

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

4 DATE: Wednesday March 8, 2006  
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 Dan Bradley, Burlington  
9 Meredith Shuft, Institutions Representative  
10 Bryan Osborne, Colchester  
11 Bernie Chagnon, Shelburne  
12 Aaron Frank, CCTA  
13 Stan Hamlet, Underhill  
14 Bill McCormick, Inter City Bus Representative  
15 Richard Watts, Environmental Representative  
16 Chris Jolly, FHWA  
17 Dennis Lutz, Essex  
18 Matt Langham, VTrans  
19 Steve Palmer, Winooski  
20 Dean Bloch, Charlotte  
21 Murray Benner, SSTA  
22 Jane Marvin, Seniors Representative  
23 Sonny Audette, South Burlington  
24 Chapin Spencer, Bike/Pedestrian Representative  
25 MPO Staff: Susan Smichenko, Senior Planner  
26 Christine Forde, Senior Planner  
27 Peter Keating, Senior Planner  
28 Scott Johnstone, Executive Director  
29 Dave Roberts, Senior Planner  
30 Daryl Benoit, Transportation Planner  
31 Others: Tom Buckley, CCMPO Board Representative from Westford  
32 Greg Brown, CCRPC  
33

34 Chair George Gerecke called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.  
35

36 **1. Consent Agenda**

37 There were several TIP amendments on this agenda item, one of which generated discussion. A  
38 motion to adopt the consent agenda was revised to remove the TIP amendment item related to the  
39 Champlain Water District (CWD). With this item removed the remainder of the consent agenda  
40 was approved unanimously. Questions about who would administer the funds awarded to CWD  
41 and how the funds would flow could not be answered at this time. Scott Johnstone offered to  
42 convene a meeting of those interested in this issue in order to get the information sought.  
43

44 **2. Approval of Minutes**

45 The minutes of February 7, 2006 were approved without changes.  
46

47 **3. Public Comments**

48 No members of the public were present. Chairman Gerecke noted a change in the agenda to start  
49 with the item on TAC committee structure.  
50  
51

#### 4. TAC Committee Structure

Scott Johnstone provided some background to this discussion item noting the CCMPO's current strategic planning process and the Board's desires to consider its subcommittee structure and committee roles/responsibilities. Scott wanted to hear from TAC members their ideas about the TAC, its functions, membership, etc. Members offered their observations and comments which included:

- Problems getting TAC at-large members to attend and to engage their interests.
- A public involvement plan that doesn't seem to work
- The TAC tries to be too much for too many.
- There's too much redundancy between what the TAC does and the Board.
- The TAC's role is advisory related to "facts."
- There's a poor view of the TAC from some Board members – a lack of respect.
- The TAC does provide a valuable role/need for the organization.
- There's value in the networking opportunities and information sharing TAC meetings provide.
- The networking provided by the TAC is available elsewhere.
- The size of the TAC makes it unwieldy.
- The TAC's day meeting schedule makes it difficult for volunteers to attend.
- The early history of MPO committees included a transit technical committee as well as the TAC – this was when the MPO had only nine members.
- A smaller TAC had been considered when the MPO grew to the whole county but it was decided to be more inclusive and go with more representation.
- More subcommittees of the TAC might help it function better.
- TAC is a misnomer – it's more of a review committee.
- TIP projects are more a policy concern and don't need to be addressed by the TAC.
- Consider using TAC members as a technical pool resource.
- Despite what some say, the TAC does not get involved in policy issues.
- The TAC should be more regionally focused and assess issues, applying technical criteria, from this perspective, then make recommendations to the Board. Political/parochial concerns should not enter into TAC deliberations.
- The MPO should identify what it needs to do then map a plan of how to get there. This could guide the establishment of committees and their respective roles.
- An annual calendar/chart of TAC agenda items, identifying what will be discussed/decided when would be informative and lead to more efficient meetings.
- Will automated management systems make the TAC obsolete?

Scott concluded the discussion noting staff would develop several committee models for future consideration and will return to the TAC for comment. He plans to have a recommendation on this for Board consideration this coming fall.

#### 5. Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan

Peter Keating reported that this Plan stemmed from MTP recommendations, its proposed content refined by a subcommittee and then put into a RFP to have a consultant prepare. That work was completed last December and the subcommittee agreed that the document should be summarized for TAC and Board consideration. The TAC has that summary before them which identifies program elements and broad implementation strategies. The summary also includes the specific recommendations from the plan to advance TDM to other areas of the region. Meredith Schuft offered that CATMA can be used as a resource on TDM plans and can share with the TAC their TDM presentation. Scott mentioned that the CCMPO could create financial incentives for TDM programs under a potential Transportation Management Association (TMA). Chapin Spencer voiced support for the plan and moving forward on its implementation recommendations. DAN

1 BRADLEY MADE A MOTION RECOMMENDING THE BOARD ADOPT THE SUMMARY  
2 AS THE CCMPO'S TDM IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY. JANE MARVIN SECONDED  
3 THE MOTION AND IT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.  
4

#### 5 **6. FY07 UPWP**

6 Scott Johnstone reported on the UPWP public forum held at the CCMPO Board's meeting in  
7 February. Input there and from emails and other sources have produced a list of potential work  
8 program tasks that is now 310 long. Over the next month this will be whittled down into a draft  
9 UPWP. Scott reported that two versions of the UPWP will be prepared, one that follows the format  
10 currently in use and another based on functional work areas. Scott also mentioned that it appears  
11 that we tend to put more funding into scoping and technical assistance categories than we can  
12 manage in a year and he wants to examine this. He also feels that we have too much money in  
13 arbitrary accounts. The UPWP subcommittee will be meeting next week to discuss the requests and  
14 help staff get a draft UPWP completed.  
15

#### 16 **7. FY07 TIP Development**

17 Christine Forde noted that the next TIP would cover four rather than three years per new federal  
18 regulations. VTrans has given us a fiscal constraint total to work with as the new TIP is developed  
19 and Christine has been in contact with VTrans project managers to obtain the most recent project  
20 cost information. She also went over the TIP development schedule culminating in a public hearing  
21 in July. Jane Marvin, George Gerecke, Sonny Audette, Stan Hamlet, Matt Langham, Chris Jolly,  
22 and Aaron Frank agreed to serve on the TIP development committee.  
23

#### 24 **8. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports**

25 Dave Roberts reported on the CIRC EIS schedule and the traffic alert program for the upcoming  
26 construction season - an RFP for this has gone out and is due March 28<sup>th</sup>. Christine Forde  
27 mentioned that the project prioritization model is still being worked on and she's attempting to  
28 combine both qualitative and quantitative criteria. A prioritized project list is needed by VTrans  
29 this June. Susan Smichenko reported that the US RT 2 Corridor study will feature a charette at the  
30 Doubletree Hotel on March 30<sup>th</sup>. The TAC approved MTP survey consultant, NRC, is developing  
31 the survey which will be distributed to 2,000 Chittenden County households in early April  
32 according to Peter Keating. Peter also noted the Safe Routes to School training coming up March  
33 27<sup>th</sup> and encouraged TAC members or others in their communities who might be interested to  
34 attend.  
35

#### 36 **9. CCMPO February Board Meeting Report**

37 Peter Keating mentioned that this meeting focused on UPWP input from the public as Scott has  
38 reported earlier.  
39

40 The meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.  
41

42 Respectfully submitted,  
43 Peter Keating  
44