Agenda
Executive Committee
Wednesday, October 3, 2018 – 5:45 p.m.
Small Conference Room, CCRPC Offices
110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT

1. Changes to the Agenda, Members’ Items

2. Approval of August 29, 2018 Joint Executive & Finance Committee Minutes* (Action)

3. Act 250 & Sec 248 Applications
   a. Ratify – UVM PFG Complex, Burlington (Case #4C0348-7)* (Action)
   b. Clearview Estates, Phase 3, Milton (Case #4C1117R-2)* (Action)

4. FY20 Municipal Dues* (Action)

5. Administrative and Operating Policies and Procedures Amendment* (Action)


7. Transportation Performance Measures* (Action)

8. Chair/Executive Director Report (Discussion)
   a. Clean Water Advisory Committee membership guidelines
   b. Legislative Breakfast topics

9. Review Agenda for October 17, 2018 Board Meeting* (Discussion)

10. Other Business (Discussion)

11. Executive Session – none anticipated (Action)

12. Adjournment (Action)

*Attachments

NEXT MEETING – Executive Committee – Wed. November 7, 2018; 5:45 p.m.

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 x *21 or evaughn@ccrpcvt.org, no later than 3 business days prior to the meeting for which services are requested.
The meeting was called to order at 5:45 p.m. by the Chair, Chris Roy.

1. Changes to the Agenda; Members’ Items. Charlie asked for an executive session to discuss personnel matters.

2. Approval of July 18, 2018 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O’BRIEN, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JULY 18 WITH CORRECTIONS IF ANY. Barbara asked for an update on the potential move to another bank. Charlie said there is no news on that yet. Barbara then asked whether any more had been done regarding Ad Hoc committee on Act 250 updates. Charlie anticipated that we’d set one up in October or November. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JULY 18TH.

3. FY18 Year End Financial Reports. Forest Cohen noted that we finished much better than what we had budgeted. We had anticipated a deficit of $98,000, but we are showing a deficit of only $10,000 in pre-audit numbers. Forest Cohen reviewed the balance sheet: Cash in checking (operating)- $181,662; cash in savings (match) - $110,170; Cash in money market & CDs (reserve)-$217,059. Current assets over liabilities: $586,333. Deferred income communities – is $0 (remaining $36,359* (subject to change) on June 29 booked to revenue on June 30. Income Statement: ACCD funds were 100% expended in May, which was expected; transportation staff billing was billed at 97%; brownfields staff time estimates were about 90% of budgeted, with consultant lines showing funds to bill in FY19. Water quality basin planning grant was expended closely to budget. Clean Streets phosphorus credit project has been more challenging at 37.6%. Expenses: The salaries and benefits expenses were slightly under budget at year end. We are under budget overall in our expenses, but we will monitor telephone/internet line more closely in FY19 as we were slightly over budget at 108%. When asked if the lower deficit number will impact on next year’s indirect rate, Forest said no because we’ve gotten closer in our budgeting as far as indirect rate and are solving the problem of the large swings in rate. Brief discussion ensued. Cash Flow: Forest reviewed the cash flow noting that we started with $596,789 and ended up with $508,889. We are in range of previous years. Members agreed we are doing ok.

4. FY18 4th Quarter Journal Entries. Jeff Carr questioned a couple of the year-end entries especially the unbilled receivables as income. Forest explained they are unbilled receivables because they haven’t been billed to a grant yet. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JEFF CARR TO APPROVE THE 4TH QUARTER JOURNAL ENTRIES. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. (Jeff Carr left the meeting.)
5. Act 250 & Sec. 248 Applications:
   a. Ratify – Northern Power Systems 2MW Storage, Hinesburg (Case #18-2743-AN). Chris Roy recused himself from any discussion/action. CATHERINE MCMAINS MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO RATIFY THE LETTER TO NORTHERN POWER SYSTEMS CORPORATION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH CHRIS ROY ABSTAINING.
   b. Ratify – Beaudoin Categorical Disposal Facility, Milton (Case #4C1314). CATHERINE MCMAINS MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JOHN ZICCONI TO RATIFY THE LETTER SENT TO DISTRICT #4 COMMISSIONER. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
   c. GMP Airport Substation, South Burlington (Case #18-2910-PET). Charlie noted that this and the next letters are ones we reviewed prior to the application submissions. He reviewed Emily’s notes – We added a line under ag soils saying that “Based on the submitted CPG petition, it appears that this project avoids prime ag soils,” (we now have a map that shows the exact location of the substation vs. this constraint.) We added a line under Forest Blocks that says “As noted in the 2018 ECOS Plan, CCRPC supports locating energy development in areas planned for growth and especially on previously-impacted sites. (This was written this way because we worried that saying “CCRPC defers to Fish and Wildlife” might give our blanket support to Fish and Wildlife restricting development here.) When Catherine asked where the forest blocks are, Mike O’Brien noted that it’s an urban forest. Charlie said we are just trying to be more up front about this site already being pretty impacted. ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE LETTER TO GREEN MOUNTAIN POWER FOR THE AIRPORT SUBSTATION. CATHERINE MCMAINS SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
   d. GMP-Essex Solar/Storage 4.45 MW Solar Array (Case #18-2902-PET). John Zicconi questioned the exact location. Charlie said it’s off River Road east of Sand Hill Road. John then questioned the note on the last line regarding slopes. We added a line that says “With these conditions, the project will avoid local known constraints and minimize impacts to local possible constraints.” (This is the conclusion that the Essex PC and Essex staff came to.) Charlie said we added that because we got the information we had asked for. CATHERINE MCMAINS MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JOHN ZICCONI, TO APPROVE THE LETTER TO GREEN MOUNTAIN POWER REGARDING THE ESSEX SOLAR ARRAY/STORAGE. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

6. Recommend Agriculture Representative – Tom Eaton to Board. Charlie noted that CCRPC has been without a representative for Agriculture since shortly after he started. He planted a seed about seven years ago and two months ago we received information about Tom Eaton who is an Agronomy consultant who works with agriculture all over the state. He lives in Richmond and has a lot of knowledge about a lot of farms and could help with our basin planning. Charlie met with Mr. Eaton and Charlie recommends his appointment to the board. (We’ll check with other interest group representatives as well.) MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION THAT THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE BOARD APPOINT TOM EATON TO THE AGRICULTURE POSITION ON THE BOARD. JOHN ZICCONI SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

7. Personnel Policy Update – Dependent Care Account Benefit. Forest noted that we are proposing a new employee benefit. This allows the employee to have pre-tax dollars deducted from their paycheck and put into a dependent care FSA or DCA. It can be used to pay for daycare, nursery school, as well as adult dependent care. The cost to CCRPC will be an annual administration fee of $250 plus $50 per account. ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE ADDITION OF THE DEPENDENT CARE ACCOUNT BENEFIT TO OUR PERSONNEL POLICIES. JOHN ZICCONI SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
8. National Highway System Update. Charlie reviewed the memo and the attached maps. The first map is the NHS as it appears today. Under MAP-21 (passed in 2012) Congress made a change that all existing principal arterials be added to the NHS. So subsequently, 44.59 miles of new NHS routes were added in Chittenden County. Following this addition, VTrans determined that many of these routes do not meet the purpose of the NHS, so they removed all MAP-21 NHS additions outside of Chittenden County, with the CCRPC agreeing to evaluate the NHS within Chittenden County upon completion of the functional classification updates. Staff evaluated the current NHS, developed and presented a proposed updated NHS in Chittenden County to the TAC in June. After discussion, the TAC recommended a change to include VT-117 west of VT-289 to the NHS—a recommendation that VTrans did not agree with. VTrans did however agree with a subsequent staff recommendation to retain as NHS the segment of VT15 west of Exit 15 to the US7/US2 intersection (Circulator) in Winooski and the segment of US 7/US2 north of the circulator to Exit 16. The proposed NHS map in the packet includes the final staff recommendation for the Executive Committee’s consideration. Brief discussion ensued to clarify the different comments and recommendations received by various parties and the committee decided to recommend to the Board the final staff proposed NHS as described in the memo and presented in the map included in the packet. The Executive Committee also added that the NHS map should be revisited if/when major changes happen such as construction of the Crescent Connector in Essex Junction and other circulation changes in the village. Charlie said the staff recommendation would be to approve the proposed NHS map as presented with the understanding that it should be reviewed and amended as necessary as the transportation system changes. JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CATHERINE McMAINS, THAT THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE CCRPC BOARD APPROVE THE PROPOSED NHS MAP AS PRESENTED, WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT IT COULD BE AND SHOULD BE AMENDED AS THE SYSTEM CHANGES. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

9. Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plan Review. Members reviewed the proposed changes. Members agreed to a minor edit on page 7, to add after...within 45 days “of the request”. This will clarify when the start day is. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY JOHN ZICCONI, THAT THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS THAT THE CCRPC BOARD BE PRESENTED THESE GUIDELINES AS EDITED, INCLUDING ANY EDITS RECOMMENDED BY THE PAC AT THEIR SEPTEMBER 12TH MEETING, FOR ADOPTION AT THE SEPTEMBER 19TH BOARD MEETING. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

10. Transportation Performance Measures introduction. Eleni Churchill said the CCRPC is required as a designated MPO to develop targets for a number of FHWA performance measures in support of National Transportation Goals. There is a requirement to coordinate with VTrans on the development of the targets and also include performance measures and adopted targets in the MTP and TIP but could also be included in a separate document that will be referenced in any future MTP and TIP document. Staff is currently developing a separate Performance Management Report (PMR) for the MPO area that will include the measures and adopted targets so for any future changes to the targets we would only amend this document and not go through the extensive public hearing process to amend the MTP. Eleni provided a brief memo (excerpt from the PMR) that included background information on the performance management efforts at the federal level. She stated the National Transportation Goal areas: Safety, infrastructure condition (pavement and bridges), system reliability (NHS performance), freight movement and economic vitality, congestion reduction, environmental sustainability, and reduced project delivery delays. Eleni mentioned that we have already dealt with safety category by adopting the VTrans statewide targets back in February and now we have a deadline to set target for the rest of the relevant measures by the end of October/early November. John Zicconi said this will affect...
VTrans spending if we’re not meeting these performance measures. Eleni said the preliminary staff recommendation will be to adopt the VTrans statewide targets for all measures. A draft PMR will be sent to the Board and will be reviewed at the September meeting with action (on the targets) in October. Discussion continued.

11. Chair/Executive Director Report.
   a. Winooski Basin Plan. – Charlie provided a brief update as to the status of the Winooski Basin Plan review by the CWAC. It will be an information item at the September Board meeting and an action item at the October Board meeting.
   b. Clean Water Advisory Committee (CWAC). Charlie said the State is asking that we have a more inclusive membership that includes not only municipal representatives, but watershed groups, conservation committee reps, etc. CCRPC bylaws state that there shall be members and representatives of organizations as follows: 1 CCRPC board member, reps of 19 municipalities; UVM, ANR, VTrans, BTV and “other voting or non-voting members as may be determined by the CCRPC after a recommendation from the CWAC.” Charlie said there are three watershed organizations he recommends be added to the CWAC: Winooski Natural Resources Conservation District, Friends of the Winooski River and Lewis Creek Association. We won’t have to amend the bylaws, but just get appointments from these organizations.
   c. BTV Plan. Charlie has been asked to participate in the Airport’s Master Plan process. A key part is that their consultant has a recommendation for a connection to the interstate as Exit 14 N. Neither South Burlington or CCRPC have ever included that in our MTP. FHWA will not pay for an airport access only, but FAA will. The Master Plan process will take 18-24 months. There is a technical committee and all members are from inside the fence organizations: Air guard, Heritage Air, flight school, etc. He has heard in these briefings that BTV is the same size in acreage as Logan. BTV is the only airport in the Northeast that has de-icing stations at each gate.

12. Review Agenda for September 19th Board meeting. Members reviewed the proposed agenda. There will be an MPO training session from 5:15 – 6:00 p.m. It was noted that Yom Kippur begins on the 18th and ends at nightfall on the 19th. Members did not feel we should change the date of the meeting. We have a public hearing on the St. George Town Plan. There may be an issue because the plan refers to our old Regional Plan. It was agreed to move the Transportation Survey Results to the October meeting.

13. Other Business. There was no other business.

14. Executive Session. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO GO INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION AT 7:26 P.M. WITH THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PRESENT TO DISCUSS PERSONNEL MATTERS. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO COME OUT OF EXECUTIVE SESSION AT 7:35 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CATHERINE MCMAINS TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:45 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,
1  Bernadette Ferenc
September 28, 2018 DRAFT

Stephanie Monaghan  
District #4 Coordinator  
111 West Street  
Essex Junction, VT 05452

RE: UVM Patrick Forbush Gutterson Complex Expansion; Burlington; Application #4C0348-7

Dear Ms. Monaghan:

The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission’s Staff and Executive Committee have reviewed this Act 250 application for a project described as improvements to the Patrick Forbush Gutterson ("PFG") Complex including a new 96,681 square foot addition at the east side of the building for use as a multipurpose events center including a 3,000 seat basketball stadium; a 17,331 square foot building addition at the north side of the building for use as a health and wellness activity space; a 5,087 square foot infill of the existing racquetball courts; a 7,909 square foot addition to the south side of the Gutterson Field House for seating and new pedestrian concourse; and utility, landscaping, site and parking modifications. The project is located at 97 Spear Street in Burlington, VT. The City of Burlington’s Development Review Board approved the project on July 5, 2018. We offer the following comments:

The project is located within the Center Planning Area as defined in the Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan. We find this project to be consistent with the Planning Areas for the following reasons:

1. The Center Planning Area encompasses regional centers or traditional downtowns that serve the County and beyond and contain a mix of jobs, housing, and community facilities. Places within Center Planning Areas are served by wastewater facilities, other infrastructure, and offer a variety of transportation options, including non-motorized modes. The expansion of the PFG Complex aligns with this description.
2. The Center Planning Area is identified in the Plan as an area planned for growth, and therefore this project helps implement Strategy #2 of the Plan, which calls for 80% of new development in the areas planned for growth.
3. The project is consistent with the local regulations, as shown by the project’s City of Burlington Zoning Permit.

Therefore, we find this project to be in conformance with the Planning Areas of the 2018 Chittenden County Regional Plan.

Additionally, we find that this project complies with Criterion 9(L), as it is located in an existing center that is compact in form and size; that contains a mixture of uses that include a substantial residential component and that are within walking distance of each other; that has significantly higher densities than densities that occur outside the settlement; and that is served by municipal infrastructure including water, wastewater, sidewalks, paths and transit.

The application indicates there will be no new trips, as the number of spectator seats in the new stadium remains the same. We therefore have no comments related to traffic.

