

CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES  
DRAFT

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 Date: Wednesday, November 15, 2017  
6 Time: 6:00 p.m.  
7 Place: CCRPC Offices; 110 W. Canal Street; Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404  
8 Present: Bolton: Sharon Murray Buels Gore: Absent  
9 Burlington: Andy Montroll Charlotte: Jim Donovan  
10 Colchester: Absent Essex: Jeff Carr  
11 Essex Jct: Dan Kerin Hinesburg: Andrea Morgante  
12 Huntington: Absent Jericho: Catherine McMains  
13 Milton: Tony Micklus Richmond: Bard Hill (6:10 p.m.)  
14 St. George: Absent Shelburne: John Zicconi  
15 So. Burlington: Chris Shaw Underhill: Brian Bigelow  
16 Westford: Vacant Williston: Chris Roy  
17 Winooski: Mike O'Brien VTrans: Amy Bell  
18 Business/Industry: Tim Baechle Cons/Environ: Don Meals  
19 Socio/Econ/Housing: Justin Dextrateur  
20 Ex-Officio: GMT: Mark Sousa, Gen. Mgr. FHWA: Absent  
21 FTA: Absent BIA: Absent  
22 Staff: Charlie Baker, Executive Director Pam Brangan, IT, GIS, Data Manager  
23 Jason Charest, Sr. Trans. Plan. Engineer Eleni Churchill, Transportation Planning Mgr.  
24 Forest Cohen, Sr. Business Manager Bernie Ferenc, Trans. Business Manager  
25 Christine Forde, Sr. Trans. Planner Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager  
26 Melanie Needle, Senior Planner  
27 Others: Fred Duplessis, Sullivan Powers & Co. Matthew Langham, VTrans  
28 Charlie Giannoni, CCTV Michael Bissonette, Hinesburg Alternate  
29 Jon Moore, GMT  
30

- 31 1. Call to order; changes to the agenda. The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by the Chair,  
32 Chris Roy. There were no changes to the agenda.  
33  
34 2. Public Comment Period for Items not on the agenda. There were none.  
35  
36 3. Action on the Consent Agenda. There were some minor amendments to the FY18 TIP including  
37 Stormwater Mitigation Grants; bike/ Ped Program Grants and US 7 signal upgrades in Shelburne &  
38 So. Burlington. CHRIS SHAW MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JOHN ZICCONI, TO APPROVE THE  
39 CONSENT AGENDA. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.  
40  
41 4. Approval of minutes from October 18, 2017 Meeting. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY  
42 CATHERINE McMAINS, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 18, 2017, WITH CORRECTIONS, IF  
43 ANY. Catherine noted that on Page 2, line 19, it should read "Marty" Illick, not Mary. MOTION  
44 CARRIED WITH ABSTENTIONS FROM DON MEALS, JIM DONOVAN AND CHRIS ROY.  
45  
46 5. Review and Accept FY17 Audit. Fred Duplessis of Sullivan Powers & Company reported that they  
47 have issued a final audit report. It's a multipurpose audit reviewing general accepted accounting  
48 practices as well as federal single audit guidelines because we receive over \$750,000 in federal

1 funding. Our financials are in full conformance with generally accepted accounting standards and  
2 there have been no changes in the last year and nothing on the horizon that will affect us. He  
3 referred members to the Management's Discussion and Analysis that begins on page 4 to get the  
4 picture of what's been happening. Then he went to the last page – Summary of Auditor's Results,  
5 which is what the state and feds go to. There are no findings and no compliance findings at all, so  
6 we continue to qualify as a low-risk auditee. Which means we have good processes in place to meet  
7 the guidelines. The other deliverable is the Management Letter. There was one suggestion in last  
8 year's letter which was dealt with so this year the Management Letter is clean. Jeff Carr thanked  
9 staff for the clean audit for the 4<sup>th</sup> or 5<sup>th</sup> year. He thanked Fred because they changed the lead  
10 auditor at our request since it'd been the same one for several years and we felt fresh eyes would  
11 be a good idea. Charlie echoed the thanks to the admin staff. JEFF CARR MADE A MOTION TO  
12 ACCEPT THE FY17 FINAL AUDIT REPORT. JIM DONOVAN SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED  
13 UNANIMOUSLY.  
14

