

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

5 DATE: Wednesday, June 17, 2009
6 TIME: 7:00 p.m.
7 PLACE: CCMPO Offices; 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404
8 PRESENT: Andy Montroll, Burlington Marc Landry, Colchester (Vice-Chair)
9 Jeff Carr, Essex (Chair) Andrea Morgante, Hinesburg
10 Rick Moulton, Huntington (7:12) Bob Penniman, Jericho
11 Phil Gingrow, St. George Jim Dudley, Shelburne (Sec. Treasurer)
12 Denis Gravelin, South Burlington Steve Owen, Underhill
13 Rich Elmore, Westford George Gerecke, Williston
14 Mike O'Brien, Winooski Amy Bell, VTrans Planning Coordinator
15 Ex-Officio: Chris Jolly, FHWA Leslie Pelch, CCRPC
16 Chris Cole, CCTA (7:10)
17 Others: Matthew Langham, VTrans
18 Staff: Michele Boomhower, Exec. Dir. Peter Keating, Sr. Trans. Planner
19 Christine Forde, Sr. Trans. Planner David Roberts, Sr. Trans. Planner
20 Eleni Churchill, Sr. Trans. Planner Daryl Benoit, Trans. Planner/ IT Web
21 Bryan Davis, Trans. Planner Jason Charest, Trans. Engineer
22 Bernadette Ferenc, Exec. Assistant
23

24 The meeting was called to order at 7:03 p.m. by the Chair, Jeff Carr.
25

26 1. Changes to the Agenda. There were none.
27

28 2. Public Comment Period. There were no members of the public present.
29

30 3. Action on Consent Agenda. There were three minor TIP amendments on the consent agenda.
31 MARC LANDRY MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA,
32 SECONDED BY GEORGE GERECKE. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
33

34 4. Approval of Minutes. JIM DUDLEY MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY DENIS
35 GRAVELIN, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MAY 20, 2009 WITH CORRECTIONS IF
36 ANY. The following changes were made: Page 3, line 22 – add the word “off” after laid. Page
37 5, line12, delete “that after five years...” MOTION CARRIED WITH JEFF CARR AND
38 ANDREA MORGANTE ABSTAINING.
39

40 5. Executive Director's Report.

- 41 • The Bridge Street Bridge in Richmond will reopen this Friday at noon with at least one lane
42 of traffic. She congratulated Local Motion on a terrific job with the bike ferry to get people
43 across the river while the bridge was closed. The started service on May 15 and it will end
44 on Friday. They have handled about 10,000 people on the ferry in that time.
45 • The Vermont Rail Council took a vote and supported the Essex to Burlington upgrade using
46 western corridor earmark funds. VTrans does not support this action since these funds have
47 already been programmed, and the Rail Council is just advisory, so it may not result in any
48 activity.

- 1 • We have been working with BIA, South Burlington and developers to coordinate and
2 organize the launch of creative financing effort for the Exit 12B area. They're trying to come
3 up with ways to finance this interchange. There is research underway to determine how we
4 can do that. There will be a kick off meeting for all interested private partners in early July.
5 Then on July 17th, there will be a public informational meeting to release the results of the
6 alignment study for Exit 12 B done for us by Resource Systems Group (RSG). We want to
7 give information to neighbors who may be impacted that we may be doing an EIS to look at
8 alternatives before a final decision is made about any alternative. We'll make an extra effort
9 to get the community involved early on.
- 10 • Michele reported that last week she did an interview for CCTV with Lauren Glenn Davitian
11 (as they've done with other regional entities.)
- 12 • Last night she attended a meeting of the Vermont Interfaith Action Group which is a group of
13 interested citizens that take up various topics that relate to the whole community. Their
14 current issue is community access to FAHC facilities at Tilley Drive. Right now there is no
15 bus service or sidewalk for folks to reach those offices. This is the type of opportunity that
16 can help us look at bike/ped and other plans to continue to work with the communities to see
17 where we can resolve this type of transportation issue.