Due to the detailed level of development review in most Chittenden County municipalities and the environmental permit reviews at the Department of Environmental Conservation, CCRPC will give specific attention in its Act 250
reviews to the type of use and the Planning Areas section of the 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan. While there are many other topics covered in the 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan, there has been significant analysis at the Regional level regarding transportation impacts. The CCRPC will also focus its attention on transportation, where appropriate, in accordance with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, which is within the 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan.

These comments are based on information currently available; we may have additional comments as the process continues. Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Charlie Baker
Executive Director

Cc: CCRPC Board
Certificate of Service
October 4, 2018 DRAFT

Rachel Lomonaco  
Act 250 Coordinator  
111 West Street  
Essex Junction, VT  05452

RE: Clearview Estates; Milton; Application #4C1117R-2

Dear Ms. Lomonaco:

The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission’s Staff and Executive Committee have reviewed this Act 250 application for a project described as Phase III of Clearview Estates, including the creation of 21 lots and 41 residential units comprised of a mixture of single family and two-family structure units. The project is located on Westford Road, in Milton, Vermont. The Commission intends to narrow the scope of the hearing to 9B (primary agricultural soils) unless that scope is expanded by the Commission at the hearing. We understand that this project has not sought local approval from the Town of Milton.

We offer the following comments:

The project is located within the Metro Planning Area as defined in the Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan. We find this project to be consistent with the Planning Areas for the following reasons:

1. The Metro Planning Area is identified in the Plan as an area planned for growth, and therefore this project helps implement Strategy #2 of the Plan which calls for 80% of new development in the areas planned for growth.
2. The project is located in an area served by municipal water and sewer service.

Therefore, we find this project to be in conformance with the Planning Areas of the 2013 Chittenden County Regional Plan.

Because the scope of this hearing is limited to Criterion 9(B), only limited information was made available in advance of this hearing. **CCRPC will defer comments on other issues, including Criterion 9(L) and traffic impacts, until more information is available.**

Due to the detailed level of development review in most Chittenden County municipalities and the environmental permit reviews at the Department of Environmental Conservation, CCRPC will give specific attention in its Act 250 reviews to the type of use and the Planning Areas section of the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan. While there are many other topics covered in the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan, there has been significant analysis at the Regional level regarding transportation impacts. The CCRPC will also focus its attention on transportation, where appropriate, in accordance with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, which is within the 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan.
These comments are based on information currently available; we may have additional comments as the process continues. Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Charlie Baker
Executive Director

Cc: CCRPC Board
Certificate of Service
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Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
October 3, 2018
Agenda Item 4: Municipal Dues for FY20

FY2020 Municipal Dues

Background:

Each year the CCRPC assesses municipal dues that are primarily used to match federal transportation dollars for municipal and regional projects in Chittenden County.

The municipal dues assessment amounts are distributed among the member municipalities based on the Equalized Education Grand List (EEGL). Even with no increase in total dues, the dues for each municipality are adjusted each year consistent with their proportion of the EEGL. The most recent EEGL issued by the State of Vermont for Chittenden County is used in the FY20 tables. The January 2018 EEGL is available on Vermont Department of Taxes website.

The CCRPC had kept municipal dues level for fiscal years 2012 through 2014 following the merger. The dues were increased by 1.8% in FY15 based on the change in the Employment Cost Index (ECI) for State and Local Government employee Compensation, which is published by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). The Commission decided to level fund the dues again for FY16, FY17, FY18, and FY19. In summary, municipal dues have only been increased once in the last 8 fiscal years.

The increase in ECI for state and local government workers during the 12-month period ending June 2018 was 2.3%. Table 1 shows the FY20 dues with a proposed 2.3% increase over the FY20 dues. The overall dollar amount of a 2.3% increase is $5,630, for a total assessment of $250,400.

Table 2, included in the packet, presents the FY20 municipal dues table with a 0% increase for comparison.

Recommendations:

Staff recommends that the Executive Committee increase municipal dues by 2.3% for FY20.

For more information contact:

Forest Cohen
fcohen@ccrpcvt.org, 846-449 ext. 19
Each town is assessed dues using their percentage of the Equalized Education Grand List. Their amount is determined by taking the total dues and multiplying it by the municipality's percentage of the total Grand List.

Equalized Education Grand List can be accessed at the Vermont Department of Taxes
http://tax.vermont.gov/content/report-pvr-2018-education-grand-list-equalized-xls
Each town is assessed dues using their percentage of the Equalized Education Grand List. Their amount is determined by taking the total dues and multiplying it by the municipality's percentage of the total Grand List.

Equalized Education Grand List can be accessed at the Vermont Department of Taxes
http://tax.vermont.gov/content/report-pvr-2018-education-grand-list-equalized-xls
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
October 3, 2018
Agenda Item 5: Administrative & Operating Policies and Procedures Amendment – Micro-purchase policy

Background:
CCRPC maintains an Administrative & Operating Policies and Procedures document that is in compliance with state and federal rules and regulations. Part of our Procurement Policy is a rule about micro-purchases.

Micro-purchases are for those purchases of supplies or services that in the instance or aggregate annual amount don’t exceed a certain dollar threshold. These purchases require the least amount of process or rules of any procurement type because the dollar amounts are considered to be very small in the context of federal awards. Our policy, which mirrors the federal rules for micro-purchases, is that the price be “reasonable”, and “to the extent practical” we distribute micro-purchases “equitably among qualified suppliers.”

Both the definition and threshold amount for micro-purchases are set by federal regulation. The State of Vermont does not have a micro-purchase policy.

At the time we adopted the micro-purchase policy the threshold amount was $3,000. Since then the federal rules for micro-purchase thresholds have changed at least once.

Staff proposes that we amend our Micro-Purchase policy to reference the federal threshold as set by federal rules, instead of a dollar amount. This would allow CCRPC to be nimbler in our operations and to comply with federal rules. It would also reduce the need to amend the policy whenever a different dollar amount is set.

An amended version of the Administrative & Operating Policies & Procedures, p. 72, is presented for your consideration.

Recommendations: Staff recommends that the Executive Committee amend the Administrative & Operating Policies & Procedures as presented.

For more information contact: Forest Cohen
fcohen@ccrpcvt.org, 846-449 ext. 19
Solicitations for goods and services shall be based on a clear and accurate description of the technical requirements for the material, product, or service to be procured. Such description shall not, in competitive procurements, contain features which unduly restrict competition. Detailed product specifications should be avoided whenever possible. “Brand name or equivalent” description may be used as a means to define the performance or other salient requirements of a procurement. 2 CFR 200.319(c)(1)

CCRPC will take all necessary affirmative steps to assure that minority firms, women’s business enterprises, and labor surplus area firms are used when possible. Affirmative step include: placing qualified small and minority businesses and women’s business enterprises on solicitation lists; ensuring that small and minority businesses, and women’s business enterprises are solicited whenever they are potential sources; dividing total requirements, when economically feasible, into smaller tasks or quantities to permit maximum participation by small and minority business, and women’s business enterprises; and requiring the prime contractor, if subcontracts are to be let, to take the affirmative steps listed in this section. 2 CFR 200.321

**Procurement Types and Requirements**

CCRPC will follow bidding thresholds and procedures contained in 2 CFR § 200.320 and Vermont Agency of Administration Administrative Bulletin 3.5 Procurement and Contracting Procedures, which define four methods of procurement that may be used by CCRPC: procurement by micro-purchase (contact amount less than $3,000); procurement by small purchase procedures (contract less than $100,000); procurement by competitive proposals (optional for contracts under $100,000, required for contracts over $100,000). CCRPC’s preferred method of procuring contractor services is procurement by competitive proposals.

The Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC), the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC), or the Clean Water Advisory Committee (CWAC) approve retention of all technical contractors consistent with CCRPC’s Bylaws, based on the recommendations of a proposal selection committee. All contracts equal to or more than $15,000 are signed by the Chair of the CCRPC. Contracts less than $15,000 are signed by the Executive Director. Administration of those contracts is the responsibility of the Executive Director who may delegate it to appropriate staff.

**Procurement by Micro-Purchase—$3,000 or less**

Procurement by micro-purchase is the acquisition of supplies or services, the aggregate annual dollar amount of which does not exceed the micro-purchase threshold as stated in federal statute. 2 CFR § 200.67, currently defined at $2,000. Micro-purchases may be awarded without soliciting competitive quotations if CCRPC considers the price to be reasonable. To the extent practicable, CCRPC will distribute micro-purchases equitably among qualified suppliers. 2 CFR 200.320(a)

**Procurement by Small Purchase Procedures (Simplified Bid Process)—Contracts not more than $100,000**

A standard bidding process is the preferred method for selecting contractors. However, a simplified bid process may be used for relatively simple and informal procurements for securing services, supplies, or other property that do not cost more than $100,000 (per Vermont Bulletin 3.5). Justification for using a simplified bid process must be submitted to, and approved by, the CCRPC Executive Director in writing. A sample Simplified Bid Procurement Form is included in the contract section of this policy. A “simplified bid process” means that the CCRPC has developed a specific and detailed statement of work
Date: October __, 2018

To: Vermont Agency of Natural Resources, Department of Environmental Conservation

From: Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission

Re: RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING CONFORMANCE OF THE DRAFT WINOOSKI TACTICAL BASIN PLAN WITH THE 2018 CHITTENDEN COUNTY ECOS PLAN

CCRPC would like to commend Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) Watershed Coordinator Karen Bates, on the comprehensive presentation and analysis contained in the Draft Winooski Tactical Basin Plan (TBP). We appreciate the opportunity to work with her and other DEC staff to strengthen municipal and public participation in TBP development. We look forward to continued cooperation with DEC and with the Agency of Natural Resources as a whole on future TBPs, as well as water quality outreach and education and other activities.

BACKGROUND

CCRPC has the opportunity to provide recommendations to the Agency of Natural Resources regarding tactical basin plans pursuant to the following sections of Vermont Statutes Title 10, Chapter 47, §1253(d)

- (2)(G) ... the Secretary [of Natural Resources] shall: develop, in consultation with the regional planning commission, an analysis and formal recommendation on conformance with the goals and objectives of applicable regional plans.
- (3)(D) ... [the regional planning commissions are to] assist the Secretary in implementing a project evaluation process to prioritize water quality improvement projects within the region to assure cost effective use of State and federal funds.

The CCRPC reviewed the Draft Winooski Tactical Basin Plan that was issued for RPC review on August 28, 2018 and the formal draft issued on September ___, 2018. The Winooski Basin includes major portions of the Chittenden County towns of Colchester, Essex, Essex Junction, Essex, Jericho, Shelburne, South Burlington, Underhill, Williston and Winooski and small portions of Burlington, Hinesburg and Westford.

The 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan serves as the County’s Regional Plan. The ECOS Plan also serves as the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) for the County.

The purpose of this memorandum is to analyze the relative conformance of the Draft Winooski Tactical Basin Plan with the relevant Goals, Strategies and Recommended Actions of the ECOS Plan and to provide recommendations regarding project prioritization.

CONFORMANCE WITH THE REGIONAL PLAN

The draft Winooski Tactical Basin Plan is in conformance with and supportive of the 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan, specifically with the following ECOS Plan Goals and Strategies:

Goals:
**Natural Systems** – Design and maintain a strategically planned and managed green infrastructure network composed of natural lands, working landscapes, and open spaces that conserve ecosystem values and functions, and provide associated benefits to our community.

**Built Environment** - Make public and private investments in the built environment to minimize environmental impact, maximize financial efficiency, optimize social equity and benefits, and improve public health.

1. Ecological Systems (Habitats, Water Quality, Air Quality) - Conserve, protect and improve the health of native species habitats, water quality and quantity, and air quality.

12. Working Lands - Support the growth and vitality of working farms and managed forests; and sustainably manage sand and gravel extraction operations.

16. Infrastructure - Ensure adequate infrastructure and facilities (i.e. water supply, wastewater treatment, stormwater treatment, broadband coverage and solid waste recovery and recycling) to support areas planned for growth while conserving resources.

**Strategies:**

#2: Strive for 80% of new development in areas planned for growth, which amounts to 15% of our land area.

#3: Improve the safety, water quality, and habitat of our rivers, streams, wetlands and lakes in each watershed.

#4 Increase investment in and decrease subdivision of working lands and significant habitats, and support local food systems.

The following table details how the Basin Plan’s top objectives and strategies are in conformance with and supportive of specific Actions of the ECOS Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft Winooski Tactical Basin Plan, Objectives and Strategies</th>
<th>Conformance with select Actions of 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan (cf. applicable section)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protect river corridors and floodplains to increase flood resilience and allow rivers to reach equilibrium</td>
<td>Strategy 3, Action 1, River Hazard Protection. And multiple sub-actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase knowledge of water quality conditions in the basin, including the identification of high quality lakes</td>
<td>Strategy 3, Action 2, Non-point source pollution prevention and treatment. The ECOS Plan does not specifically list high priority lakes, but it does include implementation of the Winooski Tactical Basin Plan in Strategy 3, Action 1.e.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement agricultural Best Management Practices (BMPs)</td>
<td>Strategy 3, Action 2.b, includes &quot;Incentivize best management practices for agricultural uses; and encourage the Agency of Agriculture to better enforce their required agricultural practices.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Strategy 3. Action 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolve E. coli impairments in along Winooski between Plainfield and Cabot, Huntington, Mad Rivers and Allen Brook</td>
<td>Non-point source pollution prevention and treatment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage stormwater from developed areas through the development and implementation of stormwater master plans and Flow Restoration Plans in MS4 communities</td>
<td>Strategy 3. and all Action 2. sub-actions which include data collection of areas producing water quality pollutants, help municipalities with regulatory measures (i.e. MRGP, developed lands permit, etc.), and help municipalities and partners with non-regulatory approaches (financial assistance for stormwater facility improvements).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve littoral zone habitat along Lake Champlain, and ponds in the Kingsbury Branch</td>
<td>Strategy 3. Action 1.f. - &quot;To protect water quality, development should be located to avoid state and local known constraints that have been field verified, and to minimize impacts to state and local possible constraints that have been field verified.&quot; These constraints include floodplains, municipal surface water setbacks, riparian areas and wildlife connectivity resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory and prioritize municipal road erosion features that discharge into surface water and implement high priority actions in existing road erosion inventoried sites</td>
<td>Strategy 4. &quot;Increase investment in and decrease subdivision of working lands and significant habitats, and support local food systems.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide technical and as available, financial assistance to wastewater treatment facilities</td>
<td>Strategy 4. Action 1. Protect forest blocks, wildlife connectivity resources and crossings, surface waters, riparian areas and other significant habitats (e.g. wetlands) from development and fragmentation.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritize wetland and floodplain restoration projects</td>
<td>Strategy 3. Action 2 includes &quot;CCRPC will work with the municipalities and other partners to implement these programs: Municipal Roads General Permit, Phosphorus reduction integration into the existing MS4 permit, and Developed Lands (3 or more acres of impervious). See Chittenden County’s Work Plan and ....All Hazard Mitigation Plan ... for more detail on these actions.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritize remediation of forest roads and log landings with high erosion risk</td>
<td>Strategy 3. Water Quality protection and restoration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assist municipalities in identifying areas of landslide hazards for benefit of future development

Preliminary data on areas of potential landslides are located in the Chittenden County Multi-Jurisdictional All Hazards Mitigation Plan which is incorporated by reference into the ECOS Plan.

