

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

5 Date: Wednesday, March 18, 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 Jim Donovan, Charlotte Alternate
9 Marc Landry, Colchester (Vice Chair) Max Levy, Essex Alternate
10 Dale Arango, Essex Junction Andrea Morgante, Hinesburg
11 Rob Zimmerman, Huntington Alternate Andy Legg, Milton Alternate
12 Jim Dudley, Shelburne (Secretary-Treasurer) Denis Gravelin, South Burlington
13 Steve Owen, Underhill George Gerecke, Williston
14 Mike O'Brien, Winooski Matthew Langham, VTrans
15 Ex-Officio: Chris Jolly, FHWA
16 Others: Charlie Baker, CCRPC Executive Dir.
17 Staff: Michele Boomhower, MPO Exec. Dir Peter Keating, Sr. Trans. Planner
18 Christine Forde, Sr. Trans. Planner Dave Roberts, Sr. Trans. Planner
19 Eleni Churchill, Sr. Trans. Planner Daryl Benoit, Trans. Planner/IT Web
20 Bryan Davis, Trans. Planner Jason Charest, Trans. Planner/Eng..
21 Bernadette Ferenc, Exec. Assistant
22

23 The meeting was called to order at 7:02 p.m. by the Vice Chair, Marc Landry.
24

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

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

29 3. Action on Consent Agenda. GEORGE GERECKE MADE A MOTION SECONDED BY
30 JIM DUDLEY TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA. MOTION CARRIED
31 UNANIMOUSLY.
32

33 4. Approval of Minutes. JIM DUDLEY MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY DENIS
34 GRAVELIN, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 21, 2009 AND FEBRUARY 18,
35 2009. Jim Dudley had a recommended change on page 5 of January 21 minutes. Add to line 7
36 to clarify – as a merger of the MPO and RPC and creation of the RTD are actions that can occur
37 independent of any other. Also on lines 11 and 12 clarify which organization is state mandated
38 (CCRPC) and which is federally mandated (CCMPO). VOTE: MOTION CARRIED
39 UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS CLARIFIED.
40

41 5. Executive Director's Update.

- 42 a. Michele Boomhower noted that she sent out her Executive Director's report electronically
43 and it contains links to our website to get additional information about various topics.
44 b. Stimulus activities at the state level. We received notice that all the towns that had submitted
45 projects to VTrans for consideration were sent a request for more information for
46 enhancement related projects. When we scrutinized the list there were a couple of things left
47 off – i.e. two projects in Milton. The Agency is not accepting any more projects for inclusion
48 and it now in the hands of the legislature.

- 1 c. Michele noted that Ernie Blais is interested in coming to the April Board meeting to talk
2 about FHWA's perspective on the federal stimulus and we're hoping someone from VTrans
3 can give us VTrans' perspective as well.
- 4 d. When asked about the Vermont Interactive TV event on Friday, Michele noted that all RPCs,
5 the MPO and VLCT put together a presentation from various state agencies to talk about
6 town/municipal level opportunities with ARRA. In terms of transportation you won't learn
7 anything new, but there should be valuable information on things like energy efficiency,
8 broadband, etc.
- 9 e. FY09 Omnibus Appropriations Bill was signed into law last week. There are a couple of
10 earmarks for BIA (\$1.5M) for runway reconfiguration and other things. The Village of
11 Essex Junction received funds along with the Town of Johnson related to improvements to
12 Route 15 (\$2.8M). We'll continue to watch other spending bills and Federal reauthorization.
13 Marc Landry noted that on Channel 3 news tonight the Town of Pantton was surprised that
14 federal stimulus funding came with match requirement. Chris Jolly said the federal stimulus
15 money comes with up to 100% federal funding but the state has the flexibility to require a
16 match. Matthew Langham said there are state laws in place which require a local match for
17 state highway/bridge projects – either 5 or 10%, and enhancement funds require a 20% local
18 match. There is also a question of equity. If you were a town that had a transportation
19 enhancement project, you'd have to pay 20%; and then if you were a town that received
20 stimulus funds, why would VTrans not require a match. Michele noted there is a bill in the
21 Vermont legislature to allow these funds to be 100% federal, but we'll have to see what
22 happens. Matthew said if an existing project was already on the program, they'll have to
23 meet existing match requirements. Chris Jolly said the Governor certified that the amount of
24 state funds that were committed to be spent on transportation projects from Feb. 09 – through
25 October 2010 would be spent on transportation projects.
- 26 f. Michele noted that our move to 110 West Canal Street will be happening April 30th and May
27 1st. You'll receive contact information as we get closer.

