DATE: **Wednesday, March 7, 2018**
TIME: 9:00 a.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Office, 110 West Canal St. Winooski

DELIBERATIVE AGENDA:

1. **Action on Consent agenda – 9:00 – 9:05**
   See attached memo for TIP amendment.

2. **Minutes of February 6, 2018 – (Action Item) 9:05 - 9:10**
   See attached.

3. **Public Comment Period (Information item) 9:10 - 9:15**
   Members of the public are invited to raise issues of interest or concern to the TAC on items not on the agenda.

4. **Transportation Survey Consultant Selection (Action Item) 9:15 – 9:25**
   We received proposals from three firms for this project. The review/evaluation committee met on March 1st. See attached memo for their recommendation.

5. **MTP Comments/Revisions and Recommendation to Board (Action Item) 9:25 – 10:00**
   The First Public Hearing MTP Draft has been revised to address comments received from various stakeholders and the public. The revised MTP Draft can be downloaded from the CCRPC ftp site [HERE](#). Staff will highlight changes and ask for TAC feedback on some comments. Also, attached for discussion is a spreadsheet of comments received on the First Public Hearing MTP Draft. Staff recommends that the TAC recommend this latest draft, with any TAC revisions, be warned for a second public hearing in May. Staff also recommends that the motion to the Board include a recommendation the Active Transportation Plan, approved by the Board last April, become an appendix to the MTP ECOS supplement.

6. **2020 Project Prioritization (Action Item) 10:00 – 10:15**
   See attached memo documenting this annual process and a staff recommendation.

7. **Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports (Information Item) 10:15 – 10:20**
   See bulleted list on the reverse for current CCRPC projects. TAC members are encouraged to ask staff for more information on the status of any of these on-going or recently completed projects.

   The Board held the first MTP public hearing and approved the safety target recommendation from the TAC agreeing to VTrans’ targets.

9. **Chairman’s/Members’ Items (Information Item) 10:25 – 10:30**

10. **Municipal Roads General Permit (MRGP) Update (Information Item) 10:30 – 11:00**
    **NOTE:** This presentation from Jim Ryan will be to a combined TAC and Clean Water Advisory Committee (CWAC)

**Next Meeting: April 3, 2018**

In accordance with provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, the CCRPC will ensure public meeting sites are accessible to all people. Requests for free interpretive or translation services, assistive devices, or other requested accommodations, should be made to Emma Vaughn, CCRPC Title VI Coordinator, at 802-846-4490 ext. *21 or evaughn@ccrpcvt.org, no later than 3 business days prior to the meeting for which services are requested.
Project list:

- Title VI program participation and Public Participation Plan implementation
- Participation in the Vermont Highway Safety Alliance
- Participation in the State’s Rail Council
- Regional Transportation Model Update
- Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Update
- Coordination with United Way on the Neighbor Rides Program
- 2018 Regional Transportation Survey
- Exit 14 Area Signal System Assessment Study (Burlington/South Burlington)
- Advanced Traffic Monitoring System through FHWA AID grant – Pilot Corridor Implementation
- Countywide NHS Review and Update
- LPM services for Underhill sidewalk construction on VT 15 – Right of Way Plans and CE
- LPM services for Hinesburg – Village South Area Sidewalk on VT 116 – Conceptual Design
- VT 117 and Skunk Hollow Road Intersection Scoping Study, Jericho
- Shelburne Road from I-189 to Prospect Pkwy Signal System Assessment Study, Burlington
- Winooski Avenue Corridor Study (Burlington)
- Amtrak Train Overnight Storage Study (Greater Burlington Area)
- Coordination with GMT on ADA, NextGEN and Elders & Disabled advisory committees
- Railyard Enterprise Supplemental Scoping of Alternative 1B (Burlington)
- Winooski River Bridge Scoping Study (Burlington/Winooski)
- South Burlington Bike Ped Gaps scoping
- Intervale Ave. Scoping (Burlington)
- Colchester Ave/Riverside Ave/Barrett St Intersection Scoping (Burlington)
- North Williston Road Scoping Study (Williston)
- Traffic calming studies for Blair Park Road, Brennon Woods/Chamberlain Lane (Williston)
- So. Burlington VT116-Kimball-Tilley Land Use and Transportation Plan
- Williston Exit 12 Transportation Improvement District (TID) Pilot Project
- Jericho Riverside Future Street Network Study
- I-89 Exit 14 Bike/Pedestrian Crossing Study (South Burlington)
- Essex Path/Sidewalk Impact Policies
- Williston Transportation Impact Fees
- Shelburne Phase 2 of Form Based Zoning to Improve Walkability (Completed)
- Overhaul of South Burlington’s Traffic Overlay District
- Update to South Burlington’s Transportation Impact Fee Ordinance
- ADA Evaluation of Pedestrian Facilities (Essex/Essex Junction)
- Malletts Bay Stormwater and Transportation Management Plan (Colchester) - Completed
- Regional Transportation Energy Planning
- Transportation Hazard Mitigation Planning
- Municipal Road General Permit (MRGP) Work
- Grants-In-Aid Coordination with Municipalities.
- VT15 Sidewalk/Path Scoping Study – Athens Drive to VT 289
- VT15 Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements Scoping Study – Ethan Allen Avenue to West Street Extension
- Winooski Main Street Revitalization Project – Streetscape Scoping
CCRPC Transportation Advisory Committee  
March 6, 2018  
Agenda Item 1: Consent Item  

