



Communities working together to  
Meet Chittenden County's transportation needs

**CHITTENDEN COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

30 Kimball Ave, Suite 206, South Burlington, Vermont 05403  
(802) 660-4071 / (802) 660-4079 Fax  
www.ccmpto.org / info@ccmpto.org

**Member Jurisdictions**

Bolton  
Burlington  
Charlotte  
Colchester  
Essex Junction  
Essex Town  
Hinesburg  
Huntington  
Jericho  
Milton  
Richmond  
St. George  
Shelburne  
South Burlington  
Underhill  
Westford  
Williston  
Winooski  
Vermont Agency of  
Transportation

**Ex Officio Members**

Chittenden County  
Transportation Authority  
Burlington International  
Airport  
Regional Planning  
Commission  
Rail Industry  
U.S. Department of  
Transportation

**2060 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Advisory Committee  
Meeting 3 – Meeting Notes**

**DATE:** Thursday April 16, 2009  
**TIME:** 3:00 PM  
**PLACE:** CCMPO, 30 Kimball Avenue, S. Burlington, VT  
**PRESENT:**  
**MEMBERS:** Amy Bell, VTrans  
Meredith Burkett, CCTA  
Dawn Francis, Chamber/GBIC  
Christopher Hill, Bike/Pedestrian Rep.  
Marty Illick, CCRPC  
Chris Jolly, FHWA  
Mike O'Brien, CCMPO Board – Winooski (Committee Chair)  
Meredith Schuft, CATMA  
Richard Watts, UVM Transportation Research Center  
**OTHERS:** Charlie Baker, CCRPC Staff  
Michele Boomhower, CCMPO Staff  
Jason Charest, CCMPO Staff  
Paul Conner, City of South Burlington  
Bryan Davis, CCMPO Staff  
Christine Forde, CCMPO Staff  
Peter Keating, CCMPO Staff  
Tim Fluck, CCRPC Staff  
Norm Marshall, Smart Mobility  
Diane Meyerhoff, Third Sector Associates  
Michael Oman, Oman Analytics  
Dave Roberts, CCMPO Staff

**1) Welcome/Introductions**

Mike O'Brien, Chair, welcomed the committee and introductions were made.

**2) Meeting Notes from February 4, 2009**

The committee will not formally adopt the meeting notes, however corrections are welcome. There were none.

**3) Scenario Analysis**

Peter Keating of the CCMPO described the three visioning workshops held last fall. Participants were required to allot future development (housing and employment) on a map of Chittenden County. Twelve different maps were created.

The twelve maps will be distilled down to three or four scenarios for testing and voting. The team looked at the maps for information that might help group them by common elements. One method is to look at the amount and types of development in three geographic areas of the County - the "core," "inner ring," and the "outer ring."

Examining the outer ring region revealed patterns that led to four possible scenarios, labeled by Smart Mobility as: dispersed housing, dispersed centers, green belt (not much development), and mixed use (these titles can be revised prior to public release). Since all twelve groups chose to consume significantly less land than the current trend suggests, the CCMPO and CCRPC Staff also created a trend scenario for analysis.

The CCRPC has developed a series of approved indicators for scenario evaluation, which were used to rank the proposed scenarios. Indicators include:

- Growth in or near Suitable Planning Areas
- Efficient Use of Infrastructure (proximity to water and sewer)
- TOD-supportive design and location (compact walkable development and/or proximity to transit)

Results ranged from 118 to 271 points for each scenario (note however that the TOD indicator information is not yet complete). Higher scores are more consistent with the Regional Plan.

**Proposed Scenarios and CCRPC Approved Indicators**

Proposed Scenario	CCRPC Approved Indicators		
	Growth in Planning Areas	Infrastructure	TOD-Supportive (incomplete)
Dispersed Housing	118	218	96
Green Belt	161	303	110
Trend	150	265	38
Mixed Use	153	271	141
Dispersed Centers	146	249	147

There was a discussion of the appropriate level of density required for “transit-ready” versus “transit-supportive” and “walkable” vs. “transit ready.”

Dawn Francis of the Chamber/GBIC asked whether the outer ring communities could support the City Center scenario. Norm responded that there were no limitations for workshop participants and some groups put development in the outer ring. Dawn asked if there had been a reality check by CCRPC/CCMPO staff for each of these scenarios. Michele Boomhower of the CCMPO explained that in a 50 year time horizon, almost anything can happen. There could be sewer capacity in the outer ring and development could happen there. We didn’t want to constrain the process by today’s existing conditions.

Norm explained that the current trend isn’t realistic because zoning wouldn’t allow that level of development to occur. Each new development is more difficult to achieve as growth continues. Michele suggested that preserving open space also adds to the difficulty of maintaining the current trend. The CCMPO is working with adjacent RPCs to anticipate their growth and its impact on Chittenden County.

Richard Watts of the UVM Transportation Research Center suggested that planning is about vision. He can see that aggressive development isn’t practical because of energy use, greenhouse gases, etc. Norm mentioned the possibility of a middle-density scenario and Richard likes that idea. There was discussion of the population projections and Tim Fluck of the CCRPC noted the growth figures are lower than they were in the last Plan, but projections for a 50 year planning horizon are very difficult. Michael Oman of Oman Analytics suggested that you can’t forecast that far out, rather you have a vision and lay the groundwork to shape the future.

