting next Monday to give more details. George Gerecke said one  
46 of his biggest concerns was putting the merger of the RPC and MPO in this document. He feels  
47 a) it may be a distraction and b) he was not in favor of the split when it happened, but his  
48 concern at this point is if the 2010 Census changes the boundary of the MPO, we would have a  
49 different region than CCRPC. Justin Dextrateur said the full board has not had the benefit of

1 discussing this. Since he first got involved with the RPC there have been discussions of a variety  
2 of consolidations considered.

3  
4 Jim Dudley said as he went through this document he wondered why the merger of MPO and  
5 RPC was in here. It seems to encumber it and he feels merger could be a separate issue. Jeff  
6 said in the new world, maybe the time is right to merge and the rest of the world wonders why  
7 we're not. Jim Dudley feels we could do some of this without a merger. Jim Donovan said the  
8 merger is integral because rather than creating a 3<sup>rd</sup> organization, we'd be making one new one.  
9 Without a merger he doesn't think it'll work. Jim Dudley wondered if in essence the MPO  
10 wasn't already the RTD. Tom Buckley noted we did look to consolidate and eventually decided  
11 against it because of the complexity. Jeff Carr noted our staffs work together anyway. One is  
12 state mandated, one is federal.

13  
14 Rich Elmore said there are some benefits that will come from merging land use and  
15 transportation planning. There is a bit of a structure piece missing. CCTA is the operational  
16 experts on public transportation. Where does CCTA fall in the dialog? We have to have  
17 operations groups we're handing off to: staff and VTrans, CCTA. A definition of Chittenden  
18 County may make sense, and Local Motion may have a role. There is a significant refinement  
19 needed in the middle of the road option.

20  
21 Chris Cole said Portland, Oregon has a model of the land use, transportation and transit system  
22 all rolled into one organization and they have the best transit system in the country.. It works  
23 really well in Oregon, but with the differences in Vermont with political history and lack of  
24 county government, will it work here? If CCTA/GMTA become a five-county entity, how do  
25 you integrate this later?

26  
27 Jeff offered other members of the public an opportunity to react and give advice. Garret Mott  
28 commended the MPO for putting this together and the outside the box thinking. He feels it may  
29 need to expand beyond just the RTD as the state is suggesting the merger of RPCs and the  
30 regional development corporations and when you start looking at the big picture you can see  
31 what a more regional authority might do and feels the region could profit by it. He's interested  
32 in having the CCMPO/CCRPC merger discussion.

33  
34 Roger Derby applauded the MPO. Vermont has got to move on and we cannot continue doing  
35 things one municipality at a time. If something like this can occur, it would be good for  
36 Vermont. Jeff Carr said these are the things we really need to consider and move thinking  
37 forward. Move the issue forward and don't miss an opportunity of a good crisis to encourage  
38 new thinking.

39  
40 Juli Beth Hinds was a member of the funding working group and is interested that the board is  
41 bringing this issue of merger with the funding options. She feels the little itty bitty steps of just  
42 looking at funding public transportation was not going to cut it. We need to really have a debate  
43 about this with discussion at VTrans and the legislature to try to tackle these issues.

44  
45 George Schiavone asked what this will do for commerce and development in the area. Is there a  
46 connection, or will it help to do other things better? Jeff Carr said there is a direct connection.  
47 As it has been said we give enough funding for the current transit system to provide bad service.  
48 We need to move people around our employment centers more efficiently. George Schiavone  
49 asked what the merger will do. Jeff Carr said the merger will provide cost savings. Chris Cole

1 said the reason CCTA and GMTA are considering merger is because there are two legal entities  
2 providing the same function that are producing two budgets, two audits, two board meetings, etc.  
3 and we're paying for it. There are better ways to deliver these services to the communities. At  
4 some point Vermont has to come to grips with infrastructure to support economic development.  
5 There is some serious work to be done and some serious dollars to do it. He applauds the MPO  
6 for the thinking.