**FY2018 Transportation Improvement Program Amendments**

**Issues**  
Make the following change to the FY18 TIP:

**FY19 Vermont Better Roads Grant – Federal Funding**

- Essex Road Erosion Inventory (Project OT038, Amendment FY18-11) $7,680 in federal funds was awarded to Essex.

**FY19 Vermont Better Roads Grants – State Funding**

- The following projects were awarded Better Roads Grants by VTrans. These projects do not use Federal Funds so do not need to be included in the TIP. This list is provided for information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Type of Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>CHARLOTTE</td>
<td>Lime Klin Rd</td>
<td>Stone Lined Ditch</td>
<td>$19,200</td>
<td>Bond Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>ESSEX JCT. VILLAGE</td>
<td>Juniper Ridge Rd.</td>
<td>Stone Lined Ditch</td>
<td>$11,566</td>
<td>Bond Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>HINESBURG</td>
<td>Lavigne Rd</td>
<td>Stone Lined Ditch</td>
<td>$15,408</td>
<td>Transportation Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>HUNTINGTON</td>
<td>Fielder Rd</td>
<td>Culvert - Upgrade / Stone Lined Ditch</td>
<td>$19,274</td>
<td>Transportation Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>HUNTINGTON</td>
<td>Texas Hill Rd/ Texas Hill Circle</td>
<td>Culvert - Upgrade / Stone Lined Ditch</td>
<td>$41,203</td>
<td>Bond Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>MILTON</td>
<td>Cadreact Rd</td>
<td>Stone Lined Ditch</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>Transportation Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>MILTON</td>
<td>McMullen Rd</td>
<td>Stone Lined Ditch</td>
<td>$18,360</td>
<td>Transportation Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>RICHMOND TOWN</td>
<td>Wes White Hill Rd.</td>
<td>Stone Lined Ditch</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>Transportation Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>ST. GEORGE</td>
<td>Ayer Rd.</td>
<td>Stone Lined Ditch</td>
<td>$12,537</td>
<td>Transportation Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>ST. GEORGE</td>
<td>Willow Brook Lane</td>
<td>Culvert - Upgrade</td>
<td>$12,576</td>
<td>Bond Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>UNDERHILL</td>
<td>Irish Settlement Rd.</td>
<td>Culvert - Upgrade</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>Bond Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>WESTFORD</td>
<td>Rogers Rd.</td>
<td>Stone Lined Ditch</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>Transportation Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>WESTFORD</td>
<td>Old #11</td>
<td>Culvert - Replacement / Stone Lined Ditch</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>Transportation Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>WESTFORD</td>
<td>Rubaud Rd</td>
<td>Stone Lined Ditch</td>
<td>$18,840</td>
<td>Transportation Funds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Staff Recommendation:** Recommend that the TAC approve the proposed TIP amendment.

**For more information, contact:** Christine Forde  
cforde@ccrpcvt.org or 846-4490 ext. *13
CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE - MINUTES

DATE: Tuesday, February 6, 2018
TIME: 9:00 a.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal St. Winooski, VT

Members Present
Dean Pierce, Shelburne
Matt Langham, VTrans
Richard Watts, Hinesburg
Bruce Hoar, Williston
Chris Jolly, FHWA
Robin Pierce, Essex Junction
Ashley Bishop, VTrans
Brian Bigelow, Underhill
Mary Anne Michaels, Rail
John Rauscher, Winooski
Barbara Elliot, Huntington
Amy Bell, VTrans
Dennis Lutz, Essex
Sandy Thibault, CATMA
Shelby Losier, BTV
Nicole Losch, Burlington
Justin Rabidoux, South Burlington

Staff Present
Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
Christine Forde, Senior Transportation Planner
Eleni Churchill, Transportation Project Manager
Sai Sarepalli, Transportation Planning Engineer
Bryan Davis, Senior Transportation Planner
Peter Keating, Senior Transportation Planner
Charlie Baker, Executive Director
Marshall Distel, Transportation Planner
Jason Charest, Senior Transportation Planning Engineer
Chris Dubin, Transportation Planner

Peter Keating called the meeting to order at 9:00AM and asked for a round of introductions.

