

Chittenden County Metropolitan Planning Organization  
Regular Meeting and Public Forum  
Meeting Minutes

DATE: Wednesday, February 18, 2009  
TIME: 7:00 p.m.  
PLACE: CCMPO Offices; 30 Kimball Avenue, Suite 206, South Burlington, VT 05403  
PRESENT: Jim Donovan, Charlotte Alternate Jeff Carr, Essex (Chair)  
Dave Crawford, Essex Jct, Alternate Andrea Morgante, Hinesburg  
Andy Legg, Milton Jim Dudley, Shelburne (Sec-Treas)  
Denis Gravelin, South Burlington George Gerecke, Williston  
Mike O'Brien, Winooski Amy Bell, VTrans  
Ex-Officio: Chris Cole, CCTA Chris Jolly, FHWA  
Others: Matthew Langham, VTrans Charlie Baker, CCRPC Exec. Dir.  
George Schiavone, Shelburne Alternate  
Staff: Michele Boomhower, Exec. Director Peter Keating, Sr. Trans. Planner  
Christine Forde, Sr. Trans. Planner Dave Roberts, Sr. Trans. Planner  
Eleni Churchill, Sr. Trans. Planner Daryl. Benoit, Trans. Planner/IT  
Bryan Davis, Trans. Planner Jason Charest, Trans Planner/Eng.  
Bernadette Ferenc, Executive Assistant

Although there was not a quorum, the Chair decided to take up the information items beginning with the MTP update, Item 7. The meeting was called to order at 7:15 p.m.

7. Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Update. Peter Keating noted that we are required to do an update of the MTP every five years. Two years ago we had thought we would update it to 2025, but were told our financial plan needed to be revamped. In late 2007 we held a workshop sponsored by FHWA on scenario planning. We've been working with a consultant since last fall on the scenario planning. We have an advisory committee consisting of Mike O'Brien, Andy Legg and Bob Marquis from MPO board, Ron Rodjenski and Meredith Schuft, from the TAC, Meredith Birkett of CCTA, Marty Illick -CCRPC board, Dawn Francis -LCRCC, Chris Hill, At-Large, Richard Watts (Env.), Chapin Spencer (Bike/Ped), Marcy Ryan (low income/Disabled), Amy Bell, VTrans and Chris Jolly, FHWA. Peter then reviewed the Draft Outline for the MTP. It'll be similar to the 2025 Plan, but content will be a little different. There will be 7 sections: 1) MTP background; 2) Public Involvement Process; 3) Demographics and Transportation: Current and Forecast Conditions; 4) Financial Plan; 5) Scenario Planning Results; 6) 2060 MTP (all projects listed by corridor as well as environmental mitigation which is a new requirement); and 7) Implementation. Peter reviewed what happened at the 3 scenario planning workshops we held last fall. He showed what we had projected for growth in housing and jobs to 2060. We also tracked historic trends on new housing units and area by type and we discovered that the land consumption rate was much higher than units. He said each workshop was basically a board game where different small groups each had a land use map with chips representing different types of development and were asked to place them where they felt housing and jobs should go. Right now we have 14 scenario maps and we'd like to reduce that to 4-5 that represent the fourteen. He described a scenario prepared by staff. When asked if we counted natural resources, Peter said that dark green areas were off limits. We are still in the scenario planning process and we'll have to refine those maps, blend them and then analyze them using transportation model and GIS data. After that we'll post the results on the website and we'll encourage the public to vote on the preferred scenario. At some point this Board, in consultation

1 with CCRPC and the Advisory Committee, will come up with the preferred scenario. Peter then  
2 noted the schedule so that we would be ready for adoption in January 2010.

3  
4 When Andrea Morgante questioned the new regulations on environmental mitigation, Peter said  
5 we will have to address the impacts of our transportation recommendations on the environment.  
6 Andrea asked if the MPO can do this in consultation with CCRPC. Michele said we've talked  
7 about having the RPC involved in writing this part of the plan and to continue to meet this  
8 criteria not only in the plan but the project development process.