7  
8 Discussion continued. Jeff Carr noted that we welcome additional comments and they can be  
9 sent by email to Michele @mboomhower@ccmpo.org. He noted that Michele will have to go  
10 back to the first few communities to discuss these recommendations since they came out after the  
11 initial municipal visits. Amy Bell said VTrans will be presenting additional feedback on the  
12 implementation matrix because they haven't yet. Their comments were on the original  
13 report/recommendations. Damir (the Channel 17 cameraman) noted that Bosnia has a better  
14 transportation system than here..

15  
16 7. CCMPO FY 08 Audit. Jim Dudley reported that the auditors were very happy with our staff  
17 and support. (We have JMM on retainer for questions we might have.) He noted that last year  
18 we had decided to have the auditors come in and speak to the Executive Committee without staff  
19 present, which they did. Jim described the significant weakness we received for not recording  
20 one consultant invoice in the correct fiscal year. He noted other suggestions are new and are  
21 being put in every audit. We will work on these for next year. Overall he's pleased with the  
22 audit report and said it is a tribute to staff. He would recommend acceptance of the audit. JIM  
23 DUDLEY MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MARC LANDRY, TO ACCEPT THE FY08  
24 AUDIT REPORT. Jeff Carr noted that since Terry Cleveland left the CCRPC, Bernie has taken  
25 over the accounting responsibilities. When asked if members could receive the audit  
26 electronically rather than printed copies, Jeff Carr said we can investigate it. VOTE: MOTION  
27 CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

28  
29 8. Transportation Action Grants (TAG). Jeff Carr noted that we had taken an email poll on the  
30 Charlotte TAG grant because they needed to get started so it could be completed by May 2009.  
31 (There were 19 yes votes and 13 communities voting in favor, so the grant was approved.)  
32 Bryan Davis noted that in this round we made \$250,000 available to communities. We received  
33 9 applications. A committee of six reviewed the applications. One was found to be ineligible.  
34 The TAC reviewed the committee's recommendation and recommends the board approve those  
35 recommendations: **Full funding** to

- 36 1. Charlotte – Alternative Transportation for CVU. Requested amount - \$6,855.80
- 37 2. Essex – Transportation Impact Fee Guidelines, Curb Cut Policies, and Lighting Study.  
38 Requested amount - \$50,000
- 39 3. Hinesburg – Hinesburg Rides: Transportation in Action. Requested amount - \$50,000
- 40 4. South Burlington – Cars to people: commercial land regulations transformed. Requested  
41 amount - \$50,000

42  
43 **Partial funding** to:

- 44 5. Burlington/Local Motion - Walk-Bike Action Grant. Requested \$53,211/ Awarded \$49,011
- 45 6. Essex Junction – Pearl Street Study. Requested \$60,000/Awarded \$50,000.
- 46 7. Jericho – Jericho Center Boardwalk. Requested \$12,000/Awarded \$10,000.
- 47 8. Richmond – Bridge Street Bicycle and Pedestrian Facility Study. Requested \$43,275/  
48 Awarded \$26,825.

49 Partial funding for these projects is recommended due to incorrect match amount, or ineligible/non-  
50 transportation related components

1  
2 . After a brief discussion, GEORGE GERECKE MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY TOM  
3 BUCKLEY, TO APPROVE THE TAG GRANT PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS. THE  
4 MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

5  
6 9. FY09 UPWP Mid-Year Adjustments. Michele Boomhower noted that the overall budget is  
7 down \$48,726. Attached to the budget spreadsheet is another table that includes highlighted  
8 tasks which indicate the most significant changes, which she described. One major change is  
9 adding funding to have adjacent RPCs study commuter corridors. Our last MTP only had one  
10 page dealing with the adjacent regions, and we feel it is important to do more, especially with the  
11 additional corridor studies we've preformed. She has convened a meeting of these RPCs to  
12 come up with scopes of work. We also removed the TLC grant program and moved those funds  
13 to the TAG line. JIM DUDLEY MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL,  
14 THAT WE APPROVE THE MID-YEAR BUDGET ADJUSTMENT FOR FY09. MOTION  
15 CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

16  
17 10. Upcoming TIP amendments and update on the Federal Economic Stimulus Package.

