

CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE - AGENDA

DATE: **Wednesday, March 8, 2017**
TIME: **9:00 a.m.**
PLACE: **CCRPC Office, 110 West Canal St. Winooski**

DELIBERATIVE AGENDA:

1. Action on Consent agenda –N/A this month, 9:00 – 9:05
2. Minutes of January 3, and February 7, 2017 – (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. Active Transportation Plan (Action Item) 9:15 – 9:30
A draft final ATP is available here: <http://www.ccrpcvt.org/our-work/our-plans/regional-bikeped-plan/>
Staff will present the major recommendations and seek a TAC recommendation to the Board to approve. See attached memo for more information.
5. Roadway Functional Class (Action Item) 9:30 – 9:50
CCRPC staff has been reviewing the region’s road classifications and has some recommendations for changes. See attached memo for more information. Staff seeks a TAC endorsement of the changes to pass along to the Board.
6. Municipal Roads General Permit Comments (Action Item) 9:50 – 10:05
Staff has compiled a list of comments regarding this draft permit – see attached. Staff seeks TAC approval and a recommendation to send to the Board.
7. Town Highway Bridge Pre-Candidate List Priorities (Action Item) 10:05 – 10:15
VTrans is again seeking RPC priorities for this bridge list. See attached memo
8. VTrans Funding Priorities (Information Item) 10:15 – 10:25
VTrans will present their FY18 project priorities.
9. MTP Fiscal Constraint (Information Item) 10:25 – 10:35
Staff presented the comprehensive MTP project list last month and asked for TAC review. More recently we’ve begun looking at the expected level of funding over the 25-year planning horizon. Staff will give a verbal update.
10. Population Forecast Update (Information Item) 10:35 - 10:45
Melanie will discuss the latest information on the forecasts presented last month.
11. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports (Information Item) 10:45 – 10:50
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.
12. CCRPC February Board Meeting Report (Information Item) 10:50 – 10:55
The Board met on February 15th and discussed/took action on the following transportation related items:
Approved major TIP amendments.
13. Chairman’s/Members’ Items (Information Item) 10:55 – 11:00

Next Meeting: Tuesday, April 4, 2017

Project list:

- Title VI program participation and Public Participation Plan implementation
- Participation in the Vermont Highway Safety Alliance's working groups
- Participation in the State's Rail Council
- Coordination with United Way on the Neighbor Rides Program
- Exit 14 Signal Scoping and Systems Engineering Analysis (Burlington/South Burlington)
- Advanced Traffic Monitoring System through FHWA AID grant – Pilot Corridor design
- Systemic Local Roads Safety (SLRS) Program
- Allen Martin/VT 15 Intersection Scoping Study (Essex)
- Countywide 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
- Regional Active Transportation Plan
- Burlington Winooski Avenue Circulation Study
- Bay Road Shelburne Bike Ped Corridor improvements study
- Coordination with GMT on ADA and Elders & Disabled advisory committees
- Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Update
- Winooski/Burlington Bridge Scoping
- Colchester Ave/Riverside Ave/Barrett St Intersection Scoping (Burlington)
- US 7 Southern Gateway Scoping (Shelburne)
- North Ave Pilot Study (Burlington)
- North Williston Road Scoping Study (Williston)
- Regional Transportation Model Update
- Winooski Transportation Master Plan (Draft Plan Completed)
- Railyard Enterprise Supplemental Scoping of Alternative 1B (Burlington)
- Transportation Hazard Mitigation Planning
- Winooski River Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge
- Essex Path/Sidewalk Impact Policies
- So. Burlington Williston Road Area Transportation and Land Use Network Analysis
- So. Burlington VT116-Kimball-Tilley Land Use and Transportation Plan
- Williston Exit 12 Transportation Improvement District (TID) Pilot Project
- Mountain View Road Scoping Study, Williston
- Alternative Transportation Crossing Study for of I-89 Exit 14, South Burlington
- Regional Transportation Energy Planning
- Shelburne Phase 2 of Form Based Zoning to Improve Walkability
- Overhaul of South Burlington's Traffic Overlay District
- Jericho Riverside Future Street Network Study
- Winooski Downtown Parking Management Study
- Update to South Burlington's Transportation Impact Fee Ordinance
- ADA Evaluation of Pedestrian Facilities in Essex/Essex Junction
- Malletts Bay Stormwater Management Plan (Colchester)

1
2 CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
3 TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE - MINUTES
4

5 DATE: Tuesday, February 7, 2017
6 TIME: 9:00 a.m.
7 PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal St. Winooski, VT
8

9 **Members Present**

10 Brian Bigelow, Underhill
11 Justin Rabidoux, South Burlington
12 Jake Hemmerick, Milton
13 Amy Bell, VTrans
14 Dick Hosking, VTrans District 5
15 Dennis Lutz, Essex
16 Dean Pierce, Shelburne
17 Barbara Elliot, Huntington
18 Chris Jolly, FHWA
19 Sandy Thibault, CATMA
20 Bruce Hoar, Williston
21 Bryan Osborne, Colchester, TAC Chair
22 Bob Henneberger, Seniors
23 Nicole Losch, Burlington
24 Katelin Brewer-Colie, Local Motion
25 Robin Pierce, Essex Junction
26 Peter Wernsdorfer, Winooski
27 Dave Armstrong, GMT
28