1. Consent Agenda
No items this month.

2. Approval of Minutes
The January 9th minutes were approved without changes.

3. Public Comments
There were none.

4. Transportation Performance Measures and Targets
Peter introduced this topic describing its genesis in federal law and regulations going back several years.
He reported that Transportation Performance Management (TPM) has been part of Federal Law (MAP-21, 2012; FAST-ACT, 2015) where national goals were established for:

- Safety
- Infrastructure condition (pavement & bridges)
- Congestion
- System Reliability
- Freight
- Environmental Sustainability (Air Emissions)

Subsequent federal rulemaking set performance measures to the goals, identified roles and responsibilities, and set target deadlines for state DOTs and MPOs to follow. Peter noted a general rule regarding MPO target setting: CCRPC has 180 days after VTrans sets their targets to either
- Agree to support VTrans’ targets, or
- Establish their own targets
Peter described the federally established measures under each of the national goal areas and then returned to safety measures and targets because VTrans has already set their targets and the CCRPC has until February 27, 2018 to take action on them. He identified these as the state safety targets for 2018:

- 5-Year Average Fatalities
  Target: 57
- 5-Year Fatality Rate (per 100M VMT)
  Target: .83
- 5-Year Average Serious Injuries
  Target: 280
- 5-Year Average Serious Injury Rate (per 100M VMT)
  Target: 4
- 5-Year Average Non-Motorized Fatalities and Non-Motorized Serious Injuries
  Target: 39.4

Peter then went through several charts showing statewide and regional trends for each of the target categories explaining how VTrans used the historic data to identify reasonable targets. He used the regional level data to conclude that staff recommend we not establish regional level targets, but rather support VTrans statewide safety targets. The rational for this recommendation included:

- Regional data display wide fluctuations year to year
- There are no policy or financial consequences if we do or don’t
- We can revisit/reconsider in future
- We already incorporate the federal safety measures into the CCRPC ECOS Scorecard

Dennis Lutz pointed out that the more recent three-year history showed a negative trend in statewide fatalities and serious injuries and that this might be a more realistic trend to use in target setting. He felt the VTrans targets too optimistic and therefore would not support the recommendation to agree to VTrans targets. Richard Watts felt that setting targets for any level of fatalities or injuries shouldn’t be tolerated and that we should be setting targets of zero. He also did not support the staff recommendation.

Following discussion, ROBIN PIERCE MADE A MOTION THE TAC RECOMMEND THE BOARD SUPPORT VTRANS STATEWIDE SAFETY TARGETS AND NOT ESTABLISH REGIONAL TARGETS IN 2018. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY BRIAN BIGELOW AND PASSED WITH ESSEX AND HINESBURG VOTING NO AND VTRANS ABSTAINING.

5. Project Prioritization Methodology

Christine began with a briefing on how VTrans is planning to revamp its project prioritization process. VTrans is undertaking this effort for a number of reasons including:

- Existing process is 10 years old.
- Feedback from RPCs that they don’t feel their input is meaningful
- Evaluation criteria needed to be reviewed/revised
- VTrans is moving towards holistic corridor management

The process to revise this will unfold over the coming year. Christine presented proposed evaluation criteria for the new process and displayed a graphic of how the model will work for both VTrans and RPC driven projects under a variety of modes. Also included is a harmonizing process to better coordinate local and state projects over time and distance. The timeline to finish this update includes:

- Further process development and customer engagement through 2018.
- Continued communications with stakeholders in 2018 and 2019.
- Pilot this in the FY20 Capital Program.
- Make it fully operational in 2020 for FY2021 capital program

Charlie Baker noted that this new system provides an opportunity for regions/towns to get projects into the state system.

Christine then provided a briefing on the upcoming, annual, project prioritization task that all regions participate in. There will be more on this next month when the TAC will be asked to make a recommendation to the Board. Christine synopsized the project’s background in legislation, its project categories, methodology components, and scoring breakdown.
6. Annual List of Projects Receiving Federal Funds
Christine noted that this is an annually required report that identifies all projects receiving federal funding obligations in the previous year. She reported that FY17 saw the highest amount of total obligations in recent memory – over $53M. Christine went through a series on bar charts showing obligations by category and year going back to FY00 noting project highlights in selected years. She then broke down the FY17 funding by amount per use category and highlighted major projects in each category. She concluded with a bar chart that compared the approved TIP amounts to actual obligation amounts by year back to FY00.

7. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports
Peter referred members to the project list on the back side of the agenda.

