DATE: Tuesday, February 2, 2016
TIME: 9:00 a.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Office, 110 West Canal St. Winooski

DELIBERATIVE AGENDA:

1. Action on Consent Agenda 9:00 - 9:05
   N/A this month.

2. Minutes of January 5, 2016 – (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. CCRPC Sidewalk Program Changes (Information Item) 9:15 – 9:45
   Sue Scribner of VTrans will join us via phone to report on proposed changes to VTrans Bike Ped programs and the future of our Sidewalk grant program. See attached “What’s New for the Bicycle and Pedestrian Program…” from VTrans.

5. Way to Go! Update (Information Item) 9:45 – 10:00
   A new consultant has been chosen to continue this long standing CCRPC program that encourages sustainable transportation over a two week period in September. Staff will give an update.

6. Burlington North Avenue Corridor Update (Information Item) 10:00 – 10:20
   This CCRPC scoping project was competed in 2014 and the City has been moving toward implementation of its recommendations. Staff will give a status report.

7. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports (Information Item) 10:20 – 10:25
   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.

8. CCRPC January Board Meeting Report (Information Item) 10:25 – 10:30
   The Board met on January 20th and held a public forum on the FY17 UPWP, and approved the regional ITS Plan, district leveling priorities and the mid-year UPWP budget adjustment.

9. Chairman’s/Members’ Items (Information Item) 10:30 – 10:35

CONSENT AGENDA – N/A this month.

Next Meeting: Wednesday, March 2, 2016
Project list:

- TDM/TCSP Project coordination
- Electric vehicle infrastructure planning – Phase III (engage stakeholders re. Charging Station installation including equipment, locations, permitting & potential funding sources)
- Title VI program participation and Public Participation Plan implementation
- Participation in working groups for the Vermont Highway Safety Alliance
- Participation on the State’s Transportation Proportional Share Implementation (Act 145)
- Participation in the State’s Rail Council
- Participation in the VTrans Safe Routes to School Task Force
- Coordination with United Way on the Neighbor Rides Program
- Regional Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Plan - Approved
- Adaptive Signal Control Planning – Burlington/South Burlington
- Advanced Traffic Monitoring System through FHWA AID grant
- Expanded National Highway System (NHS) & Functional Class Review and Update
- LPM services for Underhill sidewalk construction on VT 15
- LPM services for Shelburne sidewalk construction on US 7
- LPM services for South Burlington sidewalk construction on VT 116
- LPM services for Milton Railroad St rail crossing bike/ped improvements scoping
- LPM services for Huntington Lower Village Bike/Ped scoping
- LPM services for Jericho Four Corners/Lee River Road Bike/Ped scoping
- Burlington Residential Parking Study
- Burlington Walk Bike Plan technical committee
- Charlotte Park and Ride Study
- South Burlington Sidewalk/Path Gaps Scoping
- Planning for 2016 Walk Bike Summit
- Regional Active Transportation Plan
- Burlington Winooski Avenue Corridor Study
- Colchester Ave/Riverside Ave/Barrett St Intersection Scoping (Burlington)
- US 7 Southern Gateway Scoping (Shelburne)
- Williston Blair Park Pedestrian Facility Scoping Study
- Bolton Traffic Speed control ordinance
- Winooski Transportation Master Plan
- Winooski River Bridge Railling Assessment
- North Ave Pilot Study (Burlington)
- Railyard Enterprise Scoping/PEL Project (Burlington)
- planBTV South End Master Plan (Burlington)
- Allen Martin/VT 15 Intersection Scoping Study (Essex)
- Milton US 7 Corridor Study – Draft Final Report
- Transportation Hazard Mitigation Planning
- Transportation & Land Use Planning with Winooski and Shelburne
- Burlington Economic and Technical Analysis of Key Employee Commute TDM Strategies
- Winooski River Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge
- So. Burlington Williston Road Area Transportation and Land Use Network Analysis
- So. Burlington Chamberlin Neighborhood & Airport Area Transportation and Land Use Master Plan
- Essex Junction Train Station Access and Circulation Study
1. **Consent Agenda**

N/A this month.

2. **Approval of Minutes**

A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 1, 2015 PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

3. **Public Comments**

There were none.