Others Present

Jim Ryan, Agency of Natural Resources
John Olin, Hoyle Tanner

Staff Present

Eleni Churchill, Transportation Program Manager
Christine Forde, Senior Transportation Planner
Charlie Baker, Executive Director
Melanie Needle, Senior Planner
Jason Charest, Senior Transportation Planning Engineer
Sai Sarepalli, Transportation Planning Engineer
Chris Dubin, Transportation Planner
Peter Keating, Senior Transportation Planner

29
30 TAC Chair Bryan Osborne called the meeting to order at 9:00AM.
31

32 **1. Consent Agenda**

33 N/A this month.
34

35 **2. Approval of Minutes**

36 There was discussion over the meaning of a statement in the Flood Damage Reporting item. It was
37 decided to put off January minutes approval until Peter received clarification from Chris Brunelle of
38 ANR.
39

40 **3. Public Comments**

41 There were none.
42

43 **4. MTP Development Update: Schedule, Population Forecasts and Draft Project list**

44 Peter began by reminding the TAC that we would be using them as an advisory committee for the update
45 of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). Peter then passed around copies of the proposed
46 schedule and went over the task list, highlighting items that would be coming to the TAC over the coming
47 year. Peter noted that we planned to have a draft plan by late summer with extensive public outreach
48 through the fall and public hearings next winter and adoption anticipated in May 2018.
49

50 Melanie Needle followed with a presentation on population forecasts, a necessary piece for both long
51 range planning and the development/update of the CCRPC's transportation demand model. The CCRPC
52 hired Economic and Policy Research (EPR) to develop population and employment forecasts for the
53 County as well as the town level. During February and March, staff will review the forecasts with the

1 TAC, Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC), Planning Advisory Committee (PAC), and the Board
2 and share any feedback with EPR. Staff anticipates that the Board will consider approval of the county
3 and municipal forecasts at their March meeting. Some forecast highlights include:

- 4 • The forecasted growth is significantly less than forecasts from previous long range plans.
- 5 • We forecast a Chittenden County population of 176,000 in 2014, up from 2015's 161,000.
- 6 • Age cohort forecasts reflect in and out migration factors. (Melanie will look at other Northern
7 New England MPOs to see how they've addressed the migration issues in their long range plans.)
- 8 • Municipal level population forecasts show a continued trend of slightly more growth going to the
9 suburban areas.
- 10 • Employment is expected to go from 136,000 currently to 170,000 in 2040.
- 11 • Burlington, South Burlington and Williston are expected to continue showing the highest job
12 growth.

13 The next steps in this process are:

- 14 • RSG is developing 2050 forecasts for population, households, and employment
- 15 • Reviews will continue through February and March
- 16 • The CCRPC Board will consider the forecast for adoption in March
- 17 • The transportation demand model will be used to allocate growth to the transportation analysis
18 zone (TAZ) level.

19
20 Christine next distributed an MTP project list. This is an update from the 2013 MTP with additional
21 projects identified from planning studies completed since then. Christine explained the table and how the
22 state's capital program relates to the CCRPC TIP. There are a number of projects highlighted that we are
23 seeking clarification on from municipalities. Should these be deleted? Should other projects be added?
24 Are the descriptions accurate? This item will be on the agenda again next month as we refine the list
25 down into something that's more reasonable. Christine also pointed out that we will be applying fiscal
26 constraint to this priority list and some projects will fall below the fiscal constraint line. We are waiting
27 to hear back from VTrans on the reasonableness of our proposed method to determine fiscal constraint.
28 Christine also addressed the issue on including bike/ped projects on the road project list or having them
29 separate. Due to Complete Streets requirements, this becomes a bit of a gray area. Staff will come up
30 with a recommendation on this before the next TAC meeting.

31 32 **5. Municipal Roads General Permit (MRGP)**

33 Jim Ryan, MRGP Program Manager from ANR attended to give an update on this project that results
34 from Act 64 legislation passed last year. Jim started with background information on causes and effects
35 of runoff pollution on streams and lakes and what led to the passing of the state law and particularly the
36 Municipal Road General Permit. Proposed details of this permit include:

- 37 • The goal of bringing connected road segments up to basic maintenance standards
- 38 • Implementing Best Management Practices (BMPs) necessary to reduce erosion
- 39 • The permit's three components include, inventory, prioritization and implementation
- 40 • New inventories and implementation plans will be required every 5 years

41 Jim also provided a number of details on implementation techniques to reduce erosion. He concluded
42 with a list of funding help for this project and the oversight help he was getting from various groups in
43 developing the permit. He summarized all with these points:

- 44 • There is a new DEC municipal roads general permit
- 45 • Application coverage and annual fees begin in mid-2018 (currently proposed)
- 46 • Road erosion inventories for hydrologically-connected roads are required
- 47 • Implementation plans and schedules
- 48 • Road BMP implementation and brief annual compliance reports
- 49 • New inventories and implementation plans every 5 years

1 Some TAC comments that come up:

- 2 • Compliance update reports every six months makes little sense
- 3 • There are other erosion presentation techniques besides stones and grass.
- 4 • Charlie Baker said the CCRPC will compile TAC and other comments and get these back to the
- 5 TAC next month for committee review.
- 6

7 **6. Update on FY17 Road Erosion Inventories, Erosion Site Priorities, and FY18 Better Roads Grant**

8 Chris Dubin gave the TAC an update on the road erosion inventory work staff and interns have been
9 doing this year. Eight towns are completed and the remaining ten are expected to be done this coming
10 fiscal year. Funding for this work may come from another Better Roads grant or through our UPWP
11 planning funds.

