

Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission  
Regular Meeting & Public Forum  
Minutes  
**DRAFT**

Date: Wednesday, January 20, 2016  
Time: 6:00 p.m.  
Place: CCRPC Offices, 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404  
Present: Bolton: Joss Besse Buels Gore: David Scherr  
Burlington: Andy Montroll Charlotte: Marty Illick (6:22)  
Colchester: Marc Landry Essex: Jeff Carr  
Essex Junction: Dan Kerin Hinesburg: Andrea Morgante  
Huntington: Barbara Elliott Jericho: Catherine McMains  
Milton: Lou Mossey Richmond: Absent  
St. George: Jeff Pillsbury Shelburne: John Zicconi  
So. Burlington: Chris Shaw Underhill: Brian Bigelow  
Westford: David Tilton Williston: Chris Roy  
Winooski: Mike O'Brien VTrans: Amy Bell  
Bus/Industry: Absent Socio/Econ/Housing: Justin Dextrateur  
Cons/Environ: Don Meals  
Ex-Officio: BIA: Amanda Hanaway-Corriente CCTA: Absent  
FHWA: Absent  
Others: Scott Moody, CCTV Serrill Flash, Burlington resident  
Diane Carminati  
Staff: Charlie Baker, Executive director Dan Albrecht, Senior Planner  
Pam Brangan, GIS/Data/IT Manager Eleni Churchill, Trans. Program Manager  
Forest Cohen, Business Manager Bryan Davis, Senior Trans. Planner  
Chris Dubin, Transportation Planner Bernie Ferenc, Trans. Business Manager  
Christine Forde, Sr. Trans. Planner Peter Keating, Sr. Trans. Planner  
Lee Krohn, Senior Planner Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager  
Melanie Needle, Senior Planner Sai Sarepalli, Trans. Planning Engineer  
Emma Vaughn, Communication Manager

1. Call to order; changes to the agenda. The meeting was called to order at 6:03 p.m. by the Chair, Andy Montroll. He thanked Lee Krohn and Dan Albrecht for the board training on Emergency Management and Mitigation that was held at 5:30 p.m.
2. Public Comment Period for item NOT on the Agenda. Mr. Serrill Flash is a Burlington resident who is interested in transportation in the county. He has developed a fantasy over the past couple of years that it is possible for people to drive the speed limit or less. He wondered if there are any infrastructure changes or plans toward making his fantasy come true. Members said law enforcement. He has a selfish point of view because he is a year-round bicyclist. He knows Burlington has a 25-mile-per-hour speed limit, but he commutes to all areas of the county, even on Route 15 and Susie Wilson Road to Essex and that is very difficult route for pedestrians. He works with Local Motion and Burlington on bike issues and is concerned about the number of accidents in the region, especially at either end of the Winooski River Bridge. He feels this issue is more than education or law enforcement. He's sure infrastructure plays a big part of it, but he doesn't know all the parts and he's here to see what else might be done. We should put our money where our mouth is and work on safety concerns. Charlie said we provide services to our municipalities by

1 doing speed studies where we recommend appropriate speed and where signage might be installed.  
2 We also consider safety when we perform scoping studies to develop a project. Mr. Flash said he  
3 spoke to a couple of our interns two years ago who verified that the average speed on East Avenue  
4 was 35-40 mph. He is wondering if we can work on a miracle to solve this. Andy thanked him for  
5 bringing us his concerns. Bryan Davis gave his contact information so we could work with him.  
6 Andrea Morgante thanked Mr. Flash for his comments and said it was appropriate for him to come  
7 here and for us to advocate for safe roads. We are in charge of the safety for bikes and pedestrians;  
8 and it's our job to consider all of this in our discussions and policies.  
9

10 3. Action of Consent Agenda. There was nothing on the consent agenda.

11  
12 4. Approve Minutes of November 18, 2015 CCRPC Board Meeting. MIKE O'BRIEN MADE A MOTION,  
13 SECONDED BY JEFF CARR TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 18, 2015 WITH CHANGES. Jeff  
14 has a question about the minutes and offered some changes to clarify:

15  
16 Page 2—Beginning at the start of Line 21 through Line 29. “scoping study does not guarantee  
17 project advancement. VTrans reserves the right to advance an alternative **that is** different from the  
18 municipally-preferred alternative. Jeff Carr wondered why we would include language **in the MOU**  
19 that **said** VTrans can do what **ever** they please **with respect to the preferred alternative.** Amy said  
20 this doesn't have to be in the MOU because after scoping is done, the project development process  
21 continues at VTrans and things are taken to the public and choices are made. Charlie said the  
22 process has been that VTrans presents the **ir preferred** alternative to the municipality. Jeff Carr  
23 would like to have **VTrans include** an explanation of why they **were implementing** ~~want to do~~ a  
24 different alternative **if it was not the preferred alternative of the municipality. He was hopeful**  
25 **that the host community would be considered more of a partner in any public outreach**  
26 **process—versus just being considered a stakeholder in any VTrans outreach effort for a project.** “  
27 Discussion continued about communication to the municipality with the rationale for the change.