- 15 6. GMT Next Gen Transit Plan. Mark Sousa, GMT General Manager, said this is a comprehensive  
16 service analysis of the whole system, which they decided to do since they are in five counties now.  
17 They hired Nelson Nygaard and they're in the last quarter of that study. Jon Moore, Director of  
18 Maintenance and Planning at GMT has been the lead on this study. [Bard Hill arrived.] Nothing has  
19 been finalized yet and they anticipate a final report in February. Jon noted they wanted to report  
20 the results to date. He reviewed the goals and objectives – Goal 1 – Make service more convenient;  
21 Goal 2 – Connect people to life's activities; Goal 3 – Improve the region's quality of life; and Goal 4 –  
22 Provide financially and environmentally sustainable service. He then reviewed the trade-offs since  
23 we can't afford to do everything to serve everyone. (e.g. increased frequency vs fewer routes). In  
24 developing the various scenarios, they held stakeholder interviews, did a market analysis, evaluated  
25 existing services, developed scenarios, and will make service recommendations. The scenarios will  
26 be presented to us and the public to see which ones should be recommended. He then reviewed  
27 the Chittenden County Service Improvement major themes: simplified service (schedule and route  
28 alignments); core network of major local roads (increased frequency); more evening service; better  
29 weekend service; minimum service frequency standards and one seat ride between downtown  
30 Burlington and Burlington International Airport. They developed three service scenarios and will ask  
31 what everyone likes about each scenario - not to pick one.  
32

33 Scenario 1– Major Expansion (20% service increase) – major focus on improvements in area that  
34 are already served – based on findings from market analysis and evaluation of existing services;  
35 low focus on geographical expansion – based on market analysis findings; and, unconstrained –  
36 as long as potential services can meet VTrans “acceptable” thresholds for productivity and cost-  
37 effectiveness.  
38

39 Scenario 2: Moderate Expansion (10% service increase) – Attempts to achieve much of the same  
40 as Scenario 1 with more modest approaches.  
41

42 Scenario 3: Cost neutral - major focus on addressing issues with existing services and resources.  
43

44 Jon then reviewed summary of service improvement options by scenario for each route and then  
45 asked for questions. Mike O'Brien asked if they had taken this to the municipalities about funding.  
46 Jon said not yet – they'll address that in the second round of public hearings. Andrea Morgante  
47 asked if there was any marketing being done to young people such as high schools, etc. to encourage  
48 ridership. Jon said they do in Burlington and they need to bring that out into the county. Mark noted

1 that their marketing person has been sitting at all of these meetings to know how to address that.  
2 Sharon Murray asked if they'd been in discussion with municipalities about zoning for bus stops. Jon  
3 said they need to do their planning with land use planners. We have to determine what density is  
4 needed to support a regular bus route. Discussion continued. Andrea was happy to hear that major  
5 employers were included in the stakeholder interviews. Jon noted that at the end of the month  
6 along with CATMA and CCRPC, they will make this presentation to major employers. Lengthy  
7 discussion ensued about 20-minute headways in Scen. 1 vs. 15-minute headways in Scen. 2. It was  
8 noted that the industry standard is 20-minute headways and 15-minute headways would be the gold  
9 standard. Jon said they will do more ridership analysis, but he feels reliable 20-minute headways will  
10 increase ridership. The consultant is working on that now. It was noted that the 20% increase in  
11 Scenario 1 is for cost not ridership, but our goal is to increase ridership. Mark said there is a 6% drop  
12 in ridership across the country and the industry feels it's because of low gas prices. Chris Roy  
13 thanked Jon for his presentation and members were asked to present service improvement ideas on  
14 their blog at [www.ridegmt.com/nextgen/](http://www.ridegmt.com/nextgen/)  
15

16 7. ECOS Plan Update - MTP Scenario. Charlie noted that the MTP (Metropolitan Transportation Plan)  
17 is the 3<sup>rd</sup> section of the ECOS Plan currently being updated. Jason Charest presented the draft MTP  
18 scenario for the draft MTP that includes multimodal projects and land use strategies from Scenarios  
19 A through D, which were presented in October. We viewed this both from congestion and safety  
20 perspective. The MTP is the principal transportation planning document for the movement of  
21 people and goods. It's a requirement that we look out at least 20 years. Jason then reviewed the  
22 major projects and general categories of projects that are included in the MTP scenario (they're  
23 listed in the memo in the board packet.) Amy Bell noted that there will only be one interstate  
24 interchange proposed – it just isn't pinned down yet. Jason then reviewed the demographic data for  
25 2015 and projections for 2050, and the proposed 2050 program allocations for new MTP  
26 improvements. Total funding (2050) is \$1,744.72 million with 70% being proposed for preserving  
27 the system, 24% for new improvements; and 6% for TIP/Capital Program Front of the book projects.  
28 Charlie noted that this was built on the projects that are in the pipeline. The transit costs in here are  
29 for capital and not operations. Members were then showed the various charts showing Countywide  
30 daily VMT; Daily vehicle trips; VMT per capita; daily transit, walking & biking mode split and daily  
31 delay per capita – in 2015; using 2050 base and Draft MTP scenario. He then reviewed various maps  
32 showing AM & PM peak hour congestion; AM & PM peak hour delay for 2015 base, the 2050 base  
33 and the MTP Scenario and the changes between each. Lengthy discussion ensued. Jeff Carr said in  
34 the last two MTPs we estimated an increase in transit and bike/ped – how did we do in actuality?  
35 Members asked for explanation of the difference between congestion and delay to help them  
36 understand. Dan Kerin is less concerned about VMT than he is with the volume of vehicles on the  
37 road. Discussion continued. When asked about autonomous vehicles, Charlie noted that we felt we  
38 had to stick with what we know vs. what might happen in the future. We asked RSG to review this  
39 and they thought autonomous vehicles might actually increase VMT, but we really don't know.  
40 Although they should be safer because they won't allow the vehicle to hit something. Lengthy  
41 discussion continued. We will update the MTP every five years, and there will be discussion in the  
42 plan regarding new technology. Jason then explained the Delay Changes Map from 2050 Base to  
43 2050 Draft MTP Scenario. Jason then reviewed the main points in various committee discussions:  
44 increase length of I-89 widening vs. local road improvements; pursue alternative ways to reduce  
45 congestion; increase transit, HOV lanes; connect autonomous vehicles; increase funding share for  
46 alternative modes. Next steps: Dec/Jan – TAC and LRPC; VTrans coordination; January board  
47 meeting to warn draft ECOS Plan/MTP public hearing with public hearings in March and May.  
48 Charlie said the TAC spent some time on the big road projects vs. local road projects. After