12
13 **7. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports**

14 There were no reports of questions.

15
16 **8. CCRPC January Board Meeting Report.**

17 Peter mentioned the Board held a public forum on the FY18 UPWP and approved the mid-year budget
18 adjustment for the FY17 UPWP.

19
20 **9. Chairman's/Members' Items**

21 No items came up.

22
23 The meeting adjourned at 10:55 a.m.

24
25 Respectfully submitted,

26
27 Peter Keating



CCRPC Transportation Advisory Committee

03/08/2017

Agenda Item 4: Action Item

Active Transportation Plan: Action Item

Background:

CCRPC began an update to the Bike Ped plan in the summer of 2015 and held extensive public outreach through workshops and the project's on-line map comment tool through that fall and winter. Preliminary network and infrastructure recommendations were presented to the TAC and Board last spring and fall, based largely on GIS analysis that considered:

- Public comment, safety, level of stress,
- Trip origins and destinations, and
- Previous plans/studies.

A project feasibility layer was added later and combined with priorities to produce a recommended network map identifying both.

Staff provided extensive comments on priority recommendations and feasibility determinations last September which led to some revisions and another round of comment/review solicitation. We conducted this through Front Porch Forum and local Bike/Ped committees from October to December.

At the March TAC meeting, staff will present the plan with a focus on its recommendations.

Staff

Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the TAC recommend approval of the Active Transportation Plan to the CCRPC Board.

Staff contact:

Peter Keating, pkeating@ccrpcvt.org 861-0124

Attachments:

The ATP and priority map can be found at <http://www.ccrpcvt.org/our-work/our-plans/regional-bikeped-plan/>



CCRPC Transportation Advisory Committee

03/07/2017

Agenda Item 5: Action Item

Roadway Functional Class Changes

Background:

Throughout the past year, the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission has been in the process of conducting a comprehensive review of the Chittenden County functional classification system. While making adjustments to the Urban Functional Classification Area in 2014, CCRPC staff came across issues with the county's functional classification system. Numerous roadways were found to be improperly classified according to the most recent FHWA guidelines. During the fall and winter of 2015, CCRPC transportation staff initiated the first known comprehensive review of the functional classification system since the 1968 Federal-Aid Highway Act.

Functional classifications of county roadways were reviewed and updates are recommended based on the guidance detailed in the 2013 FHWA publication Highway Functional Classification Concepts, Criteria and Procedures (https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/processes/statewide/related/highway_functional_classifications/fcauab.pdf). The guidelines give states the ability to modify their hierarchy of roadways to meet localized needs. All proposed functional classification changes have been added to an interactive online map that can be found at <http://map.ccrpcvt.org/functionalclass/>. Proposed changes solely reflect the existing functionality of a roadway in question and do not account for future projects or plans.

Functional classification is an essential organizing element in data management and roadway statistics reporting. It is imperative to maintain an updated functional classification system to improve monitoring, tracking and reporting on the performance of the system at a national and State level. Functional classification is used in a number of ways:

Project Prioritization: Functional classification often has an impact on the prioritization of expenditures. Transportation agencies and municipalities may dedicate funding programs towards high volume arterial routes that offer enhanced levels of mobility and connect major population centers.

Safety Programs: Transportation agencies use functional classification to assess roadway safety and implement safety improvement programs. Agencies often consider the functional classification of a roadway when evaluating crash rates.

For example, the VTrans High Crash Location Report develops statewide high crash locations that are organized by functional classification.

Funding: The Federal-aid Highway System is directly tied to functional classification. Federal transportation funding is available for Interstates, Freeways and Expressways, Principal Arterials, Minor Arterials, Major Collectors and Minor Collectors (located within the urban boundary). Minor Collectors in rural areas and local roadways are ineligible for Federal transportation funding.

Asset Management: Asset management programs often use functional classification to determine which assets serve the most people and goods.

Highway Design: While functional classification does not dictate design, it does have an influence on design. Generally, higher class roadways have greater speed limits, fewer sharp curves and wider lanes, while lower class roadways have lower speed limits, steeper curves and narrower lanes. However, there is significant flexibility in the design of a roadway relative to its functional classification. When evaluating functional classification, it's important to consider the immediate environment of a roadway and the communities that it serves.

Maintenance: Pavement resurfacing cycles are usually linked to functional classification, which is also related to project prioritization and asset management. Functional classification can also be used by a State transportation agency or a municipality to prioritize snow/ice removal in winter weather.

VTrans has reviewed our proposed functional classification updates and advised us to coordinate these changes with our member municipalities. We have solicited feedback from each municipality and have made updates to our proposed changes based on the input that was received. CCRPC staff is still working with Burlington to finalize their proposed functional classification changes.

