

Chittenden County Park and Ride Facility Prioritization

Adopted by CCMPO Board February 18, 2004



***Chittenden County
Metropolitan Planning
Organization***

*Communities working together
to meet Chittenden County's
transportation needs*



**Chittenden County
Metropolitan Planning
Organization**

*30 Kimball Avenue, Suite 206
South Burlington, Vermont 05403
T 802-660-4071
F 802-660-4079
www.ccmpto.org
info@ccmpo.org*

The preparation of this document was financed jointly by the eighteen municipalities in Chittenden County and the Chittenden County Transportation Authority; the Vermont Agency of Transportation; and the United States Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, and Federal Transit Administration.

CCMPO Board

James Condos, South Burlington – Chair
Jeff McDonald, Charlotte – Vice Chair, Michael O’Brien, Winooski – Secretary-Treasurer

Gerard Mullen, Bolton
William Keogh, Burlington
Chris Conant, Colchester
Jeff Carr, Essex
John Booth, Essex Junction
Andrea Morgante, Hinesburg
Richard Moulton, Huntington
Robert Penniman, Jericho
James Manley, Milton
Virginia Clarke, Richmond

Phil Beliveau, St. George
Norman Silcox, Shelburne
Patrick Lamphere, Underhill
Tom Buckley, Westford
George Gerecke, Williston
Pat McDonald, State of Vermont
Chris Cole, CCTA (Ex-officio)
Lewis Wetzel, CCRPC (Ex-officio)
Christopher Jolly, FHWA (Ex-officio)

CCMPO Staff

Daryl Benoit, Transportation Planner
Paul Craven, Project Manager
Bernadette Ferenc, Administrative Assistant
Christine Forde, Sr. Transportation Planner

Peter Keating, Sr. Transportation Planner
William Knight, Executive Director
David Roberts, Sr. Transportation Planner
Susan Smichenko, Sr. Transportation Planner

Park and Ride Sub-committee

*Dan Bradley, Burlington
Tom Buckley, Westford
Wayne Davis, VTrans
Aaron Frank, CCTA*

*George Gerecke, Williston
Stan Hamlet, Underhill
Dennis Lutz, Essex
Bob Penniman, CATMA*

TABLE of CONTENTS

Executive Summary	2
Background	4
Prioritization Methodology	5
Description of Prioritized Tables	9
Results	10
Next Steps	19

Tables

Table 1. Facility Classification	5
Table 2. Scoring Criteria Categories	7
Table 3. Specific Scoring Criteria	7
Table 4. Intercept Facility Evaluation Spreadsheet	11
Table 5. Park and Ride Evaluation Spreadsheet	14

Figures

Figure 1. Map of Chittenden County and Adjoining Area Park and Ride Facilities	6
--	---

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report updates a 1999 Park and Ride study that grew from a 1993 report by Hamlin Engineers which identified twenty potential locations for new Park and Ride lots in Chittenden County. The purpose of this report is to prioritize an expanded list of twenty-seven locations, recommend strategies to implement priority sites, select specific facility locations for project development (scoping), and identify other ways to expand the region's Park and Ride network by combining these facilities with other transportation projects.

Facility locations are prioritized based on ten criteria that fall into the three general categories of demand, location, and readiness. Demand criteria, intended to measure potential park and ride use, account for 50% of the total possible score. Two types of facilities were identified – Intercept/Satellite lots and Park and Rides. Each category was prioritized separately. The differences between these are noted below:

Intercept/Satellite Facility – *Purpose is to provide a less expensive parking alternative to on-site locations within activity centers or the urban core area and reduce SOV use in activity centers. These facilities may capture outgoing as well as incoming activity center traffic and serve as a transfer point from car to shuttle or transit. Characteristics include an urban/activity area fringe location, high capacity, surface or structured parking, and high frequency shuttle/transit connections to activity centers. Implementation funding is likely to come from Congressional earmarks and/or public private ventures. Walk/bike access is a desirable feature.*

Park and Ride Facility – *Purpose is for car and vanpooling with potential for low frequency shuttle or transit service. It may serve multiple trip destinations. It is characterized by its suburban or rural location, a surface lot (vs. parking structure), and low to medium capacity. The private car is the dominant method of trip collection and distribution. These facilities are implemented through public funding and walk/bike access is a desirable feature.*

A Park and Ride Sub-committee of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) worked with CCMPO staff to gather location information and refine the methodology used in 1999. Additional guidance came from the TAC and CCMPO Board.

