

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

4 DATE: Tuesday August 2, 2005
5 TIME: 9:00 a.m.
6 PLACE: CCMPO Offices, 30 Kimball Avenue, Suite 206, South Burlington, VT
7 Present: George Gerecke, Chair, Williston
8 Polly McMurtry, VTrans
9 Jeanne K. Wilson, Hinesburg
10 Jane Marvin, Senior Representative
11 Dan Bradley, Burlington
12 Meredith Shuft, Institutions Representative
13 Bryan Osborne, Colchester
14 Jeff Arango, Essex Junction
15 Matt Langham, VTrans
16 Andy Legg, Milton
17 Dean Pierce, Shelburne
18 Aaron Frank, CCTA
19 Lew Wetzel, CCRPC
20 Dean Bloch, Charlotte
21 Steve Palmer, Winooski
22 Ed Wildman, Huntington
23 Sonny Audette, South Burlington
24 Stan Hamlet, Underhill
25 Chris Jolly, FWWA
26 Murray Benner, SSTA
27 Richard Watts, Environmental Representative
28 MPO Staff: Susan Smichenko, Senior Planner
29 Daryl Benoit, Transportation Planner
30 Christine Forde, Senior Planner
31 Dave Roberts, Senior Planner
32 Peter Keating, Senior Planner
33 Bill Knight, Executive Director
34 Others: Greg Brown, CCRPC Staff
35 Richard Tetreault, VTrans
36 Rich Renaldo, VTrans
37

38 Chair George Gerecke called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.
39

40 **1. Consent Agenda**

41 A minor FY04-06 TIP amendment on Burlington's South End Transit Center was approved
42 unanimously.
43

44 **2. Approval of Minutes**

45 The minutes of June 7, 2005 were approved without changes.
46

47 **3. Public Comments**

48 No members of the public were present.
49

50 **4. VTrans Capital Budget Presentation**

1 Matt Langham handed out charts displaying the various category shares of VTrans capital program
2 going back to FY01. He reported that VTrans had conducted several of these meetings in other
3 regions of the state and briefly mentioned some of the issues raised at those. The intent of the
4 regional meetings is to get comments that could assist VTrans with budget development. Matt
5 introduced VTrans Director of Project Development Rich Tetreault who was present to answer any
6 questions. Several TAC members felt that the budget shares for the town programs, transit and rail
7 were too low. Others wondered if the budget allotment reflected VTrans recognized needs
8 documented in recent plans. Rich Tetreault said that they used asset management tools to determine
9 allocations among categories and in a constrained budget not all categories could be fully funded.
10 TAC suggestions included using projections, by category, out five years into the future, and to show
11 expenditures over time with inflation factored into the totals. Discussion digressed into the recently
12 passed federal Transportation Reauthorization bill. Chris Jolly and Bill Knight briefed members on
13 what information was available/known so far. Many questions remained on the contents and effects
14 of the law and Polly reported that VTrans Policy staff was undertaking a review. A key unanswered
15 question is the degree to which non-federal matching funds for projects will be required. It was
16 noted that local representatives needed to protect the Town Highway project funds from being
17 transferred to other programs in order to match federal money since those funds are from the state.
18

19 **5. Project Prioritization**

20 Christine Forde provided background information on this item: Based on the recently passed state
21 transportation bill, the regions were asked to prioritize their projects identified in the Candidate and
22 Development & Evaluation sections of the capital program. The CCMPO has previously attempted
23 prioritizations for the TIP and project development work but the CCMPO Board had not endorsed
24 the plans developed by staff. The version used in the latest offering, included in the TAC packet,
25 comes from a Pennsylvania MPO. Christine explained that this was the first step in refining a
26 CCMPO prioritization process that would be developed over the coming months. The prioritization
27 today is to give VTrans regional priorities to plug into a statewide prioritization model for
28 consideration in their budget planning and to get the results to the legislature. Christine described
29 each criterion and how points were distributed to projects. She also used the safety criteria to
30 demonstrate how the projects scored under this category. Polly briefly described some of the criteria
31 used by other Vermont regions in their prioritization efforts. Comments included: Evaluation
32 criteria and scoring were somewhat vague and ambiguous; consider giving different weights to the
33 criteria; consider "ability to construct," potential permitting, and right-of-way issues as criteria in
34 the evaluation; expand the project types under the connectivity criterion. Bryan Osborne noted that
35 if the CCMPO uses a prioritization model to select future projects, this will be a switch from the
36 way projects were selected in the past. Following further discussion BRYAN OSBORNE MADE A
37 MOTION THE TAC FORWARD THIS PRIORITIZATION LIST TO THE BOARD WITH TAC
38 COMMENTS. SONNY AUDETTE SECONDED THE MOTION WHICH PASSED WITHOUT
39 DISSENT.
40

41 **6. Signal Optimization RFP**

42 Susan Smichenko reported that four proposals for this project had been received from the following
43 firms: Clough Harbor & Associates, Resource Systems Group with DuBois & King, Dufresne-
44 Henry, and Vanasse Hangen Bruslin (VHB). The committee reviewing the proposals recommended
45 the CCMPO hire VHB for the work. BRYAN OSBORNE MADE A MOTION THE CCMPO HIRE
46 VHB. ANDY LEGG SECONDED AND THE MOTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED. Steve
47 Palmer asked if this project could include the signal at the Colchester/Riverside intersection in
48 Burlington as this will become a choke point when the Winooski roundabout is completed. Susan
49 said that although this was not one of the involved intersections in this year's plan, the CCMPO
50 staff would discuss this with the cities to see how we could help.
51

1 **7. Transportation Model Update**

2 Dave Roberts described how this model version is an improvement over its predecessors and is
3 calibrated with more recent data. The calibration meets standards established by the Federal
4 Highway Administration. The freight component is still being worked on as there was a switch
5 from one contractor back to RSG for this model element. The model will be able to differentiate
6 between medium and large trucks, and buses will fall into the medium truck category. The new
7 model will be used in the Circumferential Highway EIS as well as the next version of the
8 Metropolitan Transportation Plan.
9

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

11 Dave Roberts reported that the infrastructure management software has some glitches related to the
12 version of Arc GIS used to develop it but the consultant should have this fixed soon. Dave also
13 gave an update on the Circ EIS mentioning the long list of alternatives generated and the next steps
14 to reduce that number through a screening process. Susan Smichenko reported that the US Route 2
15 Corridor Study RFP had been issued and described her involvement with CCTA and UMASS on a
16 transit vehicle priority project. Peter Keating said the 2030 MTP development process was
17 underway and mentioned a presentation to the Board on a proposed list of tasks and schedule. He
18 also announced a new round of Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) grants.
19 Applications would go out soon and a review committee would be solicited to help with application
20 evaluation.
21

22 **9. CCMPO June/July Board Meeting Report**

23 Peter Keating reported that the primary item discussed by the Board these months was the TIP and
24 the TIP public hearing. Peter also mentioned that the Board warned a TIP Public hearing for
25 August for a price increase on the Winooski Riverwalk project – a proposed recommendation that
26 had not come through the TAC due to its timing.
27
28

29 The meeting adjourned at 11:05 a.m.

30
31 Respectfully submitted,
32 Peter Keating
33