

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

5 DATE: Tuesday, October 2, 2018  
6 TIME: 9:00 a.m.  
7 PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal St. Winooski, VT  
8

9  
10 **Members Present**

11 Bruce Hoar, Williston  
12 Brian Bigelow, Underhill  
13 Jon Rauscher, Winooski  
14 Justin Rabidou, South Burlington  
15 Amy Bell, VTrans  
16 Bryan Osborne, Colchester, TAC Chair  
17 Nicole Losch, Burlington  
18 Bob Henneberger, AARP  
19 Allegra Williams, Local Motion  
20 Rachel Kennedy, GMT  
21 Maryann Michaels, Rail  
22 Dick Hosking, VTrans  
23 Richard Watts, Hinesburg  
24 Chris Jolly, FHWA  
25

**Staff Present**

Christine Forde, Senior Transportation Planner  
Eleni Churchill, Transportation Project Manager  
Sai Sarepalli, Transportation Planning Engineer  
Bryan Davis, Senior Transportation Planner  
Peter Keating, Senior Transportation Planner  
Marshall Distel, Transportation Planner  
Charlie Baker, Executive Director

26  
27 Bryan Osborne called the meeting to order at 9:00AM.  
28

29 **1. Consent Agenda**

30 JUSTIN RABIDOUX MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BRIAN BIGELOW, TO APPROVE THE  
31 TWO TIP AMENDMENT ITEMS DESCRIBED IN THE CONSENT AGENDA MEMOS. THE  
32 MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.  
33

34 **2. Approval of Minutes**

35 AMY BELL MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BOB HENNEBERGER, TO APPROVE THE  
36 MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 7, 2018 TAC MEETING. THE MOTION CARRIED.  
37

38 **3. Public Comments**

39 None.  
40

41 **4. Transportation Performance Management (TPM)**

42 Peter pointed TAC members to the memo and a report in their meeting packet and explained that the  
43 presentation will cover some of the same ground as well as points made in a previous presentation to the  
44 TAC this past February. Peter began by giving some background on TPM: Its basis in federal law, the  
45 national goal areas, and the rulemaking that set performance measures and target deadlines. He also noted  
46 the general rule that MPO's, like the CCRPC, have 180 days following a VTrans established performance  
47 target to either:

- 48 • Agree to the VTrans statewide target, or
- 49 • Establish their own target

50 Peter described the safety targets that VTrans established last August that the CCRPC agreed to this past  
51 February. Peter then turned the presentation over to Eleni to describe more recent efforts at VTrans to  
52 establish targets in other areas. Eleni began with infrastructure condition for pavement and bridges where  
53 VTrans recently set targets for Interstate and non-Interstate NHS pavements in both good and poor  
54 condition. VTrans also did the same for bridges on the NHS. For illustrative purposes Eleni showed

1 Chittenden County level data for these as well, to compare with the VTrans statewide data. For these  
2 infrastructure condition targets, CCRPC has a deadline to act by October 27, 2018. Eleni then explained  
3 VTrans target setting for system reliability and freight. Using charts of both statewide and Chittenden  
4 County data, Eleni illustrated how VTrans determined their targets and why regional level data is not that  
5 reliable. She concluded with a draft motion for the TAC to consider and explained the rationale for the  
6 recommendation. She also noted two goal areas that Vermont does not need to develop targets for given  
7 our small population and air quality status. The next steps, following TAC action, are Board discussion  
8 and action on 10/17/18 and the submittal to VTrans and FHWA of the Performance Management report.  
9 Some comments/discussion points included:

- 10 • Fatality rate data from VTrans and a recent uptick in fatality numbers
- 11 • The fatality rate target should be zero
- 12 • The TAC should consider a presentation of the Traffic Safety Alliance
- 13 • There should be a travel time for active transportation modes as well – consider a  
14 recommendation to FHWA on this.
- 15 • Comments during rule making may have addressed the active transportation mode issue – Chris  
16 Jolly will review those comments.