- Staff Recommendation:** The TAC accepts the proposed Functional Class changes and advises the CCRPC Board to request that VTrans considers these changes as presented for submittal to FHWA.
- Staff contacts:** Jason Charest, (802) 846-4490 ext. 32, jcharest@ccrpcvt.org
Marshall Distel, (802) 861-0122 ext. 26, mdistel@ccrpcvt.org
- Attachments:** Spreadsheet of functional class changes

Approved by Municipality

Pending Municipality approval

Chittenden County Proposed Principal Arterials

	Town	Highway	AADT	Mi.	Existing Class	Begin	End	Comments/Justification
1	Hinesburg	ROUTE 116	4,400-8,600	2.870	R, Minor Arterial	Silver St	St George TL	This is a multi-town route connecting Hinesburg's designated village with the Burlington region. Numerous minor arterials are proposed to connect to this roadway. The portion of Rt 116 that currently runs through South Burlington is a principal arterial. These proposed sections would extend the current principal arterial to Hinesburg's Designated Village Center.
	St George	ROUTE 116	5,100	1.240	R, Minor Arterial	Hinesburg TL	Shelburne TL	
	Shelburne	ROUTE 116	5,100	1.210	R, Minor Arterial	St George TL	St George TL	
2	Jericho	ROUTE 117	5,200	2.780	R, Minor Arterial	Essex TL	Richmond TL	Connects existing principal arterial in Essex to the Interstate in Richmond, AADT falls within the recommended volumes for rural principal arterials, roadway characteristics for these segments are similar to that of Rt 117 in Essex, this forms one of the primary northwest routes east of Winooski River
	Richmond	ROUTE 117	5,200	0.830	R, Minor Arterial	Jericho TL	US-2	
	Richmond	W MAIN ST (Rt 2)	8,500	0.280	R, Major Collector	VT-117	I-89 on-ramp	
3	S Burlington	KENNEDY DR	12,500-16,600	1.510	U, Minor Arterial	Dorset St	US-2	This is a major multi-lane roadway that provides direct access to both I-189 and I-89 from the Burlington International Airport.
4	Jericho	ROUTE 15	8,900-11,400	4.300	R, Minor Arterial	Essex TL	River Rd	Extension of the existing principal arterial (currently stops at Essex/Jericho TL) so that it reaches the Designated Village Centers of Jericho and Underhill
5	Williston	ESSEX RD (Rt 2A)	13,100-17,379	2.930	U, Minor Arterial	US-2	Essex TL	Connects Designated Growth Centers of Essex Jct and Williston, significant change in roadway characteristics during the past decade due to growth in the region, AADT well above recommended minor arterial volumes, existing principal arterial connection
	Essex Jct	PARK ST (Rt 2A)	15,500	0.670	U, Minor Arterial	Williston TL	Five Corners	
6	Essex	SUSIE WILSON RD	21,000	0.520	U, Major Collector	VT-15	S Wilson Byp	Susie Wilson Rd provides connectivity and mobility between Rt 15, Rt 2A and Rt 289, AADT three times higher than the recommended major collector values, multi-lane. The bypass is a limited access route with a 50 mph posted speed limit that also serves as a major commercial truck routes.
	Essex	SUSIE WILSON BYP	15,000	0.770	U, Major Collector	Susie Wilson Rd	VT-2A	
7	Colchester	ROUTE 2	11,900-13,600	2.120	R, Minor Arterial	I-89 off-ramp	Milton TL	This is an interregional highway (access management class 3) with an AADT comparable to the freeway functional classification. This is also the only route to islands and has a posted speed limit between 45 mph and 55 mph.
	Milton	ROUTE 2	9,900-10,800	3.680	R, Minor Arterial	Colchester TL	Grand Isle	
8	Colchester	ROUTE 7	10,605-13,708	0.430	R, Minor Arterial	US-2	Milton TL	AADT meets Principal Arterial threshold, connects Milton to the I-89 interchange in Colchester, roadway characteristics consistent with existing US-7 Principal Arterial sections, supports longer-distance travel
	Milton	ROUTE 7		5.040	R, Minor Arterial	Milton TL	Main St	

