

MEETING NOTES

CCMPO Park and Ride Plan Advisory Committee

Meeting #6 –August 12, 2010

Prepared: August 12, 2010 by Joe Segale

Committee Members Present: George Gerecke-Committee Chair, Williston; Wayne Davis, Amy Bell, VTrans; Meredith Birkett, CCTA; Bob Penniman, CATMA; Cathleen Gent, Town of Richmond; Peter Keating, Christine Forde, CCMPO; Joe Segale, Resource Systems Group.

Comments on Northern Corridor Parking Accumulation Counts

Joe Segale summarized the results of a parking accumulation count for all of the park-and-ride facilities located in the northern corridor. The count was conducted on Wednesday, June 30, 2010 by CCMPO interns. The results are presented in the table below and suggest that the existing park-and-ride lots are underutilized. Wayne Davis pointed out that summer time use of park-and-rides is low. Bob Penniman agreed that the counts appear to be low. The counts were conducted at the request of the advisory committee to validate perceptions that demand is high in the northern corridor. Joe Segale pointed out that other data presented in Project Memorandum 1 demonstrated that there is a big gap between potential demand for park-and-rides and the number of available spaces. The advisory committee agreed that the June 30, 2010 counts were probably conducted on a day when demand was unusually low.

Parking Accumulation Counts for Northern Corridor Park and Rides				
Wednesday, June 30, 2010				
Municipality	Location	Number of Parking Spaces	Peak Occupancy <i>(parking spaces)</i>	Percent Occupied at Peak
Colchester	Exit 17	108	36	33%
Milton	Town Hall	20	5	25%
Georgia	Exit 18	44	25	57%
Franklin	Homestead Drive	22	3	14%
Saint Albans Town	Highgate Commons	30	14	47%
Saint Albans Town	Exit 19	80	14	18%
Fairfield	Town Offices	24	1	4%
Saint Albans Town	Collins-Perley	20	4	20%
	Totals	348	102	29%

Comments on Goals and Objectives

Joe Segale reviewed the revised goals and objectives dated August 5, 2010. Suggested revisions are attached.

Objective 1.1.1: Clarify that intercept facilities should be served by high frequency transit.

Objective 1.2.1: Change entire objective to read “Give preference to park-and-ride facilities locations that are served by existing or planned transit service

Objective 4.1: Change to objective to read “Address congestion in the vicinity of entrances to existing facilities”

Objective 4.5: Add “and siting” to the objective as follows: “Consider the needs of low income and minority groups in the design and siting of all facilities”

Objective 5.2: Change “privatization” to “public/private”

Objective 6.1: delete “new”

Comments on the Prioritization Methodology

Joe Segale reviewed the preliminary prioritization methodology. The methodology was tested on the intercept and park-and-ride facilities listed in the 2004 park-and-ride plan. Park-and-ride and intercept facilities were ranked separately, but the same criteria and weighting were used.

- Provide separate criteria weighting for intercept and park-and-ride facilities.
- Use a maximum of 50 total points
- Include existing facilities with identified deficiencies (like over capacity, safety issue or sever congestion) on the list of projects to be prioritized.
- Under the readiness category:
 - Replace the phrase “right-of-way acquired” to “land acquired”
 - Add a criterion for “likelihood of obtaining local and state permits”
- There was a discussion on whether or not demonstrated local support, such as a letter from a Selectboard, should be included. The discussion was inconclusive.
- Change the “Confirmed Partnership Opportunities” criterion to read “Confirmed public/private opportunities”. Provide more points to a project with a confirmed arrangement, some points for projects with a possible opportunity and no points for all others. The maximum amount of points for this criterion should be increased.
- Wayne Davis felt that the location category should be given more weight.

Other issues related to the prioritization were discussed:

- The VTrans Park and Ride classification system should be included in the information and considered somehow
- How should the VTrans Municipal Park-and-Ride grant program be factored in?

Joe Segale will revise the test based on these comments and present a revised prioritization at the next advisory committee meeting.

Review of 2004 Facility Locations

Joe Segale presented a map that showed the locations of intercept and park-and-ride facilities proposed in 2004 and asked the committee for feedback on whether or not some locations should be consolidated or eliminated. The committee discussed the following potential changes without making any final decisions:

- The facility proposed at the railroad crossing of VT 127 (just north of Manhattan Drive in Burlington) should be considered a long-term project because it is dependent on commuter rail service between Essex and Burlington.
- Consider eliminating the CCCH/Redmond Road location



- Consider adding a new location along US 2 between Bolton and Jonesville. Amy noted that there is a piece of land currently owned by the state in Bolton under the I-89 overpass (near the Bolton Access Road) that could potentially work.
- Add a location in Williston Village
- Need to find a long-term permanent location for the Charlotte location that meets Town needs and CCTA service needs
- Consider eliminating the Saint George location near the VT 116/VT 2A intersection.
- Consider adding a location near the proposed intersection of the CCCH preferred alternative with US 2, which will be an at-grade intersection.

Next Steps

- RSG will revise the preliminary prioritization test
- RSG will identify potential new locations outside of Chittenden County (within the study area)
- RSG will revise the Goals and Objectives

Next Advisory Committee Meeting

- Tuesday, September 7, 2010, 2:30 PM CCMPO offices

