

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

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

9 **Members Present**

10 Dean Bloch, Charlotte  
11 Dean Pierce, Shelburne  
12 Dennis Lutz, Essex  
13 Bob Henneberger, Seniors  
14 Chris Jolly, FHWA  
15 Sandy Thibault, CATMA  
16 Bruce Hoar, Williston  
17 Nicole Losch, Burlington  
18 Dave Armstrong, GMT  
19 Dick Hosking, VTrans  
20 Brian Bigelow, Underhill  
21 Mary Anne Michaels, Rail  
22 Ryan Lambert, Winooski  
23 Jason Van Driesche, Local Motion  
24 Amy Bell, VTrans  
25

**Staff Present**

Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager  
Christine Forde, Senior Transportation Planner  
Eleni Churchill, Transportation Project Manager  
Sai Sarepalli, Transportation Planning Engineer  
Bryan Davis, Senior Transportation Planner  
Peter Keating, Senior Transportation Planner  
Chris Dubin, Transportation Planner  
Marshall Distel, Transportation Planner  
Jason Charest, Senior Transportation Planning Engineer

**Others**

Karen Adams, Colchester  
Jim Ryan, ANR

26  
27 Peter Keating called the meeting to order at 9:00AM and asked for a round of introductions.  
28

29 **1. Consent Agenda**

30 No items this month.  
31

32 **2. Approval of Minutes**

33 The July 5<sup>th</sup> minutes were approved without changes.  
34

35 **3. Public Comments**

36 There were none.  
37

38 **4. GMT's NextGEN Transit Plan**

39 Dave Armstrong of GMT described this planning work now underway with the help of consultant Nelson  
40 Nygaard. The Plan is designed to improve service throughout the system. The plan will help identify  
41 ways to:

- 42 • better match service with current needs,
- 43 • make service simpler, more direct, faster, and more convenient, and
- 44 • better integrate urban and rural services.

45 Dave described this plan as one recommending changes between now and the next five years. He noted  
46 that much of the Plan will be based on decisions around trade-offs. For instance, those between levels of  
47 coverage, frequency, days of service, transfers, route directness and bus stop spacing. So far, there's been  
48 work on all of the existing routes and some preliminary recommendations. Route profiles document route  
49 statistics, note route variants and suggest possible modifications. GMT and consultant staff have also  
50 done a market study to determine transit demand that includes:

- 51 • Population and employment density
- 52 • Socio-economic characteristics
- 53 • Major activity centers, and
- 54 • Work trip travel flows

1 That analysis revealed that GMT routes cover the areas of highest demand fairly well. Dave described the  
2 public outreach process that included a live blog, Survey Monkey, RPCs, local events, and public  
3 hearings. Based on the analysis and input the Plan has recommended a draft service scenario which  
4 includes:

- 5 • Simplified service(s): Fewer route deviations with more linear service
- 6 • Bolstered network of “Major Local Routes:” #7 North Ave, #2 Essex Jct., #1 Williston Rd, #6  
7 Shelburne Rd
- 8 • More evening service
- 9 • More/better weekend service
- 10 • Minimum service frequency-standards: e.g. Major Local route – trip every 20 minutes, Local  
11 route (#5 Pine St) trip every 30 minutes
- 12 • One-seat connection to Airport

13 Next steps in Plan development are:

- 14 • Continue to hold monthly Advisory Committee meetings
- 15 • Continued “public” involvement: RPCs, Towns/Cities, Planners, Passengers, Non-passengers
- 16 • Finalize service recommendations for display/discussion
- 17 • GMT Board approval
- 18 • Implementation
- 19 • Fare policy study

20 The expectation is that the Plan should be complete at the end of the calendar year.

## 21 5. MTP Update

22 Peter referred members to the memo on this in the meeting packet. There were three items to present.  
23 First was the MTP development schedule and what the TAC would be scheduled to review at upcoming  
24 meetings through March 2018. This was highlighted in a table in the memo. Next Peter addressed the  
25 financial plan of the MTP. There are three elements to this:

- 26 1. Identify the funding “reasonably expected to be available”
- 27 2. Determine the level of funding needed to operate and maintain the existing system
- 28 3. Calculate the difference between 1 and 2 and determine how this will be allocated to new  
29 projects/strategies

30 Element #1 was determined by looking at the history of federal funding coming to the entire state and  
31 then calculating what a reasonable share of that total would come to Chittenden County. This concluded  
32 that the CCRPC regions would get, on average, 19.4% of the state total which comes to \$41.05M per year  
33 (in 2016 dollars). Peter noted that VTrans has agreed on the reasonableness of this methodology. For  
34 element #2, we developed average annual costs based on historic TIP obligations to:

- 35 – Paving and Bridge, and
- 36 – CCTA Maintenance and Operations

37 We used these as proxies for the operations and maintenance calculations. When we looked at the overall  
38 funding proportions that went into these categories over different time periods we saw very different  
39 results. If we take the long view back to FY2000 up to FY16, the maintenance and operations share is  
40 55%. If, however, we look at a shorter period, over the past seven years, that share is over 73%. After  
41 consultations with VTrans we’ve decided to go with a higher percentage for our planning purposes. Next  
42 steps will be include establishing funding levels to project categories using the calculated balance  
43 between elements #1 and 2 above.

44  
45  
46 The third part of the MTP update had Jason go over some transportation model results. He began with a  
47 series of charts showing region-wide results from 2015 and 2050 with and without TIP projects.  
48 Measures charted included VMT, VMT per capita, VHT, delay per capita, transit/walking/biking mode  
49 split and average trip length. Many of the measures see significant changes due to the projected increases  
50 in houses and jobs expected over the 35-year planning period. He also showed maps of 2015 and 2050

1 featuring two measures of congestion: Volume to capacity ratio and delay per mile. Jason noted that these  
2 were just some of many other measures the model will produce and that we intend to analyze in the  
3 coming weeks.  
4

#### 5 **6. Municipal General Roads Permit (MGRP) Update**

6 Jim Ryan of ANR attended to provide the latest information on this. He reported that a final draft will be  
7 out this week and that there will be a 45-day comment period following the MGRP release. He began his  
8 presentation with some background that included the legislative language guiding the permit and the near  
9 and long-term timeline for key permit deliverables. He next defined what's covered by the permit and  
10 what a hydrologically connected road is. He then went into some detail on the permit's major  
11 components: Inventories, prioritization and implementation. Jim defined the following as MGRP  
12 principles:

- 13 • First- disconnect road Stormwater whenever possible, starting at the top of the road watershed
- 14 • Second- Infiltrate stormwater
- 15 • Third- Stabilize conveyances and turn out ditches

16 This was followed with a description of baseline standards then the following summary for towns:

- 17 • Application coverage and annual fees to begin in July 31, 2018
- 18 • Road erosion inventories for hydrologically-connected roads due for all towns by 12/1/2020 and  
19 updated every 5 years thereafter.
- 20 • Implementation plans and schedules by 12/1/2020
- 21 • Road BMP implementation on or before 2021 to achieve all connected roads meeting standards  
22 by 2036 (a minimum amount of implementation per year)
- 23 • Annual reporting on implementation progress due every February starting 2/1/2019

24 He finished mentioning assistance to towns from funding (new municipal grant-in-aid), outreach and  
25 technical assistance, and shared equipment.  
26

#### 27 **7. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports**

28 Peter referred members to the project list on the back of the agenda and encouraged members to inquire  
29 on project status if interested.  
30

#### 31 **8. CCRPC July Board Meeting Report.**

32 Peter mentioned that the Board held the public hearing and adopted the FY18 TIP.  
33

#### 34 **9. Chairman's/Members' Items**

35 No items this month  
36  
37

38 The meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.  
39

40 Respectfully submitted, Peter Keating