Chittenden County Proposed Minor Arterials								
	Town	Highway	AADT	Mi.	Existing Class	Begin	End	Comments/Justification
9	St George	ROUTE 2A	5,200	2.000	R, Major Collector	VT-116	Williston TL	Characteristics similar to Rt 2A in Williston, supports high-mobility travel, direct I-89 route for Hinesburg residents, prevents classification from changing at TL
10	Shelburne	DORSET ST	3,400	0.300	R, Major Collector	Barstow Rd	S Burl TL	The Shelburne segment of this route has an AADT higher than the recommended rural major collector volumes, ensures that the proposed arterial doesn't stop at the TL. The S Burlington segment has multi lane sections, links the Designated Growth Center with I-89/I-189 and supports high-mobility travel.
	S Burlington	DORSET ST	4,200-17,500	4.300	U, Major Collector	Shelburne TL	US-2	
11	S Burlington	KIMBALL AV	8,700-10,600	1.000	U, Major Collector	Kennedy Dr	Williston TL	Kimball Ave has AADT four times higher than recommended urban major collector volumes, will link to a principal arterial, runs through major commercial center, while Marshall Ave connects to Williston Designated Growth Center, connects to Rt 2A existing principal arterial, non-residential route, commercial area access
	Williston	MARSHALL AV	8,200-8,700	1.700	U, Major Collector	S Burl TL	VT-2A	
12	Williston	INDUSTRIAL AV	8,400-10,400	1.000	U, Major Collector	US-2	VT-2A	Will connect two principals arterials (Rt 2 & Rt 2A), provides access to a major industrial center, few residential dwellings along route
13	Richmond	W MAIN ST (Rt 2)	8,500	2.300	R, Major Collector	Williston TL	Jericho Rd	(Principal arterial through interchange) Connects Richmond downtown to I89, AADT over three times higher than the recommended volume for rural major collectors. Extends the proposed minor arterial through Richmond from Bolton, AADT above rural major collector volumes, I-89 connection The only significant east/west route since Bolton has no access to the Interstate, meets rural minor arterial AADT, Rt 2 is a multi-town route
	Richmond	E MAIN ST (Rt 2)	4,700	3.700	R, Major Collector	Jericho Rd	Bolton TL	
	Bolton	Rt 2	1,800-2,400	5.600	R, Major Collector	Richmond TL	Waterbury TL	
14	Richmond	GOVERNOR PECK HWY	2,300	0.800	R, Major Collector	VT-117	Jericho TL	Will extend Browns Trace minor arterial to the Rt 117 principal arterial/I89, highest-volume north/south roadway in or out of Jericho, few residential dwellings along route, supports long-distance travel between Underhill/Jericho Center villages, I89 connection for both towns
	Jericho	GOVERNOR PECK RD	2,400	0.700	R, Major Collector	Richmond TL	Browns Trace	
	Jericho	BROWNS TRACE	2,500-3,800	6.100	R, Major Collector	Gov Peck Rd	VT-15	
15	Burlington	SHELBURNE RD	14,200	0.120	U, Principal Arterial	Locust St	S Union St	This is a very short segment that serves as an extension of S Union and S Winooski, both are proposed minor arterial downgrades
	Burlington	ST PAUL ST	9,400	0.700	U, Major Collector	Howard St	Main St	AADT 3,000 daily vehicles higher than maximum recommended volume for urban major collectors, direct access to downtown Burlington from Rt 7. The current principal arterial section serves as an extension of S Winooski, its maintains system continuity by downgrading it to a minor arterial
	Burlington	ST PAUL ST	11,200	0.180	U, Principal Arterial	S Union St	Howard St	
	Burlington	WINOOSKI AV (SOUTH)	3,100-4,000	0.920	U, Principal Arterial	St Paul St	Pearl St	AADT does not meet principal arterial volumes, parallel to Willard principal arterial, high driveway density, partial one-way traffic
	Burlington	WINOOSKI AV (NORTH)	3,655	0.730	U, Principal Arterial	Pearl St	Riverside Av	
	Burlington	UNION ST (SOUTH)	3,100-3,400	1.070	U, Principal Arterial	Shelburne Rd	Pearl St	Low AADT, FHWA says to avoid creating parallel principal arterials, provides more access than mobility, partial one-way traffic
	Burlington	UNION ST (NORTH)	3,769	0.400	U, Principal Arterial	Pearl St	N Winooski Av	

16	Colchester	SEVERANCE RD	9,800	2.000	U, Major Collector	US-7	Essex TL	Kellogg Rd: AADT two times higher than recommended volume for urban major collectors, major route out of Essex through a commercial/industrial hub. Severance Rd: AADT exceeds recommended volume for urban major collectors, direct route from Essex to Colchester Designated Growth Center, extension of Rt 127 arterial
	Essex	KELLOGG RD	12,500-15,371	0.500	U, Major Collector	Colchester TL	S Wilson Rd	

Chittenden County Proposed Major Collectors

	Town	Highway	AADT	Mi.	Existing Class	Begin	End	Comments/Justification
17	Hinesburg	C V U RD	3,900	0.600	R, Local	VT-116	Pond Rd	Provides access to a major regional high school, makes sense to continue major collector from Richmond Rd rather than abruptly stopping it
18	Charlotte	FERRY RD	1,700	2.890	R, Minor Collector	Cedar Beach	US-7	Collects traffic from numerous local roadways, covers a significant distance across Charlotte, direct connection with Rt 7, multi-modal Champlain ferry connection
19	Charlotte	SPEAR ST	700-2,223	5.900	R, Minor Collector	Hinesburg Rd	Shelburne TL	Charlotte section: Multi-town route, supports relatively high-mobility travel, most north/south travelled route in/out of Charlotte besides Rt 7. Shelburne section: A replacement for the Thomas Rd major collector, 3 times the traffic volume, enhances system connectivity
	Shelburne	SPEAR ST	1,700	0.700	R, Local	Thomas Rd	Irish Hill Rd	
20	Shelburne	DORSET ST	490-3,500	2.600	R, Local	Irish Hill Rd	Barstow Rd	Functions as a connecting street to link two minor arterials, supports relatively high-mobility travel for a significant distance
21	Williston	OLD CREAMERY RD	3,300	2.100	R, Local	VT-2A	Oak Hill Rd	Funnels traffic from numerous cul-de-sacs and looping streets over a significant distance, links to Rt 2A minor arterial
22	Williston	S BROWNELL RD	1,900-3500	3.900	U/R, Local	St. George TL	US-2	South Brownell: Rt 2 & Rt 116 connection, major north/south route with an I-89 overpass, connects rural/suburban areas to Taft Corners in Williston. North Brownell: Improves system continuity by connecting a minor arterial with a principal arterial, links neighborhoods with commercial areas
	Williston	N BROWNELL RD	3,760	0.600	U, Local	US-2	Industrial Av	
	St. George	S BROWNELL RD			R, Local	VT-116	Williston TL	
	St. George	S BROWNELL RD			R, Local	Shelburne TL	S Brownell Rd	
	Shelburne	TH-14			R, Local	VT-116	St. George TL	
23	Williston	MOUNTAIN VIEW RD	5,100-6,300	1.800	U, Local	Redmond Rd	N Williston Rd	East/west extension of current major collector, Global Foundries access, 40 mph posted speed, collects traffic from looping and no-outlet streets