In terms of financial forecasting, Norm explained that financial forecasts and project lists will go to 2030, as required by law, but we are expanding our vision for 50 years. Michele suggested that one can creatively plan a public transit system out 50 years, not the traditional 20. She also sees a fully-developed vision to demonstrate to communities that a broader approach makes sense.

Norm explained the next steps:

- Program transportation elements for each scenario
- Complete transportation modeling and analysis
- Present results and get feedback – public meeting and Internet survey

Peter asked how many performance indicators are ideal (we now have 3). Norm thinks 5-6 would be appropriate for the public survey. Additional indicators can be described in a technical appendix. We will need to simplify the information for public consumption.

Richard asked about indicators for energy consumption and financial costs. Norm explained that Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) can be used to calculate energy consumption and out-of-pocket costs.

Mike O'Brien asked about the timeline. Peter, Norm, and Dave Roberts will be determining the schedule. Peter was hoping to present the alternatives at a public meeting in June. Mike asked if this committee would make a decision on the final 5 scenarios and Peter responded that the committee will have input. He would like to have 4 scenarios at the most.

Paul Conner of South Burlington suggested that a discussion of the public cost for compact development should describe at what point the private costs decrease. Charlie Baker of the CCRPC suggested that the road infrastructure (and cost) for the trend scenario is hard to imagine. That led the group to the next agenda item.

#### **4) Financial Plan**

Peter described the three required elements of the Financial Plan:

- Estimate of funding we can reasonably expect during the life of the plan
- Estimate for funding existing system preservation, maintenance, and operations
- Estimated cost of each of the scenarios we choose to analyze

Mike Oman of Oman Analytics has worked on the first item, the level of funding we can expect over the life of the plan (see handout). Mike's conclusion is that funding for CCMPO transportation is currently entirely dependent on Federal funding, which is matched 80/20 at the State and local levels. This is projected to increase by about 5% (4.9%) per year in real dollars over the course of the current plan to a total of about \$126 million in 2060. Some additional funds in the form of a gas tax surcharge, which is intended for bonding support, is anticipated to bring in an additional \$4-5 million per year. Additional funding sources, especially for transit operating funds, will be critical for the expansion and preservation of transit services in the region.

There was discussion about the last 10 years of CCMPO funding and Christine Forde of the CCMPO noted that the MPO's funding is based on projects that are ready-to-go, so the funding level does not change in a predictable way.

Charlie asked how much funding is available over the planning period. Mike responded that hasn't been determined yet. Michelle explained that this is a separate analysis from the funding discussion. We don't yet have the project list to cost out.

Meredith Shuft of CATMA asked how the blend of transportation infrastructure for each scenario is determined. Dave will be working on the blend of roadway and transit. He'll try to present it to the Committee in the future.

Charlie noted that the growth scenarios have different AADT on different road segments which may increase the need for maintenance funding. Will maintenance be a constant or dependent on the land use scenario? Mike Oman hasn't thought about this. Chris Jolly of FHWA suggested that level of specificity would be beyond the intent of the federal requirements. The regulations expect you to program sufficient funding to operate and maintain the system you have. There was discussion of the State's maintenance budget for roadways and the funds available for transit.

Mike introduced the idea of transit parity – that transit and roadways be funded equally. Traditionally transit has been funded at a much lower level than roadways. This group will need to address this, because the high density development will need transit to serve it.

Peter explained that CCTA and VTrans are reviewing the financial constraint assumptions and these may change as a result of their input.

### **5) Transportation Analysis**

Dave Roberts of the CCMPO presented an overview of the CCMPO's transportation model.

Dave explained that modeling goes back to 1968. He described the Transportation Analysis Zones (TAZs). For each zone, he includes housing units and employment by type. He explained the 4-step transportation model – trip generation, trip distribution, mode split, and finally, network assignment. Dave reviewed the volume flows in 2005 and projected volume flows for 2060. The preliminary results show that even with all the transportation improvements from our last MTP, congestion (level of service "F") in 2060 is very high on many road segments.

Richard asked if "business as usual" makes sense (modeling all of the MTP projects). The need to have these projects is debatable. Charlie suggested that there may only be funds to maintain the system, not build new. Peter explained that these results show an extreme scenario. Jason Charest of the CCMPO suggested that it's good to remind people that we can't build ourselves out of our transportation problems.

Dave will be doing more extensive work with the model and presenting his analysis to the Committee.

### **6) MTP Draft Chapters 1 and 2**

Peter explained that the 2025 MTP is the base for updated plan. For Chapter 1, there is an updated map and a new discussion of analytical tools used in the MTP development process .

In Chapter Two, the vision hasn't been changed, but the goals have been changed. The original 12 goals were reviewed by this committee, , and the CCMPO Board. The value/goal statements from the Visioning Workshops were also examined. Peter sorted those statements, the original MTP goals, and suggestions from Board and Advisory Committee members into themes and five goals emerged. He put the objectives under each theme. Peter would like the committee's input on both the chapters and suggested we could quantify the objectives if the group would like.

Dawn has some suggestions, including a goal that addresses the economic vitality of the region. She would like to see a goal that we build around our statewide assets, such as BIA and the western corridor rail. Peter will draft something for the next meeting.

### **7) Next Steps/Next Meeting**

There is a good deal of work ahead of us before we go to the public. Peter suggested we have a Committee meeting in June and schedule the public meeting later. The group agreed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00PM.

**The Next Meeting will be held Thursday, June 18, 2009 at 3:00PM at the  
CCMPO's NEW OFFICE at 110 West Canal Street, Winooski**