17 Following discussion, Richard Watts made the following motion, seconded by Bruce Hoar:  
18 THE TAC ACCEPTS THE STATEWIDE TARGETS FOR NHS PAVEMENTS AND BRIDGE  
19 CONDITION, NHS TIME TRAVEL RELIABILITY, AND INTERSTATE FREIGHT MOVEMENTS  
20 AND RECOMMENDS THAT THE CCRPC BOARD AGREES TO THE STATEWIDE TARGETS  
21 FOR ALL PERFORMANCE MEASURES UNDER THESE CATEGORIES. The motion passed  
22 unanimously.  
23

#### 24 **5. Winooski River Bridge Scoping Update**

25 Peter began with background information on both this project as well as scoping in general. The subject  
26 bridge was built in 1928 following the 1927 flood, has three spans and saw major repairs in 1961, 1975  
27 and 1997. Its unique bracket supporting sidewalks restricts any outward expansion of the bridge width.  
28 Before describing the five bridge alternatives developed in the scoping process, Peter identified the  
29 Advisory Committee members and the outreach to the public as well as VTrans structures and resource  
30 staffs. The alternatives are:

- 31 1. Superstructure **rehabilitation** with separate bike/ped bridge
- 32 2. Superstructure **replacement** with separate Bike/Ped bridge
- 33 3. Superstructure replacement with all modes on one bridge (widened piers **upstream**)
- 34 4. Superstructure replacement with all modes on one bridge (widened piers **downstream**)
- 35 5. Completely new two span, one pier bridge, includes all modes

36 Peter described the discussion at the Advisory Committee that modified the bike/ped facility for  
37 Alternatives 4 and 5, to be 12-foot shared use paths on both sides. He next showed the two-page  
38 evaluation matrix that compares each alternative under the dozens of criteria. Difficult to see but  
39 illustrated the complex evaluation process and comparison analysis. Peter also described the accelerated  
40 bridge program at VTrans and the use of a lateral slide technique to build the new bridge and minimize  
41 the length of time needed total bridge closure. Following extensive discussion at the last Advisory  
42 Committee, the following preferred alternative recommendation, and rationale, was agreed to: *The*  
43 *Advisory Committee recommends both Alternatives 4 and 5 move forward as locally recommended*  
44 *alternatives and that the bridge should be constructed using an accelerated bridge construction method.*

45 Decision factors:

- 46 1) The roadway configuration is identical for both Alternatives 4 and 5
- 47 2) Several unknowns at this point:
  - 48 • The condition of the existing substructure (piers and abutments)
  - 49 • Potential river access constraints from either side
  - 50 • The timeframe for construction.

51 Given the access restrictions to the site, the relatively high cost and the fact that the current substructure is  
52 still in remarkably good condition, this project is likely to be well off into the future before we see it  
53 under construction.

**6. Bicycle Parking Bylaws**

Bryan Davis presented “Model Bylaws for Short and Long-Term Bicycle Parking Facilities” He provided some photo evidence of when and where bike parking is needed noting some unusual methods owners go to to secure their bikes. Within Chittenden County, bike parking is addressed to varying degrees in current bylaws – or not at all. He noted that examples are usually tied to car parking requirements. Bryan stated that “The goal is to get well-designed and usable racks as the standard. Towns and developers pay dearly for vehicle parking and traffic impacts; the cost of a good bike rack is a fraction of those.” He recommended towns add definitions to their bylaws, describe the bike parking they want, and identify an appropriate amount to be provided, keeping the site context in mind. He then went through the language in several local bylaws – Burlington, Milton and South Burlington - to compare and contrast what each are doing. He added that Burlington has their own separate bike parking guidelines while other towns have a section as part of their land development regulations. He next illustrated with photos a number of good and bad examples and concluded with a list of resources:

- CCRPC staff
- Free *ABPB Essentials of Bike Parking*
- Free Dero Bike Parking Guide
- *APBP Bike Parking Guidelines* - RPC has on file and willing to loan.

Bob Henneberger remarked that as the population ages, bike parking that includes charging stations for e-bikes as well as room for trikes, will be needed.

**7. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports**

Bryan Osborne referred members to the project list on the reverse side of the meeting agenda.

**8. CCRPC September Board Meeting Report**

Peter reported the Board met on 9/19 hearing a presentation, and taking action, on the proposed National Highway System (NHS). They also received an update on transportation performance management and upcoming deadlines for target setting. The meeting began with a 45-minute presentation on Board responsibilities as an MPO.

**9. Chairman’s/Members’ Items**

Bryan Davis mentioned upcoming Local Road workshops on designing pedestrian facilities for accessibility.

The meeting adjourned at 10:40 a.m.

Respectfully submitted, Peter Keating