Bryan Osborne called the meeting to order at 9:00AM, calling for a round of introductions.

1. **Consent Agenda:** Bryan Osborne asked if there were any questions on the consent agenda. ANDREA MORGANTE MADE A MOTION APPROVING THE CONSENT AGENDA. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY RICHARD WATTS AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

2. **Approval of Minutes**

Bryan asked for any changes, which there were none. JOSS BESSE MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF November 5, 2019 WITH AMENDMENTS, SECONDED BY SANDY THIBAULT. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. **Public Comments**

None.

4. **High Impact Economic Development Project List**

Seth Bowden, GBIC staff, described an effort to create a methodology through which critical and high impact economic development projects may be vetted and chosen as part of an application for funding from the Northern Border Regional Commission (NBRC). The overall goal is to have a statewide list of projects that are already identified, can attract resources, and be meaningful to communities. This is being done throughout the state at the request of Department of Economic Development. This effort is using the CEDS list from 2017 (which is in the ECOS Plan) as a starting point to identify short, medium, and long-term projects focused on infrastructure and economic development, and their respective levels of impact.

The goal is to define a methodology to identify projects by the end of 2019 with a draft list ready by early...
2020. Not being on the list does not make a project ineligible and being on the list doesn’t necessarily give another project priority, but having a list makes for a stronger state application. The project list will be brought to the TAC, PAC and CCRPC Board for approval. The funding program was initially created in 2008 to help economically distressed communities, hence the focus on other communities in previous rounds, but it’s now open to other areas. Charlie noted that Winooski previously received $450,000 for their Main Street Revitalization Project. Since 2010, when funds were available, about 44 projects have been awarded in Vermont. Questions from TAC members included:

Are economic conditions considered in the NBRC program?
Yes, a 50% match is required in Chittenden County because we are a “transitional” county rather than a “distressed” county. It appears that there are no approved “isolated areas of distress” in Vermont – this is something that exists in other states. Information on how “distress” is evaluated:
http://www.nbrc.gov/content/distressed-counties

Can these funds be used for matching federal funds?
In Chittenden County, a 50% match is required. NBRC funds can be used as match for leveraging other Federal grant funds, only up to 80% of the total project. There always needs to be a 20% non-federal match.

How much money is available?
Depending on appropriations, there is $3.5M million available for projects in Vermont. There is a $500,000 maximum award to eligible infrastructure projects, up to a $250,000 maximum award for all other types of eligible projects. There’s also local development district grants and state planning grants, which may not be relevant for this particular round of list making.

Application Details
Details on how State Economic and Infrastructure Development Investment Program applications work, what’s considered and an application manual can be found here: http://www.nbrc.gov/content/2019-eid-investments

5. Chittenden County I-89 2050 Study
Eleni Churchill, CCRPC staff, provided an overview of this project. They are now finishing the current conditions, modeling to develop alternatives, and working on the draft vision, goals, and objectives which she shared. Vision and goals are important because they are used to guide decisions related to screening alternatives. The project team will complete a microsimulation model for entire corridor, and they developed five base scenarios against which all alternatives will be analyzed. The CCRPC’s ECOS/MTP and State’s Long-Range Transportation Plan are guiding documents. Dean Pierce asked about the phrase “in alignment with” municipal and regional plans as part of the vision statement, and Eleni responded that the plan needs to be in alignment with land uses in adjacent towns. There is plenty of time before the draft vision, goals, and objectives are finalized, and Eleni asked TAC members to provide any feedback.

Andrea asked if the project should acknowledge the rapidity with which transportation and technology may change in this period of time. Eleni responded that this was debated during MTP development, and technology across industries is developing at different rates so we don’t know how or when technology will change things, so it’s difficult to incorporate. Richard notes that the vision statement doesn’t include “sustainable” which is part of the MTP goal and asked if this should be included? Eleni said this can be considered. Richard also reflected about induced demand and the need to make it harder for people to live further away from growth areas, rather than easier via the interstate, if the goal is to focus development in specific areas. Bryan asked if other RPCs are involved because addressing congestion here may push it to other areas. Eleni responded that neighboring RPCs, and many other stakeholders are on the Advisory Committee. Understanding impacts to other areas, outside Chittenden County, is also why the project is using the regional model. Andrea asked if Federal Highway Administration might change rules about who/what vehicles can use the interstate as technology changes. Chris Jolly said that with the new federal transportation bill, addressing issues like this would be an evolving process. Eleni noted that the project
team is still developing metrics for the objectives. Dean Pierce noted the challenge of balancing desire to keep some areas rural, ag, residential and impacts of I-89 improvements may change demand in those areas. Eleni said the next steps include Advisory and Technical Committee meetings, public meetings, and beginning the interchange evaluation. Joss asked who makes decisions for this project, and Eleni said that the she is hopeful that the Advisory Committee would make decisions based on consensus. Charlie Baker said that the CCRPC Board will ultimately be okay with the recommendations for the I-89 Corridor as they will be included as part of the next MTP (2023). Project website: https://envision89.com/.

6. VTrans State Public Transit Projects
Ross MacDonald of VTrans described current transit projects and funding and noted that they are able to work on innovative projects due to legislative and administration support. They are working with open source data which allows for coordination of various platforms and services to make trip planning easier. The new Go! Vermont trip planner platform will launch in January 2020 and will complement the currently available Transit App. They are also launching a media campaign in 2020 to promote these services. Upcoming efforts will incorporate Microtransit into Transit App and Trip Planner and will develop an interface so Demand Response (dia-r-a-ride) trips can be revealed in Trip Planner. Other programs include Rides to Wellness to meet medical transportation needs, and Recovery Rides to provide transportation as part of behavior illness recovery plans. Ross noted that mobility in rural areas need to be addressed differently. Andrea said she was glad to see youth services included because she’s trying to get school buses as part of transit system and encourage young people to be thinking differently about transportation decisions. Daryl asked if towns can help collect data that would be useful, and Ross responded that it would be helpful for towns to help promote Go! Vermont and other programs, which is how they can track data. Bob asked about consideration of “pay as you go” model as an option, especially for automated vehicles when they serve rural areas, and Ross noted that mobility on demand is in the realm of consideration. Go! Vermont currently supports CarShare VT, which has offered to lease hardware/software to other communities. Go! Vermont website: https://www.connectingcommuters.org/

7. CCRPC FY21 UPWP Solicitation
Marshall Distel, CCRPC staff, described the FY21 UPWP development process and noted that information was distributed in mid-November with applications due January 17, 2020. For more information visit: https://www.ccrpcvt.org/about-us/commission/annual-work-plan-budget-finances/

8. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports (Information Item)
Bryan noted that the project list on the back of the agenda identifies current projects, and TAC members can follow up with staff about these or other projects.

9. CCRPC November Board Meetings Report
The Board received a report on the CCRPC’s FY19 audit, VTrans update on Williston Park and Ride and a public hearing for a major TIP Amendment in January, Draft Public Transit Policy Plan update from VTrans, and action on Town of Charlotte Determination of Energy Compliance.

10. Chairman’s/Members’ Items:
None.

AMY BELL MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN, SECOND BY ANDREA MORGANTE, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

The meeting adjourned at 10:40 AM.

Respectfully submitted, Bryan Davis