24	Burlington	N PROSPECT ST	5,100	0.600	U, Local	Pearl St	Riverside Av	Creates a connection between an existing principal arterial (Rt 2/7) and an existing minor arterial (Pearl St)
25	Burlington	MANHATTAN DR	1000-9,800	0.900	U, Local	N Champlain	Oak St	These segments form the route that links Rt 2/7 with Rt 127, AADT above recommended urban major collector volumes
	Burlington	OAK ST	6,800	0.200	U, Local	Manhattan Dr	Riverside Av	
	Burlington	RIVERSIDE AV (W/US7)	6,800	0.200	U, Local	Intervale Av	N Winooski Av	
26	Jericho	BARBER FARM RD	1,900	2.600	R, Minor Collector	VT-117	Browns Trace	Connects Jericho Center to Rt 117, AADT falls within the mid-range of values recommended for rural major collectors

27	Jericho	SKUNK HOLLOW RD	2,415	2.500	R, Local	VT-117	Plains Rd	This route connects Rt 117 to Rt 15, runs through the village of Jericho, most direct route to I-89 from the village. Plains Rd connects Skunk Hollow with Rt 15, this segment will complete the connecting route between two principal arterials
	Jericho	PLAINS RD	970	0.700	U/R, Local	Skunk Hollow	VT-15	
28	Essex	PINECREST DR	2,700-3700	1.000	U, Local	S Wilson Rd	VT-2A	Connects Rt 2A with S Wilson, functions as a major collector because many disconnected streets funnel traffic onto the roadway
29	Essex	ESSEX WY	2,800-7,783	1.000	U, Local	VT-289	VT-15	This is a wide multi-lane roadway connecting 289 to Rt 15, commercial center access, high AADT for a local roadway
30	Winooski	W CENTER ST	1,572	0.170	U, Minor Arterial	Mallets Bay	US-7	AADT volumes more closely match an urban major collector, collects Winooski residential neighborhood traffic rather than providing long-distance travel. These roadways function as a collectors that funnel traffic onto the Blakely Rd minor arterial.
31	Winooski	W ALLEN ST	2,600	0.130	U, Minor Arterial	Mallets Bay	US-7	
32	Winooski	MALLETT'S BAY AV	3,100-4,100	0.680	U, Minor Arterial	Allen/Center	Colchester TL	
33	Colchester	MALLETT'S BAY AV	3,100-4,100	3.300	U, Minor Arterial	Winooski TL	Blakely Rd	
34	Milton	BEAR TRAP RD	1,100	0.500	R, Local	Sanderson	W Milton Rd	Bear Trap Rd: This is an extension of the existing Bear Trap collector so that it connects West Milton to Milton. West Milton Rd: Serves as one of two interstate overpasses in Milton, significant east/west route
	Milton	W MILTON RD	950-1,400	1.700	U/R, Local	Bear Trap Rd	US-7	

Chittenden County Proposed Minor Collectors

	Town	Highway	AADT	Mi.	Existing Class	Begin	End	Comments/Justification
35	Charlotte	THOMPSONS POINT RD	1,100	2.400	R, Local	Pavement	Greenbush Rd	Provides access from Greenbush Rd to the Point Bay Marina, only route in/out of Thompson's Point
36	Charlotte	CHURCH HILL RD	1,900	1.100	R, Local	Hinesburg Rd	Rt 7	Connects Rt 7 and Hinesburg Rd
37	Charlotte	GREENBUSH RD	1,200	4.900	R, Local	Ferrisburgh TL	Shelburne TL	Greenbush: Only road west of Rt 7 that runs the length of Charlotte, significant north/south route for western half of the town. Bostwick: Creates a connection from Greenbush to Rt 7
	Shelburne	BOSTWICK RD	1,200	2.200	U/R Local	Charlotte TL	Rt 7	
38	Charlotte	MT PHILO RD	1,200	3.800	R, Local	Spear St	Shelburne TL	Charlotte section: Significant north/south route through the center of Charlotte, connection to Hinesburg Rd major collector. Shelburne section: Connects to Falls Rd major collector and provides access into Charlotte. Connects to Rt 7 signalized intersection in Shelburne
	Shelburne	MT PHILO RD	1,600	1.100	U, Local	Charlotte TL	Marsett Rd	
	Shelburne	FALLS RD	5,000	0.700	U, Local	Marsett Rd	Rt 7	
39	Shelburne	THOMAS RD	390	1.100	R, Major Collector	Falls Rd	Spear St	.04 mi Urban (Swap with Spear)