Top Scoring Intercept/Satellite Locations

1. Burlington: Lakeside Avenue and Champlain Parkway
2. South Burlington: I-89 Exit 14
3. South Burlington: US RT 7/I-189
4. Colchester: VT RT 15/Barnes Avenue

Top Scoring Park and Ride Lot Locations

1. Burlington: North Avenue
2. Williston: I-89 Exit 12
3. Colchester: I-89 Exit 17
4. Richmond: I-89 Exit 11

Recommended Actions

Of the twenty-seven sites evaluated, the Park and Ride Subcommittee and TAC recommend action steps related to fourteen. See the table below. In addition the CCMPO encourages the continued development and expansion of these facilities in areas outside the region such as, Grand Isle, St. Albans, Enosburg Falls, Waterbury, Bristol, Ferrisburgh, and Middlebury.

<i>Facility</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>
Burlington Lakeside	Intercept	Assist as needed City/Private developer led effort to construct parking structure.
South Burlington I-89 Exit 14	Intercept	Scope interchange improvements that will include a park and ride facility. Partner with VTrans, two cities, and UVM on possible solutions.
Williston I-89 Exit 12	Park & Ride	Advocate to VTrans for expedited construction.
Colchester I-89 Exit 16	Intercept	CCMPO scoping priority
Colchester VT RT 15/Barnes Rd	Intercept	Seek earmarked funds for all recommended VT RT 15 improvements as identified in the RT 15 Corridor Study
Essex VT RT 15/289	Park & Ride	CCMPO scoping priority
Essex VT RT 2A/289	Park & Ride	Work with VTrans to include this facility with construction of Circ segment G
Jericho VT RT 15 Underhill Flats	Park & Ride	CCMPO scoping priority
Colchester Heineberg Bridge/289	Park & Ride	CCMPO scoping priority
Colchester US7/Severance Rd	Park & Ride	Work with VTrans to include this facility with construction of Circ segment H
Hinesburg Village	Park & Ride	CCMPO scoping priority
So. Burlington I-89/Hinesburg Rd	Intercept	Partner with VTrans on EIS for new interchange to assure inclusion of a park and ride
So. Burlington/Shelburne – US RT 7 Corridor	TBD	Use CCMPO technical assistance program to analyze and screen potential sites in the corridor.
Richmond, I-89 Exit 11	Park & Ride	CCMPO scoping priority

BACKGROUND

This document presents a prioritized list of twenty-seven potential Park and Ride lot locations in Chittenden County. The list has been taken from several sources. First is a report completed in 1993 by Hamlin Consulting Engineers for the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission titled *Colchester, Essex, and Burlington Parking and Ride Share Studies, 1993 Project 4*. That report focused on potential sites within the Circumferential Highway corridor in Essex and Colchester. Actual sites were identified and evaluated. In some cases, conceptual designs were prepared. The study also identified other general locations throughout the County where Park and Ride lots should be considered. Although there were no specific sites identified outside of the Circumferential Highway corridor in the Hamlin study, in 1998 Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) members identified three additional specific sites at the Lakeside / Southern Connector intersection in Burlington, the VT Route 15 / River Road intersection in the Underhill Flats area of Jericho, and the US 7 / Ferry Road intersection in Charlotte. (With the construction of the railroad station parking lot in Charlotte, the Ferry Rd./RT 7 location has subsequently been removed from this update.). In addition, in 2003, four more potential sites were added at the request of the Park and Ride Subcommittee: I-89 Exit 14, VT RT 15 corridor in Colchester, the US RT 7 corridor in the area of the I-189 intersection, and the VT RT 127 intersection with the rail line in Burlington. A recent facility was also implemented in Burlington on North Avenue at the intersection with the Northern Connector ramps, and another established in Underhill Center.

