

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

4 DATE: Tuesday, October 3, 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 Bill McCormick, Inter City Bus Representative  
9 Polly McMurtry, VTrans  
10 Jane Marvin, Seniors Representative  
11 Jeanne K. Wilson, Vice-Chair Hinesburg  
12 Jeff Arango, Essex Junction  
13 Chris Jolly, FHWA  
14 Gary Estus, Westford  
15 Steve Palmer, Winooski  
16 Bernie Gagnon, Shelburne  
17 Bryan Osborne, Colchester  
18 Dan Bradley, Burlington  
19 Ed Wildman, Huntington  
20 Richard Watts, Environmental Representative  
21 Mike Coates, Business Representative  
22 Meredith Schuft, Institutions Representative  
23 MPO Staff: Susan Smichenko, Senior Planner  
24 Christine Forde, Senior Planner  
25 Peter Keating, Senior Planner  
26 Dave Roberts, Senior Planner  
27 Scott Johnstone, Executive Director  
28

29 Chair George Gerecke called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.  
30

31 **1. Consent Agenda**

32 There were no items this month.  
33

34 **2. Approval of Minutes**

35 The minutes of September 5, 2006 were approved without changes.  
36

37 **3. Public Comments**

38 No members of the public were present.  
39

40 **4. VTrans Long Range Transportation Plan Presentation**

41 Polly McMurtry gave an overview of the update to the VTrans Long Range Plan – titled “Long Range  
42 Transportation Business Plan 2008.” She described how this update related to its predecessor and the five  
43 goals VTrans hoped to achieve in the process – satisfy SAFETEA-LU, analyze financial need, policy  
44 develop policies for project prioritization, be innovative, and incorporate business plan concepts. She also  
45 explained how long range transportation planning fits into a business plan framework. The work will begin  
46 with data gathering and research leading to working papers on policy plan reviews, and financial,  
47 demographic and economic analyses. A major component of the plan update will deal with scenario  
48 planning where several future year scenarios are constructed based on different assumptions related to  
49 society’s driving forces. Policies are then derived to achieve the plan’s vision and goals under the various  
50 scenarios. Polly also described the plan update development process and schedule, including public and  
51 stakeholder outreach components. General discussion followed.  
52

53 **5. Enhancement Grant Application Priorities**

54 Peter Keating explained that the CCMPO had been sending their regional Enhancement grant project  
55 priorities to VTrans for close to a decade. A review committee evaluates the applications then sends their

1 recommendation through the TAC and then on to the Board. This year, that review committee – Sonny  
2 Audette, Jane Marvin, Stan Hamlet, Dan Senecal-Albrecht, and Peter Keating – evaluated nine projects:

- 3 1. Richmond Round Church Streetscape Improvements
- 4 2. Burlington North/South Bike Improvements
- 5 3. Colchester, Warner’s Corner Bike/Ped Improvements
- 6 4. Winooski School Area Pedestrian Improvements
- 7 5. LC Maritime Museum Barge Canal Breakwater project
- 8 6. Westford Salt Shed replacement
- 9 7. Intervale Center Wayfinding
- 10 8. South Burlington Tilley Drive Path
- 11 9. Shelburne Webster Road Shared Use path

12  
13 Peter displayed a graph of the cumulative project scores revealing that they fell fairly neatly into three  
14 distinct groupings. Based on this result and discussion, the evaluation committee recommended the  
15 following: High Priority – Colchester, Winooski, Burlington; Medium Priority – Richmond, Intervale  
16 Center, South Burlington, Shelburne; Low Priority – Lake Champlain Maritime Museum, Westford.

17 BILL MCCORMICK MADE A MOTION APPROVING THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE  
18 RECOMMENDATION. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY RICHARD WATTS AND  
19 UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

## 20 **6. MTP Update**

21 Peter Keating referred to a memo in the TAC packet that addressed the MTP vision and goal statements from  
22 the adopted plan, mentioning that the Board would be asked to re-endorse these at an upcoming meeting.  
23 The MTP project is not a major plan rewrite but meant to update the document’s data and revisit the analyses  
24 and recommendations. Peter sought TAC input on these statements. Jane Marvin and Mike Coates made  
25 several suggested additions to the wording in four of the goal statements. These suggestions produced the  
26 following (additions are highlighted):

27 **Goal 5:** Protect, enhance, and **integrate the transportation system with** the region's built and natural  
28 environments.

