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

1. **Consent Agenda**
   
   No items this month.

2. **Approval of Minutes**
   
   The April 4th minutes were approved without changes.

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

4. **UPWP Update and Action**
   
   Marshall provided a brief description of the work program development process noting that the number of project requests was down from last year. This allowed the CCRPC to accommodate nearly all the work asked for. Marshall also reported that the CCRPC Board had warned a public hearing on the UPWP for their May 17th meeting. **ROBIN PIERCE MADE A MOTION THE TAC RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE UPWP TO THE CCRPC BOARD. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY BRIAN BIGELOW AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

5. **I-89 Exit 14 Bike Red Crossing Study**
   
   Christine began by noting that this was the type of project staff felt would be of interest to the TAC as most are familiar with this area. If there are other similar projects members would like to hear more about, please let staff know. Christine then went through a consultant’s presentation first given at a public meeting on April 14th. The presentation offered a number of options to get across the Exit 14 area essentially on a path parallel to Williston Road. Some alternatives featured separate bridges at various distances from the existing bridge on both the north and south sides and another down the center of the bridge. A gondola alternative as well as a circular design were also suggested. Based on the project’s Purpose and Need Statement, four alternatives were recommended for further analysis. The TAC discussion that followed Christine’s presentation included the following:

   - The center bike lanes were supported by several members despite the determination that it didn’t meet the Purpose and Need.
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• Would the circle idea work better as an oval?
• Will short term ideas flow through to long term alternatives?
• Consider covering a center lane path alternative for additional safety/protection
• Consider how to deal with the traffic impacts of any of these alternatives.

The following are the remaining steps to project completion:

• Review feedback
• Meet with VTrans
• Prepare draft recommendations
• Develop concept plan
• Finalize recommendations
• Present to City Council
• Begin preliminary design and engineering

The project is scheduled to wrapped up in June.

6. Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Update
Peter reported that we are still in discussion with VTrans on how to determine our fiscal constraint levels for the MTP. He also noted that the financial determination is critical to identifying what projects can be expected to get done. The projects are part of a list compiled from the last MTP along with corridor and other studies that have been completed since the last MTP. Each project on that list has a cost with it and that cost information is also being updated. Regarding the long-range planning scenarios discussed at last month’s meeting, we are writing a scope of work to have RSG help define the model parameters and run the analysis of the scenarios. Next steps in the MTP process include drafting the existing conditions report and completing a financial plan. At the next TAC meeting we will plan to review the existing conditions work.

7. VTrans Bike Ped Program
Peter noted that this year’s program was recently announced and that all TAC members should’ve received notice. Peter mentioned that a new element in the process is to not only include a letter of support from the RPC, but to also have the RPC review the application for completeness, before submitting to VTrans. Allowing enough time for this step is something applicants should be attentive to. Applications are due mid-July.

8. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports
Peter referred members to the project list on the back of the agenda. Christine handed out a draft of the proposed FY2018-2021 TIP projects for the various communities in attendance. The version is a mark-up of the current TIP to make clear the changes under consideration. Christine explained that this document is being provided so towns can see what is being recommended in their respective communities and ask questions or make comments on schedules or costs. Any changes to the project information should be sent to Christine. This is preliminary work in finalizing the FY18 TIP.

9. CCRPC April Board Meeting Report
Peter mentioned the Board approved the Active Transportation Plan and project prioritization that the TAC has considered last month.

10. Chairman’s/Members’ Items
No items came up.

11. MGRP Road Erosion Inventory Results, Analysis, and Prioritization
Chris Dubin began by going over the timeline for this project:

1. Design and build data shell (based on MGRP Inventory form)
2. Build data collection App
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3. Complete field work
4. QA/QC
5. Draft DEC MRGP standards compliance (Fully Meets/Partially Meets/Does Not Meet)
6. Draft DEC MRGP Prioritization (Low/Medium/High/Very High)
7. CCRPC Scoring design (Fitzgerald Environmental Associates (FEA) Scoring Design
8. FEA Scoring application

He then went into detail on steps 1 through 6 leaving the last 2 items for Evan Fitzgerald. Chris described
the work done in the 5 eastern Chittenden County Towns that represented over 92 miles of roadways and
1,526 segments. He also demonstrated how segment compliance was determined using DEC’s MRGP
standards and then went through a series of charts illustrating segment evaluation totals, standards by road
surface type, and the mileage of roads not meeting DEC MGRP standards. The next steps include
finishing the other 11 Chittenden County Communities which contain 3,019 segments and 183 miles. It
was pointed out that the evaluations can show significant differences depending on how soon after
maintenance work has taken place, the evaluations occur.

Evan Fitzgerald then went over his consultant tasks and where in the process they currently stood.
(Prioritization methodology):

1. Review and QA/QC Road Erosion Inventory Data
2. Town Maps and Meetings with Road Foremen
3. Draft Prioritization Method
4. Field Assessment & Method Calibration
5. Finalize Prioritization Method
6. Select Sites for Conceptual Designs
7. Final Report

He then described the difference between sediment source and transport and how the two are factored into
determining the potential for water quality impacts and illustrated the different scores across road surface
type – paved, gravel, class 4. He also addressed the difference in slope calculations between LIDAR and
ANR.

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted, Peter Keating