18 Michele Boomhower noted that once a project gets the federal funding from the economic  
19 stimulus package, it will have to be added to the TIP, STIP and capital program. Staff is making  
20 the recommendation, after discussions with FHWA and VTrans, that projects identified for  
21 stimulus funding be considered as minor TIP amendments under the procedures in our TIP  
22 policy that indicates that projects that come from new grant awards funding are minor  
23 amendments. We can streamline the process of getting these on the TIP. You will not see  
24 projects coming out of nowhere being considered for this funding because they'll still have to be  
25 scoped, engineered, etc. Jeff Carr noted that Christine and Michele have done outreach to  
26 communities to get projects that are eligible and ready to go. If they are on the inventory and  
27 there is funding available, they can go forward. We are looking to give priority to projects on the  
28 TIP that aren't funded. When asked about the match on the stimulus funds, Chris Jolly said from  
29 what they've seen it'll be 100% federal funding. They're thinking that 50% of the funds will  
30 have to be obligated in the next 120 days and you also have to do the regular obligational  
31 authority for the FY09 regular federal aid funds by the end of this fiscal year; and the second half  
32 of the stimulus funds will need to be obligated about a year from now. Discussion continued.  
33 Chris noted that since these funds are for construction projects the environmental documents  
34 need to be completed, ROW acquisition needs to be done, etc. Chris said from what he has seen,  
35 the whole highway program will go through VTrans and there will not be direct funding to  
36 communities. Chris Cole asked what criteria VTrans will use to select projects. Matthew  
37 Langham said for projects ready to go, they will use their project prioritization. When asked if  
38 VTrans has a list of potential projects, Matthew said VTrans has shared their list with us.  
39 Michele Boomhower will send the state list to board members. There were 8-9 bridge projects,  
40 guard rails, paving activities, signage, and culverts and buses and rail. Her newest list includes  
41 definition of "shovel ready" projects and general stimulus package provisions. After refining the  
42 list, VTrans sent it out to DTA's and then we reviewed it again with our communities letting  
43 them know what "shovel ready" means and that's why there are some strikeouts. Discussion  
44 continued. Michele noted that the action we're looking for is to treat stimulus package projects  
45 as minor TIP amendments. JIM DONOVAN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY RICH  
46 ELMORE, TO CONSIDER PROJECTS GETTING FUNDING FROM THE ECONOMIC  
47 STIMULUS PACKAGE AS MINOR AMENDMENTS TO THE TIP (TRANSPORTATION  
48 IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM). Michele noted that as the bill becomes law this list will evolve.  
49 VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

1  
2 11. Minor TIP Amendment for Bridge Street Bridge in Richmond. (moved from consent agenda  
3 C-3.) Christine Forde reminded members that we can't discuss items on the consent agenda,  
4 unless they're moved to the deliberative agenda. She wanted to explain that this amendment is  
5 phase 1 of the project. There will be a follow-up phase 2 for painting. She expects the painting  
6 will be in the stimulus package in the range of \$2M because of lead paint abatement and need to  
7 keep one lane open. She just didn't want us to be surprised when we see phase 2. Chris Jolly  
8 said this project is scheduled to be advertised for construction in late January. RICH ELMORE  
9 MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT THIS MINOR TIP AMENDMENT. JIM DONOVAN  
10 SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

11  
12 12. Committee Reports:  
13 a. Executive Committee. Minutes from December and January meetings were in the meeting  
14 package.  
15 b. Transportation Advisory Committee. The TAC report was in the package.  
16 c. Public Transportation Committee. Peter Keating noted the committee met two weeks ago  
17 and had a legislative update from Sonny Audette.  
18 d. Finance Committee. Jim Dudley reported that the last meeting was December 30 and they  
19 reviewed the November financial reports.

20  
21 13. Members' Items: There were none.

22  
23 14. Other Business: There was none.

24  
25 15. Adjournment. JIM DUDLEY MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN AT 8:55 P.M.  
26 GEORGE GERECKE SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

27  
28 Respectfully submitted,

29  
30  
31  
32 Bernadette Ferenc, Executive Assistant