

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

5 DATE: Tuesday, December 7, 2021
6 TIME: 9:00 a.m.
7 PLACE: Hybrid Meeting: In-person at CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal St. Winooski, VT, and
8 virtually via Zoom
9

10 **Members Present**

11 Bryan Osborne, Colchester
12 Dennis Lutz, Essex
13 Robin Pierce, Essex Junction
14 Amy Bell, VTrans
15 Ashley Atkins, VTrans
16 Matthew Arancio, VTrans
17 Jonathon Weber, Local Motion
18 Bob Henneberger, Seniors
19 Deirdre Holmes, Charlotte
20 Sam Andersen, GBIC
21 Wayne Howe, Jericho
22 Barbara Elliott, Huntington
23 Andrea Morgante, Hinesburg
24 Sandy Thibault, CATMA
25 Josh Arneson, Richmond
26 Ravi Venkataraman, Richmond
27 Nicole Losch, Burlington
28 Adam Wechsler, People with Disabilities

Kurt Johnson, Underhill
David Allerton, Milton
Lisa Schaeffler, Williston
Jon Rauscher, Winooski
Mary Anne Michaels, Rail

16 **Staff**

Charlie Baker, Executive Director
Eleni Churchill, Transportation Program Manager
Bryan Davis, Senior Transportation Planner
Christine Forde, Senior Transportation Planner
Jason Charest, Senior Transportation Planning Engineer
Chris Dubin, Senior Transportation Planner
Sai Sarepalli, Senior Transportation Planning Engineer
Ann Janda, Senior Energy Project Manager

26 **Guests**

Peggy O'Neill-Vivanco, VT Clean Cities Coalition
Zoe Neaderland, VTrans

30 1. Bryan Osborne called the meeting to order at 9:01 AM.

32 2. **Consent Agenda**

33 No consent agenda this month.
34

35 3. **Approval of November 2, 2021 Minutes**

36 Bryan asked for any changes. Nicole asked that she be added to the attendance list for the November
37 meeting. SAM ANDERSEN MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 2,
38 2021, SECONDED BY BOB HENNEBERGER. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
39

40 4. **Public Comments**

41 No comments from the public. David Allerton asked about the Route 7 Corridor Study by VTrans and if
42 there was additional information about the project. Amy Bell responded that there have been several
43 previous studies of the Route 7 corridor between I-89 exits 17 and 18 and this project will compile those
44 efforts, identify corridor improvement needs, and provide short and long term recommendations as part of
45 upcoming VTrans projects. Katherine Otto is the VTrans staff lead.
46

47 5. **CCRPC Energy Program / VCCC Fleet Conversion Analysis**

48 Ann Janda, CCRPC, introduced herself as new staff working on the CCRPC energy implementation
49 program. There currently aren't many grants available but some may be coming with the new legislative
50 session ahead and the focus on the Climate Action Plan. The federal infrastructure bill will provide \$21
51 million over five years for a new vehicle electrification program so there will need to be a plan. Peggy
52 O'Neill-Vivanco introduced herself and role at the Vermont Clean Cities Coalition (VCCC), which is
53 housed at UVM's Transportation Research Center. Their work is grant funded from the Department of
54 Energy (DOE) and includes work on light, medium and heavy duty vehicles, idle reduction, fuel

1 economy, conversion to electric, and fuel infrastructure. She gave an overview of various fleet conversion
2 analysis tools and showed a sample fleet analysis. She noted that idle reduction is the lowest hanging fruit
3 on fuel and emissions savings, and there are devices to help with this effort. When working with entities
4 Peggy starts with a fuel analysis questionnaire to get data, discover needs, also asks about e-bikes and off-
5 road vehicles since some businesses and others are starting to use e-bikes for deliveries. Peggy showed
6 several resources including: the [FuelEconomy.gov](https://fuel-economy.gov) website has tools such as vehicle comparisons;
7 [Alternative Fuels Data Center](https://alternativefuelsdatacenter.gov) website is sponsored by the DOE and has a vehicle cost calculator and
8 fuel/energy cost comparisons; [AFLEET](https://afleet.org) site is run by Argonne National Laboratory and has
9 tools/estimators including heavy duty vehicle emissions calculator. Peggy said she is working to get
10 demos of different electric vehicles, especially heavy duty. Peggy is happy to meet with anyone to discuss
11 further and Ann encouraged TAC members to people to sign up for the VCCC newsletter.
12 poneillv@uvm.edu, <https://vtccc.w3.uvm.edu/>
13

