Peter Keating called the meeting to order at 9:00AM.

1. **Consent Agenda**
   Minor FY17 TIP amendments were unanimously approved.

2. **Approval of Minutes**
   The March 8th minutes were approved without changes.

3. **Public Comments**
   There were none.

3A. **TIP Amendment**
   This item was added at this meeting. Christine distributed a memo describing a new project recognizing Better Roads Category A Awards. This will add $35,540 to the FY17 year. BRIAN BIGELOW MADE A MOTION THE TAC APPROVE THIS AMENDMENT. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY DENNIS LUTZ AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. **Active Transportation Plan**
   Peter presented this final version of the plan. He first thanked TAC members that served on the project advisory committee: Sandy Thibault, Bob Henneberger, Dave Armstrong, Katelin Brewer-Colie and Nicole Losch. He then provided historic content citing how far back the RPC has done bike/ped plans. He also described the public process to generate input and highlighted some plan assumptions and focus areas including:
   - Improving network connectivity, closing system gaps
   - Identifying priority corridors vs. specifying facility types
   - Focusing more on biking and less on walking as biking is a viable inter-municipal mode
   Peter also went over the plan’s content and then the GIS analysis used to identify the proposed regional network. This considered public input, examining region wide trip origins and destinations, and other related plans from the state or towns. The plan then created a hierarchy based on determining what a
corridor’s priority and feasibility were and Peter presented the criteria used to determine both priority and feasibility and displayed the map revealing the results. He followed this with this list of the plan’s short term and non-infrastructure recommendations:

- Develop a network wayfinding plan
- Upgrade existing bike lanes to separated bike lanes where possible and develop contraflow lanes on one-way streets
- Improve GMT bus stops to make them more appealing to cyclists and pedestrians
- Continue bike lanes through intersections and assure bike detection at signals
- Continue Education, Encouragement, Enforcement and Evaluation programs such as the Safe Routes to School program
- Award extra points in evaluating regional priority projects under VTrans programs

The final steps in this project are to get TAC and Board approval and format the final document. Peter zoomed in to the map to get closer looks at the recommendations, focusing on Williston and Essex. Dennis Lutz commented that many of the corridor recommendations are State highways and VTrans has not always been willing to work with communities to make bike/ped improvements happen on these roads. He also thinks the actual effect of this plan will be minimal. Amy Bell responded that VTrans is making slow incremental steps to improve these facilities but they are nonetheless steps in the right direction. Bob Henneberger noted that the Complete Streets law and long range plans can help make future improvements happen. Following further discussion KATELIN BREWER-COLIE MADE A MOTION THE TAC RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN TO THE CCRPC BOARD. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY DENNIS LUTZ AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. Project Prioritization

Christine presented the latest version of this process that has been on-going for over 10 years. She first provided background information contrasting the VTrans Capital Program with CCRPC’s Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and noting the different program categories in the Capital Program. Each year the Vermont Legislature requires that projects in the State’s Transportation Capital Program be prioritized. The numerical grading system assigns a priority rating to all paving, roadway, safety and traffic operations, state bridge, interstate bridge, and town highway bridge projects. The rating system consists of two separate components:

1. An asset management-based factor which is objective and quantifiable with data provided by VTrans.
2. A priority rating system focusing on functional importance taking into consideration several factors and established by Regional Planning Commissions.

Christine provided the details that go into each of the components, identifying categories and point assignments. Also taken into consideration is where the project falls in the TIP. Typically, projects that score well are those that:

- access designated growth areas, airport, tourism facilities
- improve safety in a location with a document safety problem
- are bicycle/pedestrian facilities making intermodal, regional connection or accessing designated growth areas
- Are reconstruction projects with critical need
- Improve corridors with significant congestion

Following discussion, DENNIS LUTZ MADE A MOTION THE TAC APPROVE THE PRIORITIZATION. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY BRUCE HOAR AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
6. Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Scenarios

Peter referred members to the memo in the meeting packet that described the scenarios and how staff came up with them. He noted that we will be relying on our transportation model to evaluate different transportation futures and measure their impacts. The first scenario, or base case, will be run first and will look at what happens as the region grows in future years with only our current transportation system and the additional projects identified in our 4-year TIP. The other three scenarios will include the base case, but will be built on very different and distinct strategies so that any differences can be better evaluated in helping to determine the MTP scenario. It is likely that the MTP scenario will incorporate elements from all the scenarios. The scenarios and their elements are identified in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenarios Evaluated for Years 2015, 2030, &amp; 2050</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base Build</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing transportation system plus all TIP projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peter noted that staff is seeking TAC comment on the proposed scenarios. Dennis Lutz remarked that all assumptions going into these scenarios be clearly described/defined. Staff agreed.

7. UPWP Update

Marshall distributed copies of the latest draft of the FY18 UPWP and explained that next month staff would be back for a more detailed presentation on this and ask the TAC for approval to send to the full Board. He noted in particular some project cells highlighted in yellow and asked TAC members to look at those for comments as currently they are pending projects and will be considered for funding at the mid-year adjustment.

8. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports

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

9. CCRPC March Board Meeting Report

Peter mentioned the Board approved roadway functional classification, demographic forecasts and MRGP comments that the TAC has considered last month. They also warned a May public hearing for the UPWP.
10. Chairman’s/Members’ Items

No items came up.

The meeting adjourned at 10:10 a.m.

Respectfully submitted, Peter Keating