8. CCRPC January Board Meeting Report
Peter noted that the Board held a forum on the FY19 UPWP, approved the FY18 UPWP mid-year budget adjustment, and warned the first public hearing for the draft MTP.

9. Chairman’s/Members’ Items
No items this month.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted, Peter Keating
Transportation Survey – Consultant Selection

Background: The CCRPC has regularly undertaken surveys of the public on their attitudes towards transportation related issues. The past three, in 2000, 2006 and 2012 have essentially asked the same questions revealing historic trends and, in some cases, a shift in attitudes. We plan to again survey the public this year, maintaining the same time span between surveys.

RFP Process: CCRPC advertised the project on December 11, 2017 and the proposal due date was January 12, 2018.

We received proposals from the following three consultant firms:
1) SMART Revenue, Stamford, CT
2) National Service Research, Fort Worth, TX
3) WBA Research, Crofton, MD

Technical proposals were evaluated and scored by the review committee (roster below). The committee met on March 1st to discuss and review technical and cost proposals. The following were involved in the proposal review and consultant recommendation process:
- Sandy Thibault, CATMA
- Dave Pelletier, VTrans
- Dean Pierce, Shelburne
- Bryan Davis, CCRPC
- Peter Keating, CCRPC
- Marshall Distel, CCRPC

Following discussion on the technical proposals, where a near consensus favorite emerged, and a subsequent review of the cost proposals, the committee concluded the following:

Staff and Review Committee Recommendation: “To approve the selection of WBA Research to undertake the 2018 regional Transportation Survey”

Information contact: Peter Keating, (802) 846-4490 ext. 14, pkeating@ccrpcvt.org
I don't see this to be the case in Vermont.
Future Land Use Map

Potential change from Underhill depending on whether zoning is adopted at Town Meeting

Internal staff comment
CCRPC Transportation Advisory Committee
March 7, 2018
Agenda Item 6: Action Item

2020 Transportation Project Prioritization and Town Highway Bridge Pre-Candidate Prioritization

Issues:

Each year the Vermont Legislature requires that projects in the Transportation Capital Program be prioritized. Specifically, they directed VTrans to develop a numerical grading system to assign a priority ranking to all paving, roadway, safety and traffic operations, state bridge, interstate bridge, and town highway bridge projects. The rating system was to consist of two separate, additive components as follows:

1. One component shall be an asset management-based factor which is objective and quantifiable and shall consider, without limitation, the following:
   - the existing safety conditions in the project area and the impact of the project on improving safety conditions;
   - the average, seasonal, peak, and nonpeak volume of traffic in the project area, including the proportion of traffic volume relative to total volume in the region, and the impact of the project on congestion and mobility conditions in the region;
   - the availability, accessibility, and usability of alternative routes;
   - the impact of the project on future maintenance and reconstruction costs.

2. The second component of the priority rating system was to consider the following factors:
   - the functional importance of the highway or bridge as a link in the local, regional, or state economy; and
   - the functional importance of the highway or bridge in the social and cultural life of the surrounding communities.

A prioritization methodology was developed as a collaborative effort between VTrans and the regional planning commissions (RPCs). VTrans provides technical input on projects to determine the first part of the project score and the RPCs provide input on the second part of the score.

VTrans Methodology Overview

Prioritization methodologies were developed for each program category listed in the Transportation Capital Program. The methodologies are summarized below.

Paving

- Pavement Condition Index – 20 points (more points are given for higher levels of pavement deterioration)
- Benefit/Cost – 60 points (output comes from a Pavement Management System software which considers the type of pavement treatment, traffic volumes and percentage of trucks)
- Regional Priority – 20 points
Bridge

- Bridge Condition – 30 points (considers the condition of components of the bridge such as the deck, superstructure and substructure)
- Remaining Life – 10 points (considers the rate at which the bridge is deteriorating)
- Functionality – 5 points (adequacy of the alignment and the width)
- Load Capacity and Use – 15 points (considers if there is a weight restriction and the traffic volumes)
- Waterway Adequacy and Scour Susceptibility – 10 points (characteristics of the waterway the bridge crosses, if applicable)
- Project Momentum – 5 points (considers right-of-way and permit issues)
- Benefit Cost Factor – 10 points (considers the benefit to the traveling public of keeping the bridge open)
- Regional Priority – 15 points

Roadway

- Highway System – 40 points (looks at highway sufficiency rating and network designation)
- Cost per vehicle mile – 20 points
- Project Momentum – 20 points (considers right-of-way and permitting issues)
- Designated Downtown project – 10 bonus points
- Regional Priority – 20 points

Traffic Operations

- Intersection Capacity – 40 points (based on level of service)
- Accident Rate – 20 points
- Cost per Intersection Volume – 20 points
- Project Momentum – 10 points (considers right-of-way and permitting issues)
- Regional Input – 20 points

CCRPC Priority Methodology

CCRPC developed a methodology for regional priority scores in 2005. The methodology is based on planning factors MPOs are required to consider in their planning process, as stated in ISTEA and reiterated in subsequent Federal legislation. The methodology scores projects in each of the following categories: Economic Vitality; Safety and Security; Accessibility, Mobility and Connectivity; Environment, Energy and Quality of Life; Preservation of Existing System; and, Efficient System Management.

