

1 CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
2 REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
3 DRAFT

4 DATE: Wednesday, February 16, 2022  
5 TIME: 6:00 PM  
6 PLACE: CCRPC Offices; 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404 and  
7 REMOTE ATTENDANCE via ZOOM MEETING VIDEO  
8

9 PRESENT: Bolton: Absent Buel's Gore: Garret Mott  
10 Burlington: Andy Montroll Charlotte: Dana Hanley  
11 Charlotte: Deidre Holmes (Alt) Colchester: Jacki Murphy  
12 Essex: Jeff Carr Essex Junction: Dan Kerin  
13 Essex Junction: Elaine Haney (Alt) Huntington: Barbara Elliott  
14 Hinesburg: Mike Bissonnette Jericho: Catherine McMains  
15 Jericho: Wayne Howe (Alt) Milton: Tony Micklus  
16 Richmond: Bard Hill St. George: Absent  
17 Shelburne: Absent So. Burlington: Chris Shaw  
18 Underhill: Kurt Johnson (Alt) Westford: Absent  
19 Williston: Andrew Watts Winooski: Mike O'Brien  
20 Cons/Env.: Absent VTrans: Amy Bell  
21 VTrans: Matthew Langham Bus/Ind: Absent  
22 GMT: Absent Socio/Econ/Housing: Absent  
23 Agriculture: Absent  
24

25 Others: Scott Moody, CCTV Leroy Thompson, IEM  
26 Stephen Falbel, Steadman Hill Consulting Elizabeth Burnett, IEM  
27

28 CCRPC Staff: Charlie Baker, Executive Director Regina Mahony, Planning Pgrm Mgr.  
29 Eleni Churchill, Transp. Program Mgr. Amy Irvin Witham, Bus Office Mgr.  
30 Jason Charest, Senior Planner Marshall Distel, Senior Trans. Planner  
31 Christine Forde, Senior Trans. Planner Sai Sarepalli, Senior Planner  
32 Dan Albrecht, Senior Planner Emma Vaughn, Communications Mgr.  
33 Melanie Needle, Senior Planner  
34

35 1. Call to order; Attendance; Changes to the Agenda.

36 The meeting was called to order at 6:01 PM by the Chair, Catherine McMains.  
37

38 2. Public Comment Period on Items NOT on the Agenda.

39 3. Action on Consent Agenda -MPO Action. There were two items on the consent agenda.  
40

41 • Accept the annual Transportation Safety Performance Targets.

42 The Safety Performance Targets are established every year by VTrans, in collaboration with the  
43 CCRPC. The TAC and the Board review and accept these targets annually. The CCRPC is asked to  
44 act on the 2022 VTrans statewide safety targets as reported in the 2021 Highway Safety  
45 Improvement Program (HSIP) Report, for the metropolitan planning area.  
46  
47

1 • TIP Amendments

2 The Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) and CCRPC Staff recommend approval of the  
3 proposed FY22-TIP Amendments