PLAN CONFORMANCE CONCLUSION

The draft Winooski Tactical Basin Plan is in conformance with and supportive of the 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan.

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

1. As projects are developed, DEC and other agencies and organizations that provide funding, or implement projects directly, should prioritize projects that achieve a high phosphorus removed benefit per cost ratio. Additionally, projects that also provide co-benefits such as other TMDLs (i.e. Flow Restoration Plans, e.coli, mercury, etc.), hazard mitigation, transportation improvement, aquatic organism passage, and/or listed in municipal comprehensive plans and capital plans should also receive additional consideration in making funding decisions.

2. Given that phosphorus-loading concerns are the most critical problem in the watershed and given the requirements in the Lake Champlain TMDL are the most pressing, the Basin Plan should make it clear that some of the 11 “Top Objectives and Strategies” are more important than others. For example, we recommend that 6 of those strategies be recast as “Secondary Objectives and Strategies,” namely: Identify and protect high quality lakes; Protect and remediate lake shorelands; Reduce the spread of Aquatic Invasive Species; Increase knowledge of water quality conditions in the Basin; Address Toxics, and Identify streams for reclassification.

3. While we respect the enthusiasm and determination of DEC to see projects implemented as can be seen in the following sections:

   “(t)he Tactical Basin Plan actions are described in Chapter 5’s implementation table summary and the Watershed Projects Database and will be addressed over the five-year life of the Winooski Basin Tactical Basin Plan.” (cf. p. 3) and “(i)t is envisioned that the action items currently in the database as of the signing of the plan will be accomplished within the next five years as resources allow.” (cf. p. 134)

   We recommend that the language in those sections be softened to make it clear that only a relatively small proportion of the actions can be implemented given not only the relatively low level of funds available but also the sheer human capital needed to scope, design and implement the projects within the next five-year period.

4. CRPCC recommends that more funding be allocated towards project development at this early stage so that in subsequent years it will be easier to determine which projects reduce the most
5. CCRPC recommends that for project implementation, priority be given to those projects that reduce the most phosphorus per dollar spent with priority given to those projects with additional co-benefits.

6. CCRPC recommends that RPCs, through their Clean Water Advisory Committee be allowed to provide input to DEC’s prioritization scoring system as intended by statute: Title 10, Chapter 47, §1253(d)(3)(D) … [the regional planning commissions are to] assist the Secretary in implementing a project evaluation process to prioritize water quality improvement projects within the region to assure cost effective use of State and federal funds.

Additional comments regarding wastewater systems

According to the most recent Vermont Water Quality Funding 20-Year Projection developed by the “Working Group on Water Quality Funding, 2017 Act 73 Section 26 which submitted its report to the Vermont General Assembly in late 2017, below is a table that summarizes the cost by sector along with the required phosphorus load reduction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>20-Yr Cost ($M)</th>
<th>P-Reduction (tons)</th>
<th>$M/ton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>$143</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>$1.8M/ton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>$637</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>$4.5 M/ton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>$708</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$29.5 M/ton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Water Pollution</td>
<td>$1,039</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$45.2 M/ton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,526</strong></td>
<td><strong>268</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CCRPC recommends that the State looks for ways for phosphorus reduction investments to be made in the most cost-effective manner possible. Providing mechanisms for municipalities and other property owners with permits to invest in Natural Resource or Agriculture sector phosphorus reduction would clearly provide for much more phosphorus reduction per dollar spent.

Similarly, while the “all-in” approach to phosphorus reduction has a certain marketing appeal, it is clear both from a financial efficiency and efficacy standpoint that requiring multi-million-dollar upgrades to municipal wastewater plants to remove a relatively low amount of phosphorus is counterproductive to achieving the targets established in the Lake Champlain TMDL. Increasing these municipal operating costs will in turn further increase already high housing costs in Chittenden County and drive development and housing sales further into greenfields and present risks to intact wetlands, streams and the watershed as a whole.

Strategy 7 [Develop financing and governance systems to make the most efficient use of taxpayer dollars and reduce costs] of the ECOS Plan notes that

*Considering development and growth comes with both costs and benefits, this Plan attempts to reach a balance by directing growth in such a way that new infrastructure and long-term maintenance costs are minimized. For example: Promotion of and incentives for compact development in areas planned for growth will help keep rural areas open; this*
can also minimize stormwater problems and prevent new watersheds from becoming impaired.

Simply put, the imposition of additional costs (at a poor phosphorus per pound removal rate) on municipal wastewater systems (and to some extent municipal stormwater systems) will make it difficult for Chittenden County communities to develop appropriately and to meet key Strategies outlined in the 2018 ECOS Plan, especially #1 - #4.

1. Improve and strengthen the economic systems of our region...
2. Strive for 80% of new development in areas planned for growth..
3. Improve the safety, water quality, and habitat of our rivers, streams, wetlands and lakes...
4. Increase investment in and decrease subdivision of working lands and significant habitats...

Thank you for your consideration of our recommendations. If you desire clarification on this letter, please do not hesitate to contact Dan Albrecht, dalbrecht@ccrpcvt.org or 802-846-4490, Ext. *29.

Note: The CCRPC will plan to provide additional staff level comments prior to the formal comment deadline.
Chittenden County Performance Targets for NHS Pavement & Bridges, NHS Travel Time Reliability, and Freight Movements

**Background:** The most recent federal transportation bills, Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) Act and Fixing America’s Transportation System (FAST) Act, place considerable emphasis on system performance and direct State Departments of Transportation (DOTs), Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and Public Transit Providers to evaluate how well the transportation system is performing. At the national level, performance management has become part of the Federal Highway Administration’s (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration’s (FTA) Transportation Performance Management (TPM) program. The TPM program is a strategic initiative that uses system information to direct investments and implement polices to help achieve national performance goals. The intent is to measure progress towards the national goals through a reliable data-driven process.

FHWA has established measures in the following areas:
- Safety
- Infrastructure Condition (Pavement & Bridges)
- Congestion
- System Reliability (NHS Performance)
- Freight Movements (Interstate)
- Environmental Sustainability
- Reduced Project Delivery Delay

Once the performance measures were established at the federal level, it is up to state DOTs and MPOs to set quantifiable targets to gauge progress towards state and national goals. The schedule to establish targets, varies by measure. Federal regulations generally have state DOTs set performance targets in the various categories and then give MPOs another 180 days to either agree to the State targets or establish their own.

VTrans, in collaboration with the CCRPC, developed the statewide targets for NHS bridge and pavement performance; NHS travel time reliability for passenger vehicles; and Interstate travel reliability for freight movements. Statewide targets for performance measures for all relevant Vermont categories are listed below:

**Infrastructure Condition - Pavement**
- Percentage of pavement on the Interstate in good condition: **35%**
- Percentage of pavement on the Interstate in poor condition: **4.9%**
- Percentage of pavement on the non-Interstate NHS in good condition: **30%**
- Percentage of pavement on the non-Interstate NHS in poor condition: **9.9%**
Infrastructure Condition - *Bridges*
- Percentage of NHS bridges in good condition: **35% min**
- Percentage of NHS bridges in poor condition: **6.0%**

**National Highway System Reliability**
- Percent of Interstate System person-miles traveled that are reliable: **90%**
- Percent of non-Interstate NHS person-miles traveled that are reliable: **80%**

**Freight Movements and Economic Vitality**
- Interstate System Truck Travel Time Index: **Less than 1.75**

For more information on performance measures and targets and the reasons for the staff recommendation please see the draft CCRPC Performance Management Report in your packet.