The methodology uses a project scoring sheet that identifies project characteristics that result in a score of High, Medium-High, Medium, Low or No Impact for each of the six scoring criteria. Each project receives one score for each planning factor. The score is determined by finding the highest scoring project characteristic that applies to each project. Necessary information for scoring projects is derived from existing studies and data collected/processed by CCRPC, VTrans, consultants or towns. Only one score is applied to the project for each planning factor even though multiple characteristics may apply to the project.

In addition to the six scoring categories, projects receive points if the project is in the current TIP according to the following schedule:

- 10 points for construction funds in the TIP
Projects receive only one score for the TIP Status item corresponding to the highest scoring project phase even if there are multiple phases listed in the TIP for the project.

The list of projects to be scored comes from the annual Transportation Capital Program and is supplied by VTrans. The list includes all projects in the Capital Program except rail projects, aviation projects, interstate projects, bridge maintenance projects, projects funded with federal safety funds, bike/ped and Transportation Alternatives awards and projects expected to be under construction in the near future.

Preliminary project scoring sheets were sent to TAC members having projects in their towns for review and comment.

The attached table lists projects in rank order by program category, from high score to low score. Ties between projects are broken in the following way: higher functional classes are place before lower functional classes. Functional class order is: Interstate, Principal Arterial, Minor Arterial, Major Collector. If ties still remain higher traffic volumes are place before lower traffic volumes.

2019 Town Highway Bridge Pre-Candidate Prioritization

VTrans also requests that all Regional Planning Commissions prioritize up to 10 town highway bridges as pre-candidate projects. This list queues projects to be added to the VTrans Town Highway Bridge Program in the future.

CCRPC scored town highway bridges using our Project Prioritization methodology described above. The prioritization methodology was applied to the 20 worst-condition town highway bridges, as ranked by VTrans, in the county. The prioritized list is attached.

Additional Information

All transportation projects funded by VTrans, with state or federal funds, must be included in the Transportation Capital Program. This program is developed by VTrans and approve by the Vermont Legislature.

Chittenden County projects funded with Federal transportation funds must also be included in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). However, inclusion in the TIP does not replace inclusion in the Capital Program – Chittenden County projects funded with federal transportation funds must be included in the Capital Program and the TIP.

The Capital Program includes three categories of projects, Candidate projects, Development & Evaluation project and Front of the Book Projects. These project types are defined below.

- **Candidate** - A project gets on the Candidate list after it has completed the planning process. Candidate projects are not anticipated to have significant expenditures for preliminary engineering and/or right-of-way during the budget year, and funding for construction is not anticipated within a predictable time-frame.

- **Development & Evaluation** - A project moves from the Candidate list to the Development and Evaluation list when the Project manager anticipates the project will proceed to preliminary plans within 12 to 24 months. Development and Evaluation projects are anticipated to have preliminary engineering and/or right-of-way expenditures during the budget year.
Front of the Book - A project moves from the Development and Evaluation list to the front of the book when it has completed preliminary plan development. Front of the book projects are anticipated to have construction expenditures during the budget year and/or the following three years.

Staff Recommendation: Approve the 2020 Regional Project Scores and Town Highway Bridge Pre-Candidate Regional Project Scores, with changes if any, and forward to CCRPC Commission

For more information contact: Christine Forde cforde@ccrpcvt.org or 846-4490 ext. *13

Attachments:
- CCRPC Prioritized Project Lists – 2019
- CCRPC Project Scoring Sheet
### 2020 CCRPC Prioritized Project List