- 4 ○ **Resurfacing VT2A, Colchester-Essex** (Project HP156, Amendment FY22-17)  
5 **Description of TIP Change:** Add a new project to the TIP in FY22 for resurfacing VT  
6 Route 2A from the Class 1 limit north of North Street, in Essex, to US Route 7, in  
7 Colchester. Work will also take place on VT Route 127, between its intersections with US  
8 Route 7 and VT Route 2A. Add \$1,795,072 for construction in FY22.  
9
- 10 ○ **Resurfacing VT Route 289, Essex** (Project HP157, Amendment FY22-18)  
11 **Description of TIP Change:** Add a new project to the TIP in FY22 for resurfacing VT  
12 Route 289, from VT Route 117 to VT Route 2A. Work under this project will also include  
13 the VT Route 289 on- and off-ramps. Add \$2,979,197 for construction in FY22.  
14 Preliminary engineering for this project was funded under regional project Design  
15 Scoping Projects (OT006).  
16
- 17 ○ **GMT Capital – Federal** (Project TR003A, Amendment FY22-19)  
18 **Description of TIP Change:** Increase the amount of federal funds in FY22 from \$50,000  
19 to \$200,000.  
20
- 21 ○ **GMT Capital – Facility and Bus Heavy Repairs** (Project TR078, Amendment FY22-20) **and**  
22 **GMT Preventative Maintenance, Safety, and Equipment Replacements** (Project TR046,  
23 Amendment FY22-21) **Description of TIP Change:** Add CMAQ as a funding source, along  
24 with STP Transfer, to both projects. This change will increase funding flexibility for these  
25 projects.  
26
- 27 ○ **East-West Alternative Transportation Crossing, South Burlington** (Project BP117,  
28 Amendment FY22-22) **Description of TIP Change:** Add a new project to the TIP in FY22  
29 for an East-West Alternative Transportation Crossing in South Burlington. Add \$240,000  
30 in federal funds for PE in FY22.  
31
- 32 ○ **Lindenwood Dive Closed Drainage System and Stormwater Treatment, South**  
33 **Burlington** (Project OT046, Amendment FY22-23) **Description of TIP Change:** Advance  
34 \$96,610 from FY21 to FY22. This amendment changes the FY20 TIP to match the FY22  
35 TIP, which was approved by the CCRPC Board on July 21, 2021. This project will be  
36 constructed in 2022.  
37
- 38 ○ **VT128 Culvert BR1 Carrying Alder Brook, Essex** (Project BR060, Amendment FY22-24)  
39 **Description of TIP Change:** Move \$400,000 in federal funds for construction from FY21  
40 to FY22 and add \$60,000. This project did not advance to construction in FY21 but will  
41 be constructed in 2022.  
42
- 43 ○ **Exit 16 Improvements, Colchester** (Project HP102, Amendment FY22-25)  
44 **Description of TIP Change:** Change the FY20-23 TIP to match FY22-25 TIP as follows –  
45 increase federal funds for construction in FY22 from \$2,965,140 to \$4,000,000, add  
46 \$6,090,000 in FY23, and add \$2,997,712 in FY24. The project is scheduled to begin  
47 construction in 2022.  
48

- 1           ○ **Stormwater System Retrofit with Infiltration Systems and Stabilized Outfalls for Three**  
2 **Cul-de-sacs, Essex** (Project OT040, Amendment FY22-26)  
3 **Description of TIP Change:** Change the FY20-23 TIP to match FY22-25 TIP as follows --  
4 move \$189,104 from FY20 to FY22. This project is scheduled to be constructed in 2022.  
5  
6           ○ **US2 Paving, Bolton-Richmond** (Project HP148, Amendment FY22-27)  
7 **Description of TIP Change:** Change the FY20-23 TIP to match FY22-25 TIP as follows --  
8 \$962,838 in FY22, \$7,308,000 in FY23, and \$6,593,440 in FY24. This project is scheduled  
9 to begin construction in 2022.  
10  
11          ○ **US7 Paving, Charlotte-South Burlington** (Project HP149, Amendment FY22-28)  
12 **Description of TIP Change:** Advance construction from FY23/24 to FY22/23 as follows --  
13 \$4,000,000 in FY22 and \$3,879,517 in FY23. This change results in an increase in  
14 construction cost of \$728,474 which is a 10% increase. This project is scheduled to begin  
15 construction in 2022.  
16

17 ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JEFF CARR, TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA  
18 ITEMS. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY THE MPO MEMBERS.  
19

20 4. All Hazard Mitigation Plan Update - Leroy Thompson

21 Dan Albrecht introduced Leroy Thompson, Lead Mitigation Planner for IEM which is under contract  
22 to the State to produce the County plan with municipal annexes except for Colchester. IEM provided  
23 a small subcontract to CCRPC to assist with outreach and reviewing drafts of the plan. Leroy  
24 provided members with a presentation, *Chittenden County Multi-Jurisdictional All Hazard Mitigation*  
25 *Plan, 2022 Update*. Leroy said his colleague, Elizabeth Burnett assisted with and coordinated much  
26 of the data in the presentation. He also thanked CCRPC for their contributions, which were helpful.  
27 A [link](#) to the full presentation is posted on the CCRPC website.  
28