14 Andrea asked if anybody is doing an economic analysis of what will happen to convenience stores with
15 switching to electric vehicles and workplace charging? Peggy said that nationally and in rural places the
16 focus is on how to place infrastructure so it's accessible, such as siting it near fueling stations with
17 convenience stores, well lit areas with restrooms, places that support local economies. Andrea asked if
18 anyone is looking at snowmobiles and ATVs? Peggy said not ATVs but electric snowmobiles are coming
19 out, there have been supply chain issues. Some places locally are using electric snowmobiles to groom
20 cross county trails.
21

22 **6. Vermont Freight Plan – final draft**

23 Zoe Neaderland, VTrans, gave a short overview of the process to update the Vermont Freight Plan and
24 the strategic initiatives. The Plan and update are required but also necessary for an efficient system. Both
25 the VTrans Rail Plan and Freight Plan updates were coordinated with each other. Zoe focused on the final
26 two chapters: Ch 7 Needs Assessment, Key Trends and Issues includes the 40 initiatives grouped in 7
27 packages; and Ch 8 Implementation – Funding Sources. Comments are due December 8 so she is ready to
28 answer any questions and accept comments from the TAC on the final draft Plan before it is submitted to
29 FHWA. More information, including the four page summary, full 64 page plan, and technical memos
30 which provide a range of materials, are on the project webpage at
31 <https://vtrans.vermont.gov/planning/freight>.
32

33 Andrea asked if there is a difference between freight that moves internally to Vermont versus through the
34 state, and any analysis with what's happening with dairy and agriculture freight movement? Zoe said yes,
35 that is included in the executive summary and the plan itself. There is also an analysis by commodity type
36 including agriculture, but it may not be finer grained by specific type, like dairy. Technical memo 3 may
37 include more detailed information.
38

39 **7. CCRPC I-89 2050 Study**

40 Jason Charest and Eleni Churchill, CCRPC, provided an update on the I-89 2050 Study and the results of
41 strategic modeling of transportation demand management (TDM) strategies, and how these and other
42 investments can help meet the goal of the study. More information is available at <https://envision89.com/>.
43 Context and background: The Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) investments for 2050 include
44 \$420 million for new investments. The \$74 million line for interstate and interchange projects is a
45 placeholder for any improvements, including additional TDM improvements. The strategic model is a
46 tool to help evaluate TDM/bike/ped/transit possibilities (known as Bundle 2) to meet the future needs of
47 I-89, rather than make changes to the interstate and interchange. Since Travel Demand Models are
48 insensitive to many TDM policies and investments, the strategic model is an econometric tool that can
49 evaluate and assess complex investments at household decision level. The TDM focus group met three
50 times in the fall to inform policies and investments in the model, review results, and provide direction on
51 which investment packages to advance as part of the I-89 study Bundle 2. Remember that the model is
52 just a tool to help in the process. The model area defined different zones as part of analysis, and the team
53 could choose drivers of change and areas that relate to the goals of the study such as vehicle miles

1 traveled (VMT), congestion, emissions, etc. Scenario testing looked at six packages of investments, with
 2 a number of “levels” in each, for year 2050, plus no change. There are 432 possible scenarios in the
 3 model based on the packages and levels. Two draft scenarios were selected, which are similar except that
 4 the Low Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled (DVMT) scenario has fewer ride hailing opportunities, and the
 5 Low GHG Emissions scenario has more electric vehicles (EV) for non-household vehicles. Jason noted
 6 that the scenario view can goal-seek solutions meaning that you can select desired results in the model
 7 and see the set of policies to achieve those goals. Next steps are to finalize the strategic model results, use
 8 the Bundle 2 transportation network as the base to run bundles 3, 4, 5, then evaluate possible capacity
 9 increase of the I-89 mainline, and provide opportunities for public comment in 2022.