#### Roadway Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>CCRPC Score</th>
<th>Economic Vitality</th>
<th>Safety and Security</th>
<th>Accessibility, Mobility and Connectivity</th>
<th>Environment, Energy and Quality of Life</th>
<th>Preservation of Existing System</th>
<th>Efficient System Management</th>
<th>TIP Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US2/Industrial Avenue, Williston</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit 12 Stage 1, Williston - Shared Use Path Under I-89 and New VT2A Lane from Marshall to I-89 Ramp -- CIRC PHASE III</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susie Wilson Road Improvements, Essex - CIRC PHASE III</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prim/West Lakeshore Drive Intersection, Colchester</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Street, S. Burlington</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT2A/James Brown Drive, Williston - CIRC PHASE I</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit 12 Stage 3, Williston - Diverging Diamond Interchange -- CIRC PHASE III</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit 12 Stage 2, Williston - New Grid Streets and at grade intersection -- CIRC PHASE III</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT2A Reconstruction, Colchester - CIRC PHASE III</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT2A Culvert Rehab</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen Brook Stormwater</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit 12 Stage 4, Williston - VT2A Boulevard from grid street to US2 -- CIRC PHASE III</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT117/North Williston Road Hazard Mitigation, Essex - CIRC PHASE III</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View Road Improvements, Williston - CIRC PHASE III</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### New Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>CCRPC Score</th>
<th>Economic Vitality</th>
<th>Safety and Security</th>
<th>Accessibility, Mobility and Connectivity</th>
<th>Environment, Energy and Quality of Life</th>
<th>Preservation of Existing System</th>
<th>Efficient System Management</th>
<th>TIP Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescent Connector</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champlain Parkway, Burlington</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railyard Enterprise Project, Burlington</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit 12B EIS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Drive, S. Burlington</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2020 CCRPC Prioritized Project List

#### Traffic Operations & Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic Operations &amp; Safety</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>CCRPC Score</th>
<th>Economic Vitality</th>
<th>Safety and Security</th>
<th>Accessibility, Mobility and Connectivity</th>
<th>Environment, Energy and Quality of Life</th>
<th>Preservation of Existing System</th>
<th>Efficient System Management</th>
<th>TIP Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exit 16 Improvements, Colchester - CIRC PHASE I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>CON-1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severance Corners, Colchester - CIRC PHASE II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>CON-3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT116/CVU Road, Hinesburg</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>CON-1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelburne Road Roundabout, Burlington</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>CON-1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US7/Middle Road/Railroad Street, Milton</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>CON-3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US2/Trader Lane</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>CON-1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT2A/Industrial Avenue, Willston - CIRC PHASE III</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>ROW-1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US7/Ferry Road</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>CON-1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT15/Sand Hill, CIRC PHASE II</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>CON-3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US7/ Harbor Road/Falls Road, Shelburne</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blakely Road/Laker Lane, Colchester - CIRC PHASE III</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>CON-1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT117/North Williston Road, Essex - CIRC PHASE III</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>PE-1,2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* US7/Harbor Road/Falls Road has recently completed scoping and CCRPC seeks to have this project added to the Capital Program. The project has been scored, but not ranked because it is not currently part of the transportation program.
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#### Paving, State Bridge and Town Highway Bridge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>VT117, Essex</th>
<th>VT117, Jericho-Richmond</th>
<th>VT15, Essex-Underhill</th>
<th>VT15, Underhill-Cambridge</th>
<th>US2, Richmond-Bolton</th>
<th>Huntington Bridge 32 on Camels Hump Road (TH22) - west of Fielder Road</th>
<th>Underhill Bridge 7 on Pleasant Valley Road - near Deane Road</th>
<th>Huntington Bridge 10 on Main Road - south of Beane Road</th>
<th>Jericho Bridge 15 on Brown's Trace - near Fitzsimonds Road</th>
<th>Charlotte Bridge 31 on Dorset Street - south of Carpenter Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCRPC Score</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Vitality</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and Security</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility, Mobility and Connectivity</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment, Energy and Quality of Life</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation of Existing System</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient System Management</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIP Status</td>
<td>CON-1,2</td>
<td>CON-1,2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>CON-3,4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Efficient System Management**

**Management Rank**

**TIP Status**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCRPC Rank</th>
<th>CCRPC Score</th>
<th>VTrans Rank</th>
<th>CCRPC Planning Designation</th>
<th>Roadway Functional Class</th>
<th>Condition - Deck/ Superstructure/ Substructure (out of 10)</th>
<th>Detour Length (Miles)</th>
<th>Average Daily Traffic</th>
<th>Federal Sufficiency Rating (out of 100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHELBURNE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Major Collector</td>
<td>5/6/5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNTINGTON</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>CCRPC Village</td>
<td>Major Collector</td>
<td>6/6/7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINESBURG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>CCRPC Village</td>
<td>Major Collector</td>
<td>Culvert - 5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINESBURG</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>Major Collector</td>
<td>6/6/6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERHILL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>CCRPC Village</td>
<td>Town Road</td>
<td>6/6/7</td>
<td>No alt route</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINESBURG</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Town Road</td>
<td>6/5/8</td>
<td>No alt route</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHMOND</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Major Collector</td>
<td>7/7/5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURLINGTON</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>Town Road</td>
<td>5/7/7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNTINGTON</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Major Collector</td>
<td>8/6/6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINESBURG</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Major Collector</td>
<td>7/7/7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERHILL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>CCRPC Village</td>
<td>Major Collector</td>
<td>6/7/7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JERICHO</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Rural Minor Collector</td>
<td>6/7/6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOLTON</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Rural Minor Collector</td>
<td>6/7/7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLCHESTER</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Town Road</td>
<td>7/8/5</td>
<td>No alt route</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOLTON</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Town Road</td>
<td>7/5/7</td>
<td>No alt route</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNTINGTON</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Major Collector</td>
<td>8/8/7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JERICHO</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Major Collector</td>
<td>6/7/6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOLTON</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Town Road</td>
<td>5/6/7</td>
<td>No alt route</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JERICHO</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Town Road</td>
<td>7/6/5</td>
<td>No alt route</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNTINGTON</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Town Road</td>
<td>6/7/7</td>
<td>No alt route</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MRGP Coverage