The Hamlin study recommended “inner” and “outer” commuter buffers. The inner buffer would be created by placing lots along the Circumferential Highway corridor, I-89 from Exit 12 to Exit 13, I-189 and US 7 to Shelburne Village. It was envisioned that Inner buffer lots would generally be paved, have lighting, and may be served by transit. Lots in the outer buffer area were generally anticipated to be smaller, unpaved, located in or near village centers and have fewer amenities. The 1999 report retained the inner and outer Park and Ride lot system and prioritized each separately.

For this update, the Park and Ride Subcommittee decided on a new categorization – Intercept/Satellite facilities distinguished from the traditional Park and Ride lot. This distinction was based on guidance from the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) and described on the next page in **Table 1**. The two classes of facilities were evaluated separately and the results revealed on **Table 4** on page 11 and **Table 5** on page 14.

The map on page 6 identifies not only Chittenden County existing and proposed Intercept and Park and Ride facilities but those currently or planned in communities lying just outside the region. These facilities also play a role in reducing single occupant vehicle (SOV) numbers coming into the region. VTrans has ten existing or proposed lots outside Chittenden County ranging from the ten space gravel lot in Bristol to the about to be expanded (to 89 spaces) facility in St. Albans. Future facilities in Ferrisburgh, Enosburg, Grand Isle, Middlebury, an expansion of the Bristol lot, and perhaps an expanded Waterbury lot will all contribute to SOV trip reductions within our region.

FACILITY CLASSIFICATION

<i>Facility Type</i>	<i>Function</i>	<i>Characteristics</i>
Park and Ride Lot	Car and vanpooling with potential for low frequency shuttle or transit service. May serve multiple trip destinations.	Suburban or rural location, surface lot, low to medium capacity. Private car is the dominant method of trip collection and distribution. Implemented through public funding. Walk and bike access is desirable
Intercept or Satellite Facility	Provide a less expensive parking alternative to on-site locations within activity centers or the urban core area. Reduce SOV use in activity centers. May capture outgoing as well as incoming activity center traffic. Transfer point from car to shuttle or transit.	Urban/activity area fringe location, high capacity, surface or structured parking. High frequency shuttle/transit connections to activity centers. Funding from Congressional earmarks and/or public private ventures. Walk and bike access is desirable.

Table 1 Source: Adapted from *Guide for Park and Ride Facilities*, draft August 2003, AASHTO

While this report updates the 1999 study, it also evaluates the proposed facilities in a slightly different way than its predecessor. This update modified some criteria while eliminating others. For example the Park and Ride Subcommittee felt this update needed a stronger emphasis on transit service availability so that criterion is now weighted more heavily. Two previous criteria – recreational use, and other facilities in the corridor - were removed due to difficulties in making clear determinations for each. At the suggestion of the CCMPO Board this analysis was revised again in late 2003 to reduce by half the weight accorded average annual daily traffic (AADT).

While identifying and prioritizing facility locations it is important to consider the long range transportation planning context. The CCMPO has recently approved elements of its Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) that bear on the location of park and rides. Strategies, projects and programs related to Transportation Demand Management (TDM), Transportation Systems Management (TSM), transit, bike/pedestrian facilities, and the full Circumferential Highway were endorsed by the CCMPO, and complement the effectiveness of park and ride lots. Therefore, in addition to past reports and other evaluation criteria, the draft MTP became an integral part in determining their best potential locations. The evaluation criteria in this report closely reflect draft MTP guidance as well.