28
29 6. Reclassification of Pond Road in Hinesburg. Michele said it was brought up at the last
30 meeting that a tiny portion of this road traverses St. George. We did write them a letter asking
31 for concurrence in this change, but have heard nothing. After a brief discussion Marc Landry
32 suggested that since there was no critical need for action, we table action to the April board
33 meeting.

34
35 7. Project Prioritization. Christine Forde gave a slide presentation on project prioritization
36 giving some background of what we do and why we do it. (i.e. ensure consistency in the
37 programming of transportation projects; accountability and transparency; advance projects
38 consistent with long-range goals and objectives; efficient use of transportation dollars; equitable
39 distributions of funds; and it's required by the Legislature.) There are specific factors required
40 by the legislation. We look at projects in VTrans program categories: roadway; traffic
41 operations and safety; paving; interstate bridge; state bridge; town highway bridge; bike and
42 pedestrian facilities and park and ride facilities. The list of projects that we prioritize comes
43 from VTrans and this feeds into the VTrans prioritization. It's not the ultimate MPO
44 prioritization. The TAC asked why we don't prioritize rail or transit and it's because the state
45 hasn't asked us to. The TAC wants us to send a letter to VTrans stating support for rail and
46 transit. VTrans scores projects based on more quantitative information and the MPO tries to
47 score on more a qualitative basis and then those scores are combined. Christine then described
48 MPO's scoring categories and scoring system. She reviewed a completed scoring sheet that was
49 in the meeting packet. Staff fills out a scoring sheet for each project which are reviewed by the

1 TAC and sent to the respective board members as well. She then reviewed the categories that we
2 use and the scoring ranges. The she distributed a table showing how scoring compared from
3 2010 to 2011. Christine noted that our scores become a part of the VTrans scoring. VTrans
4 scoring is 80% of the total and MPO scoring is 20%.

5
6 Jim Dudley asked what “candidate” projects are. Matthew said in the Capital Program the “front
7 of the book” projects include those we’re going to expend a great deal of money on, such as
8 ROW & construction. D&E are further in the development process and have the potential to
9 move to front of the book within five years. Candidate projects are not currently being worked
10 on but would move into D&E as those projects advance.

11
12 When asked why Circ Colchester is not in the package, but they’ve acquired ROW, Chris Jolly
13 said in the 1980’s FHWA authorized ROW acquisition after the environmental document was
14 done. He said the purchase of ROW in Colchester has ended. We could not go out and purchase
15 additional ROW now without an updated EIS.

16
17 When Chris Jolly questioned the interstate bridge category showing zero, Christine said there are
18 no interstate bridge projects in Chittenden County.

19
20 Andrea Morgante questioned environment, energy and quality of life and noticed that there’s
21 nothing saying that we’re considering stormwater when we rank a project. Christine noted on
22 page 27 in the high impact category it does talk about water runoff. She also noted that the
23 prioritization is evolving and we can made adjustments. Andrea feels that culverts could be
24 improved to help with water quality, wildlife, etc. as well.

25
26 Andrea questioned whether having the circ be prioritized is keeping funds from other projects?
27 Christine said this document is not obligating funds only stating that it’s important. Michele
28 Boomhower said we have a couple of things at play. We have the prioritization and then we
29 have the Capital Program and the circ never makes it. She noted that your point is that funds are
30 constrained and if they’re being tied up for the circ they can’t be used for other projects.
31 Christine said the state has determined the fiscal constraint based on projects that are ready to go.
32 George Gerecke asked whether the circ is part of the fiscal constraint – Christine said yes.

33
34 Marc Landry asked if we were looking for a vote from the board relative to including rail and
35 transit. Christine said the TAC suggested we write a letter of support for rail and transit since we
36 can’t really prioritize them. Michele suggested that it wouldn’t hurt when we send in our
37 priorities to indicate support for rail and transit projects in Chittenden County. She can also get
38 us a list of the current prioritized projects for rail and transit in the state. Andrea would also like
39 to include in that letter that by prioritizing the rail projects we’d be helping some of the roadway
40 projects and that they are related to each other. Matthew Langham said we should bear in mind
41 that Chittenden County transit funds are generally a different pot of funds and are only available
42 to the urbanized area. George Gerecke suggested that in our letter supporting rail we should
43 encourage the Agency to include rail in one form or another in the project prioritization to give
44 us a voice. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE 2011
45 PRIORITIZATION, INCLUDING A COVER LETTER TO INCLUDE RAIL AND TRANSIT
46 SUPPORT AS DISCUSSED EARLIER. JIM DONOVAN SECONDED. VOTE: MOTION
47 CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