29 Leroy covered the following topics with members:

- 30 • *Mitigation Overview*
- 31 • *Mitigation Planning Benefits*
- 32 • *Intent of Plan Update*
- 33 • *Plan Participants*
- 34 • *Realignment of the 2022 Plan*
- 35 • *Phases/Planning Process*
- 36 • *Hazards Covered*
- 37 • *Results of Risk Assessment*
- 38 • *Regional Goals and Regional Strategies*
- 39 • *Draft Plan*
- 40 • *Next Steps*

41  
42 Garret Mott asked why Shelburne had different winter weather than other communities? Leroy  
43 explained, much of the data is based on National data and information coming from the weather  
44 service at the BTV Airport. Leroy said when municipalities receive copies of the plan, if there are  
45 discrepancies the towns should follow up with IEM. Dan Albrecht explained that the towns can remain  
46 eligible for a good ERAF match rate contribution from the State in the event of a disaster declaration  
47 if their draft mitigation plan is in the process of review by VEM. Leroy agreed noting that VEM has

1 delegated authority from FEMA to review plans for consistency with requirements and can turn it  
2 around much faster than FEMA's up-to-45 days' timeframe. The large multi-Jurisdictional draft plan  
3 will be submitted to the towns and CCRPC for review in the next few days and then after a 10-day  
4 turnaround time he will then submit it to VEM. The individual town hazard mitigation plans, which  
5 are annexes to the larger plan document will be wrapped up in the coming few weeks and submitted  
6 to VEM after their drafts are approved by the respective towns. Leroy said there has been a bit of a  
7 learning curve in working with COVID; they are trying to conduct meetings that were typically held in-  
8 person.

9  
10 Dana Hanley asked if crime and looting were noted in the plan? Dan answered, yes, crime, especially  
11 as triggered by the opioid crisis and other societal hazards, have always been in the County's plan  
12 since the first version in 2005. It is not required but we have always wanted to also note Societal and  
13 Technological hazards rather than just the FEMA minimum of addressing Natural hazards. Chris  
14 Shaw feels the plan should include cyber-threats and cyber-attacks. This is a real risk. Leroy said he  
15 does not believe it is addressed in the current plan. Dan stated we did have some verbiage regarding  
16 solar flares and extended outages in the 2017 plan. However, since this is a draft, information  
17 pertaining to cyber-attacks can be added to the plan and he will reach out to UVMMC to see if they  
18 have an after-action-report for the cyberattack they suffered. Chris and members agreed this would  
19 be good to add to the plan.

20  
21 Jeff stated, as a regional planning organization, if one of the core communities chooses not to  
22 participate and all communities are not all on board, does it present any issues? Dan said when the  
23 State of Vermont received the funds for Hazard Mitigation and began to work on the big RFP for this  
24 Plan, the State reached out to towns if they wished to participate and if they were willing to provide  
25 the required 25% match. In Chittenden County all municipalities confirmed they would except  
26 Colchester. The Town of Colchester has a robust public safety and planning department and  
27 therefore they decided to hire a consultant to update their existing plan. Dan provided the text  
28 template from their 2017 Plan for the consultant to use. There should be no issues with them having  
29 a separate plan although it may have taken some more work on their part.

30  
31 5. Transit Financing Report, Stephen Falbel, Steadman Hill Consulting

32 Marshall Distal explained that over the past year, CCRPC has worked in partnership with GMT,  
33 VTrans, and Steadman Hill Consulting, on a study analyzing different options for financing the local  
34 share of public transit funding in Vermont. The current funding system is heavily reliant on local  
35 property taxes and fares. Reevaluating transit funding could also support permanent fare free  
36 transit and identify how we may be able to generate additional resources at the local level to serve  
37 as local match for increased federal funding. The study has been shared with a variety of  
38 stakeholders including the House and Senate Transportation Committees. Marshall introduced  
39 Stephen Falbel with Steadman Hill Consulting. Stephen shared a PowerPoint presentation, *CCRPC*  
40 *Transit Funding Study* with members. Links to the full [presentation](#) and [report](#) can be found on the  
41 CCRPC website.