PRIORITIZATION METHOD

Potential Park and Ride lot locations have been selected and prioritized based on specific criteria that fall under the categories of potential demand, location, and readiness. **Table 2** shows the total maximum possible score under each category. A maximum total of 25 points is possible for any location. As indicated below, the potential demand category has the most influence on the score. **Table 3** lists the maximum points possible by specific

criteria. AADT of adjacent roads and transit availability or potential have the most influence on the total score. Managing transportation demand in those corridors moving the most vehicles closely follows the recommended guidance of the draft MTP which places a significant emphasis on TDM strategies. Specific criteria are described further below.

<i>Category</i>	<i>Max Possible Points</i>	<i>Share of Score</i>
Demand	12	49%
Location	7	28%
Readiness	6	24%
Total	25	100%

Table 2. Scoring Criteria Categories

<i>Category</i>	<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Max Point</i>	
Potential Demand	AADT	5	20%
	Transit	5	20%
	Bike/Ped	2	8%
Location	Activity Center	2	8%
	Inter/Art Access	3	12%
	Congestion	1	4%
	Services	1	4%
Readiness	Site Identified	3	12%
	ROW Required	3	12%

Table 3. Specific Scoring Criteria

Demand Criteria

The intent of this category is to identify and rank factors that would affect the use of a Park and Ride lot.

AADT

Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) of adjacent roadways near proposed Park and Ride lot locations ranges from 1,600 to 87,000 vehicles per day. Points from 1 to 5 are assigned in proportion to this range. The low AADT sites receive 1 point, the high sites up to 5.

Transit Connections

Along with traffic volumes, the availability of current or anticipated future connections to transit services, were considered equally important. The draft MTP, CCTA's 2003 *Short Range Transit Plan* (SRTP), and existing transit services were used to evaluate the level of transit service connection, when a connection might take place, and whether that connection could be to rail and/or bus. The table below illustrates how up to five points were distributed.

<i>Service</i>	<i>Score</i>
Existing high frequency bus with rail transit potential	5
Existing high frequency bus	4
Existing low level of bus service	3
Potential for future bus service in near to mid term	2
Future bus transit in long term and likely at low frequency	1

Transit Scoring

Bicycle Pedestrian Connections

The table below shows the point assignment for bicycle/pedestrian values. Bike and pedestrian connections are based on current availability of these facilities to the proposed park and ride site, and/or when these facilities are planned for implementation. The CCMPO 2003 *Regional Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan Update* and local plans form the basis for this assessment.

<i>Connection</i>	<i>Score</i>
Existing or available in near term	2
Likely only in long term	1

Bike / Ped Scoring

Location Criteria

Location criteria are characteristics of the general area that may benefit or detract from a Park and Ride lot.

Activity Center

Placing Park and Ride lots within activity centers combines the benefits of reducing auto travel with supporting the local economy and encouraging development within growth areas. Vehicle trips may be further reduced because other activities such as shopping are nearby. If a proposed location is less than ½ mile from a growth area, it receives two points.

<i>Value</i>	<i>Score</i>
Less than 0.5 miles	2
More than 0.5 miles	0

Distance to Activity Center

Accessibility to the Interstate or a Principal Arterial

The closer a Park and Ride lot is to either the interstate or a principal arterial, the more convenient it will be for people to find, access and meet.

<i>Value</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Score</i>
High	At an interstate exit or on a principle arterial	3
Moderate	Just off a principal arterial	2
Low	Not on or near a principal arterial	1

Interstate / Principal Arterial Scores

Congestion

The more congested a location is, the more difficult the Park and Ride lot is to access. Therefore, areas with low or moderate levels of congestion are awarded a single point. Highly congested sites receive no points.

<i>Value</i>	<i>Score</i>
High	0
Moderate	1
Low	1

Congestion Scores

Services

This criterion allows points to be assigned to areas with a minimal amount of services, such as a convenience store or gas station, nearby.

<i>Value</i>	<i>Score</i>
None	0
Yes	1

Service Score

Readiness Criteria

The intent of the readiness criteria is to award Park and Ride lot locations that could be implemented within a reasonable amount of time.

Has and Actual Site(s) been Identified?

<i>Value</i>	<i>Score</i>
No	0
Yes	3

Site Identification Score

Is it necessary to purchase Right of Way?