**Staff Recommendation:**
The Executive Committee recommends that the CCRPC Board agrees to the statewide targets for all performance measures under the NHS Infrastructure Condition, NHS Time Travel Reliability, and Interstate Freight Movement categories.

**Staff contacts:**
Eleni Churchill, echurchill@ccrpcvt.org
Peter Keating, pkeating@ccrpcvt.org
Introduction

The most recent federal transportation bills, Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) Act and Fixing America’s Transportation System (FAST) Act, place considerable emphasis on system performance and direct State Departments of Transportation (DOTs), Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and Public Transit Providers to evaluate how well the transportation system is performing. At the national level, performance management has become part of the Federal Highway Administration’s (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration’s (FTA) Transportation Performance Management (TPM) program (https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tpm/ & https://www.transit.dot.gov/PerformanceManagement). The TPM program is a strategic initiative that uses system information to direct investments and implement polices to help achieve national performance goals. The intent is to measure progress towards the national goals through a reliable data-driven process.

COORDINATION

In establishing targets for all performance measures, state DOTs are required to coordinate with all MPOs in the state as well as Public Transit Providers (where applicable). The schedule to establish targets varies by measure. Federal regulations generally have state DOTs set performance targets in the various categories and then give MPOs another 180 days to either adopt the State targets or establish their own.

The CCRPC has an agreement with VTrans and Green Mountain Transit (GMT – transit provider in the MPO area) dated May 18, 2016 that describes our intent to work collaboratively in carrying out the performance based planning as outlined in federal rules. The agreement can be accessed at: https://www.ccrpcvt.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/CCTA-CCRPC-VTrans-Agreement-May-2016.pdf.

On May 27, 2016, the final rule for statewide and metropolitan transportation planning was published. As part of this final rule, 23 CFR 450.314 (h) was amended to state:

The MPO(s), State(s), and the providers of public transportation shall jointly agree upon and develop specific written provisions for cooperatively developing and sharing information related to transportation performance data, the selection of performance targets, the reporting of performance targets, the reporting of performance to be used in tracking progress toward attainment of critical outcomes for the region of the MPO (see §450.306(d)) … These provisions shall be documented either as part of the metropolitan planning agreements required under paragraphs (a), (e), and (g) of this section, or documented it in some other means outside of the metropolitan planning agreements as determined cooperatively by the MPO(s), State(s), and providers of public transportation.

The Vermont Agency of Transportation (VTrans) has coordinated with the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC), which serves as the only MPO that operates within Vermont, on all statewide targets developed for the following areas: Safety, Infrastructure Condition, NHS Reliability, and Freight Movements.
DEVELOPING AND SHARING OF DATA

VTrans is the agency primarily responsible for developing statewide data for all established measures to track progress towards meeting the approved targets under each category. VTrans has in the past and we anticipate will continue in the future to provide data for the MPO area so that the CCRPC can track progress towards various transportation goals under the 2018 ECOS/Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). Relevant data will be shared with GMT to facilitate their transit planning and tracking their established targets.

National Transportation Goals and FHWA Performance Measures

MEASURES AND TARGETS

FHWA has established or will be establishing measures for the following National Goal areas:

- **Safety**: To achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads.
- **Infrastructure Condition (Pavement & Bridges)**: To maintain the highway infrastructure asset system in a state of good repair.
- **System Reliability (NHS Performance)**: To improve the efficiency of the surface transportation system.
- **Freight Movements and Economic Vitality**: To improve the National Highway Freight Network, strengthen the ability of rural communities to access national and international trade markets, and support regional economic development.
- **Congestion Reduction**: To achieve a significant reduction in congestion on the National Highway System.
- **Environmental Sustainability**: To enhance the performance of the transportation system while protecting and enhancing the natural environment.
- **Reduced project delivery delays**: To reduce project costs, promote jobs and the economy, and expedite the movement of people and goods by accelerating project completion through eliminating delays in the project development and delivery process, including reducing regulatory burdens and improving agencies' work practices.

The established performance measures under each of these categories are:

- **Safety**
  1. Number of Fatalities
  2. Rate of Fatalities per 100 million Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)
  3. Number of Serious Injuries
  4. Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 million VMT
  5. Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Non-Motorized Serious Injuries

- **Infrastructure Condition**

  *Pavement*
  1. Percentage of pavement on the Interstate in good condition
  2. Percentage of pavement on the Interstate in poor condition
3. Percentage of pavement on the non-Interstate National Highway System (NHS) in good condition
4. Percentage of pavement on the non-Interstate National Highway System (NHS) in poor condition

**Bridges**
1. Percentage of NHS bridges in good condition
2. Percentage of NHS bridges in poor condition

- **National Highway System Reliability**
  1. Percent of Interstate System person-miles traveled that are reliable
  2. Percent of non-Interstate NHS person-miles traveled that are reliable

- **Freight Movements and Economic Vitality**
  1. Percent of Interstate System providing reliable truck travel times

- **Congestion Reduction** - *Not required in Vermont because we are not a designated nonattainment area*
  1. Annual Hours of National Highway System Peak-Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita
  2. Percent of National Highway System Peak-Hour Non-SOV travel
  3. Total CMAQ project emissions

- **Environmental Sustainability** – *No Rulemaking on this measure*
  1. Percent change in tailpipe carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions on the National Highway System

- **Reduced Project Delivery Delays** – *No measures?*

### Safety Performance Targets

#### STATEWIDE AND CCRPC TARGETS
The Vermont Agency of Transportation (VTrans) and the CCRPC have closely collaborated through the winter and spring of 2017 to develop statewide targets for the five performance measures that were established under the Safety category in support of the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP). These targets are set by DOTs and MPOs to evaluate performance on reducing fatalities and serious injuries on our highways. State HSIP targets are reported by August 31 each year and MPOs must establish targets within 180 days of the State reporting their targets or by February 27 of each year.

#### COORDINATION – CCRPC/VTRANS
On January 10, 2017 VTrans and CCRPC staff attended an FHWA sponsored workshop on safety performance target setting. Following the workshop VTrans established a multi-disciplinary task force to evaluate crash data and propose the 2017 safety targets for Vermont’s public roads. The task force met in February 2017 and discussed data for each of the five performance measures from 2005 to the most recent year that data was available and developed proposed targets for the established measures that were vetted by the VTrans’
Executive Staff and the Vermont Highway Safety Alliance Board of Directors throughout the spring of 2017. VTrans Task force participants are listed below:

**VTrans and CCRPC/MPO Attendees:**
Bruce Nyquist, Director, VTrans OHS
Scott Davidson, Chief, VTrans GHSP
Mario Dupigny-Giroux, VTrans HSIP
Evelyn McFarlane, VHSA
Costa Pappis, VTrans Planning Coordinator
Jon Kaplan, VTrans, Bike & Ped Coordinator
Eleni Churchill, CCRPC/MPO Transportation Program Manager

**VTRANS AND MPO SAFETY TARGETS**

Table 1 presents VTrans’ statewide safety targets as reported in the 2017 Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) report (https://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/hsip/reports/pdf/2017/vt.pdf). Figures 1 through 5 illustrate the crash data tracked to help establish statewide safety targets for Vermont’s public roads. The CCRPC Board adopted the VTrans statewide safety targets for the MPO area at their meeting on February 21, 2018.

