

1 CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
2 TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE - MINUTES  
3

4 DATE: Tuesday, January 3, 2012  
5 TIME: 9:00 a.m.  
6 PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT  
7

8 **Members Present**

9 Bernie Gagnon, Shelburne  
10 George Gerecke, TAC Chair, Williston  
11 Bob Henneberger, Seniors  
12 Chris Jolly, FHWA  
13 Matt Langham, VTrans  
14 George Little, Environment  
15 Dennis Lutz, Essex  
16 Brian Osborne, Colchester  
17 Brian Palaia, Milton  
18 Steve Palmer, Winooski  
19 Craig Plumb, Milton  
20 Justin Rabidoux, South Burlington  
21

Sandy Thibault, CATMA  
Geoffrey Urbanik, Richmond

**Staff**

Daryl Benoit, Transportation Planner  
Michele Boomhower, Assistant/MPO Director  
Janet Botula, Administrative Assistant  
Jason Charest, Transportation Engineer  
Eleni Churchill, Senior Transportation Engineer  
Bryan Davis, Transportation Planner  
Christine Forde, Senior Transportation Planner  
Peter Keating, Senior Transportation Planner  
Dave Roberts, Senior Transportation Planner

22 Chair George Gerecke called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.  
23

24 **1. Consent Agenda**

25 No items this month.  
26

27 **2. Approval of Minutes**

28 A MOTION WAS MADE TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 6TH BY DENNIS LUTZ AND  
29 SECONDED BY BRIAN OSBORNE. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.  
30

31 **3. Public Comments**

32 No members of the public were present.  
33

34 **4. CCRPC Sidewalk Program Round 2 Recommendations**

35 Peter reminded the TAC that there were only two proposals submitted for the \$300,000 available in the first  
36 round of grant applications. Funding was awarded to both Essex Junction and Burlington. This left around  
37 \$100,000 available for a second round in which applications were received from Williston, Colchester, Milton  
38 and Richmond in November totaling over \$300,000. The review committee ranked Williston's, Colchester's  
39 and Milton's applications very similarly with Richmond trailing in points. After quite a bit of discussion the  
40 committee decided to make a recommendation to award partial grants as follows: Colchester \$40,000,  
41 Williston \$30,000, and Milton \$30,000. Peter explained that although Richmond had a worthy project, it did  
42 not score well using the established criteria. The review committee discussed how to rectify the fact that rural  
43 towns seem to be at a disadvantage - perhaps by having a set aside for rural communities, revising the criteria,  
44 offering assistance or something else to help them be more competitive in the evaluation process. He noted  
45 that rural towns rarely receive awards under this program. He asked for comments about this issue from the  
46 TAC. A long discussion followed. It was agreed that, before the TAC concurred with the recommendation,  
47 that the top scoring three communities should be contacted to determine if they intend to use the partial  
48 funding and how the funds fit into their project implementation strategy. George Gerecke suggested adding a  
49 question to the application about partial funding. Dennis stated that because funding is now only for  
50 construction and not for design and right-of-way, communities may need to draw out projects for many years  
51 in order to have enough money. Making partial awards may be contributing to the problem of obligating funds.  
52 Brian stated that the application does require information about the match and a timeline for the project.  
53 Michele agreed that if a partial award is given and there is a gap in funding which delays the schedule, it  
54 delays the obligation of funds and money moving through the program in the county. This is one of the reasons

1 that VTrans is now only awarding funds for construction. In the last round, Burlington was awarded a grant  
2 despite the delayed status of their previous awards. This round, the status of previously awarded projects was  
3 considered.