18

19 6. Endorsement of Blue Ribbon Commission on Innovative Finance. Michele noted the
20 document in the meeting packet includes initial background of this including public outreach on
21 the original recommendations. Page 10 goes on to show recent statewide actions that occurred
22 simultaneously to and as a result of the BRC dialog over the last 18 months; and the feedback on
23 the seven recommendations. Andrea Morgante wondered how these recommendations fit into
24 the UPWP and who is responsible for them. Michele noted some are already built into the
25 UPWP. Some activities are being spearheaded by others such as CCTA or others in
26 collaboration with other entities with ongoing interest in transportation issues. One exception
27 would be if we get into project delivery recommendations 4-7. The third bullet we'd have to
28 assess if there was an internal staff lead and either redistribute current work or hire a consultant.
29 Rich Elmore asked what "endorsement" means and noted that some of these recommendations
30 differ from the original recommendations. Michele envisions the board endorsing means moving
31 forward with recommendations listed on pages 10 & 11. These items differ slightly because
32 from our feedback we could not obtain agreement with the specific language in the original
33 recommendations. Jeff Carr said there were discussions at a couple of board meetings, and we
34 had Michele visit several communities. Jeff Carr feels the good work the BRC did laid the
35 groundwork because we couldn't get agreement on all issues. There were many good ideas and
36 perhaps the timing was just off. We're looking for the board to give us the thumbs up tonight
37 and perhaps the action will be that these recommendations will be amended further. Denis
38 Gravelin said those points they're talking about deferring – can they perhaps take a slower pace.
39 Jeff feels that these will be taken at a slower pace. All good things respond to the circumstances
40 and he feels that even our MOU partner will agree that we should at least talk about some of
41 these things.

42

43 Amy Bell suggested that on Project Delivery Recommendations 4-7; bullet #3 we separate
44 design build and LTF Program because they are really two different topics that are not
45 necessarily linked. Members agreed to separate these two items by adding another bullet. They
46 would now read:

- 47 • Design-Build– work with VTrans to implement a Design-Build project in Chittenden County, as
48 authorized by the 2010 legislature.

- 1 • Local Transportation Facilities Program (LTF): work with member municipalities to develop and
2 offer Municipal Project Management (MPM) services through the CCMPO to assist in directing
3 additional LTF projects to the region; work with VTrans to determine if LTF program
4 management functions for Chittenden County LTF projects could be shifted from VTrans to the
5 CCMPO.
6

7 BOB PENNIMAN MADE A MOTION THAT WE ENDORSE THE BLUE RIBBON
8 COMMISSION ON INNOVATIVE FINANCE RECOMMENDATIONS REFLECTIVE OF
9 THE DISCUSSION WE JUST HAD REGARDING DESIGN BUILD AND LTF. ANDY
10 MONTROLL SECONDED.

11
12 At Marc Landry's suggestion and after considerable discussion it was agreed to add a sentence
13 under the second bullet under Funding Recommendation #3 to read: "To the extent innovative
14 financing can be encouraged, it significantly enhances the leveraging of state and federal funds
15 and should be reflected in the prioritization process." The intent is to have this move a project
16 up in the statewide prioritization. Amy Bell noted that VTrans is willing to take a look at this.
17

18 Rich Elmore thanked Michele and the Executive Committee for the work on these which he
19 thinks reflect the comments received. The environmental permitting streamlining is problematic
20 for his selectboard as folks in their town feel very strongly about Act 250. Jeff Carr said this just
21 says we agree to have a dialog about this. Andrea Morgante is similarly concerned because it's
22 not clear who would be doing the dialog and whether we would have an opportunity to act on
23 any suggested changes. Andy Montroll suggested at the end of that bullet we add "and report
24 back to the CCMPO Board periodically as needed." Rich Elmore suggested that there be some
25 explanation that this is about efficiencies rather than Act 250 in general. After a brief discussion
26 it was agreed to change the word "streamlining" to "efficiencies," so that it reads ..."permit
27 process efficiencies". VOTE TO ENDORSE THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS AMENDED:
28 MOTION CARRIED WITH VTRANS ABSTAINING. We will send out the revised language
29 to the board, all communities and MOU partners.
30

31 7. Public Hearing on Major Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment. Jeff Carr
32 opened the public hearing at 7:49 p.m. The request is to add a project to the FY09 year of the
33 TIP for reconstruction of a previously existing pedestrian bridge adjacent to the VT 15 roadway
34 bridge over the Browns River in Jericho. MIKE O'BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED
35 BY JIM DUDLEY, TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 7:50 P.M. MOTION CARRIED
36 UNANIMOUSLY. GEORGE GERECKE MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE TIP
37 AMENDMENT AS PRESENTED. MARC LANDRY SECONDED AND THE MOTION
38 CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
39

40 8. Warn a Public Hearing for the FY2010-2013 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).
41 Michele Boomhower said we've been working on a few issues that were outstanding since the
42 TAC approved the TIP to be forwarded to the board for public hearing. Christine has outlined
43 these in the proposed changes in her memo. We did have a meeting with CCTA, VTrans and
44 CCMPO staff and have resolved questions on transit issues. The one area where we disagree
45 with VTrans is the rail upgrade between Burlington and Milton using Western Corridor Earmark
46 funds. Michele read a response from VTrans "they disagree that they haven't commented on the
47 railroad upgrades given that they voted no for the amendment and they reiterated their position at
48 the TAC meeting. This position is consistent with their position at the May board meeting. For

1 the record, they reiterated that, while they support the concept of the project, they **do not** support
2 the use of the Western Corridor Earmark as a funding source for the project.”