<i>Value</i>	<i>Score</i>
No	3
Yes	0

ROW Score

DESCRIPTION OF PRIORITIZED TABLES

Table 4 on page 11 provides descriptions, location information and the evaluation scoring for each of the seven Intercept Facilities. Note that these are evaluated separately from park and ride lots. Where identified, the number of spaces required was estimated by developing a relationship between Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) and parking spaces at existing VAOT Park and Ride lots, or where a specific number was cited in a report – for example the Fanny Allen Multimodal facility number from the RT 15 Corridor study.

While five of the facilities described below are recommended to advance, two should move into scoping by the CCMPO or VTrans. Scoping, or project definition, is a process that defines a transportation problem, develops alternatives to address the problem, analyzes those alternatives then presents them to the affected community. The community, usually the legislative body, then selects the preferred alternative and that alternative is further developed. In this process any fatal flaws are identified and the scoping modified. All environmental constraints are identified as well. Prior to moving a scoping project into design/engineering and eventual construction, VTrans assemble a Project Development Team which reviews and approves the scoping report. One approved, the project can then start the implementation phase.

RESULTS

Top Rated Intercept/Satellite Facility Locations

Of these seven locations, the Burlington Lakeside facility clearly stands out given its high demand location, potential for connections to other modes, and its proximity to services

and employment sites (see **Table 4**). The other proposed facilities trail this considerably in priority ranking.

Burlington Lakeside

This area is already in use to run CCTA's PARC shuttles and services to CATMA institutions. With its location just off the next leg of the Champlain Parkway, access will be improved in the future. This facility, which could be expanded into a parking structure, has already shown it can provide some of the parking capacity necessitated by the tight parking conditions/requirements of downtown and the Hill institutions.

Expansion here will be in partnership with the private developer, the city, CCTA and CATMA and will likely seek a congressional earmark to construct. The city sees this facility as an auto intercept site reducing the demands on the Central Business District's heavily used transportation and parking infrastructure.

RECOMMENDATION: Assist the partners as needed to advance the project, but is not at this time a CCMPO scoping priority.

South Burlington I-89 Exit 14

This location lies at the point of highest AADT in the region. It has potential to serve bus transit as well as become a shuttle terminal for downtown Burlington, the Hill institutions, Burlington International Airport and other South Burlington commercial and retail businesses. Its potential high use in a development constrained area will likely mean a parking structure rather than a surface lot. Direct access to the site from I-89 southbound could help US RT 2 congestion. There are possible public private partnership opportunities to build at this site; especially in light of possible UVM development plans. Like the Lakeside facility, Burlington would utilize this site to intercept cars with a Hill or Downtown destination thereby lessening demand on city streets and parking facilities.

RECOMMENDATION: Exit 14 improvements will be the subject of VTrans/CCMPO scoping in FY04. This park and ride should become a required element in that scoping effort.

South Burlington South of the US 7/I-189 Intersection

With a fairly long gap between the Shelburne and Burlington Lakeside facilities in the US RT 7 corridor, it seemed that another facility somewhere in the vicinity of I-189 and US RT 7 was in order. With redevelopment occurring in the area of the old Kmart Plaza, this general area appeared a good place to locate another facility. High AADT combined with available transit and possibly even rail, lying just outside Burlington suggests high relative usage. However, city support is tepid and it may be too close (1.2 miles) to the Burlington Lakeside facility to be fully effective.

RECOMMENDATION: No action specific to this site pending an analysis of the operations at Lakeside Avenue in Burlington when that facility is finished. However, given the high demands in this corridor, refine a location analysis to determine the optimal site for a future facility location. The CCMPO should undertake this as a technical assistance task.

Colchester I-89 Exit 16

This is a high volume arterial/Interstate interchange location with potential high use. A future commuter transit service link is planned by CCTA. There is currently very limited bicycle and pedestrian access, though the town is studying ways to improve the bike/pedestrian environment. Though designated an intercept/satellite facility that may in the future necessitate of parking structure, this site should start as a surface lot and evolve as demand dictates.

