

1 CHITTENDEN COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
2 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
3 MINUTES
4

5 DATE: Wednesday March 2, 2005

6 TIME: 9:00 a.m.

7 PLACE: CCMPO Offices, 30 Kimball Avenue, Suite 102, South Burlington, VT

8 Present: George Gerecke, Chair, Williston

9 Polly McMurtry, VTrans

10 Jeanne K. Wilson, Hinesburg

11 Ed Wildman, Huntington

12 Jane Marvin, Senior Representative

13 Dan Bradley, Burlington

14 Meredith Shuft, Institutions Representative

15 Bryan Osborne, Colchester

16 Mike Coates, Business Representative

17 Stan Hamlet, Underhill

18 Matt Langham, VTrans

19 Dennis Lutz, Essex

20 Andy Legg, Milton

21 Bill McCormick, Intercity Bus Representative

22 Chris Jolly, FHWA

23 Jeff Arango, Essex Junction

24 Sonny Audette, South Burlington

25 Chapin Spencer, Bike/Pedestrian Representative

26 Aaron Frank, CCTA

27 MPO Staff: Peter Keating, Senior Planner

28 Susan Smichenko, Senior Planner

29 Daryl Benoit, Transportation Planner

30 Christine Forde, Senior Planner

31 Dave Roberts, Senior Planner

32 Others: Mick Matsky, FHWA

33
34 Chair George Gerecke called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.
35

36 **1. Consent Agenda**

37 There were no items this month.
38

39 **2. Approval of Minutes**

40 The minutes of February 1, 2005 were approved without changes.
41

42 **3. Public Comments**

43 No members of the public were present.
44

45 **4. Scoping Projects**

46 Christine Forde distributed some revised documents, updated versions of what had gone out with
47 the agenda packet, plus a table showing staff's attempt to prioritize the many scoping requests.

48 Christine suggested that we should first move forward on the scoping projects already identified in
49 the FY05 UPWP but that we were looking to TAC members for any comments given the large
50 number of requests. Christine noted that there were two UPWP scoping categories – one with a 3%
51 local match managed by the CCMPO and the other, locally managed, requiring a 20% local match.

1 There was discussion about the Williston Park and Ride, where it fell on the staff's priority list and
2 an update on the latest news about this long-identified project. Dennis Lutz suggested that if it's the
3 municipalities' intent to get more projects in the pipeline for construction, and scoping is how we
4 get them ready, then scoping more projects – even if the municipal share goes above 20% - is what
5 we should do. Christine reported that the project prioritization system is being updated and that
6 scoping requests would be reevaluated with the new criteria. At this point, the TAC felt that moving
7 forward with the scoping already identified in the UPWP was preferred. The UPWP committee will
8 be meeting over the coming months to consider scoping requests in FY06.

9 10 **5. ITS Plan**

11 Susan Smichenko opened this presentation noting this project had been underway since last fall and
12 is nearing completion. The regional ITS architecture needs to be in place by April and we are on
13 schedule to do this. Susan introduced Randy Knappick of IBI Group, the project consultant, for an
14 overview of the ITS Plan update. Randy used a PowerPoint presentation to describe the project
15 objectives, the need to develop a regional ITS architecture, the project outcomes, and the elements
16 of the project's final report. He also described how the report satisfied the federal requirements,
17 how the report could be accessed via the web, next steps, and architecture maintenance. Randy
18 finished by identifying future key issues to the successful implementation to ITS. Following a short
19 discussion, DENNIS LUTZ MADE A MOTION THE TAC ENDORSE THE ITS PLAN. THE
20 MOTION WAS SECONDED BY SONNY AUDETTE AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

21 22 **5A. TIP Amendment**

23 Christine Forde distributed a proposed FY05 TIP amendment to add a non-fiscally constrained
24 paving project for I-89 southbound from South Burlington to Bolton for \$3.5 million. This item led
25 to discussion about the paving of the southbound off ramp at Exit 12 which will be part of the
26 overall I-89 project. DAN BRADLEY MADE A MOTION THE TAC RECOMMEND THE
27 BOARD APPROVE THIS TIP AMENDMENT. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY SONNY
28 AUDETTE AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