28 Page 3 Beginning at the start of Line 15 through Line 21:

29 Dan Kerin said Essex and Essex Junction are looking to share services. They're looking to merge the  
30 highway departments; they've consolidated tax billings and unified **the** manager **position**; and all  
31 departments are working together. They're also looking into having employees from the town and  
32 village to be paid under one payroll system. The village plan will be incorporated as part of the  
33 town plan. Jeff noted they did **the effort included** a 2½ year study **evaluating the delivery of**  
34 **services department-by-department** . ~~When they did a bond issue, they did a huge public~~  
35 ~~information effort to show savings.~~ **Essex and Essex Junction** also recently merged the two school  
36 districts along with Westford.

37 Catherine noted a change on page 3, line 25, to verify that this is the “Riverside village center”, as  
38 they have three village centers.

39 VOTE: MOTION CARRIED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS CORRECTED WITH ABSTENTIONS FROM  
40 JOHN ZICCONI, DON MEALS, AND DAVID SCHERR.

41  
42 5. Public Forum for FY17 UPWP. Bryan Davis explained that this begins the planning of the work  
43 program and budget for the next fiscal year. We hold the forum to let folks have a say. He  
44 explained the public outreach effort we make with formal applications due on January 22, 2016. He  
45 has received applications for half of the communities already. The UPWP committee will meet three  
46 times between January 28<sup>th</sup> and the end of March to develop the work program. There were no  
47 members of the public present, but at Andrea's suggestion we will leave this open until the end of  
48 the meeting.

1  
2 6. Approval of 2016 Jericho Town Plan. Regina reported that the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC)  
3 reviewed the plan and held a public hearing. The Town has approved the plan. Catherine McMains  
4 said they began the review of the town plan with an on-line survey and had 335 comments on it.  
5 Charlie noted there is a resolution in the board packet. JOSS BESSE MADE A MOTION, SECONDED  
6 BY CATHERINE MCMAINS, TO APPROVE THE JERICHO TOWN PLAN AND CONFIRM THE TOWN OF  
7 JERICHO’S PLANNING PROCESS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE RESOLUTION IN THE PACKET. Charlie  
8 noted that only municipalities can vote on this. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

9  
10 7. Warn a Public Hearing for ECOS Plan Update. Regina noted that the Long Range Planning  
11 Committee (LRPC) has been working on the update of the ECOS Plan. The updates are just the  
12 items that we are required to do to be in compliance with ACCD/VAPDA’s regional plan review. We  
13 need to warn a public hearing for March tonight because if wait until the February meeting, we  
14 won’t meet the 30-day warning period. After the public hearing we will incorporate any comments  
15 received during the 30-day comment period. They will make changes and hold a second public  
16 hearing. CHRIS SHAW, MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MARC LANDRY, TO WARN THE FIRST  
17 PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE ECOS PLAN AMENDMENTS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 16, 2016 AT 6:00  
18 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

19  
20 8. FY16 Mid-Year Adjustment Approval. Charlie noted that we will be voting on this in two parts. One  
21 for the transportation portion, which is an MPO vote; and the full board on the entire UPWP and  
22 budget. Charlie explained changes in the UPWP which are highlighted in yellow. Changes include  
23 additions or deletions to descriptions and deliverables or in the consultant dollars needed for a  
24 given task – either correcting the amount carried forward from FY15 or reduction in consultant  
25 dollars that will get spent by June 30<sup>th</sup>; or additional funds to complete the project. The last two  
26 columns give the original budget by task and the difference between that and the Mid-year. Many  
27 of the tasks have changes because we have had staff adjust the hours they had budgeted to reflect  
28 what projects they are actually working on. If the entire row is yellow, it is either a new project we  
29 hadn’t anticipated or it was a task from FY15 we had thought would be completed by last June 30<sup>th</sup>  
30 and it wasn’t. When Andrea asked if changes in staff hours will affect municipal match, Charlie  
31 clarified that if staff is doing work such as zoning bylaws, and we estimated more than budgeted  
32 we probably wouldn’t ask, unless there is a large change in scope. Jeff Carr noted that we often  
33 have left over match so we would use that for changes. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION THAT WE  
34 APPROVE THE MID-YEAR ADJUSTMENT FOR THE NON-TRANSPORTATION PORTION AS PROPOSED.  
35 MARC LANDRY SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