RECOMMENDATION: This site should become the top intercept facility scoping priority for the CCMPO.

Colchester VT RT 15/Barnes Road Multimodal Facility

The VT RT 15 Corridor Study identified this site as an intercept lot for the major employers closer into the Burlington urbanized area. The site lies on a relatively high frequency CCTA route and has potential access to the rail line. A large parking structure is under consideration here. Implementation of this facility will occur in conjunction with other VT RT 15 Corridor Study recommendations and likely require a congressional earmark to fund.

RECOMMENDATION: Await special funding (congressional earmark) to implement along with other corridor improvements.

Burlington Northern Connector/Railroad Underpass Area

A logical capture point before traffic enters the densely populated Old North End. There could also be a link to a soon to be constructed bike path and future rail service. There is also potential for shuttle services to downtown and Hill institutions. A site here could pose significant construction obstacles given the rail/road grade differences and wetland constraints however and its close proximity to the Burlington CBD (less than one mile) may limit its attractiveness.

RECOMMENDATION: This is not a CCMPO scoping priority at this time.

South Burlington VT RT 116 at I-89

Good location to run shuttles to the Airport, downtown/Hill, and other areas. It becomes a more important site (and scores much higher) when a planned interchange with I-89 is built and the AADT rises to nearly 40,000. VTrans will soon undertake an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed interchange and VTrans and the city have agreed that the EIS will include construction of a park and ride here.

RECOMMENDATION: Monitor EIS process to assure inclusion of a park and ride.

Top Rated Park & Ride Lot Locations

Table 5 on page 14 shows the evaluation of the remaining twenty Park and Ride facilities. Four locations, all existing or soon to go to construction, stand out from the others:

1. Burlington: North Avenue
2. Williston: I-89 Exit 12
3. Colchester: I-89 Exit 17
4. Richmond: I-89 Exit 11

Burlington North Ave. Elks Club

A small lot exists on site. It serves as minor intercept facility for downtown and Hill institutions.

RECOMMENDATION: Maintain as is. The city has no interest or plans to expand this facility. The high potential for facilities in this corridor however could be at least partly served by the proposed lot on the Colchester side of the Heineberg Bridge. That project should be advanced through scoping.

Williston I-89 Exit 12

The facility here was removed several years ago. A new site was selected south of Maple Tree Place with space for 180 vehicles. This site has CCTA commuter service potential in the future but may have access limitations to VT RT2A. The new facility should be under design in the near future and will likely be the next one constructed in Chittenden County. It has been, and remains, on the CCMPO's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

RECOMMENDATION: Continue advocating for the advancement of the project with VTrans.

Colchester I-89 Exit 17

A new 100 space facility on US RT 7 north of the interchange, just at the Milton town line, recently opened at the site of the VTrans District garage. This replaces the small gravel lot at the Chimney Corners intersection.

RECOMMENDATION: Monitor use and encourage future transit links.

Richmond I-89 Exit 11

This 105 space lot was completed several years ago. Currently it is the state's largest park and ride and features the highest levels of park and ride amenities – shelter, lights, phone, etc. The lot is heavily used and often at capacity throughout the week. The CCTA's Link Express commuter route between Burlington and Montpelier serves this facility. Site constraints and liability issues unfortunately limit expansion possibilities in the immediate vicinity. Expectations are that the Williston I-89 Exit 12 facility will relieve pressures here.

RECOMMENDATION: Monitor facility use before and after construction of the Williston I-89 Exit 12 site. Scoping an expansion of this facility should become a CCMPO priority.

Other Priorities and Recommendations

Essex Lang Farm Area, VT RT 15/289 Intersection

The vicinity of the Lang Farm features an intersection of two major routes (15 and 289) and is the municipality's designated growth area. This is a logical site for IBM as well as traffic headed into Greater Burlington from points to the northeast. Site is already served by CCTA and has plans for improved bike/pedestrian links. There is the possibility of sharing commercial parking spaces or working with the private developers in this area for joint use of potential facilities.

