



Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission

Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC)

Notes

Tuesday, September 22, 2026

Attendees:					
	Barre City			Northfield	Thomas Davis
	Barre Town				Jeff Schulz, Alt
	Berlin	Robert Wernecke	X	Orange	Lee Cattaneo
	Cabot	John Cookson	X	Plainfield	Bob Atchinson (Chair)
x	Calais	David Ellenbogen	X	Roxbury	Gerry D'Amico
		Jordan Keyes, Alt	X	Waitsfield	Don LaHaye
X	Duxbury	Alan Quackenbush			Alice Peal, Alt
				Warren	Jim Crafts
X	E. Montpelier	Adam Stanforth			Jennifer Faillace
		Jen Devine, Alt		Washington	Peter Carbee
	Fayston		X	Waterbury	Mike Hedges (Vice Chair)
	Marshfield	Todd Eaton			Doug Greason, Alt
X	Middlesex	Ronald Krauth		Williamstown	Richard Turner
	Montpelier			Woodbury	Michael Gray
	Moretown	John Lynch			
				Worcester	Bill Arrand
Staff: Keith Cubbon					
Guests: Marcella Dent (VTrans)					

Bob A. brought the meeting to order at 6:33 PM.

Roll Call

- Roll was called and a quorum was not present.

Adjustments to the Agenda

- None

Public Comments

Steve Whitaker raised concerns regarding the availability of meeting agendas and packets on the committee website, noting that the website appeared to contain only the July packet. He

1 questioned whether the August and September meetings had been properly warned and whether
2 the Committee had a quorum.

3 Whitaker also discussed a July 28 memorandum concerning the Transportation Advisory
4 Committee's authority to review projects. He stated that, while the memorandum appropriately
5 addressed project-level review and permit jurisdiction, he believed it did not address the
6 Regional Planning Commission's broader statutory responsibilities regarding transportation
7 capacity studies.

8 Whitaker cited Vermont statutes concerning regional capacity studies and argued that
9 transportation should be considered within those studies. He specifically raised concerns about
10 the Country Club Road project, including its Act 250 jurisdiction, grant conditions, VTrans
11 involvement, traffic impacts, and multimodal access. He questioned which entity should require
12 and define the scope of a traffic study.

13 Whitaker stated that he would leave a copy of his memorandum with Keith for distribution to the
14 Committee.

15 The Chair asked Whitaker to conclude his remarks after the allotted public-comment period.

16 **Staff Announcements**

17 Keith provided several updates:

- 18 • **Better Roads Grants:** Applications are now open and are due at the end of October. The
19 program primarily supports culvert and erosion-related projects associated with the
20 Municipal Roads General Permit.
- 21 • **Fall Road Foremen Meeting:** The meeting is planned for the East Montpelier Town
22 Garage for October 7th at 9:30 am. The facility recently incorporated geothermal heating
23 and other energy-efficiency improvements that staff would like to highlight as examples
24 for other municipalities.
- 25 • **Marshfield Mini-Grant:** Ruben was in Marshfield completing the closeout of one of the
26 mini-grant conducted with Marshfield and Williamstown, including a presentation from
27 the engineers.
- 28 • **Year-End Reporting:** Staff are completing calendar-year reporting and related financial
29 work.
- 30 • **Municipal Salt Purchasing:** Staff are working with road foremen, particularly Sid
31 Griggs in Cabot, to explore a cooperative municipal salt-purchasing arrangement for the
32 following winter. The goal is to combine municipal purchases and coordinate
33 transportation to reduce costs.

34 **Approval of July 2026 Minutes**

- 35 • As a quorum wasn't present, no action was taken.

Vermont Bond Bank Disaster-Reserve Analysis

Keith presented an analysis prepared by the Vermont Bond Bank involving **110 municipalities** that have used the Bond Bank for financing.

The analysis examined:

- Percentage of roads considered vulnerable.
- Percentage of roads considered both critical and vulnerable.
- Annual average road and bridge losses from **2009–2024**.
- Worst-year losses.
- Potential disaster-reserve targets.

The analysis used the Transportation Resiliency Planning Tool and FEMA Category C data for roads and bridges. It did not include building or personal-property damage and doesn't include all losses from 2024 as some were still being finalized.

Keith reported that the ten most-exposed communities accounted for approximately 30% of total losses. The analysis also identified potential disaster-reserve targets based on **15% of the average of the three highest-loss years**, with suggested annual contributions to build those reserves.