9  
10 George Gerecke asked if the public will be given certain choices or will there be a mix and  
11 match. Peter said on line it'll have distinct choices, but depending on responses we may come  
12 up with a blend. Denis Gravelin suggested we have the public rate the scenarios rather than  
13 choose one.

14  
15 Andrea Morgante said in these workshops, she found it refreshing that people felt they did have  
16 distinct scenarios and people were able to get data and support extreme points of view. You  
17 could articulate the assumptions and come to a compromise. She suggested there be narrative to  
18 go with the maps to describe the scenario. George Gerecke said his concern is that the scenarios  
19 become absolutes rather than something you can work with. When asked if the scenarios would  
20 cover enough of a range, Peter said we'll have 5 choices with 1 and 5 at extremes and the three  
21 in the middle will be more similar. Discussion continued. Peter said we've discussed taking a  
22 few of these scenarios to the local planning staff to see if these scenarios are realistic.

23  
24 5. Executive Director's Report. Michele noted there are a few handouts tonight.

- 25 a. CCTA had requested several TIP amendments for consideration. Item C-3 is related to  
26 anticipated additional STP funds to transfer to FTA pool for use in transit activities.  
27 However, VTrans has decided not to identify that transfer as it relates to stimulus funding.  
28 Chris Cole said \$10.9M is transferred annually to fund capital and some of it goes to funding  
29 on-going operations. In the spirit of equity, he was asked to write a letter from VPTA  
30 requesting the transfer. The Secretary explained his rationale, but will work with  
31 transportation providers statewide to develop specific projects in the second round.
- 32 b. Blue Ribbon Commission – Bernie collected all of the feedback from the public comment  
33 period at the last meeting. Michele has received additional feedback from communities and  
34 she'll put them all together and distribute it to the communities and general interested parties  
35 for further comments and we can discuss it at the March board meeting.
- 36 c. Christine and Michele have been working extensively on the stimulus funding preparation.  
37 In the handouts she presented an excerpt from a NADO (National Association of  
38 Development Organizations) report relating to the transportation components of the stimulus  
39 package. Vermont is getting \$125M for highways and bridges and \$5.6M for transit.  
40 Another handout was the project information form Christine has prepared for stimulus list  
41 eligibility to help communities know what "shovel ready" meant. The third handout is a  
42 color coded list of projects we submitted. Yellow indicates projects that are in the TIP.  
43 There were 13 that are "shovel ready." Blue indicates those eligible for the Class 2 town  
44 highway & bridge program (\$5M in 90-day projects). She visited the House Transportation  
45 Committee to let them know that we had projects in the stimulus list that could go through  
46 the Class 2 Town Highway program should alternative sources of funding be found. She  
47 noted that a list came back from VTrans over the weekend and some communities had given  
48 information directly to VTrans or VLCT, so we'll add those to our list. Tomorrow evening  
49 there is a meeting with all RPCs at VTrans about getting LTF agreement in place and how

1 they'll handle the additional activities. Jim Dudley asked when these will go into the TIP.  
2 Michele said we're waiting to hear from VTrans which projects that are not already in the  
3 TIP will get funded before we add them. VTrans is likely to ask us for our top 4-5 projects.  
4 Michele said that's where we'll have to see where it ranks in our prioritization. Michele said  
5 one of the things that VTrans will look at, because there are TACs all over the state that have  
6 been prioritizing projects for many years, is what the regional priorities are. Chris Cole  
7 asked when the clock will start. Chris Jolly said the bill was signed yesterday and 50% of the  
8 funds must be obligated in 120 days. The clock starts ticking when money is available about  
9 March 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup>, once each state gets notification. When asked if it was too late to get  
10 projects on this list, Michele said it is not. Jeff Carr said we have not made everyone happy  
11 because we wanted to be sure we had a list of real shovel ready projects. Michele feels  
12 confident that now that VTrans and the legislature know what the real backlog is, perhaps  
13 they'll get bonding mechanism or other funding in place. Chris Jolly pointed out that the bill  
14 is now to be referred to as the "American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA)."  
15 They've taken the word "stimulus" out of it. Jeff Carr said the other reason for us to  
16 continue to develop projects is the second year of the plan. Michele will send this final list  
17 that we forwarded to VTrans to our communities. Amy Bell pointed out that in the  
18 information from NADO the description is for MPOs that are TMAs with populations of over  
19 200,000.