RECOMMENDATION: Along with five other park and rides, this should become a CCMPO priority for scoping.

Essex VT RT 2A/289 Intersection

A cleared site with significant capacity is already available. There is potential for a rail link and this site could serve as an intercept/satellite location for IBM. This facility should be constructed in conjunction with Circumferential Highway segments west from here.

RECOMMENDATION: Work with VTrans to assure Circ Segment G construction includes construction of this park and ride.

Jericho VT RT 15 Underhill Flats Area

Good rural site where Underhill, Jericho, and Lamoille County travelers in the region come together. Site would be in a designated growth area and will feature future bike/pedestrian links. Not likely to see the level of use of the facilities closer to the major urbanized areas so should therefore be kept small. There is a possible opportunity to coordinate with local efforts to purchase land for recreational uses. The site location needs to carefully consider potential congestion effects from nearby uses especially the two schools.

RECOMMENDATION: Along with sites in Richmond, Hinesburg, Essex, and Colchester, this site should become a CCMPO scoping priority.

Shelburne Village

A lengthy gap in park and ride facilities between Charlotte and Burlington, and a Village location would make a facility in this heavily trafficked corridor attractive. It will also link well with existing and planned bike and pedestrian facilities, CCTA service and potential rail. Using the existing railroad station for park and ride purposes can help gage need in this area.

RECOMMENDATION: Monitor RR station lot for existing use. Not a CCMPO scoping priority at this time.

Colchester, VT RT 127 near Heineberg Bridge

In the 1999 Park and Ride Report this site was placed ahead of I-89 Exit 16, per the request of the town of Colchester. This is a logical capture point for traffic headed into downtown Burlington, especially with completion of the Circ. Highway. This site could provide a terminal point for potential shuttle services to Downtown and Hill institutions, and falls along a proposed CCTA route extension and planned bike/pedestrian improvements.

RECOMMENDATION: Along with the Essex, Hinesburg, Richmond, and Jericho lots, this should be a CCMPO park and ride scoping priority.

Essex VT RT 15 near Allen Martin Drive

The proposed site is state owned, and lies along a planned future transit commuter route and bike/pedestrian path. Its proximity with planned lots in Underhill Flats to the east and Lang Farm to the west may limit its attractiveness however, especially if the Allen Martin connector to the Circ. Highway is not constructed. The site also lies in the Browns River flood plain. A nearby site adjacent to a convenience store/gas station is an alternative the town has considered. A condition of approving development of the store allows the town to lease the adjoining land as a park and ride.

RECOMMENDATION: This is not a CCMPO scoping priority at this time.

Essex VT RT 117/289 Intersection

Other than its location at a major intersection there are few features that suggest this facility could capture significant car or vanpoolers. It falls in the middle of a triangle of other existing or planned park and rides (Lang Farm, Exit 12, and Exit 11) that would expect to draw more heavily. The proposed site is also in a flood plain.

RECOMMENDATION: This is not a CCMPO scoping priority at this time.

Colchester US RT 7/Blakely/Severance Intersection Area

This area is planned as a new growth center in the town of Colchester thus making it a logical point to run shuttles and buses into. Its location between I-89 Exits 16 and 17 where other park and rides exist or are planned may, however, detract from its attractiveness and potential use. The site becomes more appealing when the Circ. and its interchange are constructed here.

RECOMMENDATION: This is not a CCMPO scoping priority at this time. A facility should however be built in conjunction with Circ segment H.

Charlotte Railroad Station

This facility already exists and is an obvious link to any potential restarting of rail service. Its distance to US 7 may be a detriment for north/south carpoolers however and the opening of the new Ferrisburgh facility may inhibit use from Addison County travelers.

RECOMMENDATION: Monitor the site and gage its use as a park and ride under current conditions and following the opening of the Ferrisburgh facility. No further action at this time.