29 30 **6. Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan Update**

31 Peter Keating provided background on this project first by defining TDM and then noting that the
32 scope of work was developed last year in consultation with Burlington, CATMA, CCTA, the
33 Alliance for Climate Action and VTrans. This was followed by the hiring of URS Corporation to
34 do the Plan. To date, URS has completed briefing papers related to several of the tasks, including
35 Existing TDM Conditions, Opportunities and Challenges, TDM Regulations, and Prioritizing TDM
36 Program Areas. These have been reviewed and commented on by the interested parties. The
37 consultant will be meeting with the steering committee later this month to discuss preliminary
38 implementation strategies and the entire plan is scheduled to be completed by the end of the fiscal
39 year.

40 41 **7. Sidewalk Program**

42 Peter Keating passed out application forms for this new CCMPO program designed to fund
43 preliminary engineering for sidewalks. Peter noted that this effort started five years ago as a way
44 for Chittenden County towns to gain access to federal funds to construct more sidewalks. With
45 recent VTrans acceptance of this program, the application was put together in close coordination
46 with VTrans staff from Local Transportation Facilities. Peter stated that eligible projects would be
47 those that have completed scoping or conceptual alignments analyses, and that \$100,000 in federal
48 funds were in the approved TIP and could be obligated for these grants. Applications were due
49 April 1st and would be evaluated by a TAC subcommittee (Sonny Audette, Jane Marvin, and Stan
50 Hamlet agreed to serve on this committee). The project evaluation criteria were identified in the
51 2000 Pedestrian Policy and Sidewalk Plan. Bryan Osborne felt that a \$25,000 grant was too low for

1 towns to take advantage since the administrative requirements of using federal funds meant that
2 only large projects would want to use this money for sidewalks. Dennis Lutz echoed this concern
3 stating that using federal funds was only cost efficient if the project was large. Both wondered if
4 state-only funds could pay for this program. Chris Jolly noted that the federal regulation referenced
5 under the Procurement Procedures section was not accurate and he would get the correct citation to
6 CCMPO staff. In response to other questions staff stated this program could be used to supplement
7 funding for a project already receiving funds through the Bicycle/Pedestrian Program, and that
8 updating existing sidewalks to ADA standards was an eligible project.
9

10 **8. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports**

11 Susan reported that the US RT 2 technical study had been cancelled and a new scope of work for
12 this corridor would be written in the near future. Dave Roberts said the black and white
13 orthoimagery was going to the towns this week and that the color, infrared, and terrain model data
14 would soon follow. He also noted that the travel demand model was being calibrated and that the
15 freight component was to be separated as a distinct task that would take longer to complete. Dave
16 noted that the infrastructure management training would take place tomorrow at Champlain
17 College, and that three Circ EIS public meetings were planned in the coming weeks. Christine
18 Forde reminded the TAC that work would soon start on the FY06 TIP. Sonny Audette reported that
19 the state legislative transportation committees had been briefed by US Senate staff on the status of
20 the transportation reauthorization bill. Sonny noted that the new bill could see a twenty percent
21 increase in funding to the state.
22

23 **9. CCMPO February Board Meeting Report**

24 Peter Keating reported that the meeting discussed the reliability of some of the cost estimate data in
25 the MTP, the Board received an update on the VT RT 15 Jericho to Hardwick Corridor Study, and
26 heard reports on the National Association of Regional Councils in Washington DC and the Circ
27 EIS.
28

29 **10. Chairman's/Members' Items**

30 Chapin Spencer reported that two votes in Grand Isle County related to paths had been approved by
31 voters in South and North Hero and these could lead to extending further north the Island Line Rail
32 trail. Bryan Osborne inquired from VTrans about delays to the Lime Kiln Road Bridge and VTrans
33 responded that resolving a railroad agreement was the cause.
34

35 The meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.
36

37 Respectfully submitted,
38 Peter Keating
39