**Table 1 – 2018 VTrans and CCRPC Adopted Safety Performance Targets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VTrans Safety Performance Management Targets (5-Year Averages)</th>
<th>2018 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Fatalities</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Fatalities per 100M VMT</td>
<td>0.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Serious Injuries</td>
<td>280.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Serious Injuries per 100M VMT</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Non-Motorized Serious Injuries</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1: Statewide and Chittenden County: Annual and 5-Year Average Fatalities

Figure 2: Statewide and Chittenden County: Annual and 5-Year Average Serious Injuries
Figure 3: Statewide and Chittenden County 5-year Average Fatality Rate

Figure 4: Statewide and Chittenden County 5-year Average Serious Injury Rate
NHS Pavement and Bridge Performance Targets

BACKGROUND

The final FHWA rule on establishing performance measures for State DOTs to use in managing pavement and bridge performance on the NHS was published in the Federal Register on May 20, 2017. DOTs had one year from the effective date to establish statewide performance targets and MPOs have an additional 180 days to either accept the statewide targets or adopt their own. This final rule also establishes the process for DOTs and MPOs to report targets and the process that FHWA will use to assess progress towards achieving the targets. The established NHS pavement and bridge performance measures are:

- Percentage of pavements on the Interstate System in Good condition;
- Percentage of pavements on the Interstate System in Poor condition;
- Percentage of pavements on the NHS (excluding the Interstate System) in Good condition;
- Percentage of pavements on the NHS (excluding the Interstate System) in Poor condition;
- Percentage of deck area of NHS bridges classified as in Good condition; and
- Percentage of deck area of NHS bridges classified as in Poor condition.

VTrans collects NHS pavement condition data in 0.1 mile segments. Pavement condition is computed using the following metrics: International Roughness Index, Cracking Percent, Rutting, and Faulting. If two or more
metrics are rated poor for a specific segment then the pavement for that segment is rated “Poor.” All metrics must be good in order for pavement of a specific roadway segment to be considered “Good.” Pavement segments not meeting any of the criteria above are considered to be in “Fair” condition.

VTrans collects NHS bridge data and computes the percent of deck area classified as “Good” and “Poor” using National Bridge Inventory (NBI) condition ratings for Deck, Superstructure, Substructure. The condition of a specific bridge is determined by the lowest rating of these components. If the lowest rating is greater than or equal to 7, the bridge is classified as good; if any component is less than or equal to 4, the bridge is classified as poor (structurally deficient). Deck area not meeting any of these criteria is considered to be “Fair.”

COORDINATION MEETING

As required by federal rules, VTrans, CCRPC and FHWA staff met on January 24, 2018 to review and discuss potential targets for the NHS bridge and pavement performance measure targets. Participating staff are listed below:

VTrans Attendees:
Chad Allen, Asset Management & Performance (AMP) Bureau Director
Amy Bell, Transportation Planner & VTrans’ MPO Coordinator
Reid Kiniry, Pavement Subject Matter Expert
Kevin Marshia, AMP Budget & Programming Manager
Zoe Neaderland, Transportation Planner and Lead Writer on VTrans’ TAMP
Costa Pappis, VTrans Transportation Planning Coordinator
Dave Pelletier, Transportation Planner & Long Range Transportation Plan Lead
Jason Tremblay, Risk Management Engineer

MPO: Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC)
Charlie Baker, CCRPC Executive Director
Eleni Churchill, CCRPC Transportation Program Manager

FHWA:
Chris Jolly, Planning & Programming Engineer
Tod Kimball, Structures/Bridge Engineer
Paul Maloney, Program Analyst
Larkin Wellborn, Field Operations Engineer

STATEWIDE PERFORMANCE TARGETS

VTrans, in collaboration with the CCRPC, developed the statewide targets for the NHS pavement and bridge measures and these targets were submitted to FHWA on April 30, 2018. The CCRPC has until October 27, 2018 to either accept the statewide targets or adopt targets for the MPO area. Statewide targets for NHS pavements and bridges are presented in Tables 2 and 3, respectively.
## Table 2 – Vermont NHS Pavement Condition and Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pavement</th>
<th>Interstate System</th>
<th>Non-Interstate NHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>640.35 miles</td>
<td>457.69 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of pavements of the Interstate in <strong>Good</strong> Condition</td>
<td>173.3 miles</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>Target:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of pavements of the Interstate in <strong>Poor</strong> Condition(^1)</td>
<td>13.27 miles</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>Target:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Maximum:</strong></td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td><strong>Federal Maximum:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VTrans</th>
<th>Interstate System</th>
<th>Non-Interstate NHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77.2 miles(^2)</td>
<td>71.87 miles(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of pavements of the Interstate in <strong>Good</strong> Condition</td>
<td>8.0 miles(^2)</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td><strong>35.0%</strong></td>
<td>Target:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of pavements of the Interstate in <strong>Poor</strong> Condition</td>
<td>0 miles(^2)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td><strong>4.9%</strong></td>
<td>Target:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

\(^1\) - Indicates the enforcement of a possible penalty! If for 3 consecutive years the minimum Interstate condition level is not met then the State must obligate and set aside NHPP funds for eligible pavement projects on the NHS.

\(^2\) - These values could change significantly as the NHS within the MPO is currently being evaluated and significant changes are expected.

*Proposed CCRPC Target*
Table 3 – Vermont NHS Bridge Condition and Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bridges</th>
<th>NHS Bridge Condition by Deck Area as of 12/31/2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VTrans</td>
<td>All NHS Bridges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of NHS Bridges classified as in Good Condition:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current:</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of NHS Bridges classified as in Poor Condition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current:</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Maximum:</td>
<td>10%¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO</td>
<td>All NHS Bridges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of NHS Bridges classified as in Good Condition:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current:</td>
<td>37%²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>35.0%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of NHS Bridges classified as in Poor Condition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current:</td>
<td>1.1%²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>6.0%*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1 - Indicates the enforcement of a possible penalty! If for 3 consecutive years the minimum condition level of NHS bridges is not met then the State must obligate and set aside NHPP funds for eligible bridge projects on the NHS.
2 - These values could change significantly as the NHS within the MPO is currently being evaluated and significant changes are expected.

*Proposed CCRPC Target

RECOMMENDED CCRPC PERFORMANCE TARGETS

Preliminary staff recommendation: Board should adopt the VTrans statewide targets for the NHS pavement and bridge measures as presented in Tables 2 and 3. Reasons for this recommendation include:

- There are no practical policy or funding benefits or negative implications for the CCRPC to adopt separate targets.
- Extra work and coordination would be required to set separate CCRPC targets with no clear benefits.
- Currently, there is no historic data for pavement conditions on municipally owned NHS highways in the state, including Chittenden County – VTrans began collecting pavement condition data for these NHS

Notes:
1 - Indicates the enforcement of a possible penalty! If for 3 consecutive years the minimum condition level of NHS bridges is not met then the State must obligate and set aside NHPP funds for eligible bridge projects on the NHS.
2 - These values could change significantly as the NHS within the MPO is currently being evaluated and significant changes are expected.

*Proposed CCRPC Target
segments in 2017. Furthermore, the CCRPC is recommending changes to the NHS system that might render the initial 2017 NHS data not fully useable.

- As we collect and monitor data under this category, the Board will have the opportunity to set targets for the MPO area in the future.