Hinesburg Village

This facility features similarities to the proposed Shelburne lot. However it has 40% less traffic volume to pull cars from. Within the corridor there is currently only a small 10 car facility 11 miles to the south in Bristol. A Hinesburg lot could potentially intercept travelers from Monkton, Starksboro and Huntington, as well as Hinesburg, as they head north to activities in our region. Travelers from Charlotte and Ferrisburgh with Williston and Essex Junction destinations might also use this lot. The Town has long expressed their interest in hosting a park and ride facility.

RECOMMENDATION: Scope this proposed facility along with the other five recommended above.

Milton Village

This is a likely terminus for a future CCTA commuter route. It is a logical connection point within the Town Core Area for carpools and shuttle services. The site also links to existing and proposed bike/pedestrian facilities. With a new 100 space facility recently completed 3+ miles to the south however, this site may lose some of its attractiveness.

RECOMMENDATION: This is not a CCMPO scoping priority at this time.

Richmond Village

With the largest park and ride in VT just 2 miles down US RT2, a Village facility might be considered redundant. A Village location does provide access to services and good pedestrian links however and the potential access to future rail service.

RECOMMENDATION: This is not a CCMPO scoping priority at this time.

St George VT RT 116/2A Intersection Area

With completion of a lot at I-89 Exit 12 and future lots in Hinesburg Village and at I-89/Hinesburg Road, a lot in between near the junction of VT RTS 2A and 116 would not appear to have much of a draw. If however a Hinesburg Village site does not materialize or if the Hinesburg Road I-89 Interchange is not built, then this area should be reconsidered.

RECOMMENDATION: This is not a CCMPO scoping priority at this time.

Westford Village

Expected light use due to low traffic volumes. The Village site is most conducive to potential walk bike use however.

RECOMMENDATION: This is not a CCMPO scoping priority at this time.

Williston Redmond Road at 289 Interchange

There appears to be limited use potential here. Its highest potential use is likely as a satellite parking lot for IBM and the Taft Corners commercial area.

RECOMMENDATION: This is not a CCMPO scoping priority at this time.

NEXT STEPS

CCMPO efforts on several fronts will be needed to advance the recommended sites to design, right-of-way, and construction. The CCMPO will take the lead on stand-alone Park and Ride scoping projects – I-89 Exit 16, Essex VT RT 15/289, Jericho VT RT 15/Underhill Flats, Colchester/Heineberg Bridge, an expansion of the existing Richmond facility, and Hinesburg Village. Scoping will be identified in the MPO's Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) and all six sites should complete the scoping process over the next three years. In addition, in order to potentially advance to scoping another facility, the MPO will screen sites in the Shelburne Road corridor between Shelburne Village and I-189. This work will be performed under the MPO's technical assistance task and involve Shelburne and South Burlington

The CCMPO will play a less central role in seeing other priorities implemented. For example, the Burlington Lakeside facility is a city/private sector led effort that will likely seek special funding through Congress, while the Williston Exit 12 lot rests in the hands of VTrans after the MPO has identified this facility for years in its Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

Still other facilities will be completed in combination with related projects: Exit 14 will advance in combination with scoping interchange and access improvements (likely in partnership with others), and Hinesburg Road/I-89 as part of a new interchange about to undergo an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) by VTrans.

In order to advance two other facilities, the CCMPO will encourage VTrans to add facilities as specific elements of future Circ segments – the VT RT 2A lot when segment G proceeds and US RT 7/Severance Road facility when segment H is built.

Although rural park and ride sites rate low in this evaluation, these facilities are likely to be significantly lower in cost and easier to establish than their urban/suburban/Interstate Exit counterparts. Rural towns are encouraged to site small lots at critical locations and seek CCMPO assistance to help plan and implement such facilities.

Finally, the CCMPO encourages the continued development and expansion of facilities in areas outside the region such as, Grand Isle, St. Albans, Enosburg Falls, Waterbury, Bristol, Ferrisburgh, and Middlebury. Waterbury and St. Albans expansion projects will especially assist interregional transit services.

