

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

5 DATE: Wednesday, October 21, 2009
6 TIME: 7:00 p.m.
7 PLACE: CCMPO Offices, 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404
8 PRESENT: Andy Montroll, Burlington Jim Donovan, Charlotte Alt. (7:04)
9 Marc Landry, Colchester (Vice-Chair) Jeff Carr, Essex (Chair)
10 Andrea Morgante, Hinesburg Lori Donna, Milton
11 Jim Dudley, Shelburne Denis Gravelin, South Burlington
12 George Gerecke, Williston Mike O'Brien, Winooski
13 Amy Bell, VTrans Planning Coordinator
14 Ex-Officio: Chris Jolly, FHWA Chris Cole, CCTA (7:55)
15 Brad Worthen, BIA
16 OTHERS: Matthew Langham, VTrans Barry Lampke, Champlain Initiative
17 Tom Buckley, Winooski Alternate
18 Staff: Michele Boomhower, Exec. Director Peter Keating, Sr. Trans. Planner
19 Christine Forde, Sr. Trans. Planner Dave Roberts, Sr. Trans. Planner
20 Daryl Benoit, Trans. Planner/IT Web Bryan Davis, Trans. Planner
21 Jason Charest, Trans. Engineer Bernadette Ferenc, Exec. Assistant
22

23 The meeting was called to order at 7:02 p.m. by the Chair, Jeff Carr. He took the opportunity to
24 let members know that the Executive Committee had a mini-retreat in October. After briefly
25 discussing the MOU, it was decided that because we have so many new board members and we
26 thought a retreat would be in order. We'll discuss the ins and outs of working with VTrans and
27 what the MPO does and how it might change with new federal legislation and new Census data.
28 There will be a short business meeting before the retreat to help keep the regular December
29 board meeting short. He asked board members and alternates to clear their calendars to attend
30 that evening. The retreat will be held on December 9th from 5-9 p.m. at the DoubleTree and
31 dinner will be provided.
32

33 2. Public Comment Period. There were no members of the public present.
34

35 3. Consent Agenda. There were three minor amendments on the consent agenda. Christine
36 Forde noted these are three interstate projects that do not affect our fiscal constraint. JIM
37 DONOVAN MADE A MOTION TO ACCEPT THE CONSENT AGENDA. MARC LANDRY
38 SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
39

40 4. Approval of minutes. ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE
41 MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 16, 2009 WITH CORRECTION IF ANY. JIM DUDLEY
42 SECONDED. When asked if we had resolved the question of who can vote on minutes, Michele
43 noted that minutes are part of the accepted record and unless there is a correction everyone can
44 vote on the minutes. The following grammatical corrections were made: Page 1, line 38 "as"
45 should be "has"; Page 1, attendance list – add a close parenthesis after (Chair); Delete second
46 period on line 37, after 7. Report on Local Motion activities.
47

48 5. Executive Director's Report.

- 1 • Exit 12B – we’ve completed an alignment study to determine options for designing ramps for
2 this intersection. The report is on our website.
- 3 • We are working on a follow-up creative financing study for the state legislature with RSG
4 and Mike Munson, to assist with local share match and other funds needed if we were able to
5 construct the interchange.
- 6 • We also need to perform an access study required by FHWA, which is a determination of
7 traffic flow, alignment, etc. This report goes to FHWA to review prior to an EIS to see if
8 they would even allow an interchange to be built there. It would not preclude an EIS, but
9 doing it would let us know earlier whether it could be built or not. The access study will be
10 completed by May 2010 – we have \$10,000 cash match committed from private developers
11 and BIA for this study.
- 12 • Outreach will be going on mid-November to late January to advise our communities about
13 the final recommendations of the BRC. The Executive Committee and the executive director
14 have been working on the final report and developing a resolution for legislative bodies to
15 sign onto. She will send the final report and links to various reports. We’ll look at the
16 resolution at the brief business meeting on November 18th. She’ll let members know when
17 she’ll visit their communities so they can attend.
- 18 • The TAC and Executive Committee have been working on sidewalk grant criteria update.
19 The TAC will review it at their November meeting and we will deal with it at our December
20 meeting. Peter Keating can answer any questions.
- 21 • The Western Corridor Management Plan final draft for public review had been delayed, but
22 the steering committee is reviewing it and will finalize it in early November. Michele hopes
23 we’ll have a document at the November meeting and we can discuss it at the December
24 meeting.
- 25 • Town Highway Bridge Program. The State of Vermont is updating the candidate list of
26 bridge projects portion of the Town Highway bridges. The TAC was tasked with looking at
27 the list of bridges related to their communities. We want to be sure board members are aware
28 of it. Each region can submit 8 bridges and the list of 80 will be whittled down to 30.
29 Christine noted that CCMPO has 3 bridges on the state’s top 60 list and they’re all in
30 Huntington. Michele noted that the board will need to take action on a prioritization at our
31 November business meeting.