- 20 d. Michele noted that Bryan prepared a new document called "Newsbreak" that'll be sent out  
21 quarterly. They met with Channel 17 and we're talking about coming up with strategies for  
22 using the media to get things out to the public.  
23 e. Last item lists the UPWP committee members, which will meet March 11<sup>th</sup> at 1:30 p.m.

24  
25 8. Reclassification of Pond Road in Hinesburg. Although we can't take action Jeff Carr  
26 requested that Michele give members an update. Michele noted that we received a request from  
27 Hinesburg to reclassify a section of Pond Road from a rural minor collector to a rural major  
28 collector. We provided a map showing AADTs. Andy Legg asked what the criteria are  
29 regarding changing road classification. Chris Jolly noted the criteria date to the 1990's. There  
30 are various roadway functional classifications (arterials, collectors, local) which are based upon  
31 ranges of VMT and mileage. The different classifications are based upon the service the  
32 roadway is intended to provide. A brief discussion about how long ago roads were classified  
33 because some communities discovered that some of their roads were not on the federal aid  
34 system that surprised them. Chris Jolly feels we'll probably go through reclassification in 2012  
35 after the next Census. Amy Bell said a small segment of this road is in St. George and we'll  
36 need to coordinate with them on this.

37  
38 9. Committee Reports.

- 39 a. Executive Committee. Draft minutes were in the meeting packet.  
40 b. Transportation Advisory Committee. Report is in the meeting packet.  
41 c. Public Transportation Committee. Did not meet in February.  
42 d. Finance Committee. They will meet on March 9<sup>th</sup> and cash flow is positive.  
43 e. CCRPC. Charlie Baker reported that they have an item on their agenda to discuss BRC; and  
44 they are working on the 2010 work program.  
45

1 6. FY2010 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Public Forum. Jeff Carr asked if there  
2 were any members of the public here to put forth items to consider. There were none.

3  
4 Andrea Morgante suggested one work item could be to look at storm water issues related to state  
5 roads in the county. When communities put sidewalks next to existing road they have to deal  
6 with how to treat stormwater generated from the new sidewalks but we're not doing anything  
7 about stormwater on existing roads and we should consider that. Michele said it gets back to the  
8 issue that the state does not have a stormwater policy related to state roads. Discussion  
9 continued about this issue and whether the MPO could take the lead on this. Michele noted we  
10 could work with VTrans on this.

11  
12 Andrea Morgante said the RPC was working on open space plan and she feels that'd be good for  
13 the environmental mitigation process we need to address to supplement the MTP. Michele said  
14 we're also talking about having CCRPC look at wildlife corridors as well.

15  
16 Denis Gravelin said Paul Conner, South Burlington City Planner had sent a few suggestions  
17 today so we should watch for them.

18  
19 It was noted that the original notice allowed for comments to be submitted until February 20<sup>th</sup>,  
20 but a recent notice extended the deadline to February 28<sup>th</sup>.

21  
22 Members Items:

23 a. Jim Dudley noted that Shelburne's meetings are aired live and he wondered why the MPO  
24 meeting isn't aired live, instead of a week or two later. Staff will research this.

25  
26 The meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

27  
28 Respectfully submitted,

29  
30  
31  
32 Bernadette Ferenc  
33 Executive Assistant  
34