DATE: Wednesday, March 2, 2016
TIME: 9:00 a.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal St. Winooski, VT

1. Consent Agenda
N/A this month.

2. Approval of Minutes
A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF February 2, 2016 PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. Public Comments
There were none.

4. VTrans White Paper on Class 1 Town Highway Program
Amy Bell began by going over the reasons VTrans decided to undertake this paper. They wanted:
   • To better identify costs & benefits of Class I Town Highway ownership
   • To determine if the existing Town Highway Aid formula adequately reimburses municipalities for Class 1 mileage, and
   • To develop a cost estimation tool and FAQ’s for VTrans’ “Orange Book” to assist towns with weighing costs and benefits of Class 1 takeover
Amy defined Class 1 town highways and stressed that they are subject to concurrent authority and jurisdiction between both the municipality and VTrans. Even with joint jurisdiction and coordination on maintenance issues there are benefits to towns that do take over these highways, including:
   1. Design control and flexibility that includes: Crosswalk location & surface type; Street trees & other amenities (benches, street lights & landscaping); Traffic calming (bulb outs, curb extensions etc.); On-street parking, including angled parking; Placement of road and wayfinding signs; Travel lane and shoulder widths and Median islands
2. Speed Control on the highway
3. Access Management of driveways to land uses along the highway
4. Utilities within the Right-of-Way (ROW)

Amy also cited some results of the survey VTrans undertook with towns that currently have Class 1 Town highways, noting that:

- 80% would keep their Class I highways due to the design control and flexibility, and the greater local autonomy over speed limits, road closures & ROW permitting
- On the flip side however, 20% of Towns would give the Class 1’s back to VTrans, citing inadequate funding and staffing challenges. Most of these towns tended to be in more economically distressed areas

Amy showed a table that illustrated in more detail who has what responsibilities when comparing a Class 1 town highway with a State route not under Class 1. See table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>State Highway</th>
<th>Class 1 Town Highway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Signal Maintenance</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Lights-Pedestrian</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Lights-Highway Safety</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance and Repair of Bridges/Culverts*</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Striping* – Centerline</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Striping* – Stop bars</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Striping* – Edge lines</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Striping* – on-street parking</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Striping* – Crosswalks on Side Streets</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Striping* – Crosswalks across State Highway</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plowing – Travel Lanes</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plowing – on-street parking</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plowing – sidewalks</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement – Major Resurfacing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement – Patching and crack sealing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater – Management and Compliance</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater – Maintaining and cleaning</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacing or Repairing Signs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

She then reported on what the legislature approved for Class 1 in 2015: $11,213.23 per mile, and Class 1 funding represents only 6% of the total of town highway funds allocated by the State. In trying to determine if the funding is appealing to towns to take over more Class 1 highways, Amy stated that it depended on the complexity of the infrastructure along the road segment. She used a chart contrasting the winter and summer maintenance costs between a signalized vs. signalized road segment to illustrate the point. Amy finished by identifying potential Chittenden County Towns that might consider Class 1 highway designation and then described next steps: Presenting the white paper to the legislature and continuing a conversation on possible incentives for towns to consider taking over more roadways as Class 1s. Some discussion points and clarifications/questions that followed Amy’s presentation included:

- How the funding share for Class 1 was first determined
- If there were further constraints should a Class 1 also be on the National Highway System (NHS)
- The white paper is more a “fact-finding” document, not offering policy prescriptions
- The reimbursement levels are too low to incentivize many Chittenden County towns to take on Class 1 responsibilities
- At this point there are no specific incentives under discussion
Any program changes will still maintain a partnership between towns and VTrans. There will not be any mandates.

5. ECOS Plan Amendments
Regina presented this item noting that the amendments are not a full update, and do not include any changes to the transportation/MTP part of the Plan. The Board will be holding the first public hearing on March 16th and would appreciate any comments that the TAC may have. The amendments are related to child care, compatibility and consistency with our surrounding regions, earth resource extraction, schools, and hospitals, some minor amendments to a few other facilities, ECOS/CEDS Project list, and flood resiliency which brings in references to the All Hazard Mitigation Plan, Tactical Basin Plans and the draft TMDL. Comments included:

1. The extensive CEDS/ECOS project list includes everything under the sun, most of which may not even qualify for EDA funding. Review and prioritize them to ensure they do qualify. This is a useless exercise for municipalities otherwise.
2. Ask for municipal feedback prior to 2017 for full ECOS amendment – particularly regarding the project list. (Regina explained that this will likely turn into an improved implementation program for the Plan, and so we will start to get feedback earlier.)

6. Active Transportation Plan (ATP) Update
Peter began by noting this is an update of what’s happened since the last TAC report last November. Peter recapped the workshops and wiki-mapping processes from last fall that have contributed to a recommended walk bike network. Several factors fed into the draft network recommendation, including, crash data (safety), public comments (especially from the wiki-mapping exercise) and a Level of Stress (LoS) analysis. For this last item, Toole Design assigned a 1 to 4 level of stress to all of the regions roadways, the numbers closely following the 3 types of bicyclists:

- Interested but Concerned
- Casual and Somewhat Confident
- Experienced and Confident

Peter then revealed the road network map where stress levels were highest: Rated 3 or 4. The LoS classification was linked with other GIS layers (former Walk Bike Plan recommendations and trip origins and destinations) to identify a preferred regional network. Peter displayed that map and then identified some major long term infrastructure challenges and recommendations:

- Where feasible, focus on separated facilities (separated bike lanes, shared use paths) to attract the greatest number of potential users
- Consider alternate designs for I-89 Exit 14 interchange
  - A separate Bike-ped bridge?
- Develop separated bike lanes through the Jug-Handle on Williston Road/East Ave./Spear St.
- The Winooski-Burlington bridge
  - Rebuild bridge with separated bike lanes
  - Or build a separate bike-ped bridge (under feasibility study)
- Reroute bicycles around the Winooski Circulator

Peter also mentioned that the current report also makes recommendations on non-infrastructure items such as educations and enforcement initiatives. The next steps in the ATP are to:

- Revise, as needed, the recommended network
- Continue to coordinate with
  - Vermont Statewide On-road Bike Plan
  - Burlington’s PlanBTV Bike-Walk
- Develop performance measures
- Prioritize recommendations
- Develop cost estimates
• Develop an implementation plan
• Continue the public engagement process
• The project will be complete this coming summer

7. Prioritization of Town Highway Bridge Pre-Candidates
Christine handed out a list of 83 Chittenden County Bridges and their associated rankings as established by VTrans priority. This list does not include bridges that are identified as projects in the Capital Plan. Christine is looking for TAC members comments on whether or not towns think their bridge priorities should be higher or lower than what VTrans has identified. This list is used by VTrans to select future projects. Matt Langham noted that the rankings are based solely on condition and not function.

8. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports
Bryan Osborne directed TAC members to the project list on the back of the agenda page and asked if members had any questions.

9. CCRPC February Board Meeting Report
Peter mentioned the Board discussion around VTrans’ elimination of the CCRPC Sidewalk Program. Charlie reported that he had submitted a letter to VTrans in response.

10. Chairman’s/Members’ Items
Bryan Davis thanked members who have submitted Complete Streets reports to him and that he would be in touch with those towns he has yet to hear from. Bryan also mentioned the upcoming Walk Bike Summit to take place in Rutland on April 1 and 2. He distributed event posters for members to display in their town offices.

The meeting adjourned at 10:25 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter Keating