32

33 Andrea Morgante noted that a couple of meetings ago we were talking about public access for
34 people getting to the medical facilities on Tilley Drive. She understands that an EIS has a public
35 transportation component. She feels it’s important for us not to make an assumption that this is a
36 project until we have a full EIS. She feels it brings into question why public transportation
37 wasn’t considered before the medical buildings were constructed. Michele said the only way
38 12B would become a priority is if additional funds could be brought to the table besides federal
39 and state funds. Jeff Carr said we do not preempt any process. The attention is here because the
40 private sector has stepped up to the plate. Michele said the Tilley Drive access issues continue to
41 be discussions that the MPO staff is facilitating by bringing parties together on how to get the
42 public to the facilities on Tilley Drive. We’ve identified the fact that we shouldn’t create
43 facilities that need to be accessed by public transportation.

44

45 Mike O’Brien questioned the Burlington Street car study. Dave Roberts noted that the city
46 requested a locally managed project to look into streetcars and have hired a consultant to do this.
47 Andy Montroll said it grew out of a city task force looking into environmental things the city
48 could do.

49

1 Peter Keating noted that the City of south Burlington has been putting together a project to finish
2 the sidewalk out near Tilley Drive through the enhancement program.

3
4 6. Update on Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Process. Peter Keating brought new
5 members up to date on what the MTP is. He reviewed the draft document outline – we’re using
6 the same template from the 2025 plan. He noted that the MTP is one of three major documents
7 MPOs are required to complete. The UPWP is a program of tasks we’ll do every year. The TIP
8 is a list of projects developed by MPO, VTrans and CCTA, to be completed over a 3-4 year
9 period and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) which has to look out over at least 25
10 years. The current document has been in development for a little over a year now. He reviewed
11 the chapters: 1) MTP background; 2) public involvement process and policies; 3) demographics
12 and transportation – current housing and jobs and forecasted conditions – we’ve asked all
13 adjacent regions to give input as to how these are related to other regions. 4) financial plan – it
14 has to be based on realistic resources that might be available and we have to subtract costs of
15 maintaining the existing system; 5) scenario planning – we started a scenario planning exercise
16 last fall and asked for input of where folks thought development, etc. should take place over the
17 next 50 years. 6) After that’s completed we’ll do a 2060 MTP to develop projects for each of the
18 9 corridors going out the next 50 years; 7) Implementation of the plan.

19
20 Peter then reviewed the remaining scenario planning tasks. We produced 13 different scenarios
21 based on these workshops. When we ran our transportation model we saw very little difference
22 in the various scenarios, so we began looking at the model to see why we weren’t seeing
23 differences between the scenarios. It became a long process between the two consultants and
24 now we’ve tried to come up with model enhancements to better sensitize the non-motorized trips
25 to the land use changes. Dave Roberts said we’re trying to make the dense mixed-use land use
26 more sensitive to walk/bike trips. Jeff Carr wanted them to be very careful changing the co-
27 efficients of the model and the underlying justification for them so we can be sure we’re on the
28 highest and best ground for doing that. He wanted to go on record that he’d like to see an
29 inventory of changes and the underlying justification for those, so we can be sure we’re on the
30 highest and best ground. Dave Roberts said we do have documentation and we did extensive
31 research with RSG and Smart Mobility and both consultants agree to the changes. Lengthy
32 discussion ensued. Peter Keating said there are a number of other things we have to do, such as
33 refine the scenarios from 13 to a more manageable number; pair transportation solutions with
34 land use; analyze these using the model. Then we’ll post our results on line and ask folks to
35 review how they perform and vote on the preferred land use scenario. Then we’ll go back to the
36 Board, RPC, etc. to see what they think. After that we have to develop transportation strategies
37 with land use selected. We’ll need to go to local communities and interest groups. When asked
38 why we’re doing a 50 year outcome rather than a shorter period, Peter Keating said that stems
39 from the previous executive director who felt we could get a fairer look at heavy transportation
40 investments, such as rail if we looked out further. Some members feel there will be many
41 significant changes in transportation over 50 years. Peter noted that’s why we have to update it
42 every five years, but it doesn’t mean we’ll have to continue to do 50 year plans. Brad Worthen
43 said he attended the scenario planning workshop at CVU done a year ago when gas was
44 \$4/gallon and that really affected people’s decisions that night.

45
46 Peter noted that we will have to do more extensive public outreach and when SAFETEA-LU
47 passed five years ago it contained new regulations about how to develop the plan. One
48 requirement is involving natural resource agencies. When we put together a schedule 16 months
49 ago we anticipated the project would be done in January 2010. That date was not arbitrary; it’s

1 when our 2025 plan expires. We've been talking with FHWA and AMPO (our national
2 organization) and advice we got was not to let the plan lapse and at a minimum we should adopt
3 the old plan with changes needed from SAFETEA-LU. Then we can extend the deadline for
4 adoption of the new plan. The chart in the meeting package shows what we'll need to do to
5 adopt a new plan in December 2010. In the meantime, we will need to hold a public hearing in
6 January 2010 to amend the 2025 plan with changes. Before the December meeting, the advisory
7 committee will have reviewed the document and then we can warn a public hearing for January
8 so we can adopt it in time. Chris Jolly noted that we have to update the cost information as well.
9 The plan does include a laundry list of projects that the MPO included in the MTP including
10 some significant projects and when the plan is amended and adopted the board will be buying
11 into that list. Mike O'Brien wondered about the MTP advisory committee and board
12 representation. Peter will make sure we have more board members on that committee.
13

