ATP Committee meeting
October 26, 2022
Amanda Froeschle, Greg Rowangould, Jonathon Weber, Josh Katz, Matthew Arancio, Jon Rauscher, Samuel Dingba, John Abbott, Bryan Davis, Eleni Churchill, Marshall Distel, Pam Brangan, Michael Blau, Jake Berman

- Welcome and introductions
- Schedule update – the recommendations and prioritization are in process with the final plan expected Dec/Jan.
- Bicycle network recommendations
    - Jake gave an overview of the countywide bicycle network recommendations. These were developed using trip potential analysis and bicycle network analysis, public input, and existing/planned facilities and projects. Jake showed the map of recommended network, as well as existing trails/paths
    - The next step was to break the network into segments based on road characteristics, built environment, municipal boundaries, TIP project boundaries, barriers like highways and bridges. Jake showed part of the table with project level recommendations as an example. Note that specific facility types won't be determined through this effort. Traffic speeds and volumes are important in determining comfortable facility types.
    - Jonathon asked about preferred and acceptable facilities based on the two charts shown. Michael noted that acceptable means it meets minimum requirements but doesn't necessarily mean it's comfortable. Preferred facilities are more comfortable for more users. Jonathon asked that the Plan call out this distinction and that "preferred" facilities are preferred.
    - Amanda asked about other variables that may not factor in as much but still have impact, particularly on rural roads. Michael noted that during COVID people tended to drive faster. Other factors include land use and access to destinations are an issue, and access to schools/younger users, so these charts are helpful but specific projects need to consider local context and other factors.
    - Jonathon suggested that these charts provide guidance but separation is really what would be most comfortable for more people.
    - Matthew suggested phasing could be a scenario that starts with a short term option but with a longer term option that is more protected.
    - Greg noted that young riders won't be using shoulders on high speed roadways despite what the charts show. In prioritization, we need to consider how and where to spend limited resources – on separated/protected areas, in urban areas, how do we decide?
    - Michael noted there are different ways to approach this, like separating rural and urban, and we can discuss further.
    - Greg followed up that it's important to consider rural areas, and maybe some of them are higher priority and could bring in new users.
    - Michael asked if we want the plan to consider attracting new users as a priority? We can discuss further.
    - Michael then covered the local pedestrian network recommendations. While some county level analysis was conducted, local recommendations were developed for Milton

and South Burlington. Trip potential analysis was conducted countywide as well as specific to Milton and South Burlington. CCRPC can share this dataset as well as Level of Traffic Stress data if local communities want to explore and use. Other data sets are in the public realm. Recommendations include both linear and spot improvements: Linear are connections between existing sidewalk segments and proposed facilities where there is strong usage but also high levels of traffic stress. Spot improvements are high stress, high use intersections, and also where existing facilities aren't working optimally. About 20 recommendations were provided for both Milton and South Burlington.

- o Prioritization was based on equity, network extension, safety (speed and volume), demand, and stakeholder input.
- Review of prioritization map
  - o Greg asked about places like North Ave which has existing facilities and is included in the recommended network, while other places don't have facilities and are also included.
  - o Eleni asked about Shelburne Rd (South Burlington and beyond), how will feasibility be taken into account as part of prioritization since it might not be feasible if curbs have to be moved. Michael said they could ID a few specific places and take a closer look, but also need to hear from the committee to understand what's important to include in the plan.
  - o Amanda asked which variables went into the equity analysis, and could we see the overlay of the equity analysis on the map? Equity had 3 variables, race, income, vehicle ownership.
  - o Michael noted we'll want to include this map overlay in the final plan to show the relationship.
  - o Bryan commented about his review of local networks versus the regional network so note that not all local segments are included in the recommended network.
  - o Greg noted it's important to think about access to jobs, services, etc. and not just whether a project is in a particular neighborhood.
  - o Amanda asked if data is available for others to use (which it is), and Bryan noted that having this plan can help with grant applications and so on.
- Next steps: please provide comments on the bicycle network recommendations and prioritization by November 9.

Tasks:
1. Toole to provide data package and prioritization memo
2. Toole to update program and policy memo and send
3. Bryan will share these with the committee and note that we'll schedule the final committee meeting for December