3 Bob clarified that tonight we are just approving warning a public hearing for the next meeting.

4 Christine Forde made a powerpoint presentation about what the TIP is, what it does, how it is
5 developed and the project use categories. There are 22 projects in Function and Performance
6 Preservation – totaling \$27.9M. It is broken into several categories including:

7 Corridors and streetscapes: 6 projects

8 Intersections – 11 projects.

9 Paving: 4 projects

10 Bridge Preservation – 7 projects totaling \$22.4 M

11 Capacity expansion: 7 projects totaling \$65.3 M

12 Bike/Ped Projects – 11 projects totaling \$7.9 M, including 6 enhancement grants; 1
13 bike/ped award, 3 earmarks and the regional sidewalk project.

14 Intermodal – 3 projects totaling \$1.8 M

15 Christine noted that she had included transit section changes to the proposed TIP:

16 \$5.5 M for rolling stock

17 \$4.8 M for expanded routes

18 \$14.5 M FTA funding

19 \$4.5 M preventative maintenance

20 \$4.3 M for ITS improvements

21
22 Christine then reviewed 11 projects that should be completed this year and 10 projects that will
23 be delayed in the new TIP from the current TIP. She described how to read the TIP. The first
24 section is the introduction; second section is a list of projects by municipality – she described
25 each column in that section; Section 3 is financial information that summarizes the data in the
26 TIP showing each project use category and funding in each year. The last page in the TIP shows
27 a history of the TIP from FFY 2000-2008 for activity obligated in Chittenden County. The only
28 outstanding issue between CCMPO and VTrans is the rail improvement project. Marc Landry
29 asked if the information on the last page is available statewide. When asked what happened at
30 the TAC regarding rail improvements, George Gerecke noted the TAC had been supporting
31 putting both earmark and ARRA funds as funding source to cover all bases, but Mike Coates
32 changed it to use earmark only because we could then use the money this year and not be
33 delayed because ARRA funding may not be available until next year. Jeff Carr explained to new
34 members that we have been in discussions for over five years over the earmark funding with
35 Rutland. Michele noted that Rob Ide of VTrans Rail Division has been invited to our July board
36 meeting to talk about statewide rail activities, Chittenden County rail activities, the Jeffords
37 Earmark and ARRA. **BOB PENNIMAN MADE A MOTION THAT WE WARN A PUBLIC
38 HEARING FOR THE FY2010-2013 TIP AS PRESENTED TONIGHT. MARC LANDRY
39 SECONDED.** Rich Elmore noted there seems to be a disconnect with the bike/ped funding
40 which is down from previous years and seems to be in conflict with our bike/ped plan. Michele
41 noted that there is basically one source of bike/ped funds in the state, although there is also
42 sidewalk funding. Bob noted that all roadway projects in the state now have some type of
43 bike/ped component and that is not insignificant, but it doesn't show in bike/ped spending.
44 **VOTE: MOTION CARRIED WITH VTRANS OPPOSED.**

45
46 9. Approval of Transportation Action Grant Round 2 Award Recommendations. Bryan Davis
47 reported that this is the second round of TAG grants. Last time we approved 8 grants totaling
48 \$300,000. We have about \$100,000 in the second round and we have opened this up to non-
49 profits. He listed the applicants which included: City of Burlington – sharing space in