Discharges of Stormwater (SW) from municipal roads including:

• Town highways, Classes 1-4

• SW infrastructure associated with town highways under the operational control of the municipality

Exemptions:

• **Unorganized towns and gores exempt** from MRGP permit

• **MS4 towns**- exempt from MRGP fee and permit application but MRGP standards implementation will be required in future SW Management Plans
What is **not** covered by the MRGP

• Perennial stream crossing replacements or retrofits

• Road embankment streambank or lakeshore stabilization-related to stream or wave erosion

• Standard implementation considered infeasible if the implementation of that practice will trigger another state or federal permit (except non-reporting permits such as ACOE Self-Verified)
MRGP Timeline of Deliverables (Near-Term)

- **Summer-Fall 2017**: MRGP public hearings and comments
- **July 31, 2018**: Municipalities apply for MRGP coverage (NOI) and pay fees
- **2020 - 2022**: Required implementation of priority road projects. A minimum of 15% of non-compliant segments upgraded to meet standards in 2021 and 2022
- **Starting in 2019**: Annual Reports due April 1st
- **December 31, 2020**: Initial Road Erosion Inventory and Implementation Table Due

**Draft municipal roads general permit**

**MRGP Issued**
On-going MRGP practice implementation and maintenance throughout 2023 and 2028.

December 31, 2025

All Very High Priority segments (except Class 4) upgraded.

December 31, 2028

All Class 4 Very High Priority segments upgraded.

December 31, 2036

All connected roads meet MRGP Standard. On-going practice maintenance forward.

Annual MRGP schedule updates - due April 1st.
Hydrologically-Connected Road Segments
Road Stormwater Management Plan Components

Inventory

Prioritize – Implementation Table

Implement
Road Erosion Inventories (REIs)

Separate REIs and standards for:

- Paved and gravel roads with ditches
- Paved roads with catch basins
- Class 4 roads

REI “scores” for each 328 foot segment:

- Fully Meets
- Partially Meets or
- Does Not Meet
Approximately half of connected roads already meet the MRGP Standards.
Implementation Prioritization

• Towns will submit REI results and Implementation Tables by 12/31/2020

• All “connected” roads brought up to MRGP standards no later than 12/31/2036
Very High Priority (VHP) Segments Criteria

Gravel and Paved Roads with Drainage Ditches:
• *Does Not Meet* MRGP on slopes >10%

Paved Roads with Catch Basins:
• *Does Not Meet* with outfall erosion of 3 cubic yards or more

Cubic yards = (length x width x depth)/27

Class 4 Roads:
• *Does Not Meet* MRGP (gully erosion) on slopes >10%
Very High Priority Segments
Implementation Schedule

