

1
2 CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
3 TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE - MINUTES
4

5 DATE: Wednesday October 3, 2017
6 TIME: 9:00 a.m.
7 PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal St. Winooski, VT
8

9 **Members Present**

10 Bryan Osborne, Colchester, TAC Chair
11 Dennis Lutz, Essex
12 Chris Jolly, FHWA
13 Sandy Thibault, CATMA
14 Jason Van Driesche, Local Motion
15 Justin Rabadoux, South Burlington
16 Bruce Hoar, Williston
17 Nicole Losch, Burlington
18 Joss Besse, Bolton
19 Barbara Elliot, Huntington
20 Brian Bigelow, Underhill
21 Luke Valentine, St George
22 Ryan Lambert, Winooski
23 Nic Longo, BTV

Matt Langham, VTrans
Dick Hosking, VTrans
Ashley Bishop, VTrans
Mary Anne Michaels, Rail
Charles Hunter, GWRR

24 **Staff Present**

Eleni Churchill, Transportation Program Manager
Christine Forde, Senior Transportation Planner
Charlie Baker, Executive Director
Sai Sarepalli, Transportation Planning Engineer
Bryan Davis, Senior Transportation Planner
Jason Charest, Senior Transportation Planning Engineer
Chris Dubin, Transportation Planner
Marshall Distel, Transportation Planner
Dan Albrecht, Senior Planner

25
26 Bryan Osborne called the meeting to order at 9:00AM.
27

28 **1. Consent Agenda**

29 N/A this month.
30

31 **2. Approval of Minutes**

32 The September 5th minutes were approved without changes.
33

34 **3. Public Comments**

35 There were none.
36

37 **4. Comments on the Municipal Roads General Permit (MRGP) (Action Item)**

38 Dan Albrecht walked TAC members through comments from CCRPC staff (included in the agenda
39 packet) on the draft MRGP. There was discussion about addressing transitory issues like crowns and
40 berms versus other issues requiring a more permanent solution. The distinction is important when
41 determining priorities and maintenance schedules. CCRPC staff can help municipalities with that part of
42 the process, and Dan will add language to the comments clarifying the transitory nature of some issues,
43 and reaffirming that the permit should be focused on water quality rather than road maintenance. Dick
44 Hosking expressed concerns for allowing grass-lined ditching for slopes more than 5% and the possible
45 failure of seeding techniques for steep slopes. In cases of steep slopes, stone-lined ditches would be
46 better. Dan will ask that slope language be clarified in the comments. There is concern from the Bolton
47 Selectboard about roads greater than 10% slope meeting permit requirements within the required time
48 period. Some flexibility would be appreciated. Bryan Osborne initiated the discussion about how the
49 MRGP permit will affect the MS4 communities. A number MS4 communities expressed concern that
50 when the MRGP requirements are included in the MS4 permits that will also include the MRGP timeline
51 requirements which could be problematic for a number of reasons including varying costs of projects,
52 limiting the ability of a municipality to do capital planning and determine which projects are constructed
53 each year. There was agreement that towns should be able to determine their own maintenance and
54 construction schedules so that they can meet the MRGP compliance date, rather than being required by

1 the permit to complete a specific number of projects each year. The sentiment was expressed that towns
2 can better determine which of their projects will have the greatest impact to improve water quality and
3 how those project schedules will help MS4 towns meet their Phosphorus reduction plans and MS4 permit
4 requirements. Dan suggested that DEC is proposing this type of scheduling to encourage towns to do
5 work sooner rather than waiting until MRGP deadlines approach. Charlie noted that this issue is specific
6 to MS4 towns because of their additional requirements. The concern from Colchester is that the
7 requirement to complete a certain number of projects per year that may not necessarily meet the goals of
8 the MS4 permit. Justin Rabidoux suggested that there needs to be one plan, and that MS4 towns have
9 other permit requirements and will need to balance and manage (i.e., costs and deadlines). Bryan will
10 share less substantive comments with Dan outside of this meeting.

11
12 Please submit additional comments to Dan Albrecht, dalbrecht@ccrpcvt.org, 802-846-4490 ext. *29.
13 Deadline for edits is next Wednesday, October 10.