1 downtown Burlington (\$30,000); CarShare Vermont – expanding CarShare (\$30,620); Cross
2 Vermont Trail – planning tasks to benefit CSVT in Chittenden County (\$12,512); Town of
3 Huntington – Huntington Rides (\$25,000); Town of Jericho – Mt. Mansfield Union HS – Jericho
4 Center multimodal connection (\$15,500); Local Motion – walk/bike action grant, phase II
5 (\$28,536); Vermont Earth Institute – Sustainable Transportation Education: From Talking to
6 Action (\$8,000). The committee recommends we approve the following projects: Full funding
7 to CarShare Vermont; the Town of Jericho; the Town of Huntington and Local Motion – totaling
8 \$99,656 – including local match. Since there is \$100,308 available, the committee recommends
9 the remaining \$652 be awarded to Town of Jericho. Andy Montroll asked why the Burlington
10 project was dropped out. Bryan said the committee thought they were trying to do too much for
11 what they were asking for. ANDREA MORGANTE MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY
12 DENIS GRAVELIN, TO APPROVE ROUND 2 OF THE TAG GRANTS. Bob Penniman will
13 vote to approve this but there was a time when there was a carryover. He feels the Executive
14 Committee needs to know early on and make the decision whether they want to put it all into
15 TAG grants vs. whether we want to bank it as we have in the past. Jeff Carr asked for an update
16 on the first round of projects to see what was done with our dollars to be sure our money is being
17 well used. Michele suggested we have quarterly reports to the board. VOTE: MOTION
18 CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
19

20 10. Report of Nominating Committee/Election of Officers. Jim Dudley reported that he, Rick
21 Moulton and Marc Landry served on the nominating committee. All officers will remain the
22 same (Jeff Carr, Chair; Marc Landry, Vice-Chair; Jim Dudley, Secretary-Treasurer; Andy
23 Montroll, At-Large; Bob Penniman, Immediate Past Chair) with the addition of Steve Owen as
24 an at-large member, since Rick Moulton’s term on Executive Committee is up. Jeff Carr opened
25 it up for nominations from the floor. BOB PENNIMAN MADE A MOTION THAT
26 NOMINATIONS BE CLOSED. JIM DUDLEY SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED
27 UNANIMOUSLY. JIM DUDLEY MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDREA
28 MORGANTE, TO ELECT THE SLATE OF OFFICERS AS PRESENTED. MOTION
29 CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
30

31 11. Committee Reports:

- 32 a. Executive Committee. The draft minutes from June 5th are in the packet
33 b. Transportation Advisory Committee. Report from the June 2nd meeting is in packet.
34 c. Public Transportation Committee.
35 d. Finance Committee. Jim Dudley noted that the Finance Committee will meet on June 29th
36 and he welcomed Denis Gravelin to that committee.
37 e. Voting Committee. Marc Landry reported the committee will meet tomorrow morning.
38 f. CCRPC. No report.
39

40 12. Members Items:

- 41 a. Andrea Morgante would like to support MPO involvement in the Tilley Drive transportation
42 solutions including better review of projects that have regional implications, so we can do
43 better in the future. When asked if there are some next steps on that project, Michele said
44 FAHC, CCTA and South Burlington will continue to meet with Vermont Interfaith Action
45 Group and work towards a solution.
46 b. Phil Gingrow questioned the April reclassification of Pond Road in St. George. There is no
47 “Pond Road” in St. George, it’s Oak Hill Road.
48 c. Rich Elmore said the discussion of the earmark with the CCMPO and VTrans is
49 disconcerting. He asked that the Executive Committee come back with some

1 recommendations to the board about how we address this with VTrans and come to grips
2 with it. Bob noted the Executive Committee has had an MOU process with VTrans but
3 discussions stalled when Scott left. Jeff Carr said it's a disagreement because certain parties
4 around the southern part of the western corridor have projects in line for those funds and
5 VTrans agreed to fund them but the earmark money hasn't been spent in five years. Those of
6 us in the northern part of the corridor feel that because we have an immediate use for those
7 funds, we should spend them and let the other projects find other sources. Rich Elmore feels
8 this is an example of bad governance and we really need to address this because it's not in
9 the best interest of the MPO. Jeff said we're trying to do what is right for the region. VTrans
10 believes there is a higher priority use of these funds. There is room to disagree with how
11 funds are being spent and not necessarily bad governance. Discussion continued. Amy Bell
12 said this project has only come up within the last couple of months and has not even been
13 included in the TIP subcommittee discussions. It was inserted by the TAC at its last meeting,
14 without being fully vetted as it would have been had it come in at the beginning of the
15 process. Matthew noted that the first part of the legislation does recognize that the corridor
16 goes from Swanton to Rutland, but the second part of the language states that priority will be
17 given to the Middlebury Rail Spur, passenger rail from Bennington to Burlington and freight
18 operations in major cities including the City of Rutland.

19
20 GEORGE GERECKE MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN AT 8:50 P.M. MIKE O'BRIEN
21 SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

22
23 Respectfully submitted,

24
25
26
27 Bernadette Ferenc
28 Executive Assistant