4. **ITS Plan Approval/Recommendation to Board**

Sai introduced this by providing some background and history on ITS planning in the region and the hiring of Cambridge Systematics (CS) to do the latest update. He then turned it over to Dan Krechmer of CS to provide further detail. Dan began with an overview of the topics he’d be covering then went into a formal definition of what ITS is. More simply ITS is using technology to provide rapid response for users and the professionals who run the transportation system. Specific areas of applications include highway management, emergency services, traveler information, traffic control, traffic control centers and automatic vehicle location (AVL). ITS is established around a National Architecture that state, regional and local plans must follow in order to assure interoperability and to be eligible to receive federal funds for implementation. Having a regional ITS plan that follows the National Architecture has other benefits as well, including:

- The opportunity to identify regional system gaps and needs
- Opportunity to expand stakeholder outreach
- Promotes discussion of new technologies and how they can meet regional gaps and needs
- Identifies specific operational/ITS projects and strategies
- Encourages improved data and information sharing among agencies
• Identifies specific links between systems that will benefit transportation system users

Dan then went into some detail on the Plan process, addressing gaps and needs, highway and arterial projects, transit projects and other project types that include other modes, data management, weather related and vanguard projects. He then described the strategic deployment plan that identifies which projects should be short, medium or long term and the estimated costs of each strategy over time. Next steps will include:

• Incorporating short-term, high priority projects into the TIP
• Consider incorporation of Operational/ITS strategies into capital projects
  ♦ View ITS Plan project list as “toolbox” of strategies
  ♦ Analytical tools for benefit/cost evaluation
  ♦ When systems projects are being implemented refer to architecture for agency linkages and information exchanges
• Provide input to VTrans ITS Architecture and Plan
• Incorporate ITS/Operations into Long Range Plan – use ITS plan as starting point
• Update ITS architecture when new projects are implemented

Following brief discussion, BRUCE HOAR MADE AMOTION THAT THE TAC RECOMMEND ACCEPTANCE OF THE REGIONAL ITS PLAN TO THE CCRPC BOARD. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY ROGER HUNT AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. District Leveling Priorities
Christine reminded the TAC that this was an annual request from VTrans to the Regional Planning Commissions to help develop project priorities for pavement overlay designed to last until funds become available for a more comprehensive project. These projects are designed to allow quick improvements to be made to road surfaces at a lower cost per mile allowing more miles to be repaired. VTrans has identified only two projects in Chittenden County for this program paid for with State, not Federal, funds (although Chris Jolly reported that some federal funding would support this program). The two projects are on VT RT 2A St. George/Williston and VT RT 15 Westford/Cambridge. Discussion included;

• The possibility of new striping to narrow lane width to benefit bicyclists,
• if VTrans has performed a cost benefit of this program to document its efficiency, and
• how funding for this program has varied over time.

Following the discussion, ROBIN PIERCE MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ROGER HUNT, TO APPROVE THE DISTRICT LEVELING LIST OF PROJECTS AND FORWARD IT TO VTRANS.

6. VTrans Street Tree Policy
Amy presented this recently adopted VTrans policy and noted that she had previously reported to the TAC on a draft policy a little over a year ago. This project involved both an internal VTrans working group and an external group of other state agencies and environmental organizations. She then described the issues behind why a policy was needed and the various considerations VTrans maintenance staff is confronted with related to trees. These considerations include:

• Safety & Liability concerns
• Leaf litter and debris on highway
• Overhead hazards – particularly during storm events e.g. wind, ice and snow
• Damaged limbs from maintenance vehicles, large trucks and oversize vehicles
• Tree Shadows – icing during winter months
• Funding Pressures: Maintenance is 100% State funds

When Amy presented last year about the draft policy VTrans was only considering one tier but has now split this into a three tiered policy. Under these three municipal categories…

1. Take State Highway over as a Class I Town Highway (VTrans Preference)
2. Have or seek Downtown, Village Center, Growth Center or New Town Center Designation and meet established criteria.

3. If no designation or Designated but unable/unwilling to meet established criteria, VTrans will allow different levels of municipal control over street trees in the public right-of-way. There was some discussion under tier #1 where a municipality takes over highway control by a Class 1 designation. VTrans is considering a higher payment to towns that the current $11,200 per mile highway aid for Class 1 roadways and VTrans is working on a white paper specific to the Class 1 program. Amy will present that paper at a future TAC meeting.

7. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports
Peter directed TAC members to the list on the back of the agenda page.

8. CCRPC December Board Meeting Report
Charlie reported that in lieu of a December Board meeting the CCRPC hosted a legislative breakfast for House and Senate representatives. He mentioned that two of the topics focused on were shared services and water quality.

9. Chairman’s/Members’ Items
There were none.

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter Keating
WHAT’S NEW FOR THE BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PROGRAM IN SFY17?