10
 11 Jonathon asked for an explanation of how the analysis findings affect whether or not to consider capacity
 12 increase on I-89. Eleni said the hope is that focusing on the TDM bundle will reduce the need for capacity
 13 expansion. It’s also incumbent on all of us to change our behaviors. We haven’t yet developed “triggers”
 14 like annual average daily traffic (AADT) to help us understand if more capacity is actually needed and
 15 how to plan for that. Andrea asked that when we talk about capacity changes on I-89, is there thought on
 16 including other modes so instead of adding a lane, could we change modes within the right-of-way. Eleni
 17 asked if Andrea meant something like adding a separate path along I-89? If so, that idea came up and we
 18 need further discussion with VTrans on whether that’s allowed or not. There are examples of this but it’s
 19 generally not preferred. It’s a state not federal decision. Dennis said his concern is that what happens with
 20 I-89 is at the state level, not the municipality, but modeling depends on things not related to transportation
 21 like land use. Pricing for housing is an issue, if people choose to live in areas with cheaper housing, then
 22 TDM inputs don’t matter. The model is useful but it doesn’t account for those kinds of personal decisions.
 23 Eleni agrees and the model provides opportunities for different scenarios, and we can talk to the state
 24 when they are working on other plans, etc. Ravi asked how the model accounts for Route 2 and other
 25 routes that help people get from A to B on the corridor. Eleni said the strategic model doesn’t include that
 26 but the travel demand model does. Sam followed up on Dennis’s comment and said that the model
 27 doesn’t take age demographics into account, which are severely impacting the workplace and workforce
 28 shortage. We may not be able to model it but discussion is needed. This group needs to keep this in mind
 29 as we talk about bike ped, and what transit opportunities are. Jonathon said it’s important to acknowledge
 30 that part of the problem with land use is the result of the capacity that’s been built into the system that
 31 supports living further from employment centers. How does I-89 decisions take induced demand into
 32 consideration? Eleni said it is taken into account, we haven’t looked at adding lanes to I-89 yet, and we
 33 are gathering information from other states on this. Jason noted that we’re not the only place trying to
 34 figure this out but there is emerging consensus that if you make it easier to travel by adding capacity, then
 35 it does fill up. The diverging diamond interchange (DDI) alternative at Exit 14 represents reduced
 36 capacity demand, so it could lead to thinking that reducing capacity could lead to decreased demand.
 37 Jonathon said yes and if better TDM options and facilities exist then that reduces demand. It doesn’t make
 38 sense to build expensive capacity that fills up and then we’re in the same situation. Charlie reminded the
 39 TAC that this is the same conversation we had 18 months ago, and we did a deep dive into induced
 40 demand so that information is available. Ashley asked how reducing capacity will improve travel times,
 41 we don’t want to lose sight of the mission and vision of the project. Charlie replied that decreasing travel
 42 time wasn’t a specific objective, but more reliable travel time may have been an objective. Eleni said we
 43 know there is congestion during peak hours now, and demand might be changing in the future based on
 44 telework, changes in transit, etc. Reliability of travel is part of the goals. Sandy in chat: Consider/Explore
 45 addition of a “High Occupancy Lane” for transit, microtransit, carpool, vanpool (this may encourage
 46 sustainable travel). Jonathon added: Also transit signal priority.

47
 48 **8. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports**

49 See bulleted list at the end of the agenda for current CCRPC projects. TAC members are encouraged to
 50 ask staff for more information on the status of any of these on-going or recently completed projects.

51
 52 **9. CCRPC Board Meeting Report**

1 In November the Board heard a presentation on, and voted to accept the FY21 audit report, heard a
2 presentation on telework trends from CATMA, voted to approve using the 2018 ECOS Plan forecasts for
3 the 2023 ECOS Plan update, discussed the legislative breakfast topics, and heard an update from the
4 Executive Director.

5

6 **10. Chairman's/Members' Items**

7 • **Vermont Better Roads Program:** the use of erosion control and maintenance techniques that
8 save money while protecting and enhancing water quality around the State. **Applications for**
9 **funding will be accepted until December 17, 2021.** Funding will be awarded after the
10 legislative appropriations process, which is expected to be July 2022. For the most up-to-date
11 information or to download a copy of the application, please visit the AOT website at
12 <http://vtrans.vermont.gov/highway/better-roads>

13 • **VLCT is hosting a webinar on December 9 on the new federal Infrastructure Investment**
14 **and Jobs Act (IIJA):** <https://www.vlct.org/event/what-does-infrastructure-bill-mean-your-town>

15

16 The next TAC meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, January 4, 2021.

17

18 SAM ANDERSEN MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN, SECONDED BY NICOLE LOSCH,
19 UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED. THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 10:39 AM.

20

21 Respectfully submitted, Bryan Davis

