The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:35 PM.

**ATTENDANCE**

Jack Cunningham  Edgar Rice  Kendall Gifford (staff)
Fred Bullock   Gary Fox  Lou Bruso
Lew Sorenson

Regrets: Matt Mann was at a meeting with VTrans in Montpelier.

**MINUTES APPROVAL:** Members reviewed the minutes of the meeting on 15 Nov 2010. Kendall offered two corrections to punctuation errors, and suggested the addition of the parenthetical phrase “(on river corridor management)” to more clearly identify the referenced “ACT 110.”

The Chair then requested input on the meeting schedule, and called for announcements so these items did not get lost at the very end of the meeting. Next meeting was set for 14 February. There was a request to put railroad infrastructure projects and funding on a future Agenda.

**BUSINESS**

**Town Road and Bridge Standards**

Members, who had not been present at the November meeting, when the new guidelines were reviewed, noted that because the draft document was handed out at the meeting, they were not familiar with the content of the new guidelines. They asked staff to include such topically relevant material in future meeting announcements.

Committee reviewed and potential impacts on towns that adopt these new guidelines. The 10% reduction in local match sounds attractive, and the new standards are worthy, but there is concern about possibly insufficient flexibility for implementing the “one size fits all” standards. The Committee agreed that the situation should be watched for problems as our towns are asked to comply with the new standards.

**Weight limits on Vermont Interstate Highways**

Members discussed the 16 Dec expiration of the federal provision temporarily allowing increase of the maximum gross weight on the interstates from 80 to 99 thousand pounds. Continuation of that pilot program has broad support from our towns along I-91. Committee did not simply want to send another letter to our federal congressional
delegation, which had already written in support of the program. Committee identified additional information they would like staff to obtain for the next meeting, in order to more effectively craft and direct an appeal for reinstating the higher limit:

- How many other states have the 99,000 pound limit -- in particular, which of the states that neighbor Vermont;
- What entities and interests oppose the increase for Vermont and why.
- What response from our region and towns does our federal delegation believe would help advance re-instatement.
- What evidence exists of tangible benefits to our towns while the higher limit was in effect.

Members also requested copies of the VT Act 63 on weight limits, in advance of the next meeting.

Proposed “Complete Streets” Bill

Committee discussed in some detail the draft of a bill included in the meeting announcement packet. State Representative Mollie Burke of Brattleboro will bring this “Complete Streets” proposal to the Vermont House Transportation Committee. Among the points the Committee raised:

- Purpose statement identifies a perhaps unrealistically broad group to accommodate and benefit.
- Some wording in the bill might undermine the intent of the bill as a whole. The phrase, “presumption of disproportionality” as used with regard to unpaved roads was cited as an example.
- The guidelines and standards used to for evaluations should be more fully defined
- The use of those evaluations needs to be more carefully described.
- In general the members felt that the bill as worded sounded like it could be initiating an unrealistic scope of work.

Committee agreed an appropriate action would be to offer constructive comment to our legislators, and our Public Policy Committee. Committee then reached a Consensus decision that the first step should be to invite Mollie Burke to attend an upcoming WRC Transportation Committee meeting for discussion on this bill and other transportation issues that might be coming before the House Transportation Committee. For the next Committee meeting mailing, staff will review the bill and draft a list of comments or issues based on that review and on committee member comments.

Notes on the 2010 Transportation Board Hearing

Due to time constraints this consisted of brief list of the major items raised by the public at the meeting.

- Route 103 repaving has not included the section through Chester Village, which is Class one town highway that gets just as much trucking traffic and at least as much local traffic.
- Truck weight limits. The pilot program raising the Interstate limit has benefited towns long that route. Towns on 103 are still subject to “overweight” through truck traffic, enabled by annual highway permits.
- Bicycle and pedestrian facilities received a lot comments, including discussion of the new bike lanes on Putney road, and the practice of using new striping to widen paved shoulders and reduce travel lane width.

Members were invited to request from staff further details on these and other Board discussion.

Meeting adjourned at 6:03