1 Christine said as you look at the TIP, the FY09-11 TIP was not adopted by the Agency (and
2 probably won't be), so we are operating in the FY09 year of the FY08-11 TIP. There is an
3 updated document on our website where we have included all amendments made and we'll keep
4 it up to date. Matthew Langham said they didn't amend the STIP with FHWA because there was
5 some concern that the stimulus bill might include language saying that projects on the list would
6 not have been eligible, but that language was not in there. It was noted that the STIP and TIP are
7 good for four years, so both documents are okay.
8

9 8. FY09 UPWP Budget Adjustment. Michele and Bernie described changes necessitated in the
10 mid-year adjustment by limits on earmark funds for the Western Corridor Study. JIM DUDLEY
11 MADE A MOTION THAT WE APPROVE THE MID-YEAR ADJUSTMENT FOR THE
12 WESTERN CORRIDOR AS PRESENTED. ANDY MONTROLL SECONDED AND THE
13 MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
14

15 9. FY2010 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Briefing. Michele noted the committee
16 has commenced its work. She distributed the list of members and the anticipated schedule.
17 During the first meeting they reviewed framework of activities. The narrative for the work
18 program will be forwarded to the committee tomorrow. We'll have a full presentation at the
19 next board meeting.
20

21 10. Committee Reports.

- 22 a. Executive Committee. Minutes of the March 5, 2009 meeting are in the packet.
23 b. Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC). George Gerecke said the meeting notes from
24 March 4, 2009 are in the packet and he could answer any questions.
25 c. Public Transportation Committee. Peter Keating noted that they met a couple of weeks ago
26 with a presentation from AARP who have taken on a project with the Snelling Center for
27 Government to look at the make up of transportation in the future. They had a legislative
28 update in terms of what is happening with transit. CCTA is working to create a larger
29 northwestern transit district since GMTA already expanded to Franklin County. They're also
30 looking at hybrid buses. Peter noted that we have a Park and Ride Plan and in the proposed
31 UPWP we want to update that plan and the Public Transportation Committee wants to be
32 included in this task. Michele met with the AARP director. There is a push to see if they can
33 get an AARP representative on each MPO board in the country. Michele noted that on the
34 legislative front, there was a bill introduced from Rep. Sue Minter of Waterbury/Huntington
35 to formulate a statewide transit authority that would put them under one umbrella agency
36 statewide.
37 d. Finance Committee. Jim Dudley reported the committee met on March 9th. They looked at
38 the UPWP assumptions and reviewed financial reports for December and January. He asked
39 board members to let Bernie know what the percent increase will be for their municipal
40 salaries for the next fiscal year. Whether it's 2, 3 or 4%, please let us know within a week so
41 we can include this in our budget preparations.
42 e. CCRPC. Charlie Baker said at their last meeting they took a consensus of the group on the
43 BRC recommendations and he wanted us to know that they're looking forward to joint
44 Executive Committee to discuss possibilities of merger with CCMPO. He noted appreciation
45 of our UPWP committee process.
46

1 11. Members Items:

2 a. Andrea Morgante heard the Administration was thinking about eliminating the enhancement
3 program in the state and wondered whether that would be possible. Matthew said what she
4 heard was that they'd suspended funding awards for one year. They are required by law to
5 do an enhancement program. State law requires funding go to local level and Federal
6 regulations requires 10% of STP funding has to go to enhancement type projects. Chris Jolly
7 said Federal regulations state the types of projects that are eligible for enhancement funds.
8 Peter Keating noted that they did suspend it for one year some years ago, so there is
9 precedence and he noted that some years they spend more than 10% of STP funds on
10 enhancements. Peter and Chris Jolly noted that 3% of stimulus money has to go to
11 enhancement type projects, although it doesn't say "local." Andrea wanted to follow-up on
12 that and noted that enhancement projects are important to all communities in Chittenden
13 County and we appreciate a suspension of funding for one year, but that it is an important
14 program. Chris Jolly said in terms of trying to get stimulus money to locals, that'll all go
15 through the LTF (Local Transportation Facilities) Division which is how community
16 enhancement projects are handled as well so part of it is a VTrans staffing issue.

17
18 12. Other business. There was none.

19
20 13. Adjourn. MIKE O'BRIEN MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN AT 8:30 P.M. SECONDED
21 BY JIM DUDLEY. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

22
23 Respectfully submitted,

24
25
26
27 Bernadette Ferenc
28 Executive Assistant

29