Following a 7-year hiatus which began in SFY05, the Agency began funding new projects within the Bicycle & Pedestrian (B/P) Program through a competitive grant program in SFY12. In SFY12, approximately $2,000,000 in federal funds were allocated for new projects; in subsequent years that amount has risen to $4,000,000.

Funding Ratios

The Agency currently has two programs that fund bicycle and pedestrian improvements, the Transportation Alternatives (TA) Program and the B/P Program. Parameters for the TA Program are in state statute (Title 19, Chapter 1 §38); state statute requires that grant recipients pay the full matching share required for the projects. Furthermore, the Transportation Alternatives Grant Committee decided that scoping studies would be funded at the ratio of 50% federal funds and 50% local funds. The SFY17 budget proposal is predicated on projects within the B/P Program being funded at the same ratio as the TA Program. Furthermore, it proposes that funding for state funded projects be in line with transportation projects funded through the Downtown Program administered by the Agency of Commerce and Community Development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Ratio in SFY16 Program</th>
<th>Funding Ratio in SFY17 Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scoping Studies</td>
<td>90% Fed/ State + 10% Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Funded Construction Projects</td>
<td>80% State + 20% Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federally Funded Construction Projects</td>
<td>90% Fed/ State + 10% Local</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New and/ or Increased Funding Levels

New Awards for State Aid Construction Projects: SFY16 was the first year that the state proposed a line item for new awards for state aid construction projects – targeted for small scale improvements. The amount in SFY16 was $150,000; the proposal in SFY17 increasing this to $300,000 which will leverage $300,000 in local funds for a $600,000 investment in state only funded projects. Please see section above for pro rata share changes.

Local Motion ST BP16( ) – Ferry Operation: The Island Line Trail utilizes a bike ferry to make the connection across the Lake Champlain causeway from Colchester to South Hero. Local Motion stepped up to the plate and secured funding, and took all responsibility for the ferry and necessary improvements for its operation. In addition to purchase of a ferry, their efforts included improvements to the ramps and docks, turnarounds on each side of the cut, installation of viewing/ fishing platforms, repairs to the causeway, and installation of wave attenuators to ensure safe and dependable operation of the ferry. They also agreed to providing the day to day operational responsibilities of this ferry. The $60,000 included in the SFY17 budget is approximately ½ of the cost to operate the ferry. VTrans recognizes the regional importance of this facility and thus would like to support Local Motion in sharing the cost of operation. VTrans supports Local Motion recognizing Local Motion’s long history of supporting efforts in the region and the setbacks they have faced over the years from natural events. By financially supporting Local Motion, it will also allow them to focus their efforts on enhancing their membership and finances to ensure they can continue supporting this regional bike ferry connection for the foreseeable future.

Statewide ST BP16( ) – VYCC: VTrans has supported the operations of the Vermont Youth Conservation Corps (VYCC) for many years through federal transportation enhancement (TE) funding. Changes in the eligibility of the program and the difficulties meeting all the federal requirements have put this in jeopardy. The SFY17 budget proposal includes $100,000 of state funds, approximately one-half of the former commitment of TE funds, so that this program can continue through a three-way partnership of VTrans, VYCC and the Department of Forest Parks & Recreation.

Discontinued Funding

Chittenden County STP SDWK( ) – The SFY17 proposal does not include new projects funded through this line item as Chittenden County project needs can be funded through the TA and B/P competitive grant programs. This funding had been at 80% Federal and 20% Local with annual award amounts of $300,000 in federal funds.
CCRPC Sidewalk Grant Program

Program History
After many years of awarding bicycle and pedestrian grants, the VTrans Bicycle and Pedestrian Program took a long hiatus, starting in SFY05. The CCRPC Sidewalk Grant Program was committed to by then Secretary McDonald shortly after the Circumferential Highway was stopped from going to construction through legal measures; the program was agreed to in order to meet some of the area needs. Funding for the program was first shown in the Capital Program in the SFY06 budget proposal. The only other funding opportunity for these types of projects at that time was the Transportation Enhancement Program (TE).

Since SFY12 VTrans has had an annual solicitation for new bicycle and pedestrian related projects through the TE Program and subsequently the Transportation Alternatives (TA) Program. In SFY12, approximately $2,000,000 in federal funds were allocated for new projects; in subsequent years that amount has risen to $4,000,000.