42  
43 Stephen provided information on the following topic headings with members:

- 44 • *Overview of Transit Funding Study*
  - 45 ○ *Goal*
  - 46 ○ *Scope*
  - 47 ○ *Principles*
- 48 • *Statewide Transit Access*

- 1 • *Potential Funding Replacement*
- 2 • *Continue to Fund Transit from Automobile-based fees?*
- 3 • *Alternatives Under Consideration*
- 4 • *Evaluation of Alternatives*

5

6 Bard said he really appreciates the table (*Evaluation of Alternatives*), and asked how the values were  
7 assigned? Stephen explained he came up with the values and then presented them to the steering  
8 committees for review. Dana asked what the volunteer driver concept for rural areas looked like?  
9 She wonders if this is realistic and if there are any models available from other states that can  
10 demonstrate success? Stephen said there are currently volunteer drivers here in Vermont and it  
11 does work, if this is expanded, then we do need to take a closer look at funding and other  
12 considerations. Stephen said he did a study of the current volunteer ride program active in the tri-  
13 towns of Jericho, Underhill, and Cambridge to see if this could be a pilot program for the entire  
14 State. Micro Transit Volunteer transportation could work, there is no technical reason it could not,  
15 it is a matter of finding enough volunteer drivers. Garret said for many years there was a private van  
16 running from the Bristol, Lincoln, New Haven, Starksboro area into Montpelier. This was a privately  
17 funded endeavor and people chipped in to make it work. Garret asked about the utility fee concept  
18 if it is as regressive as sales tax since so many people do have electricity. Bard said he was also  
19 pondering this, regarding the utility subsidies, he was wondering how the volunteer program would  
20 be set up. He feels this could be difficult to expand as there may not be enough supply of volunteer  
21 drivers that is currently in effect. Catherine agreed and wondered about liability issues for drivers?  
22 Stephen explained there are insurance options available, like UBER and LYFT drivers have currently.  
23 He explained the funding source is not necessarily coming from the riders, there may be a funding  
24 source available at State and Federal levels. Jeff said, according to the data, the only improvement in  
25 service was for rural areas. Stephen said that wasn't the only place, it is an area that is highlighted  
26 because there are rural areas that have no options; however, this is a service expansion for all areas.  
27 Jeff said if we are only talking about \$21 million dollars, if it is allocated for rural areas, when we are  
28 looking into funding models, we should design a system that works and then figure out the best way  
29 to fund it. Jeff worries the model isn't sustainable. Dan Kerin said, regarding Jeff's thoughts, he  
30 agrees there are many issues that go along with transit. He said even the Vermont weather creates  
31 an issue. During the cold winter months, riders must wait for the bus and then board the bus while  
32 managing the ice and snowbanks. When we are looking at the rural areas, ridership decreases, and  
33 the distance traveled is greater. He also said, even if Volkswagen provided electric vehicles, one of  
34 the questions is about the performance of these vehicles in the winter months? There will be  
35 concerns when an EV breaks down or has an accident in a rural area. Dan said he suggests funding  
36 for buildings and/or warming huts at bus stops. He also thinks a partnership between a coffee shop  
37 or bakery with transit could promote ridership. Members agreed. Stephen said GMT is developing a  
38 strategic plan for rural areas as well as incentives for increased ridership over the coming months  
39 and years. Charlie thanked Stephen for his presentation and explained we wanted to make sure the  
40 board was aware this report is out there, Charlie also stated he thinks there may be some issues  
41 with the State and municipalities being able to fund the local match required to fully utilize the  
42 federal funds that will be available in the coming years.

43

44 6. I-89 2050 Study – Transportation Climate Actions analysis

45 Eleni Churchill and Jason Charest shared the *I-89 2050 Transportation Climate Actions [presentation](#)*  
46 with members that covered the following areas of the project:

- 47 • *I-89 Study Background*

1 Eleni explained that the study is now focusing on the development and evaluation of  
2 multimodal alternatives (Task 5) which will bring us into late spring, early summer when the  
3 results of this evaluation will be presented to the project committees, the public, and the  
4 Board. There are 5 proposed I-89 Corridor bundles. The current focus is development of  
5 Bundle 2 that includes TDM, Bike, Pedestrian, Transit improvements. Once developed, this  
6 will provide the base for Bundles 3, 4 and 5 which will include enhanced or new  
7 interchanges at Exit 14, 13 and 12B, respectively.