4  
5 A MOTION TO TABLE THE DECISION ON THE FUNDING AWARDS UNTIL THE THREE TOWNS  
6 WERE CONTACTED BY THE CCRPC AND ASKED ABOUT THE IMPACT OF A PARTIAL AWARD  
7 ON THEIR CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE WAS MADE BY DENNIS LUTZ AND SECONDED BY  
8 STEVE PALMER. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY  
9

10 Peter again brought up the topic of how to help rural towns be more competitive in the application process -  
11 whether it be through a set-aside, a change of criteria, or offering technical assistance with the application.  
12 When looking at the Richmond application, it lost points for the project's link to multi-modal transportation and  
13 public transit. Although there is a criterion involving an equal distribution of awards over time, it is worth only  
14 two points and is only given a weight factor of one. It was agreed that technical assistance might be a good way  
15 to assist the rural towns. More discussion followed. Dennis felt that because this is a regional group it was most  
16 important to make improvements where they would serve the greatest pedestrian demand, which is one of the  
17 purposes of a regional plan. He thought that unless there's a project involving safety, school to school, school to  
18 parks and libraries etc., in a rural community, funding should go to projects with highest pedestrian demand.  
19 Peter stated that he thought the criteria now favors urban areas with higher demand but that there ought to be  
20 some way to help the rural towns. When asked about funding in the past, Michele said that there is a list of  
21 previously funded projects which shows the geographical distribution of funds. This will be provided for the  
22 next TAC meeting.  
23

#### 24 **5. CIRC Alternatives Project Update**

25 Michele reported that the CIRC Task Force had met prior to the holidays to review and prioritize planning  
26 projects that would begin after the adoption of the mid-year budget adjustment. There is just over \$465,000  
27 available for the first phase of planning related projects for the CIRC alternatives effort. Projects were  
28 identified in each of the CIRC communities as well as a regionally related project for a VT15 corridor multi-  
29 use path scoping study. There was also discussion at the Task Force meeting about potentially identifying the  
30 next round of projects that need to be moving forward that might not have gone through scoping and  
31 determining if they should be considered as part of the process going forward. They will be meeting again in  
32 January to determine the path forward in consultation with VTrans on how to phase the next implementation  
33 activities. Of particular concern is Williston where there hasn't been a focus on alternatives or supplemental  
34 projects related to the CIRC because of their belief that the CIRC AB would be built. Until there's an analysis  
35 of how to proceed in Williston, the study of alternatives will not really be complete. This will be an on-going,  
36 multi-year and multi-phased planning project. There was a public meeting in mid-December where the  
37 implementation process and projects were discussed. The Task Force will meet again in late January and  
38 probably not as frequently thereafter, perhaps once in late spring and then in the fall. Michele stated that  
39 consultants helped to facilitate the process and will be involved in the planning studies to come.  
40

#### 41 **6. FY12 Transportation Improvement Program**

42 Christine referred to the list of both major and minor TIP amendments described in TAC packet. The  
43 first four are major amendments that will be warned for public hearing (VT2A/VT289 Interchange, Exit 16  
44 Improvements, Crescent Connector and VT2A/James Brown Drive). They are CIRC alternative projects that  
45 will move them into design. Both the Crescent Connector and James Brown Drive are already in the TIP as  
46 illustrative projects and this will add money for the design phase. The consent agenda item is a minor  
47 amendment for I-89 Bridge replacement. Christine reminded the TAC that the TIP is a fiscally constrained  
48 document and that projects cannot be added without taking other projects out. The CIRC alternative projects,  
49 however, will be in addition to the fiscal constraint. Michele explained that because the CIRC AB issues have  
50 not been resolved yet, the State is pursuing parallel paths. The TIP contains money for both the alternatives  
51 and the CIRC. This will be resolved over the next few years. The amount of funding available will also be

1 impacted by how much the State receives from Washington D.C. for relief from the impacts of Hurricane  
2 Irene.

3  
4 A long discussion followed about the future of previously acquired CIRC Right-of-way property if the CIRC is  
5 not built, eligible uses for that land, and what happens to the proceeds from any sale of the land. It was clear  
6 that a decision will not be made in the near future and that this will be a complicated issue to resolve.

7  
8 A MOTION TO FORWARD THE TIP AMENDMENTS TO THE BOARD FOR APPROVAL WAS MADE  
9 BY DENNIS LUTZ AND SECONDED BY BRIAN OSBORNE. THE MOTION PASSED  
10 UNANIMOUSLY.