14 7. Presentation on Champlain Initiative (CI) Project. Michele Boomhower noted that Barry
15 Lampke is the program director at United Way for the Champlain Initiative. She briefly
16 described what the Champlain Initiative is. Barry Lampke said CI was formed in 1996 when
17 Fanny Allen and Medical Center of Vermont hospitals merged. What grew out of the meetings
18 was to look at health, environment and economic well-being for the region. He described some
19 earlier programs. The program they're launching now is "The Changing Face of Chittenden
20 County." Each of us has an internal switch that triggers a response such as gas prices, economic
21 downturn etc. How are we responding? Have we reached a "tipping point" – the point at which
22 social change is unstoppable? What's different? How has the economic uncertainty affected
23 how we will embrace the coming changes? People are open to seeing how the pieces connect
24 between our personal actions and our community at large. In 2006 CI identified issues changing
25 the face of our community: health; IT/Communications; demographic changes; and energy. So
26 they're creating this project with about 26 organizations in the region. They've launched the
27 program with an initial focus on energy. They're combining data, stories and actions to show
28 folks what they can do. Over the next year they'll focus on the other three issues. January –
29 March it'll be IT and communications; April-June health and July-September – Changing
30 population. Mr. Lampke then walked members through their website. He noted the CCMPO &
31 CCRPC have been involved in this for years. We're trying to get the word out to the public so
32 they can see what they can do. When asked about the cost, Mr. Lampke said it's funded through
33 United Way, FAHC and other groups. He is the only staff and they have some staff resources of
34 the steering committee organizations. When asked what role the MPO plays in this, Mr. Lampke
35 said the MPO & RPC bring long term planning experience in both energy and demographic
36 areas. When we talk about energy and transportation it brings it into perspective.
37

38 8. Presentation on proposed legislation for statewide transit authority. Chris Cole of CCTA
39 departed from the subject. They introduced legislation at the end of last year as a jumping off
40 piece for GMTA and CCTA to legally come together (H.457). The two boards have been
41 meeting for two years and what came from those meetings was a desire to create a more efficient
42 operation. They've been trying to use September-November to gain insight on the legislation.
43 He's been meeting with various groups and the meeting with VTrans two weeks ago will cause
44 them to shift gears in how to approach the solution to "how do we function more efficiently and
45 effectively." They could amend their charter to allow more communities to join them. The last
46 time they changed the charter, it could only include communities in Chittenden County. VPTA,
47 the statewide transit organization has questioned the local vs. statewide funding and VTrans has
48 questioned the investment plan they're proposing. VTrans would rather GMTA and CCTA
49 come together to see how it works rather than create a statewide transit authority. Chris will

1 have to reconvene the two board committees and go over the feedback he's received from
2 various sources. Charter change would: 1) expand service area; 2) create process for approving
3 their assessment policy. Right now every member community has to agree with the assessment
4 policy. If they become a transit authority with 14 municipalities, it may be difficult to get all to
5 agree, and because they'd be both urban and rural communities they will have different needs
6 and different ability to pay; 3) their name would change; 4) governance – which is a big issue.
7 Once the legislature acts, municipalities would vote on this on an individual basis rather than
8 county-wide vote. He doesn't think Vermont is ready for a statewide authority. Both boards
9 believe this would be good public policy for the State of Vermont and they've been doing this
10 since 2002 and really want one legal organization. They will either bring these two
11 organizations together or go their separate ways when the contract expires in 2011. It doesn't
12 look like they'll be trying for a statewide agency, but only a charter change if approved by his
13 boards. Brief discussion ensued and Chris Cole answered questions about their finances.
14

15 9. Committee Reports.

- 16 a. Executive Committee. Minutes are in the meeting packet.
- 17 b. Transportation Advisory Committee. The minutes are in the packet and George Gerecke
18 noted there was a lengthy discussion on the sidewalk grant criteria.
- 19 c. Finance Committee. Jim Dudley said the committee met on Monday and reviewed the draft
20 audit. Sullivan Powers & Co. will attend the November Executive Committee meeting to
21 discuss the audit without staff present. The audit has no findings.
22

23 10. Members' Items:

- 24 a. Matthew Langham noted that next Wednesday, October 28th at 7:00 p.m. VTrans is holding
25 the annual STIP public hearing. Chittenden County's interactive site is at VTC in Williston.
- 26 b. Michele Boomhower noted that the Vermont Transportation Board will hold their annual
27 meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Thursday, November 5th at Milton Community Room at town hall.
28

29 11. Other Business.

30 Michele recognized Dave Roberts for his 10 years of service with the CCMPO.

31
32 ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN AT 8:50 P.M. JIM DUDLEY
33 SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
34

35 Respectfully submitted,
36
37
38

39 Bernadette Ferenc
40 Executive Assistant