



MEETING NOTES

CCMPO Park and Ride Plan Advisory Committee

Meeting #2 – January 6, 2010

Prepared: January 8, 2010 by Joe Segale

Committee Members Present: George Gerecke (chair), Williston MPO Representative; Wayne Davis, Amy Bell, VTrans; Dean Bloch, Charlotte Planner/Selectboard Assistant; Tom Buckley; Meredith Birkett, CCTA; Peter Keating, Daryl Benoit, Bryan Davis, Christine Forde, Michelle Boomhower, CCMPO; Joe Segale, Resource Systems Group; Cathleen Gent, Richmond

George Gerecke started the meeting and everyone present introduced themselves. This meeting focused on Project Memo 1: Inventory and Travel Characteristics (December 30, 2009 draft) distributed by email the prior week to all committee members. Joe Segale used a PowerPoint presentation to summarize the findings in the memorandum.

Discussion on Project Memo 1: Inventory and Travel Characteristics

- Add the municipal park and rides in Underhill Center and New Haven
- Verify if the park and ride in Fairfax (junction of VT 14/VT 128) is active. The report assumes it is.
- Is the Shelburne Train station used as a park and ride?
- The Charlotte park and ride, off Ferry Road and adjacent to the rail lines, is not accessible by transit. It is also owned by VTrans
- The committee spent some time discussing the definitions of Park and Rides and Satellite facilities (Table 1 in the report). It was suggested that we use the term “Intercept Facility” instead of “Satellite Facility”. The two terms are used interchangeably in the AASHTO Park and Ride Guide. The committee felt that “intercept” did a better job of capturing the function and purpose of this type of park and ride facility. In the definition of Park and Ride facilities, structured parking may be an option for rural/suburban park and rides when there is not enough room to expand on an existing site.
- Joe Segale explained that he made a judgment call on which facilities would be inventoried (site visits). The inventory included all facilities in Chittenden County and included most but not all of the facilities in the adjacent counties. The committee members present generally agreed that the inventory was inclusive enough.
- Joe asked how the plan should address facilities outside of Chittenden County. For example, if it appears there is a need to expand a facility in Saint Albans, which is outside of the CCMPO’s planning area, should recommendations still be identified in this plan? Michelle Boomhower responded that recommendations should be made for facilities outside of Chittenden County where necessary. The CCMPO may support additional planning efforts in the surrounding counties as a result of this study.
- Joe pointed out that the inventory included two CATMA intercept facilities (Gilbane and North Avenue). He suggested that two other CATMA intercept facilities located at Fanny Allen along VT 15 in Colchester and at the parking garage at Winooski Falls should have been included in the inventory but were missed.
- Joe asked for direction on lots that CCTA leases for its Express Link services to Montpelier, St. Albans and Middlebury. The facilities that serve a park and ride function include Highgate

Commons and the Collins-Perley sports center in St. Albans; the CITGO station in Charlotte; Exchange Street in Middlebury and Vermont Department of Employment and Training in Montpelier. The committee agreed that these facilities should be noted in the inventory.

- Joe asked why the Montpelier Link Express stops at the VT DET rather than the park and ride on Dog River Road in Montpelier. Wayne responded that the VT DET lot is accessible by foot and a bike path, provides a connection with local transit service, is more accessible for transit vehicles and has better lighting. Wayne also noted that having a transit stop at the VT DET lot frees up parking capacity at the Dog River Road lot for people sharing rides.
- Meredith Birkett will provide Joe with a list of park and ride facilities that have access constraints for transit vehicles.
- The report notes that the Bristol park and ride lot does not have great visibility and lacks signs. It does not appear to be a park and ride lot. Wayne provided some history on the facility. The land under or near the facility is owned by private citizens, the municipality and state which has complicated efforts to make improvements.
- Wayne and Amy noted that the use of bicycle for access to park and rides has been low. Meredith may be able to provide data on how many bikes are loaded on the express link services to the park and rides.
- Peter Keating suggested that the differences between the 2000 CTPP journey to work data and the LHED data appeared to be more significant than suggested in the report. Daryl Benoit felt the differences were not that meaningful and suggested the information be presented as ranges (for example, the percentage of workers living in a corridor ranges from 28-35%)
- Meredith asked for clarification on the CATMA mode split data which shows “park-and-ride”. How does that differ from car-pool?
- Daryl suggested that Link Express ridership numbers from previous years should be added to Table 7 to show how use of the service has increased.
- Michelle suggested that the plan should include a goal related to reducing SOV use in Chittenden County and resulting reductions in congestion and emission in the plan.
- Meredith and Amy asked that the plan clarify the difference between the availability of transit and accessibility related to geometric constraints for transit vehicles.
- Dean pointed out that the terms “good” and “ok” as used in the inventory sheets are vague and maybe overlapping. More precise terms should be used.
- Tom suggested that the Short Range Transit plan should be reviewed.
- Michelle suggested that the title of the report should include the words “Intercept Facility.” Such as “Chittenden County Park and Ride and Intercept Facility Plan.”

Comments on Task 3. Goals and Objectives

Task 3 is the next step. Joe reminded the committee on the major components of this task which include a survey, interviews with employers, a public meeting and development of goals and objectives.

- Survey. A decision on whether or not to conduct the survey was not made and will remain as an option for a while. Daryl will work with Wayne to provide origin information from license plates that were gathered at different facilities since 2003 or 2004. Wayne noted that the UVM TRC conducted a survey of park and ride users, but the response rate was not very good. Joe will ask for the data anyway to see if it can be of use. Peter noted that the survey proposed by RSG was of interest to other members of the Park and Ride committee that were not able to attend this meeting and a final decision on whether or not a survey is necessary should wait for more input.



- Public Meeting. Joe suggested that the CCMPO Board meeting may be a good event for holding a public meeting. Michelle will discuss with the Chair to verify. (Since the Jan 6 meeting, a decision has been made to hold the meeting following the regular board meeting on **February 17, 2010**).
- Employer Interviews. Joe will develop a list of employers to interview. The committee suggested reviewing the list of participants in Way-to-Go week. Amy suggested speaking with Ross McDonald, Go Vermont rideshare program manager. Car Share Vermont should also be consulted. RSG will be asking about the types (if any) of TDM programs that employers have to encourage employees to use non SOV modes, the types of obstacles they may face, etc. Joe will work with Peter in refining the list of employers and the questions to be asked.

Next Steps

- Committee members were asked to submit comments on the draft of Project Memo 1: Inventory and Travel Characteristics within two weeks (January 20).
- The next Advisory Committee is scheduled for Thursday, March 25, 2010 at 9:00 am at the CCMPO offices. RSG will forward Project Memo 2 –Goals and Objectives, one week prior to the meeting.

