

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

5 DATE: Tuesday, February 6, 2018
6 TIME: 9:00 a.m.
7 PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal St. Winooski, VT
8

9 **Members Present**

10 Dean Pierce, Shelburne
11 Matt Langham, VTrans
12 Richard Watts, Hinesburg
13 Bruce Hoar, Williston
14 Chris Jolly, FHWA
15 Robin Pierce, Essex Junction
16 Ashley Bishop, VTrans
17 Brian Bigelow, Underhill
18 Mary Anne Michaels, Rail
19 John Rauscher, Winooski
20 Barbara Elliot, Huntington
21 Amy Bell, VTrans
22 Dennis Lutz, Essex
23 Sandy Thibault, CATMA
24 Shelby Losier, BTV
25 Nicole Losch, Burlington
26 Justin Rabidoux, South Burlington
27

Staff Present

Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
Christine Forde, Senior Transportation Planner
Eleni Churchill, Transportation Project Manager
Sai Sarepalli, Transportation Planning Engineer
Bryan Davis, Senior Transportation Planner
Peter Keating, Senior Transportation Planner
Charlie Baker, Executive Director
Marshall Distel, Transportation Planner
Jason Charest, Senior Transportation Planning Engineer
Chris Dubin, Transportation Planner

28 Peter Keating called the meeting to order at 9:00AM and asked for a round of introductions.
29

30 **1. Consent Agenda**

31 No items this month.
32

33 **2. Approval of Minutes**

34 The January 9th minutes were approved without changes.
35

36 **3. Public Comments**

37 There were none.
38

39 **4. Transportation Performance Measures and Targets**

40 Peter introduced this topic describing its genesis in federal law and regulations going back several years.
41 He reported that Transportation Performance Management (TPM) has been part of Federal Law (MAP-
42 21, 2012; FAST-ACT, 2015) where national goals were established for:

- 43 – Safety
- 44 – Infrastructure condition (pavement & bridges)
- 45 – Congestion
- 46 – System Reliability
- 47 – Freight
- 48 – Environmental Sustainability (Air Emissions)

49 Subsequent federal rulemaking set performance measures to the goals, identified roles and
50 responsibilities, and set target deadlines for state DOTs and MPOs to follow. Peter noted a general rule
51 regarding MPO target setting: CCRPC has 180 days after VTrans sets their targets to either

- 52 – Agree to support VTrans' targets, or
- 53 – Establish their own targets
54

1 Peter described the federally established measures under each of the national goal areas and then returned
 2 to safety measures and targets because VTrans has already set their targets and the CCRPC has until
 3 February 27, 2018 to take action on them. He identified these as the state safety targets for 2018:

- 4 • 5-Year Average Fatalities Target: 57
- 5 • 5-Year Fatality Rate (per 100M VMT) Target: .83
- 6 • 5-Year Average Serious Injuries Target: 280
- 7 • 5-Year Average Serious Injury Rate (per 100M VMT) Target: 4
- 8 • 5-Year Average Non-Motorized Fatalities and Non-Motorized
 9 Serious Injuries Target: 39.4

10 Peter then went through several charts showing statewide and regional trends for each of the target
 11 categories explaining how VTrans used the historic data to identify reasonable targets. He used the
 12 regional level data to conclude that staff recommend we not establish regional level targets, but rather
 13 support VTrans statewide safety targets. The rationale for this recommendation included:

- 14 • Regional data display wide fluctuations year to year
- 15 • There are no policy or financial consequences if we do or don't
- 16 • We can revisit/reconsider in future
- 17 • We already incorporate the federal safety measures into the CCRPC ECOS
 18 Scorecard

19 Dennis Lutz pointed out that the more recent three-year history showed a negative trend in statewide
 20 fatalities and serious injuries and that this might be a more realistic trend to use in target setting. He felt
 21 the VTrans targets too optimistic and therefore would not support the recommendation to agree to VTrans
 22 targets. Richard Watts felt that setting targets for any level of fatalities or injuries shouldn't be tolerated
 23 and that we should be setting targets of zero. He also did not support the staff recommendation.
 24

25 Following discussion, ROBIN PIERCE MADE A MOTION THE TAC RECOMMEND THE BOARD
 26 SUPPORT VTRANS STATEWIDE SAFETY TARGETS AND NOT ESTABLISH REGIONAL
 27 TARGETS IN 2018. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY BRIAN BIGELOW AND PASSED WITH
 28 ESSEX AND HINESBURG VOTING NO AND VTRANS ABSTAINING.
 29

30 **5. Project Prioritization Methodology**

31 Christine began with a briefing on how VTrans is planning to revamp its project prioritization process.
 32 VTrans is undertaking this effort for a number of reasons including:

- 33 • Existing process is 10 years old.
- 34 • Feedback from RPCs that they don't feel their input is meaningful
- 35 • Evaluation criteria needed to be reviewed/revised
- 36 • VTrans is moving towards holistic corridor management

37 The process to revise this will unfold over the coming year. Christine presented proposed evaluation
 38 criteria for the new process and displayed a graphic of how the model will work for both VTrans and RPC
 39 driven projects under a variety of modes. Also included is a harmonizing process to better coordinate
 40 local and state projects over time and distance. The timeline to finish this update includes:

- 41 • Further process development and customer engagement through 2018.
- 42 • Continued communications with stakeholders in 2018 and 2019.
- 43 • Pilot this in the FY20 Capital Program.
- 44 • Make it fully operational in 2020 for FY2021 capital program

45 Charlie Baker noted that this new system provides an opportunity for regions/towns to get projects into
 46 the state system.
 47

48 Christine then provided a briefing on the upcoming, annual, project prioritization task that all regions
 49 participate in. There will be more on this next month when the TAC will be asked to make a
 50 recommendation to the Board. Christine synopsized the project's background in legislation, its project
 51 categories, methodology components, and scoring breakdown.

1 **6. Annual List of Projects Receiving Federal Funds**

2 Christine noted that this is an annually required report that identifies all projects receiving federal funding
3 obligations in the previous year. She reported that FY17 saw the highest amount of total obligations in
4 recent memory – over \$53M. Christine went through a series on bar charts showing obligations by
5 category and year going back to FY00 noting project highlights in selected years. She then broke down
6 the FY17 funding by amount per use category and highlighted major projects in each category. She
7 concluded with a bar chart that compared the approved TIP amounts to actual obligation amounts by year
8 back to FY00.
9

10 **7. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports**

11 Peter referred members to the project list on the back side of the agenda.
12

13 **8. CCRPC January Board Meeting Report.**

14 Peter noted that the Board held a forum on the FY19 UPWP, approved the FY18 UPWP mid-year budget
15 adjustment, and warned the first public hearing for the draft MTP
16

17 **9. Chairman's/Members' Items**

18 No items this month.
19
20

21 The meeting adjourned at 10:00 a.m.
22

23 Respectfully submitted, Peter Keating