Statewide resources available to CCRPC municipalities for bike/ped projects include the following; these figures represent the total resources awarded, including any federal, state, and local share (see prior funding ratios for details):

- $ 5.0 M – Federally Funded Bike/Ped Program
- $ 1.4 M – *Transportation Alternatives Program
- $ 850 K – *Vermont Downtown Transportation Program
- $ 600 K – State Funded Bike/Ped Program

Moving Forward
In the SFY17 budget VTrans is recommending the discontinuance of funding for the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC) Sidewalk Grant Program. It is the position of the Agency that there are adequate resources available to the communities of Chittenden County through the statewide bicycle and pedestrian funding programs. Due to the federal planning funding provided to the CCRPC as a federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization, communities of the region have unique access to project planning resources and technical assistance to plan for projects and develop highly competitive grant applications. Many communities in the region have received state designations as Growth Centers, Downtowns, Neighborhood Development Areas and Village Centers. The density of residents and businesses and the ubiquitous accessibility to transit in the region all contribute to the high level of bike/ped trip generation. The chart below summarizes the success of the region historically in obtaining grant awards through the statewide program.

In SFY16 the Agency shifted its focus to determining how to more expeditiously advance sidewalk and pedestrian infrastructure projects by creating a state funded only program. VTrans sees this program as a better mechanism to advance the implementation of projects which had previously been awarded through the federally funded CCRPC Sidewalk Grant Program. By using state only funds, more linear feet of sidewalk are able to be constructed and the permitting and administrative burden to the state and communities is greatly reduced. In SFY17 VTrans is proposing a doubling of the state resources available for this program which would total $300,000 and which will leverage $300,000 in local funds for a $600,000 investment in state only funded projects.

VTrans is committed to bringing resources to communities to enhance their bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure needs. This proposal advances the magnitude of those investments and provides equitable access on a statewide basis while still recognizing through the funding criteria that there are areas of the
state in which these resources are more critically needed. The evolution of these programs will continue to support the mobility and safety needs of Vermonters.

Below is a summary of funding received for bicycle and pedestrian projects within Chittenden County for the last 5 years, excluding funding through the CCRPC Sidewalk Grant Program:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>NO OF PROJ</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>NO OF PROJ</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>% TOTAL</th>
<th>NO OF PROJ</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$2,745,432.83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$208,805.83</td>
<td>7.61%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$148,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$3,355,000.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$469,000.00</td>
<td>13.98%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$530,095.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$2,076,593.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$750,000.00</td>
<td>36.12%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$678,027.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$2,142,250.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$203,000.00</td>
<td>9.48%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$1,998,205.60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1,154,531.60</td>
<td>57.78%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$300,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIKE-PED</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$2,245,500.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$342,000.00</td>
<td>15.23%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,397,165.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$4,200,660.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$1,381,950.00</td>
<td>32.90%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$4,146,570.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$782,100.00</td>
<td>18.86%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$770,484.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$4,579,500.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$1,161,200.00</td>
<td>25.36%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,481,603.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2011-2015</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>$27,489,711.43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$6,452,587.43</td>
<td>23.47%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$5,305,374.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1,2 INLCUDES "SCOPING" & "SMALL SCALE" PROJECTS, NON BIKE-PED TE & TA PROJECTS HAVE BEEN REMOVED.
2 FEDERAL AND STATE FUNDS, DOES NOT INCLUDE "LOCAL" SHARE.
3 A 2014 MILTON SCOPING REQUEST ($10,000) WAS FUNDED THROUGH THE CCMPO AND WITHDRAWN FROM THE PROGRAM.

In addition to there being more funding opportunities now than in SFY06, the selection criteria used in the program(s) currently favor projects within Chittenden County being funded. This is in part due to the availability of professional staff, scoping assistance through the CCRPC, high volume of pedestrians and cyclists, etc. Projects are selected based on the following:

- Describe how the project addresses a pedestrian or bicyclist need identified in local or regional planning documents. Describe how the project contributes to a system of pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities.
- Describe how the area being studied is one which would provide access to likely generators of pedestrian and/or bicyclist activity.
- Is the project located within a Designated Downtown or Village Center recognized by the VT Department of Economic, Housing and Community Development?
- Describe how the project was budgeted.
- Please describe how the proposed project addresses unsafe conditions. Be as specific as possible and provide data/documentation in support.
- To what degree has the project advanced to date?
- Does the proposed project appear to have potentially significant permitting issues? (E.g. Act 250, stormwater, wetlands, 401 water quality, Section 4f) If so, how have those issues been considered?
- Does the proposed project require complex right of way acquisition? Right of way includes any temporary easements that might be needed to construct the project.
- Does the proposed project appear to include complex design issues (e.g. extensive retaining walls, bridges, railroad involvement?) If so, how have those issues been addressed?
- Is the application complete, well-written, internally consistent, and realistic; does it describe a single, clearly defined project.

01/26/16