14 **5. MTP Update**

15
16 Jason Charest provided hard copies of the handouts (updated charts and Scenario A map), which included
17 results from Scenario A (2050 with all MTP Projects). His presentation pointed out the four main
18 scenarios, and sub-scenarios, which build off the 2050 Base scenario (2050 Forecasts with TIP Projects),
19 but the presentation focused on the model results of Scenarios A and D. Scenario A is a traditional
20 capacity expansion and doesn't include any other improvements besides roadway. Scenario D, the land
21 use scenario, is included in the charts provided but not in the maps. Results of running Scenario B
22 (connected and autonomous vehicles) and Scenario C (transit, bike & ped, TDM) in the model will be
23 presented at the November TAC meeting.

24 Jason reviewed the various bar charts that included countywide results (VMT, VHT, Total Trips, Mode
25 Share, Trip Lengths) for the various model scenarios run to date. Charlie pointed out the 25% increase in
26 VMT for most of the 2050 scenarios compared to the 2025 scenarios and reminded the TAC that these
27 results don't include any TDM projects to reduce vehicle travel (i.e., TDM). In these charts, most of
28 scenario model results are comparable except for Scenario D (10% increase in HH in the county). The
29 TAC was reminded that these model results are countywide averages, meaning conditions would improve
30 in some areas and decline in others. There was discussion about impacts of autonomous vehicles, which
31 RSG is working on (Scenario B) as well as in other, larger communities. Jason Van Driesche suggested
32 and there was discussion about including Scenario D3 as part of all other scenarios given its striking
33 impact on model results. There was also discussion about the historical split of percent of Chittenden
34 County employees living inside or outside of the county, whether Scenario D3 is attainable given the
35 various issues with housing/development density, and how autonomous vehicles may change where
36 people live and their commutes (e.g., people can work in self-driving car).

37 The presentation then examined the maps, which focused on lane capacity issues and not operational
38 issues (congestion due to intersection delays/signal timings) which is why for example Williston Road
39 doesn't show up on the maps as having issues. Dennis Lutz asked if we removed some TIP projects, and
40 added other projects, would it have a bigger impact on the results? Dick Hosking pointed out that the
41 maps represent a time-based issue; Jason Charest responded that the maps combine the AM and PM peak
42 congestion rather than demonstrate a continuous deficiency. Jason Van Driesche noted previous
43 conversations about new grid streets having the biggest impact in Williston, and whether the CCRPC has
44 considered including more of these as part of the model to determine impacts?

45 Jason Charest then toggled through different map layers showing the impacts of including all MTP
46 projects for the 2050 Interchange and Scenario A. Joss Besse questioned whether the model takes into
47 account how increasing capacity on some roads (Interstate) impacts congestion on arterials (US7 & US2)
48 and local streets. That is, does congestion get pushed to other parts of network? Jason noted that the

1 model accounts for that impact. There was discussion about whether VTrans concurs with how projects
2 get implemented and the projections being presented, and it was pointed out that they are involved in this
3 process.

4 Jason reminded the TAC that the maps show volume-to-capacity ratio rather than delay, which is why
5 Shelburne Road isn't showing up (similar to the previous Williston Road example). Bryan Osborne
6 questioned how we can make the case for additional funds when improvements in some areas results in
7 deficiencies in other areas. Jason pointed out that the map shows that we can't build our way out of
8 congestion.

9 Dennis asked whether we could have looked at the TIP and MTP for specific solutions with less
10 detrimental effects than a full build out? He suggested that addressing other issues such as housing and
11 wastewater could have a bigger effect on the transportation network compare to some of the MTP
12 transportation projects.

13 The next step is to show the results of Scenarios B and C at the November TAC meeting and hopefully
14 have the hybrid MTP Scenario in December. The full draft MTP will be available in January.

15

16 **6. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports**

17 Bryan referred members to the project list on the back of the agenda and encouraged members to inquire
18 on project status if interested.

19

20 **7. CCRPC September Board Meeting Report.**

21 Eleni mentioned that the MTP financial plan was presented to the Board and staff received their
22 comments.

23

24 **8. Chairman's/Members' Items**

25 Bryan Osborne requested that the Transportation Funding Sources spreadsheet be updated and sent to
26 TAC members. CCRPC staff noted it was updated this summer and can be found at
27 <http://www.ccrpcvt.org/resources/transportation-funding-sources/>. Water quality funding opportunities
28 can be found at <http://www.ccrpcvt.org/our-work/environment-natural-resources/water-quality/#funding>.

29

30 The meeting adjourned at 10:45 a.m.

31

32 Respectfully submitted, Bryan Davis