

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

5 DATE: Tuesday, December 5, 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 Matt Langham, VTrans
14 Bruce Hoar, Williston
15 Chris Jolly, FHWA
16 Robin Pierce, Essex Junction
17 Dick Hosking, VTrans
18 Brian Bigelow, Underhill
19 Mary Anne Michaels, Rail
20 Ryan Lambert, Winooski
21 Dennis Lutz, Essex
22 Amy Bell, VTrans
23 Dean Bloch, Charlotte
24 Sandy Thibault, CATMA
25 Jason Van Driesche, Local Motion
26 Elizabeth Gohringer, Burlington
27

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
Charlie Baker, Executive Director
Marshall Distel, Transportation Planner
Jason Charest, Senior Transportation Planning Engineer

Others

Tony Redington
Charles Simpson
Rick Brown, Burlington International Airport

28 Peter Keating called the meeting to order at 9:00AM and asked for a round of introductions.
29

30 **1. Consent Agenda**

31 No items this month.
32

33 **2. Approval of Minutes**

34 The November 7th minutes were approved without changes.
35

36 **3. Public Comments**

37 Tony Redington distributed a flyer from Burlington's Pine Street Coalition. He spoke to the group's
38 efforts to reopen the design discussion around the Champlain Parkway. He noted that using OECD data,
39 the US has fallen behind many other countries when it comes to road safety and that the current
40 Champlain Parkway design with six new signalized intersections will only worsen safety. He also noted
41 that the project hinders water quality. He feels there is a need to redesign the project to, among other
42 things, maintain the Pine St. connection and improve the City Market entrance. Charles Simpson also
43 spoke in opposition to the current Champlain Parkway design by first referring to a recent film on Jane
44 Jacobs and her efforts to stop freeways from entering Manhattan. He noted the current design reduces
45 connectivity, limits stormwater retention, and will likely adversely impact safety. He feels the design is
46 archaic and needs to be reexamined.
47

48 **4. MTP Update**

49 Peter Keating noted that this is the first completed draft of the full MTP and that while the TAC had
50 previously seen various pieces of it over the past six months, this is the first time all of the content has
51 been assembled together. Peter also stressed that this draft is a work in progress and will see considerable
52 improvement before it comes back to the TAC in January. The points he planned to cover in this
53 presentation included:

- 54
- MTP Background information on why we do this

- 1 • Draft MTP Content – the various chapter topics
- 2 • Previous Presentations/Discussion with TAC on some of the draft content
- 3 • What’s New – MTP section drafts that the TAC has yet to see.
- 4 • Next Steps/Schedule – when the TAC will again discuss and recommend action on the MTP

5 Here are the MTP sections in sequence

- 6 • Introduction and Background – Federal regulations and guidelines; the MTP in context with other
- 7 responsibilities
- 8 • Transportation Goal, Issues, and Performance Measures – newly drafted but same goal from
- 9 ECOS plan with updated issues discussion and new performance target information and charts;
- 10 coordination with VTrans on targets.
- 11 • Existing Metropolitan Transportation System – first presented back in June but updated,
- 12 especially crash data and maps; some content still in progress – travel patterns and congestion
- 13 discussion.
- 14 • Financial Plan – seen before; how much we expect to have and where it’s budgeted to go (three
- 15 fourths to system maintenance).
- 16 • Scenario Planning Review and Future Conditions – also new content describing all of the
- 17 modelled scenarios and the MTP scenario. Still needs text on the scenario analysis and
- 18 performance metrics.
- 19 • MTP Corridors – new but similar to last MTP – a description and discussion of the main travel
- 20 corridors and the projects identified with each.
- 21 • MTP Investments and Project List – more detail on strategic priorities; the still in-process project
- 22 list under review/revision from local government staff.
- 23 • Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Report – Similar to last MTP but shortened to make less
- 24 specific regarding individual projects, as allowed under federal regulations.

25 Peter concluded by asking the TAC to get any comment back to staff by 12/15. Another draft will
 26 then be circulated to the TAC before its January meeting. At that meeting we will look for a TAC
 27 recommendation to ask the Board to warn a public hearing.

28
 29 Following the presentation, the discussion featured several comments and questions, including:

- 30 • Dennis Lutz asked about the specificity of the MTP funding categories regards to stormwater
- 31 projects. Chris Jolly responded by saying that there is no issue with having more general project
- 32 categories with their own funding allotments.
- 33 • Jason Van Driesche asked why VMT for 80% connected vehicles would be higher than having
- 34 100% connected vehicles. Jason Charest replied that a 100% shift includes the assumption that
- 35 there would be more shared vehicle ownership, which could in turn, reduce VMT.
- 36 • Dean Bloch suggested that the MTP should address the storage of rail cars with hazardous
- 37 materials. Maryanne Michaels stated that rail storage is federally regulated and that there is a
- 38 need to be cognizant of federal regulatory preemption. Amy Bell stressed that the MPO and
- 39 VTrans don’t have authority related to rail storage. Dean Pierce interjected that federal
- 40 regulations provide a subsidy to rail that could be dedicated to issues related to storage. Dean
- 41 Bloch said that it is not forward thinking to leave this issue out of the MTP. He also stated that if
- 42 we can’t make recommendations related to rail storage, then he would like to see federal planning
- 43 funds used to explore this issue. Staff will propose additional text to address this.
- 44 • Jason Van Driesche asked about the congestion implications related to the interstate expansion.
- 45 Jason Charest replied that an expansion would increase congestion between I-89 Exits 15 and 16,
- 46 but is not projected to increase congestion elsewhere. There is a need to address capacity
- 47 problems between Exits 14 and 15.
- 48 • Jason Van Driesche asked why the MTP would be recommending system-wide 20-minute
- 49 headways for transit rather than a preferable 15-minute headway. Peter replied that the decision
- 50 for 20-minute headways was made as a compromise to bring all transit routes into an improved
- 51 industry standard and would be less costly than implementing 15-minute service.

- 1 • Dennis Lutz questioned how statewide transportation safety targets will impact Chittenden
2 County. Staff will look into this and add information within the MTP.
- 3 • Jason Van Driesche inquired about the mechanism that would be used to drive down non-
4 motorized injuries/fatalities. The CCRPC will work to identify locations that are deemed most
5 unsafe for bicyclists and pedestrians.
6

7 **5. Stormwater Programs Update**

8 Chris Dubin brought the TAC up to date on the various programs funding stormwater activity (planning,
9 design, construction) and the status of which towns have received how much funding from which sources.
10 He used a series of maps to display grant awards for planning and design/construction as well as pending
11 applications for design/construction activity. CCRPC staff will continue working with towns on FY18
12 projects and will be preparing a solicitation to towns for planning work in FY19. Considerable discussion
13 followed on the time/effort/expertise of local governments, and RPC staff, to manage all of this
14 stormwater work. While RPCs can and will help, and the larger towns likely have their own staff
15 resources to contribute, there was concern that statewide, in small towns, managing these projects will be
16 challenging.
17

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

19 Peter referred members to the project list on the back of the agenda and encouraged members to inquire
20 on project status if interested.
21

22 **7. CCRPC November Board Meeting Report.**

23 Peter mentioned that the Board received an update on the MTP scenario and heard a presentation on
24 GMT's NextGEN Transit Plan.
25

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

27 N/A this month.
28

29
30 The meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m.

31
32 Respectfully submitted, Peter Keating