36  
37 JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION THAT WE APPROVE THE TRANSPORTATION PORTION OF THE MID-  
38 YEAR ADJUSTMENT AS PROPOSED. MARC LANDRY SECONDED. VOTE:

39	Bolton	Yes	Burlington	Yes (4)	Charlotte	Yes
40	Colchester	Yes (2)	Essex	Yes	Essex Junction	Yes
41	Hinesburg	Yes	Huntington	Yes	Jericho	Yes
42	Milton	Yes	Richmond	Absent	St. George	Yes
43	Shelburne	Yes	So. Burlington	Yes (2)	Underhill:	Yes
44	Westford	Yes	Williston	Yes	Winooski	Yes
45	VTrans	Yes				

46 THE MOTION CARRIED WITH 23 OF 24 VOTES; AND 17 OF 18 MUNICIPALITIES. Jeff Carr asked if  
47 consultants were not moving projects along because they were using us to fill in their open time, as  
48 had happened in the past. Charlie said some projects were delayed in starting while we re-

1 organized the management on the transportation side and Eleni was just coming on board and it  
2 was not the fault of the consultants.

- 3 9. ITS Plan Update Presentation and Approval. Eleni Churchill noted that Sai Sarepalli is the project  
4 manager for the 2016 ITS plan update. The last time we updated the ITS plan was in 2005. One of  
5 the reasons we need to update the ITS Architecture Plan is to get federal funding for any regional ITS  
6 projects in our area; and we have some significant projects proposed for the region. The plan looks  
7 at all the new technology out there and how to use it to get more efficient highways in our region.  
8

9 Sai gave a PowerPoint presentation starting with what is ITS (Intelligent Transportation Systems),  
10 what the ITS plan is, why we need it, objectives and outcomes and why it's important. ITS promotes  
11 the use of advance technology in an integrated manner to make travel safer, faster and more  
12 efficient. It can be used for Freeway Management; Emergency Services; Traveler Information;  
13 Traffic Control; Control Centers; and Automatic Vehicle Locators. Sai explained how ITS works in  
14 each of those instances. For example, intelligent traffic control systems help reduce time spent  
15 stopped at red lights by signal phase and timing based on real-time traffic information, optimization  
16 and coordination of signals; reliable vehicle detection system; adaptive signal control and transit  
17 signal priority. A lengthy discussion ensued about Google app that can give travelers this  
18 information right now. Justin pointed out that Google is good for major routes and trip planning but  
19 the local information can give updates on when to change signals and adapt to current conditions on  
20 a local basis. Sai then reviewed the plan process and noted that it includes Strategic Deployment  
21 Plans for things we can do short term (0-3 years); medium term (4-7 years); and long term ((8+  
22 years). There was a question and answer period. CCRPC and VTrans applied for a federal grant last  
23 year to work on Real Time Traffic monitoring using Bluetooth in five corridors in the region. We are  
24 currently developing an RFP to hire a consultant. Sai showed the study corridor and gave the  
25 benefits of real-time traffic monitoring. Charlie noted that one of the benefits from this is to get  
26 these corridors connected to each other and VTrans' system. We are also looking at Adaptive Signal  
27 Control feasibility for Williston Road to Hinesburg Road and Dorset Street and Sai reviewed the  
28 benefits, which include: continuously distribute green light time equitably for all traffic movements;  
29 improve travel time reliability by progressively moving vehicles through green lights and reduce  
30 congestion by creating smoother flow.  
31

32 ITS next steps include incorporating short-term, high priority projects into the TIP; incorporate  
33 ITS/Operations into Long Range Plan; consider incorporation of Operational/ITS strategies into  
34 capital projects; provide input to VTrans ITS Architecture and Plan; update ITS architecture when  
35 new projects are implemented. Don Meals said another question we need to ask is "Are there  
36 services that already exist on smartphone apps? Jeff Carr said some of these were discussed in the  
37 Circ alternatives process. It was noted that this technology allows us to upgrade our controls, etc.  
38 We're also getting more data point in these corridors. Andrea said the focus seems to be on vehicle  
39 and transit – what are we doing for pedestrians. Who's holding the data and who's sharing it. Sai  
40 said each project will consider bike/pedestrians, etc. in the development process. When Andrea  
41 asked if there is timing for pedestrians wait time, Sai said yes, they will be considered. Discussion  
42 continued about data, and privacy issues using vehicle licenses, cameras, etc. Justin said EZ Pay is  
43 the only system that can send automatic tickets. It was noted that prioritization of projects will  
44 consider how easy the project is to implement and if it's low cost; and will happen in the TIP  
45 process. Charlie said there may be a generic project line for ITS projects, so specific projects might  
46 not show up. We are trying to avoid any capacity expansion projects by making ITS improvements.  
47 JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CHRIS SHAW, TO ADOPT THE RESOLUTION FOR THE  
48 ITS PLAN. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