### 11 12 **7. Mid-Year UPWP Budget Adjustment**

13 Michele briefed the TAC on the mid-year budget adjustments. She stated that this might not typically come  
14 before the TAC if it was only a minor adjustment as it is most years but this year is a little different. She  
15 reported that on December 30, a notice was sent to the press, the Board, and TAC communities - notifying  
16 them of the upcoming public hearing at the Board meeting on January 18<sup>th</sup>, regarding the Mid-Year UPWP  
17 Budget Adjustment. Barring any concerns, the Board will take action on the budget that evening. The FY12  
18 budget as originally adopted was about \$2.8 million. In September there was a budget adjustment to add funds  
19 for disaster recovery in the amount of \$60,000 for our assistance in the Hurricane Irene recovery efforts. At  
20 this point, we are contemplating adding in the new CIRC PL (\$466,000) this fiscal year, including a 20 percent  
21 match provided by VTrans. Along with this is another \$65,456 in additional Disaster Recovery funding plus a  
22 reconciled PL amount of \$367,000 for a total proposed adjusted FY12 budget of a little over \$3.6 million.  
23 There are also two non-PL related projects not reflected in the budget 1) a small Safe Routes to School project  
24 in Jericho and 2) and a TCSP TDM grant. She referenced the memo which described other significant  
25 additions of over \$50,000. She also referenced the spread sheet she had distributed and described the  
26 information available. Some of the items she highlighted included: a) Planning Assistance and Coordination –  
27 additional \$45,000 including some additional money for small technical assistance requests b) Locally  
28 Managed Planning Assistance – additional \$80,000 plus about \$50,000 of uncommitted funds which require a  
29 local match c) CIRC Alternatives Planning – added funding, with the bulk of activity being directed toward the  
30 CIRC related transportation network analysis for Essex and Williston d) a reduction in funding for Local  
31 Corridors and Circulation studies for two projects in Burlington which were delayed as well as a reduction in  
32 the Transportation Demand Management category e) Locally Managed Scoping Studies – saw the most  
33 significant increase, adding almost \$200,000 including \$100,000 which has not yet been committed. She asked  
34 that towns that have matching funds available for scoping studies to contact staff about their potential projects.  
35

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

37 In response to a question from Brian Osborne about ACT 250 training, Jason and Eleni reported that ACT 250  
38 Commissioners have expressed a desire for some additional training so that they can better review applications  
39 with Traffic Impact Studies that come through. This training could include Level of Service (LOS) and other  
40 traffic related concepts – they plan to work with VTrans to provide a Traffic Engineering 101 type of program  
41 and Michele thought that the training might be taken statewide. In the future there might be a more advanced  
42 course for the ACT 250 coordinators. Brian thought this might create an opportunity to address policy issues  
43 such as accepted level of services in highly congested areas. Michele said that there has been an internal  
44 working group at VTrans dealing with these types of issues and they will be bringing the CCRPC to the table  
45 along with other RPC's throughout the state. Sue Minter and others at the highest level are involved in this  
46 effort. Dennis would like the Act 250 training to look at the municipal role in the implementation process as  
47 well as other concerns. Michele suggested that Dennis be involved as the training is developed.  
48

### 49 **9. CCRPC November/December Board Meeting**

50 As there is only one Board now and many issues are discussed, Peter highlighted those related to  
51 transportation. This included the approval of some consent agenda items for TIP amendments, approval of the

1 priorities the TAC recommended for Enhancement application review, heard an update on the CIRC from  
2 Michele, and they warned a public hearing for the Mid-Year UPWP Budget Adjustment.

3

4 **10. Chairman's/Member' Items**

5 Michele stated that the process of integrating CCMPO and CCRPC activities is continuing. She reiterated that  
6 it will be important for the TAC to take a stepped up role in looking at transportation related activities as the  
7 Board now has a broader range of responsibilities to consider. TAC members are sent a copy of the Board  
8 agenda each month and she asked that they contact their Boards to highlight any issues that should be given  
9 special attention.

10

11 The meeting adjourned at 10:10 a.m.

12

13 Respectfully submitted,

14

15 Janet Botula