## NHS System Reliability & Freight Movement Performance Targets

### BACKGROUND

The final FHWA rule on establishing performance measures for State DOTs to use in managing operational performance on the National Highway System (NHS) was published in the Federal Register on May 20, 2017. DOTs had one year from the effective date to establish statewide performance targets and MPOS have an additional 180 days to either accept the statewide targets or adopt their own. This final rule also establishes the process for DOTs and MPOs to report targets and the process that FHWA will use to assess progress towards achieving the targets. The three performance measures for assessing NHS and Freight Performance which are applicable to Vermont are:

- Interstate NHS Travel Time Reliability Measure;
- Non-Interstate NHS Travel Time Reliability Measure; and
- Interstate NHS Truck Travel Time Reliability Index.

*Travel time reliability* is a measure of how reliable, or predictable, travel times are on the NHS over the course of a calendar year and is presented as the percent of person-miles traveled on the Interstate and non-Interstate NHS that are reliable.

- For more information please go to: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tpm/workshop/az/reliability.pdf.

*Truck time travel reliability* index is a measure of how reliable is truck travel on the Interstate.

- For more information go to : https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tpm/workshop/az/freight.pdf.

### COORDINATION MEETING

As required by federal rules, VTrans, CCRPC and FHWA staff met on March 13, 2018 to review and discuss potential targets for the NHS operations and freight performance targets. Participating staff are listed below:

**VTrans:**
- Josh Schultz, TSMO Manager
- Amy Bell, Transportation Planner & VTrans’ MPO Coordinator
- Zoe Neaderland, Transportation Planner
- Joe Segale, Policy, Planning and Research Bureau Director
- Kevin Viani, Chief of Performance
- Mike Pologruto, Chief of Quality Assurance
- Ian Degutis, Traffic Mobility Engineer
**STATEWIDE PERFORMANCE TARGETS**

VTrans, in collaboration with the CCRPC, developed the statewide targets for NHS travel time reliability for passenger vehicles and freight movements and these targets were submitted to FHWA on May 14, 2018. The CCRPC has until November 10, 2018 to either accept the statewide targets or adopt targets for the MPO area.

VTrans used FHWA’s National Performance Management Research Data Set (NPMRDS v2) to monitor travel time performance for passenger vehicles and trucks on the National Highway System. Vermont’s statewide data and performance targets are presented in Figures 6 through 8.

**Figure 6 – Statewide Interstate Travel Time Reliability**

![Figure 6 - Statewide Interstate Travel Time Reliability](image-url)
Figure 7 – Statewide Non-Interstate NHS Travel Time Reliability

2017 Non-interstate NHS Travel Time Reliability for Vermont

Vermont
MAP-21 Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Non-Interstate NHS That Are Reliable (the Non-Interstate NHS Travel Time Reliability measure)

2017 Target at least 80.0%

Year-to-Date 2017

Target: At least 80% of the system should have a LOTTR less than 1.50

Calculated using 100.00% of miles in Vermont
Data source: NPMRDS INRIX

Figure 8 – Statewide Interstate Truck Travel Time Reliability Index

2017 Truck Travel Time Reliability Index for Vermont

Vermont
MAP-21 Truck Travel Time Reliability Index

2017 Target less than 1.75

Year-to-Date 2017

Target: The system should have a TTTR less than 1.75

Calculated using 100.00% of miles in Vermont
Data source: NPMRDS INRIX
CHITTENDEN COUNTY TRAVEL TIME RELIABILITY DATA

Travel time reliability data for the MPO region are presented in Figures 9 through 11. Target values shown are VTrans’ statewide target values; The CCRPC has 180 days following the VTrans submittal of the NHS Performance targets to determine targets for their region.

Figure 9 – Chittenden County Interstate Travel Time Reliability

![Figure 9](image_url)

Figure 10 – Chittenden County Non-Interstate NHS Travel Time Reliability

![Figure 10](image_url)
RECOMMENDED CCRPC PERFORMANCE TARGETS

Preliminary staff recommendation: Board should adopt the VTrans statewide targets as presented in Figures 6, through 8 for the NHS time travel reliability and truck travel reliability index for the MPO area. Reasons for this recommendation include:

- There are no practical policy or funding benefits or negative implications for the CCRPC to adopt separate targets.
- Extra work and coordination would be required to set separate CCRPC targets with no clear benefits.
- Generally, there is limited historic data (2 years) from which to set statewide or regional targets and furthermore the available data for the non-Interstate NHS routes in Chittenden County is unreliable.
- As we collect and monitor data under this category, the Board will have the opportunity to set targets for the MPO area in the future.
REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
Wednesday, October 17, 2018 - 6:00 p.m.
CCRPC Offices; 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202
Winooski, VT 05404

TRAINING – MPO Introduction 5:15 – 6:00 p.m. (Light dinner will be available)

CONSENT AGENDA – DRAFT
C.1 TIP Amendments

DELIBERATIVE AGENDA
1. Call to Order; Changes to the Agenda
2. Public Comment Period on Items NOT on the Agenda
3. Action on Consent Agenda - (MPO Business) (Action; 1 minute)
4. Approve Minutes of September 19, 2018 Meeting* (Action; 1 minute)
5. Winooski Tactical Basin Plan * (Action; 20 minutes)
6. Transportation Survey Results* (Discussion; 30 minutes)
7. FY20 Municipal Dues* (Action; 5 minutes)
8. Clean Water Advisory Committee (CWAC) Membership Guidelines* (Action; 10 minutes)
9. Committee on Commission on Act 250 Appointments* (Action; 10 minutes)
10. Transportation Performance Measures Report* - (MPO Business) (Action; 10 minutes)
11. Chair/Executive Director Report (Discussion; 5 minutes)
a. Cabinet for a Day
b. Building Homes Together results
c. Public Utility Commission meetings
d. Legislative Breakfast
12. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports * (Information, 2 minutes)
a. Executive Committee (draft minutes October 3, 2018)*
   i. Act 250 Sec 248 letters*
b. Transportation Advisory Committee (draft minutes, October 2, 2018)*
c. CWAC & MS4 Subcommittee (draft minutes, October 2, 2018)*
d. Planning Advisory Committee (draft minutes, September 12, 2018)*
13. Members’ Items, Other Business (Information, 5 minutes)
14. Adjourn

The October 17th Chittenden County RPC streams LIVE on YouTube at
https://www.youtube.com/Channel17TownMeetingTV. The meeting will air on ____________ 2018 at 1 p.m. and is available on the web at https://www.cctv.org/watch-tv/series/chittenden-county-regional-planning-commission.

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.
Upcoming Meetings - Unless otherwise noted, all meetings are held at our offices:

- Transportation Advisory Committee - Tuesday, November 6, 2018; 9:00 a.m.
- Clean Water Advisory Committee - Tuesday, November 6, 2018; 11:00 a.m.
- CWAC MS4 Subcommittee - Tuesday, November 6, 2018; 12:15 a.m.
- Planning Advisory Committee - Wednesday, November 7, 2018; 2:30 p.m.
- Executive Committee - Wednesday, November 7, 2018; 5:45 p.m.
- **HAPPY THANKSGIVING!** Thanks for all you do.
- CCRPC Board Meeting - Wednesday, **November 28, 2018; 6:00 p.m.**

Tentative future Board agenda items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Agenda Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 28, 2018</td>
<td><strong>MPO Training Session in advance of Meeting (5:15 p.m.)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY18 Audit – Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UPWP Process Update – Action?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>greenride bikeshare Update – Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vermont Climate Action Pledge - Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VTrans Project Selection &amp; Prioritization Process - Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December ?</td>
<td>Legislative Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 16, 2019</td>
<td>Mid-Year Budget Adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECOS Annual Report?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.