- 8 • Transportation Demand Focus Group  
9 A focus group was formed that included representatives from a variety of organizations to  
10 help define Bundle 2. Eleni said the participants provided valuable input. The organizations  
11 included: Transportation Equity Coalition, VTrans, Town of Williston, City of South  
12 Burlington, Green Mountain Transit, Burlington Electric, CATMA, Local Motion, Conservation  
13 Law Foundation, Sustainable Transportation Vermont, and staff from CCRPC, RSG and VHB.
- 14 • Telework Evaluation  
15 Telework Evaluation Summary: A methodology was developed to estimate the most  
16 probable scenario for percent vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction (post pandemic) due  
17 to teleworking. A chart, "Job Category Mix in Study Area" contained 3 categories of job  
18 types, including Professional, Mixed, and On-Site and demonstrated that 47% of employees  
19 in the greater Burlington area were required to be on site for work. Telework would be very  
20 difficult for this population. Pre-pandemic, the greater Burlington commuter travel  
21 breakdown showed 74% were full time commuters, 9% teleworked full time, while the  
22 remaining 17% teleworked a few days a week. The study team evaluated two scenarios for  
23 possible vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reductions due to teleworking, and Eleni explained  
24 they are proposing Scenario 1: 11% reduction in daily commuter vehicle miles traveled  
25 (VMT) and approximate 50% increase in telework participation.
- 26 • Strategic Model (to assess investments and policies to decrease VMT and GHG emissions)  
27 A Strategic Model was developed to help define Bundle 2 because it is the best tool to  
28 evaluate high-level policies and investments to accomplish the goals of reducing vehicle  
29 miles traveled (VMT) and greenhouse gas emissions (GHG). Strategic model is an  
30 econometric model, sensitive to a variety of policies and investments that affect household  
31 travel, multiple modes of travel, and how travel may be constrained by pricing of gas,  
32 carbon, and VMT tax. The model area includes Chittenden County and the surrounding five  
33 counties of Grand Isle, Franklin, Lamoille, Washington, and Addison.
- 34 • Strategic Model Evaluation and Results  
35 Eleni introduced Jason Charest to the group. Jason reviewed the Scenario Testing Structure
  - 36 ○ Each policy or investment option has different levels which are evaluated
  - 37 ○ The Strategic Model runs all the combinations of levels within six options38 Jason explained the different levels of policies and/or investments included in each package,  
39 went through the strategic model outputs, and described how the model was used. The  
40 strategic model is not a prediction or forecast of the future; if we want low VMT/GHG, what  
41 policies and investment options are most likely to get us there?
- 42 • Recommended Policies and Investments to be included in Bundle 2:
  - 43 ○ Increase teleworking by 50%
  - 44 ○ MTP land use density (90% of households in existing developed areas)
  - 45 ○ Double trips made by bike
  - 46 ○ Triple transit services and improve frequencies
  - 47 ○ Double participation in TDM programs and increase cost of parking in downtowns  
48 and villages

- Implement a mileage-based fee (5 cents per mile)

If all the above policies and investments are implemented, they will result in a total VMT reduction between 10% and 20%.

- Advisory Committee Action on Bundle 2

Eleni explained there was a great deal of public support for Bundle 2 and the inclusion of climate-friendly policies and investments in this study, at a January 26<sup>th</sup> Public Meeting. She encouraged members and guests to visit the Envision89 website if they want more information on the public's feedback (<https://envision89.com/public-process>).

Eleni also said the I-89 Advisory Committee at their February 8, 2022, unanimously supported further evaluation of the recommended policies and investments for Bundle 2.

