Committee Chair Mike O’Brien opened the meeting at 5:37 p.m.

Introductions were made.

The minutes from the first UPWP Committee meeting were reviewed and approved with no changes. John Zicconi made the motion and Jeff Bartley seconded.

Eleni Churchill introduced the second draft of the UPWP project spreadsheet to the Committee. Projects highlighted in red signify a recommended deletion by CCRPC staff; blue signifies a change from the previous spreadsheet; yellow signifies an outstanding question.

The budget for the Chittenden County Freight Plan was reduced to $40,000 after Eleni coordinated with VTrans.

The Prioritization of Regional Bike/Ped Connections, Model Parking Guidelines and the Regional Park and Ride Plan were recommended to be removed by CCRPC staff because of budget constraints. These will be reevaluated at mid-year.

The Water Quality Transportation task was reduced from $100,000 to $40,000 because sufficient funding for water quality projects is being directed to the municipalities through individual project requests as part of the UPWP process.

Chris Jolly asked about the status of current park and ride projects. The Exit 16 park and ride was completed, and coordination is taking place to evaluate options around Exit 17. Amy Bell suggested that since there aren’t many park and ride projects in the pipeline, this task should see a higher level of prioritization. Eleni said that a consensus was made by staff to wait until GMT updates their new transit routes prior to moving forward with an update to the Park and Ride Plan.

The Regional Energy Assistance task was changed to staff time only.

The E&D budget was reduced further because this task is just a placeholder for now. John Zicconi asked about how this task relates to the current United Way project. Charlie Baker mentioned that this is intended to be a follow up to that work.

The 150,000 budget is still the best estimate that CCRPC staff have for the FY20 phase of the I-89 Project. There will be better information for the next meeting.

Way to Go! is a new addition that was not included on the original spreadsheet.

Marshall Distel brought up Dean Pierce’s comment about whether the Multiuse Path Connecting Williston to South Burlington should be a regional project. Amy Bell said that this link was identified as a regional priority within the Active Transportation Plan.
• The Winooski Ave task was removed because no new funds are being requested for FY20.
• Eleni described the ongoing conversation with Burlington about the ROW inventory request. At the request of CCRPC staff, Burlington provided three new cost proposals with assessment areas every 500 feet versus every 200 feet. The UPWP Committee would like CCRPC staff to clarify the difference in cost between doing two wards and one ward within a single fiscal year.
• Burlington’s Lake Street request was changed to a feasibility study rather than a scoping study.
• The budget for the Colchester Avenue project was reduced to $60,000 from $85,000 after discussions with Burlington. If safety funding becomes available from VTrans, this project would become a higher priority for Burlington.
• The cost proposals for the Essex and Essex Junction stormwater inventory projects were lowered to $45,000 each because the cleaning of the pipes was removed from the proposal.
• The description of the Tanglewood Drive Project was updated to reflect the need to complete scoping.
• CCRPC staff clarified the scope of the Stormwater Project Conceptual Design task with Richmond, VTrans and FHWA.
• The UPWP Committee discussed the procurement issues with UVM’s Chittenden County Bus Commuter Ridership Pilot Project. After discussions with VTrans and UVM, there may be a way forward through the use of a cooperative agreement. Questions were raised about how this new request would relate to the Route 116 request from FY19. Marshall Distel conveyed that UVM held a meeting with GMT and CATMA to discuss the development of this project. Both GMT and CATMA expressed support for the project and recognized the regional benefits. John Zicconi expressed concerns about the project and the process. Michael Bissonnette informed the Committee that he has not seen final results from the first study. Amy Bell suggested that if UPWP funds were granted to UVM, then that might open the door to numerous other entities, other than the traditional TDM partners, requesting UPWP funds. Mike O’Brien asked if there was a consensus to remove this task from the UPWP. The Committee agreed to remove this request from the draft UPWP and to reconsider at mid-year after the final results are made available from the Route 116 project.
• The VEIC budget was cut down to $30,000.
• Charlie Baker outlined the next steps. At the third UPWP Committee meeting on 3/21, CCRPC staff will present a full draft of the FY20 UPWP.
• Marshall Distel provided the Committee with a funding overview of the FY18-FY20 UPWP requests. Water quality requests have been increasing, while traditional transportation-related studies have been decreasing. Marshall Distel also mentioned that Bryan Davis had prepared an overview spreadsheet of partner requests and deliverables. A link will be sent by email to the Committee members.
• John Zicconi made a motion to adjourn the meeting, with a second from Michael Bissonnette. The meeting adjourned at 6:37.

Respectfully submitted,

Marshall Distel