1  
2 10. Approve District Leveling recommendations. Christine Forde noted that we've done this for the  
3 past couple of years to provide information to VTrans. Leveling is a thin coat of pavement to give  
4 roads a bandaid until more extensive paving can be done. She described the process. There are two  
5 projects in Chittenden County: VT2A in St. George-Williston – Ayer Road to Hurricane Lane (3.8  
6 miles); and VT 15 in Westford-Cambridge – Cowie Road north to Blanchard Road (3.5 miles).  
7 Discussion ensued about whether a leveling project would change the road condition to move it  
8 higher or lower on the list. Amy said it would certainly improve the condition, but it would remain  
9 on the list in its place. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O'BRIEN, THAT WE  
10 APPROVE THE PRIORITIZED DISTRICT LEVELING PROJECT LIST AND FORWARD OUR 20% AS LISTED.  
11 MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY, WITH JEFF PILLSBURY ABSTAINING.  
12

13 11. Executive Director's Updates:

- 14 a. Legislative Breakfast. – discussed later.
- 15 b. ECOS Annual Report. Charlie noted that this is the time of year that Melanie does a ton of work  
16 on updating the ECOS scorecard. Melanie gave a brief demonstration of the ECOS scorecard. It  
17 can be viewed at [www.ECOSproject.com](http://www.ECOSproject.com), then click on Annual Report and then follow the link to  
18 the ECOS scorecard. The indicators are based on the four broad goals and sub-goals of the ECOS  
19 plan. The slider bar is important because its position gives varying amounts of data. The time  
20 period shows the year of the most current data we have. The majority of the data is updated  
21 annually, others less frequently. She described what the arrows indicate: red is negative trend;  
22 green is positive trend and black means no judgement. When Melanie talked about the rental  
23 property vacancy rates and said the rate for Burlington & Winooski is 3.7% is the highest since  
24 1993, Justin said this a point in time snapshot on projects built, but not yet leased so he  
25 wouldn't rely too much on that because new units tend to take one to two months to rent. You  
26 have to look at the long-term trends. Melanie said they collect the data in June and December.  
27 When someone suggested maybe we want to add other indicator, Charlie noted that we started  
28 with about 80 in 2012 when the plan was adopted and now we have about 100, so we are  
29 reviewing this each year. A lengthy discussion continued about being careful how we use the  
30 data if we don't know where it came from. We need to put caveats on some of the indicators so  
31 folks can correctly interpret the data. Charlie said we're working with the partners and trying to  
32 get the story. We're at the early stages of this and we haven't tried to drive policy yet. Perhaps  
33 when the plan is updated, we'll need this level of detail. The ECOS Annual Report from partners  
34 will be out next week and this is very much a shared process with the Chamber, GBIC, Medical  
35 Center, UVM, United Way, municipalities, and state agencies. Melanie will add a note on each  
36 indicator to show where data came from, as the Health Department does.
- 37 c. MOU with VTrans/CCTA. Charlie noted we are down to 2-3 sentences for review. We're hoping  
38 this is on the February board agenda. Amy said this is at FHWA to get their feedback.
- 39 d. CCRPC 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary. Charlie said Emma is working on a communication plan and we will  
40 have the celebration at our June annual meeting.
- 41 e. Monthly Report. This will be sent out next week.
- 42 a. Legislative Breakfast. Charlie noted there were close to 60 people there. We got favorable  
43 responses verbally, but we did not get much feedback to our electronic survey. Jeff Carr  
44 suggested we not ask for things from the legislators, but lend some support to them. Justin  
45 Dextrateur suggested we offer staff as resources, as well as the ECOS Indicators. Jeff Carr said  
46 the gubernatorial candidates should be encouraged to attend in election years.
- 47 f. Legislative update. Charlie noted the COG bill is having a hearing in front of Govt. Operations  
48 Committee tomorrow. We have towns in Chittenden County on both sides of the issue. He had

1 a difficult discussion in Milton on Monday regarding this issue. They have concerns that RPC  
2 would tell the towns what to do. The bill submitted by VTrans on stormwater utilities is in  
3 committee.  
4

5 12 Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports. Andrea had a question on the Executive Committee  
6 minutes regarding Exit 1. Members explained.  
7

8 13. Members Items: Other business. There was none.  
9

10 14. Adjourn. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MARC LANDRY TO ADJOURN AT 8:00 P.M.  
11 MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.  
12

13 Respectfully submitted,  
14

15 Bernadette Ferenc  
16 Transportation Business Manager  
17

DRAFT