

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

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

9 **Members Present**

10 Dean Pierce, Shelburne
11 Joss Besse, Bolton
12 Bob Henneberger, Seniors
13 Bryan Osborne, Colchester, TAC Chair
14 Bruce Hoar, Williston
15 Luke Valentine, St. George
16 Dave Armstrong, GMT
17 Dick Hosking, VTrans
18 Brian Bigelow, Underhill
19 Mary Anne Michaels, Rail
20 Ryan Lambert, Winooski
21 Justin Rabidoux, South Burlington
22 Amy Bell, VTrans
23 Barbara Elliot, Huntington
24 Brendan Atwood, CATMA
25

Staff Present

Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
Melanie Needle, Senior Planner
Eleni Churchill, Transportation Project Manager
Sai Sarepalli, Transportation Planning Engineer
Bryan Davis, Senior Transportation Planner
Peter Keating, Senior Transportation Planner
Charlie Baker, Executive Director
Marshall Distel, Transportation Planner
Jason Charest, Senior Transportation Planning Engineer

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

28 **1. Consent Agenda**

29 TIP amendments as described in meeting memo were unanimously approved.
30

31 **2. Approval of Minutes**

32 The October 3rd minutes were approved without changes.
33

34 **3. Public Comments**

35 There were none.
36

37 **4. MTP Update**

38 Jason Charest shared a PowerPoint presentation of the highlights from the MTP scenario modeling
39 analysis. He began with a scenario summary noting the inclusion of TDM measures due to their health
40 benefits and mobility support for underserved populations, and roadway improvements that mainly
41 address localized congestion and safety issues. He reported on the demographics behind the scenario:
42 Growth in population, jobs and homes, then provided this outline of the scenario elements:

- 43 • Includes all TIP Projects
- 44 • Third Lane on I-89 between Exits 14 and 15
- 45 • Exit 12B placeholder
 - 46 – Future I-89 Interchange Scoping Study to better determine where
- 47 • ITS Investments
- 48 • Transit enhancements
 - 49 – 20 minute headways, and New Colchester loop
- 50 • Increases in walking/biking in growth areas
- 51 • Land-use concentration
 - 52 – 90% of HH growth in areas planned for growth

53 He then displayed a map of the areas planned for growth to identify where the 90% of new growth is
54 planned for. He followed with a chart that summarized the MTP financial plan identifying funding levels

1 for different project types. Looking at five different performance measures, Jason compared the MTP
2 scenario with the 2015 and 2050 base scenarios. The MTP scenario showed improved performance,
3 compared to the 2050 base under the following measures: Daily VMT, VMT per Capita, total trips, delay
4 per capita, and mode share for transit/walking/biking. Using maps, he showed the differences between
5 scenarios related to road capacity, delay and the percentage change in delay.
6

7 During and following Jason's presentation the following issues/questions arose:

- 8 • Allocating 90% of new growth to the planning areas designated for growth
- 9 • The decision-making process that produced the MTP scenario from the modeling process
- 10 • The basis for the allocation to the environmental/stormwater category
- 11 • Are we pushing interstate problems further out by addressing only the worst segments?
- 12 • Will induced demand result from widening the Interstate?
- 13 • What's the balance between investment in local problem areas vs. Interstate congestion?
- 14 • This plan is looking out 35 years yet will be revisited within next 5

15
16 At the conclusion there was general consensus that the MTP scenario seemed reasonable as the basis for
17 long range planning. Jason concluded by going over the project schedule:

- 18 • Long Range Planning Committee this Thursday
- 19 • November CCRPC Board next week
- 20 • VTrans Coordination meetings
- 21 • December/January TAC
 - 22 – Draft MTP
- 23 • January CCRPC Board
 - 24 – Warn Draft ECOS Plan/MTP Public Hearing

25 26 **5. GMT's NextGEN Transit Plan**

27 Dave Armstrong of GMT reminded the TAC he had been here a couple of months previous to give some
28 background and status information. He wanted now to go over some of the draft recommendations for
29 GMT's urbanized (Chittenden County) services. He went over the project's goals and addressed how such
30 a project, under fiscal constraints, entails a number of trade-offs. GMT, with their consultant Nelson
31 Nygard, went through a process to develop three new service scenarios. That process included
32 stakeholder interviews, a market analysis, an evaluation of existing services, scenario development and
33 analysis, and finally, recommendations. The three scenarios and their recommendations are now drafted,
34 and all include some common themes:

- 35 • Simplified Service
- 36 • Streamlined and consistent schedules
- 37 • Core network of major local routes
- 38 • More evening service
- 39 • Better weekend service
- 40 • Minimum service frequency standards

41 The three scenarios are based on different levels of funding. One envisions an additional 20%, another
42 10% more funding and the third is cost neutral relative to the current investment. Dave then gave some
43 details/differences between the first and second scenarios. He concluded, noting the outreach meetings
44 coming up and the schedule to have the GMT Board make some decisions on recommendations in time
45 for possible February or later timetable changes. He also noted that NextGEN is looking fairly short term
46 – asking what can we change today? Over the next year or two they will update their Transit
47 Development Plan (TDP) that looks out more medium to long term.
48
49
50

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

2 Bryan referred members to the project list on the back of the agenda and encouraged members to inquire
3 on project status if interested.
4

5 **7. CCRPC October Board Meeting Report.**

6 Peter mentioned that the Board approved MGRP comments and heard updates on the MTP scenarios.
7

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

9 Peter referred to the handout that CCRPC staff regularly updates identifying transportation related grant
10 opportunities.
11

12
13 The meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m.
14

15 Respectfully submitted, Peter Keating

DRAFT