40	Shelburne	HARBOR RD	1,300	2.900	R, Local	Bay Rd	Marina	The only route in/out of Shelburne Point
41	Jericho	NASHVILLE RD	713-910	3.600	R, Local	Browns Trace	Bolton TL	Jericho section: Connects West Bolton and the eastern half of Jericho to Browns Trace. Bolton section: The roadway is the only east/west route out of West Bolton, smaller backroads feed into the roadway.
	Bolton	NASHVILLE RD	910	0.400	R, Local	Jericho TL	Stage Rd	
42	Jericho	LEE RIVER RD	1,000	3.100	R, Major Collector	Browns Trace	Rt 15	1.5 mi U, .04mi(Rt15 to Plains)Major Col.
43	Essex Jct	S SUMMIT ST	3,863	0.400	U, Local	West St	Rt 15	Connects the West St major collector with the Rt 15 principal arterial, traffic funnels onto this street from cul-de-sacs and looping streets
44	Essex Jct	RAILROAD AVE	No data	0.100	U, Local	Rt 15	Central St	Links to Amtrak Station
	Essex Jct	CENTRAL ST	No data	0.040	U, Local	Rt 2A	Railroad Av	
45	Burlington	LEDGE RD	1,600	0.400	U, Local	Shelburne Rd	S Prospect St	Ledge Rd: Connects Rt 7 & S Prospect St, it's the most direct route from UVM's athletic campus to the Rt 7 corridor. S Prospect St: Cul-de-sacs and looping streets funnel traffic onto this street, provides direct access to UVM from Main St
	Burlington	S PROSPECT ST	6,000	1.000	U, Local	Ledge Rd	Main St	
46	Colchester	FARNSWORTH RD	1,700	0.800	R, Local	East Rd	Milton TL	Farnsworth Rd: Connects East Rd major collector. East Rd: Significant north/south route east of Rt 7 connecting parts of Colchester Village and eastern Milton. North Rd: Connects eastern Milton to Rt 104A in Georgia
	Milton	EAST RD	1,700	4.000	U/R, Local	Colchester TL	Westford Rd	
	Milton	NORTH RD	1,200	2.300	U/R Local	Westford Rd	Georgia TL	
47	Colchester	JASPER MINE RD	1,400	1.800	R, Local	Rt 2	Mayo Rd	Jasper Mine: Creates the most direct route from West Milton to I-89 and Rt 2. Mayo: Link to Rt 2/I-89 via Jasper Mine Rd. W Milton: Connection to Rt 2 from West Milton
	Colchester	MAYO RD	1,400	0.400	R, Local	Jasper Mine	Milton TL	
	Milton	W MILTON RD	950-1,400	4.300	R, Local	Colchester TL	Bear Trap Rd	
48	Milton	BOMBARDIER RD		0.360	U, Local	US-7	Hobbs Rd	Connects neighborhood street traffic to US-7/McMullen Rd.
	Milton	HOBBS RD	2,600	0.510	U, Local	Bombardier Rd	McMullen Rd	
49	Milton	MCMULLEN RD	1,100	1.560	U/R, Local	Railroad St	East Rd	Collects neighborhood street traffic from numerous disconnected streets
50	Shelburne	DORSET ST		0.320	R, Local	Shelburne Hinesburg Rd	Charlotte TL	Connects East Charlotte with Dorset St in Shelburne & So. Burlington, enhances system continuity by connecting a Minor Collector to the existing Hinesburg Rd Major Collector
	Charlotte	DORSET ST	480	2.83	R, Local	Shelburne TL	Hinesburg Rd	
51	Burlington	NORTH ST	2,900	0.300	U, Local	N Willard St	N Prospect St	Connects the existing North Street Major Collector to the proposed North Prospect Major Collector
52	Burlington	BIRCHCLIFF PKWY		0.310	U, Local	Pine St	Shelburne Rd	Connects a Minor Arterial with a Principal Arterial, serves a large subdivision
53	Burlington	LOCUST ST		0.330	U, Local	Pine St	Shelburne Rd	Connects a Minor Arterial with a Principal Arterial, serves a popular recreation area
54	Burlington	HOWARD ST		0.440	U, Local	Pine St	N Willard St	Serves as a significant east/west route, connects multiple arterials

55	Burlington	MAPLE ST		0.880	U, Local	Battery St	S Prospect St	Serves as a significant east/west route, connects multiple arterials
56	Burlington	COLLEGE ST		0.890	U, Local	Battery St	S Prospect St	Serves as a significant east/west route, connects multiple arterials
57	Burlington	APPLETREE POINT		0.700	U, Local	Nottingham Ln	Staniford Rd	Connects numerous neighborhood streets to the North Ave Minor Arterial
	Burlington	STANIFORD RD		0.510	U, Local	Appletree Point	North Ave	
58	Burlington	ETHAN ALLEN PKWY		0.910	U, Local	North Ave	Gazo Ave	Serves as the only route to a large subdivision in the New North End
59	Burlington	NORTH AVE		0.860	U, Local	Plattsburg Ave	Derway Dr	Connects the northernmost New North End subdivisions to the existing Minor Arterial

Additions recommended made by Vtrans

60	Williston	REDMOND RD		0.180	U, Major Collector	Mountain View Rd	Terminus at former unbuilt CIRC interchange	With CIRC not being built, there is no need for a section of major collector to be retained on Redmond Road and this should be dropped from the federal aid system and revert to a local road
61	Westford	OLD STAGE RD		0.650	R, Major Collector	Essex - Westford TL	Woods Hollow Road and Chapin Road Intersection	Does it make sense to extend the Major Collector on Old Stage Road to the intersection of Woods Hollow Road and Chapin Road, where this is a logical change in the traffic patterns?
62	Richmond	COCHRAN RD		0.150	R, Local	Cochran Road - River Road Intersection	US-2 Intersection	Short section needs assignment to a Minor Collector for connectivity between Cochran Road and US-2 in Jonesville

DRAFT MEMORANDUM

TO: Jim Ryan, Municipal Roads General Permit Manager
FROM: Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
DATE: March __, 2017
RE: Comments on initial draft Municipal Roads General Permit

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the initial draft Municipal Roads General Permit. Please consider these comments as you revise the draft permit for final rule making. Thank you for your consideration

