

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

5 DATE: Tuesday, April 4, 2017
6 TIME: 9:00 a.m.
7 PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal St. Winooski, VT
8

9 **Members Present**

10 Matt Langham, VTrans
11 Dean Bloch, Charlotte
12 Dennis Lutz, Essex
13 Bob Henneberger, Seniors
14 Chris Jolly, FHWA
15 Sandy Thibault, CATMA
16 Bruce Hoar, Williston
17 Nicole Losch, Burlington
18 Katelin Brewer-Colie, Local Motion
19 Peter Wernsdorfer, Winooski
20 Luke Valentine, St George
21 Brian Bigelow, Underhill
22 Ashley Bishop, VTrans District 5
23 Amy Bell, VTrans
24 Alain Hirsch, GMT

Staff Present

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

25
26 Peter Keating called the meeting to order at 9:00AM.
27

28 **1. Consent Agenda**

29 Minor FY17 TIP amendments were unanimously approved.
30

31 **2. Approval of Minutes**

32 The March 8th minutes were approved without changes.
33

34 **3. Public Comments**

35 There were none.
36

37 **3A. TIP Amendment**

38 This item was added at this meeting. Christine distributed a memo describing a new project recognizing
39 Better Roads Category A Awards. This will add \$35,540 to the FY17 year. BRIAN BIGELOW MADE
40 A MOTION THE TAC APPROVE THIS AMENDMENT. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY
41 DENNIS LUTZ AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
42

43 **4. Active Transportation Plan**

44 Peter presented this final version of the plan. He first thanked TAC members that served on the project
45 advisory committee: Sandy Thibault, Bob Henneberger, Dave Armstrong, Katelin Brewer-Colie and
46 Nicole Losch. He then provided historic content citing how far back the RPC has done bike/ped plans. He
47 also described the public process to generate input and highlighted some plan assumptions and focus
48 areas including:

- 49 • Improving network connectivity, closing system gaps
- 50 • Identifying priority corridors vs. specifying facility types
- 51 • Focusing more on biking and less on walking as biking is a viable inter-municipal mode

52 Peter also went over the plan's content and then the GIS analysis used to identify the proposed regional
53 network. This considered public input, examining region wide trip origins and destinations, and other
54 related plans from the state or towns. The plan then created a hierarchy based on determining what a

1 corridor's priority and feasibility were and Peter presented the criteria used to determine both priority and
 2 feasibility and displayed the map revealing the results. He followed this with this list of the plan's short
 3 term and non-infrastructure recommendations:

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

12 The final steps in this project are to get TAC and Board approval and format the final document. Peter
 13 zoomed in to the map to get closer looks at the recommendations, focusing on Williston and Essex.

14 Dennis Lutz commented that many of the corridor recommendations are State highways and VTrans has
 15 not always been willing to work with communities to make bike/ped improvements happen on these
 16 roads. He also thinks the actual effect of this plan will be minimal. Amy Bell responded that VTrans is
 17 making slow incremental steps to improve these facilities but they are nonetheless steps in the right
 18 direction. Bob Henneberger noted that the Complete Streets law and long range plans can help make
 19 future improvements happen. Following further discussion KATELIN BREWER-COLIE MADE A
 20 MOTION THE TAC RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN TO
 21 THE CCRPC BOARD. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY DENNIS LUTZ AND PASSED
 22 UNANIMOUSLY.
 23

24 **5. Project Prioritization**

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

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

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

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

44 Following discussion, DENNIS LUTZ MADE A MOTION THE TAC APPROVE THE
 45 PRIORITIZATION. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY BRUCE HOAR AND PASSED
 46 UNANIMOUSLY.
 47
 48
 49

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.

<i>Scenarios Evaluated for Years 2015, 2030, & 2050</i>				
Base Build	Technology Intensive	Transportation Demand Management/ Energy Conservation	Capacity Expansion	Hybrid/MTP Scenario
Existing transportation system plus all TIP projects	Base Build, plus... Autonomous and connected vehicle deployment; Intelligent Transportation Systems implementation; MaaS (Mobility as a Service) expansion – car sharing, ride-hailing (Uber, Lyft), bikeshare, flexible transit; communications infrastructure to make these possible	Base Build, plus... Significant fleet conversion to EVs; Mode shifts from SOV to expanded alternatives (transit, walk, bike, rideshare); Telework/work-at-home expansion; Vehicles per household decline; Increase policy of 80% future growth in the areas planned for growth to 90%	Base Build, plus... New local connector roads (from official maps); Other potential priority congestion relief projects as revealed by model analysis; expansion of 89 and interchanges will be considered for this scenario	Base Build, plus... Projects and Strategies TBD

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.

- 1 **10. Chairman's/Members' Items**
- 2 No items came up.
- 3
- 4 The meeting adjourned at 10:10 a.m.
- 5
- 6 Respectfully submitted, Peter Keating

DRAFT