29 **Goal 6:** Create a transportation system that builds community, enhances neighborhood vitality, and  
30 minimizes noise, glare, vibration, **and congestion.**

31 **Goal 7:** Provide levels of access and mobility that insure people and goods can **efficiently** travel when  
32 and where they need to go.

33 **Goal 9:** Establish a transportation system that uses diverse sources of power, maximizes energy  
34 efficiency and conservation, and **reduces environmental impacts.**

35 There was TAC consensus that these additions were not substantive and Peter said that the suggested  
36 changes would be circulated for comment.

## 37 38 **7. Strategic Plan Update**

39 Scott Johnstone referred members to the revised CCMPO committee organizational flow chart included in  
40 the meeting packet. Committee restructuring, focusing especially on the TAC’s role, had been a recent  
41 discussion item with the CCMPO’s strategic plan subcommittee. Scott noted that that committee is  
42 considering slotting the TAC as a technical resource to four new “super committees” that would be  
43 composed solely of Board members. The proposal elicited the following reactions from TAC members:

- 44 • This ignores what the TAC actually does.
- 45 • Too much power in the Executive Committee is diluting the Board.
- 46 • Under this framework, there’s no need for a TAC – eliminate it.

- 1 • The TAC is currently not a technical group.
- 2 • The proposed super committees should include interested volunteers.
- 3 • Some at-large TAC members do not fit into the proposed framework.
- 4 • The TAC is where all aspects of transportation discussion come together. Without it, some things
- 5 could get lost.
- 6 • This is a valuable committee and should be kept. The peer interaction is invaluable.
- 7 • The proposed super committees are too segmented and will not have diverse enough representation.
- 8 • Perhaps there's a hang-up on the word "technical"

9 Two TAC members, George Gerecke and Jane Marvin, agreed to attend the next meeting of the strategic  
10 plan committee to relay the concerns raised here.

#### 11

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

13 Susan Smichenko reported that three VT RT 15 Corridor study meetings were recently complete and that a  
14 stakeholder meeting will take place in November. The US RT 2 Corridor Study Plan is being drafted and will  
15 be presented early next year at a public meeting. Dave Roberts mentioned that the 2004 high resolution  
16 orthophotos are now available on Goggle Earth. He also reported that Circumferential Highway EIS public  
17 meetings related to cumulative impacts would be taking place in November. He wondered if the TAC might  
18 be interested in a presentation on this but there appeared to be little interest. Dave also described  
19 employment and housing forecast work that the CCRPC was undertaking as part of the MTP update. Later  
20 today there was a meeting taking place in Hinesburg on the flexibility of road design standards on state  
21 highways and perhaps the TAC should hear the results from this discussion. Christine Forde announced that  
22 copies of the TIP and TIP brochure were available for anyone interested. Scott Johnstone mentioned that  
23 Dennis Meadows would be the speaker at the CCMPO Board's upcoming annual meeting later this month.  
24 Peter Keating reported that three Transportation for Livable Community grant applications had been  
25 received, evaluated and that recommendations had gone on to the Executive Director for action.

### 26

### 27 **9. CCMPO September Board Meeting Report**

28 Peter Keating mentioned presentations on Way to Go Week and the Safe Routes to School Pilot project,  
29 approval of a traffic signal pre-emption standard and discussion of committee restructuring.

### 30

### 31 **10. Chairman's/Members' Items**

32 With the November meeting date the same as election day, members decided to move the next TAC meeting  
33 to the Wednesday following – the eighth.

34  
35 The meeting adjourned at 11:05 a.m.

36  
37 Respectfully submitted,  
38 Peter Keating