A major concern discussed was a recommendation from the FEMA Review Council to reduce FEMA Public Assistance reimbursement from 75% to 50%. Keith explained that such a change could substantially increase municipalities' share of disaster costs.

He noted that municipalities are already financially constrained and that maintaining adequate reserves could be difficult. Staff intend to discuss the issue with Select Boards as well.

Jerry D'Amico asked for clarification of the terms "vulnerable" and "critical and vulnerable."

Keith explained:

- **Vulnerable:** Roads identified as likely to experience damage, such as roads located in floodplains, erosion-prone areas, or areas with a history of damage.
- **Critical and vulnerable:** Vulnerable roads for which there is limited or no practical alternate route if the road becomes unavailable.

Keith offered to include a link to the Transportation Resiliency Planning Tool with the meeting notes.

Regional Bridge Priority List

Keith presented an updated regional bridge list intended to develop a **regional-specific priority list** for use by the TAC and RPC.

The list incorporates information including:

- Bridge condition.
- Vulnerability and criticality scores from the Transportation Resiliency Planning Tool.
- Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT), where available.
- Construction/design status.
- Other bridge-related information from state sources.

Keith explained the color coding currently used:

- **Green:** Good score; green highlighting across a row indicates a bridge is under construction.
- **Yellow:** Middle-range score; yellow highlighting indicates a bridge is in design.
- **Red:** Lower scores, including scores below 4.

Several bridges are currently being replaced through FEMA or Federal Highway Emergency Relief programs. Keith noted that some bridge-status information needs to be updated, including projects that have moved into construction.

The Committee discussed developing a regional priority list that could:

1. Incorporation into the regional plan.
2. Serve as a reference when grant opportunities arise.
3. Help municipalities support grant applications by demonstrating regional priorities.
4. Provide a basis for a future TAC review and prioritization process.

Keith asked Committee members to identify bridges in their communities that they believe should receive the highest priority. The intent is to compile a shorter list and subsequently conduct a deeper analysis of the economics, structure, mobility impacts, and other relevant factors before developing a regional top-five or top-ten priority list.

Keith noted that the Vermont Priority System for Projects (VPSB2) could eventually be used again, although it is not expected to resume in the immediate future.

Helpful additions were requested by members including

The Committee requested clearer explanations of the information contained in the bridge table.

Lee Cattaneo asked for a legend explaining the colors.

David Ellenbogen requested that acronyms be defined and that the scales and meanings of the various ratings and columns be explained. He specifically asked for clarification of items such as superstructure ratings, culvert ratings, and bypass/detour length.

1 Keith agreed to create an **updated worksheet** containing definitions and explanations.

2 Mike Hedges explained that bridge deck, superstructure, and substructure ratings generally range
3 from 0 to 9, with lower scores indicating more serious conditions. He noted that superstructure
4 and substructure deficiencies can be more consequential than deck deficiencies.

5 Keith also agreed to review and update AADT information where possible.

6 **Potential Expansion of Regional Priority Lists**

7 Mike Hedges suggested developing similar priority lists for other transportation programs,
8 including bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and enhancement projects.

9 Keith agreed that this could be useful after the bridge list is completed. He also suggested that an
10 updated paving priority list could be valuable.

11 Marcella Dent of VTTrans said she would check whether there are plans to update the state's
12 paving list and report back.

13

14 **TAC Member Round Table**

- 15 • **Waterbury**-Mike Hedges advised members to avoid the Waterbury Interstate ramps that
16 evening because the southbound ramps were closed for paving.
- 17 • **Plainfield**-Chair Bob Atchinson reported on a September 9 information meeting
18 concerning alternatives for the Brook Road/East Hill Road area.

19 Approximately four proposals were discussed, ranging from repairing Brook Road
20 through its connection with East Hill Road and continuing toward Route 302 to
21 alternative routes.

22 An environmental report was expected on September 30 and would provide additional
23 information for the community.

24 Atchinson noted that the Plainfield Select Board is considering the alternatives and
25 seeking public input. A future vote may be associated with financing the selected
26 approach.

27 **Adjourn**

28 A motion to adjourn was made by **Don La Haye** and seconded by **Lee Cattaneo**.

29 The Chair noted that, because there was no quorum, the Committee could not formally vote, but
30 the members agreed to conclude the meeting.

1 **Meeting adjourned.**

2

3 Respectfully submitted by:

4 Keith Cubbon