1 discussion the TAC generally agreed with what staff proposed. The list of projects in our MTP is  
2 \$120-130 M more than meets this financial constraint. There are a lot of projects that may be  
3 outdated. We're meeting with town staffs (managers, planners) to look at projects in those  
4 municipalities. Sharon Murray said in terms of Energy Plan is there any correlation between the  
5 2050 date in the two plans. Charlie said yes and we're making sure the two plans are coordinated.  
6

- 7 8. Legislative Breakfast Preview. Charlie noted the breakfast is scheduled for Tuesday, December 12<sup>th</sup>  
8 at 7:30 a.m. at the DoubleTree. Unfortunately, the Vermont Bankers Association is having a  
9 legislative breakfast on the same day, same time and same place. We are coordinating our program  
10 with them. Our talking points will be based on implementing the ECOS Plan. We'll focus on our  
11 economy, transportation investment, housing, long term funding of water quality, and an update on  
12 Regional dispatch. We're getting requests from town managers to also talk about mental health  
13 issues. The suburban towns are working with Howard Center and the Medical Center to expand and  
14 integrate mental health services with police services. We also want to emphasize that CCRPC is a  
15 resource to the legislators. We'll work out the details with the Executive Committee. Chris Shaw  
16 asked whether there should be discussion with legislators to say how to attract people to Vermont,  
17 and what we can do to retain those who are educated here and have them stay here. Bard Hill said  
18 the state agencies were asked to report to the Governor on that and his department suggested  
19 interns. Chris Roy said UVM is having some of the same issues with housing for employees, etc.  
20 Discussion continued. More Champlain students stay here than UVM students who go there.  
21

22 9. Chair/Executive Director's Update.

- 23 a. Clean Water Initiatives Update. Charlie distributed copies of the Report of the Working Group  
24 on Water Quality Funding that was released today. Sec. Moore included a two-page Executive  
25 Summary. They're saying we'll use existing funding sources through 2021. The treasurer was  
26 thinking only two years, but this group is asking the legislature to think about making it a little  
27 longer. They got hung up on the parcel fee collection which would cost \$5 million annually to  
28 collect \$20 million. We're working on getting capital money to towns with project ready to go.  
29 Half of our towns participated in Grants-in-Aid Program and we're hoping for more money next  
30 spring. We're continuing to talk with DEC about getting the right projects ready for funding.  
31 b. Regional Dispatch Update. The Union Municipal District agreement should be back from AG's  
32 office next week. The Joint Survey Committee will recommend the agreement to municipal  
33 legislative bodies to see if municipalities want to put this on the ballot next March. The  
34 agreement would establish a public safety authority. All the details are not yet worked out.  
35 There is still a lot of process left to do after the authority is approved.  
36 c. FY19 UPWP Project solicitation. Were sent out today with Marshall as the primary contact.  
37 d. VTrans project selection process. VTrans has been working to update their project selection  
38 process and are looking at the criteria and how to prioritize projects. We'll keep members  
39 updated. They're close to having a draft, but will review it for a year to test it first.  
40

- 41 10. Committee/Liaison Activities and Reports. Minutes of various meetings were included in the board  
42 packet.

43 11. Members' Items/Other business. There was none.

44 12. Adjournment. DAN KERIN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JIM DONOVAN, TO ADJOURN AT 7:35  
45 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

46 Respectfully submitted,

47  
48 Bernadette Ferenc