1. **Inventories** - Please clarify if ALL connected roads (including ones that meet the MRGP road standards and have no erosion issues) need to be inventoried every 5 years.
2. **Triggers** - For each of the triggers for improvement identified in the permit, there needs to be clear definitions on the thresholds for "Fully Meets", "Partially Meets", and "Does Not Meet."
3. **Class 4 Roads** - Currently municipalities are not required to maintain Class 4 roads in accordance with Title 19. If this permit is going to require municipalities to correct gullies on Class 4 roads, statute should be clarified to specifically require only this kind of maintenance. However, we are also concerned that requiring municipalities on Class 4 roads, even if it is confined to major erosion problems, could lead to causing more erosion just to get to the site with the right equipment.
4. **Stone-lined Ditching** - We are concerned that the stone line ditching standards in the draft MRGP creates a discrepancy with the Orange Book standards (i.e. 5% v. 8%). The standard should be consistent across programs to ensure municipalities are remain eligible for funding programs including FEMA Disaster Recover funds. We feel strongly that municipalities should not have to try to follow two different sets of standards for connected roads and non-connected roads to avoid these conflicts.
5. **Outfalls outside of the ROW** – Often these grass lined ditches will need to be stabilized well outside of the ROW. Make it clear in the permit what responsibilities the municipalities have to address these issues even if they are outside the ROW.
6. **Culvert Requirements** - Please clearly define the different culverts and associated standards (driveway, conveyance, drainage, etc.).

7. **Reporting Cycle** - Consider an annual reporting cycle rather than semi-annual, considering there will be minimal work occurring between October to April to report. We would prefer an April reporting date so that municipalities can report what has been approved in the budget to be addressed in that construction season. Reducing the administrative burden for both municipalities and the State by 50% is desirable.
8. **Annual Fee** – A \$2,000 flat annual fee is too heavy of a burden for smaller Towns. Fee level should be variable depending on the number of connected road segments or road-related impervious cover with maybe some additional consideration related to the size of the municipal budget. The total amount of fees should be tied to the cost to administer the permit and not generate excess revenue.
9. **MS4 Fees** –We understand and would like confirmed that no additional fees will be charged to MS4 permittees when the MRGP requirements are added to the MS4 permits.
10. **Historic Projects** – Although it may not seem to be directly connected to the MRGP permit going forward, it is our understanding that the State can document and take credit for phosphorous reduction to meet the Lake Champlain TMDL going back to more than 10 or maybe even 15 years ago. We understand that date is 2002 for the stormwater permits, v. two years prior to the permit issuance for the MRGP. It would seem to us that it would be very beneficial to the State to ask for documentation of these prior projects that were done solely by municipalities.
11. **Slope Data** – Recent higher resolution LiDAR (elevation) data is a more accurate source for slope data. There is a chance that fewer roads may be deemed “connected” because of this more accurate data. While this data may not be available statewide yet, we’d like to use it in Chittenden County. Can we re-examine the slope data and provide information back to the State to update your data?



CCRPC Transportation Advisory Committee

March 8, 2017

Agenda Item 7: Action Item

2019 Town Highway Bridge Pre-Candidate Prioritization

Issues: VTrans requests that all Regional Planning Commissions prioritize up to 10 town highway bridges in each region 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. A full overview of the methodology will be provided at the April TAC meeting when prioritization of the TIP projects is discussed. 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.

Background: 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 approved 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 2019 Town Highway Bridge Pre-Candidate 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 Town Highway Bridge Pre-Candidate List

**2019 CCMPO Prioritized Project List
Town Highway Bridge Pre-Candidates**

	CCRPC Rank	CCRPC Score	Vtrans Rank	CCRPC Designation	Roadway Functional Class	Condition - Deck/ Superstructure/ Substructure (out of 10)	Detour Length (Miles)	Average Daily Traffic	Federal Sufficiency Rating (out of 100)
SHELBURNE	1	38	117	Suburban	Major Collector	5/6/5	5	2300	40.6
HUNTINGTON	2	38	178	CCRPC Village	Major Collector	6/6/7	15	2140	44.5
HINESBURG	3	34	142	Enterprise	Major Collector	6/6/6	17	1560	51
HUNTINGTON	4	34	246	CCRPC Village	Major Collector	8/6/6	23	1740	63.4
HINESBURG	5	34	137	CCRPC Village	Major Collector	Culvert - 5	11	2010	58.1
BURLINGTON	6	32	415	Metro	Town Road	5/7/7	99	1890	53
COLCHESTER	7	31	374	Rural	Town Road	7/8/5	99	75	63.2
BOLTON	8	31	392	Rural	Town Road	7/5/7	99	10	50.8
RICHMOND	9	30	128	Rural	Major Collector	7/7/5	15	2170	66.2
UNDERHILL	10	30	383	CCRPC Village	Major Collector	6/7/7	20	1550	87
JERICHO	11	30	205	Rural	Rural Minor Collector	6/7/6	16	850	68.3
BOLTON	12	30	390	Rural	Rural Minor Collector	6/7/7	20	500	66.1
HINESBURG	13	29	422	Rural	Major Collector	7/7/7	30	3330	73.6
BOLTON	14	27	155	Rural	Town Road	5/6/7	99	20	81
HUNTINGTON	15	27	286	Rural	Town Road	6/7/7	99	10	75.9
JERICHO	16	27	297	Rural	Town Road	7/7/6	99	10	72.7
HUNTINGTON	17	26	231	Rural	Major Collector	Culvert - 8	23	890	86.5
CHARLOTTE	18	26	194	Rural	Town Road	7/6/6	6	550	53.8
JERICHO	19	24	304	Rural	Major Collector	6/7/6	6	2820	79.3
RICHMOND	20	24	362	Rural	Rural Minor Collector	8/8/7	7	1345	88.5