

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

5 DATE: Tuesday, May 2, 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 Brendan Atwood, CATMA
16 Bruce Hoar, Williston
17 Nicole Losch, Burlington
18 Katelin Brewer-Colie, Local Motion
19 Barbara Elliot, Huntington
20 Brian Bigelow, Underhill
21 Ashley Bishop, VTrans District 5
22

Dick Hosking, VTrans District 5

Amy Bell, VTrans
Robin Pierce, Essex Junction
Mary Anne Michaels, Rail

23 **Staff Present**

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

24 Peter Keating called the meeting to order at 9:00AM and asked for a round of introductions.
25

26 **1. Consent Agenda**

27 No items this month.
28

29 **2. Approval of Minutes**

30 The April 4th minutes were approved without changes.
31

32 **3. Public Comments**

33 There were none.
34

35 **4. UPWP Update and Action**

36 Marshall provided a brief description of the work program development process noting that the number of
37 project requests was down from last year. This allowed the CCRPC to accommodate nearly all the work
38 asked for. Marshall also reported that the CCRPC Board had warned a public hearing on the UPWP for
39 their May 17th meeting. ROBIN PIERCE MADE A MOTION THE TAC RECOMMEND APPROVAL
40 OF THE UPWP TO THE CCRPC BOARD. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY BRIAN BIGELOW
41 AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.
42

43 **5. I-89 Exit 14 Bike Red Crossing Study**

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

- 53
- The center bike lanes were supported by several members despite the determination that it didn't
54 meet the Purpose and Need.

- 1 • Would the circle idea work better as an oval?
- 2 • Will short term ideas flow through to long term alternatives?
- 3 • Consider covering a center lane path alternative for additional safety/protection
- 4 • Consider how to deal with the traffic impacts of any of these alternatives.

5 The following are the remaining steps to project completion:

- 6 • Review feedback
- 7 • Meet with VTrans
- 8 • Prepare draft recommendations
- 9 • Develop concept plan
- 10 • Finalize recommendations
- 11 • Present to City Council
- 12 • Begin preliminary design and engineering

13 The project is scheduled to wrapped up in June.

14

15 **6. Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Update**

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

25

26 **7. VTrans Bike Ped Program**

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

32

33 **8. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports**

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

40

41 **9. CCRPC April Board Meeting Report.**

42 Peter mentioned the Board approved the Active Transportation Plan and project prioritization that the
43 TAC has considered last month.

44

45 **10. Chairman's/Members' Items**

46 No items came up.

47

48 **11. MGRP Road Erosion Inventory Results, Analysis, and Prioritization**

49 Chris Dubin began by going over the timeline for this project:

- 50 1. Design and build data shell (based on MRGP Inventory form)
- 51 2. Build data collection App

- 1 3. Complete field work
- 2 4. QA/QC
- 3 5. Draft DEC MRGP standards compliance (Fully Meets/Partially Meets/Does Not Meet)
- 4 6. Draft DEC MRGP Prioritization (Low/Medium/High/Very High)
- 5 7. CCRPC Scoring design (Fitzgerald Environmental Associates (FEA) Scoring Design
- 6 8. FEA Scoring application

7 He then went into detail on steps 1 through 6 leaving the last 2 items for Evan Fitzgerald. Chris described
8 the work done in the 5 eastern Chittenden County Towns that represented over 92 miles of roadways and
9 1,526 segments. He also demonstrated how segment compliance was determined using DEC's MRGP
10 standards and then went through a series of charts illustrating segment evaluation totals, standards by road
11 surface type, and the mileage of roads not meeting DEC MGRP standards. The next steps include
12 finishing the other 11 Chittenden County Communities which contain 3,019 segments and 183 miles. It
13 was pointed out that the evaluations can show significant differences depending on how soon after
14 maintenance work has taken place, the evaluations occur.

15
16 Evan Fitzgerald then went over his consultant tasks and where in the process they currently stood.
17 (Prioritization methodology):

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

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

29
30 The meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m.

31
32 Respectfully submitted, Peter Keating