- I89 Study Next Steps

Eleni explained there is still a lot of work ahead in the spring. The relevant strategic model outputs and telework VMT reductions will be used to develop the Bundle 2 travel demand model. This will be the basis for Bundle 3, 4 and 5. The next public meeting will be held in April or May and the results of all corridor bundles will be reviewed. The next advisory meeting will be in May. A Board presentation will be either May or July. She also mentioned that a technical assessment review of the existing Milton and Bolton interchange plans will be ready in early March.

Eleni thanked the members and asked for any questions. Dana Hanley said she was curious about the price of gas in relation to an increase in alternate modes of transportation. She read an article that outlined a study done that indicated increased use of alternative modes of transportation as gas prices rose; she wonders if more expensive gas is something that will move people to find other methods of transportation. Garret said this could be true. Many parts of California are currently paying over \$5 a gallon for gas. However, they have better public transit in the areas with the highest priced gas, he said there needs to be a way to do this in order not to adversely hurt those who can least afford it. Andy Montroll asked if there was any further discussion or study of autonomous vehicles. Eleni said we did not look at this in the strategic model, but an evaluation of autonomous/connected vehicles was included in the 2018 ECOS MTP. This is an unknown factor; however, she expects we will look at this in the future. A [link](#) to the full presentation is posted on the CCRPC website.

7. Appointees to Basin Water Quality Council.

Charlie referred members to the memo in the packet. Act 76 established a system of Clean Water Service Providers (CWSP) for each of the six Lake Champlain Basins and the Lake Memphremagog basin to work to identify, prioritize, develop, implement, and maintain non-regulatory water quality projects to help meet required Total Maximum Daily Load allowances for phosphorus. We asked for volunteers for the three basins within Chittenden County.

The following people volunteered to serve on the council:

- Northern Lake Champlain Direct Drainages (Basin 5)
  - Member: Karen Adams, Colchester
  - Alternate: Miles Waite, Environment/Conservation
- Lamoille River (Basin 7)
  - Member: Kate Lalley, Westford
- Winooski River (Basin 8)
  - Member: Darlene Palola, Huntington
  - Alternate: Garret Mott, Buels Gore

1  
2 CHRIS SHAW MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO APPROVE THE APPOINTMENTS  
3 TO THE BASIN WATER QUALITY COUNCIL AS PRESENTED. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.  
4

5 8. Chair/Executive Director Report

- 6 a. FY23 UPWP Update Charlie said the second FY23 UPWP meeting is scheduled for next  
7 Wednesday, February 23. There were approximately 50 applications and a total dollar  
8 amount of almost \$1.8 million. The increased federal funding may be a staff resource  
9 challenge, but we will spend some time over the next few weeks determining if our current  
10 staffing levels will support the work. The funds will allow us to do more, but it creates  
11 pressure on the municipal dues for match dollars.  
12 b. FY2023 Transportation Capital Program Charlie referred members to the *FY2023 VTrans*  
13 *Capital Program – Governor’s Recommended Budget, Chittenden County Projects* document  
14 included with the Board packet.  
15 c. Legislative Update  
16 Charlie noted that Regina sent out a legislative update from the Vermont Planners  
17 Association. Please let us know if you have any questions.  
18 d. Equity and Engagement Manager Hiring Update  
19 Charlie said we have posted the position to various outlets with an application deadline of  
20 February 25, 2022. More information will be shared at the March Board meeting.  
21

22 9. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports.

23 Catherine noted the minutes for our committees are included with the packet and as links to the  
24 online documents. (Executive/Finance Committee, TAC, CWAC, Equity Leadership Team and All  
25 Hazard Mitigation Committee).  
26

27 10. Future Agenda Topics. Charlie referred members to the last page of the agenda that lists tentative  
28 future agenda items. He asked members if anyone had any additional items they would like to see  
29 on upcoming agendas. There was nothing more.  
30

31 11. Members’ Items, Other business. There was none.  
32

33 12. Adjournment. GARRET MOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL TO ADJOURN THE  
34 BOARD MEETING AT 8:11 PM. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.  
35

36 Respectfully submitted,  
37 Amy Irvin Witham  
38