VHP Paved and Gravel Roads with Ditches:
• Shall meet standards by 12/31/2025

VHP Class 4 roads:
• Shall meet standards by 12/31/2028

VHP Paved Roads with Catch Basins:
• Shall meet standard by 12/31/2025

(Gully erosion)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment ID</th>
<th>TH Number</th>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Change in Connectivity</th>
<th>Road Type</th>
<th>Segment Slope %</th>
<th>Date of Assessment</th>
<th>Assessor</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Assessment Reason</th>
<th>Assessment Reason Notes</th>
<th>Roadway Crown/Travel Lane</th>
<th>Roadway Crown/Travel Lane Erosion</th>
<th>Grader Berm/Windrow Assessment</th>
<th>Grader Berm/Windrow Erosion</th>
<th>Road Drainage Assessment</th>
<th>Road Erosion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VT-001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gravel-ditched</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>5/13/2017</td>
<td>John Snow</td>
<td>Initial Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fully Meets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT-002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gravel-ditched</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5/13/2017</td>
<td>John Snow</td>
<td>Initial Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partially Meets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT-003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gravel-ditched</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5/13/2017</td>
<td>John Snow</td>
<td>Initial Assessment</td>
<td>Re Assessment</td>
<td>Storm Damage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT-004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Class 4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5/13/2017</td>
<td>John Snow</td>
<td>Re Assessment</td>
<td>Storm Damage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT-005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Class 4</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>5/13/2017</td>
<td>John Snow</td>
<td>Work Done</td>
<td>Rock lined Ditches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT-006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gravel-ditched</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5/13/2017</td>
<td>John Snow</td>
<td>Work Done</td>
<td>Rock lined Ditches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT-007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paved-ditched</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5/13/2017</td>
<td>John Snow</td>
<td>Work Done</td>
<td>Rock lined Ditches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT-008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paved-ditched</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5/13/2017</td>
<td>John Snow</td>
<td>Work Done</td>
<td>Rock lined Ditches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT-009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paved-ditched</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5/13/2017</td>
<td>John Snow</td>
<td>Work Done</td>
<td>Rock lined Ditches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation Table Components

- Road Erosion Inventory (REI) results

- Connected segments *Fully Meeting, Partially Meeting, and Not Meeting* MRGP Standards - report any segment status changes

- Lists all segments upgraded to meet MRGP Standards in previous calendar year
MRGP Implementation Example

Town A. has 52 total road miles (VT average)

- 26 road miles are *hydrologically-connected* road segments
- 26 miles not considered *connected* (no BMP work needed)
- 13 *connected* road miles currently fully meet MRGP standards (maintenance of BMPs only)
- 13 remaining *connected* miles – required to be brought up to MRGP Standards before 2036
- 15% of 13 miles = 1.95 miles or 31.2 segments will be brought up to standards over a 2 year period 2021 and 2022
Annual Reports due April 1\textsuperscript{st} – starting in 2019

- Status of Road Erosion Inventory completion (2019 and 2020 reports)
- Documentation of segment upgrades during the previous calendar year
- Changes to segment compliance status
MRGP Principles

**First** – Disconnect road
Stormwater whenever possible, starting at the top of the road watershed

**Second** – Infiltrate stormwater

**Third** – Stabilize conveyances and turn out ditches
Implementation “Triggers”

Required baseline standards- no matter what existing conditions are:

- Road grading/crowning
- Grass and stone-lined ditching (based on slope) or distributed flow
- Removal of grader berm
- Lowering of shoulders
- Stable turnouts

Practices are required when moderate (rill) to severe (gully) erosion present and for new construction:

- 18” drainage culvert minimum- (Culvert sizing information for intermittent streams available)
- 15” drive culvert
- Culvert headwalls/headers
- Culvert outlet stabilization
- Class 4 roads- gully erosion present
- Catch basin outfall erosion
Types of Erosion

Rill erosion 1” to <12” deep

Gully erosion 12” plus
Seed and mulch or stone stabilization required for any work on connected roads within 5 days of disturbance (starting this field season)
New MRGP Fees?

Fees established through the 2015 Legislative Fee Bill

- $240/Administrative processing fee- due 7/31/18 twice every permit cycle (is considered a major permit amendment)

- $400/application fee- due 6/1/19 (once every permit cycle)

- $2,000/annual operating fee- due 6/1/19
MRGP Summary for Municipalities:

- **July 31, 2018**: MRGP application coverage – Notice of Intent and annual fees begin
- **April 1, 2019**: Annual Reporting begins
- **December 31, 2020**: Road Erosion Inventories and Implementation Plans due
- **2021 Field Season** (or sooner): Road upgrades begin
- **December 31, 2025** (or sooner): All *Very High Priority* segments brought up to standards, except Class 4’s
- **December 31, 2028** (or sooner): All *Very High Priority* Class 4 roads brought up to standards
- **December 31, 2036** (or sooner): all connected roads meet MRGP standards
Assistance to Towns

• Funding – *New Municipal Grant-in-Aid*

• Outreach and Technical Assistance

• Shared Equipment
Grant in Aid – FY18 Results and FY19 Funding

FY 18 GIA – Actual Funding:

- 186 participating towns – 70% participation
- $2.6 million
- Approximately 42 road miles will be brought up to the new MRGP standards by July 1, 2018.

FY 19 GIA – $2.9 million (anticipated)
VTrans and DEC Road Roundtable Trainings

Spring 2018 Roundtable Forums schedule:

• 4/26 Wallingford
• 5/3 Bellows Falls
• 5/10 Hinesburg
• 5/17 Groton
• 5/24 Wolcott
For Additional Information:
http://dec.vermont.gov/watershed/stormwater/permit-information-applications-fees/municipal-roads-program#Development of Permit

Jim Ryan
jim.ryan@vermont.gov
(802) 490-6140