



FY2021 UPWP Committee - Meeting 2

February 19, 2020

Members Present:

Catherine McMains, Committee Chair
John Zicconi, Board
Michael Bissonnette, Board
Jaqueline Murphy, Board
Sharon Murray, Board
Amy Bell, VTrans
Chris Damiani, GMT
Chris Jolly, FHWA
Annie Costandi, CWAC
Karen Adams, CWAC

Eric Vorwald, PAC
Justin Rabidoux (via phone), TAC
Barbara Elliot, TAC

Staff:

Charlie Baker, CCRPC
Eleni Churchill, CCRPC
Regina Mahony, CCRPC
Marshall Distel, CCRPC
Bryan Davis, CCRPC

1. Welcome & Introductions

Committee Chair Catherine McMains opened the meeting shortly after 3:30 p.m. and introductions were made. There were no changes to the agenda.

2. Review and approval of UPWP Committee Minutes – Meeting #1

Barbara Elliot made a motion, seconded by Sharon Murray, to approve the minutes from the first UPWP Committee meeting that was held on 1/23.

3. Review of FY21 Project Applications, Comments and Updates with a Focus on PL-Funded (Transportation) Projects

Eleni Churchill introduced the updated project spreadsheet to the UPWP Committee. Marshall Distel outlined the new color scheme. Projects shaded in green indicated a new addition; yellow shading indicated that a change was made; red shading indicated that a deletion was made; blue shading highlighted that the project was related to land use rather than transportation. Charlie Baker then provided an overview of the federal funding and described the PL funding eligibility screening. Following this overview, Eleni continued to outline changes that CCRPC staff had made to the project spreadsheet.

For the first project in the regional category related to closing the gaps in regional bike/ped facilities, the project description changed to reflect how CCRPC staff will focus on identifying proposed off-road transportation links that can be used to close existing gaps with on-road bike and ped facilities in order to enhance network connectivity and improve safety of bicyclists and pedestrians. The originally proposed Active Transportation Plan work has been combined with a slightly revised UVM TRC project.

The proposed project to update the Regional Park and Ride Plan was deferred from the FY21

UPWP for consideration in FY22. Amy Bell stressed the need for high capacity park and ride facilities at interchanges in Chittenden County.

The Grayfield Retrofitting project was deleted. Sharon briefly outlined some of the work related to grayfield development that has been explored within the past couple of years. She also mentioned how there didn't seem to be very much work related to housing in this the FY21 UPWP. She would be interested in reevaluating this task in the future.

Chris Jolly asked a clarifying question about the technical assistance task. Eleni explained how the technical assistance funding is representative of a catch-all task that is used for minor initiatives where consultant work is needed.

The UPWP Committee then moved on to evaluating the municipal project requests.

Marshall clarified the deliverables for the Right-of-Way Green Streets Condition Inventory – Phase 2. Current deliverables include numerous GIS data layers.

Eleni discussed the cost reduction related to the City of Burlington School District (BSD) School Travel Plan and Traffic Control Plan. CCRPC staff also received a more detailed explanation of the traffic control plan.

Marshall clarified the revised description for Burlington's Property Transportation Plan project. The updated description better reflects the project's transportation nexus.

Eleni outlined the proposed funding cut to Colchester's Phase 2 Stormwater Condition Assessment. Karen Adams asked how the budget cut compares with the other projects, in terms of the total percentage of the cut. Eleni explained that cuts were not based on a percentage, but were made on a case-by-case basis in an attempt to balance the overall UPWP budget. John Zicconi expressed that the budget for the Colchester project may be easier to cut than others because the project consists of using a camera to evaluate stormwater infrastructure. Karen stressed that the overall scope may need to be narrowed given the reduction.

Eleni described the Bolger Hill Road Improvement Project. Some elements are not PL eligible. The survey, environmental review and project management meetings/coordination tasks are PL eligible and are necessary to verify the feasibility and constructability of the preferred alternative. The budget has been reduced to reflect this.

The Jericho official map request can be conducted with CCRPC staff time.

The South Burlington Climate Action Plan Impact Evaluation Program will also be completed using CCRPC staff time.

Eleni explained how the South Burlington Traffic Overlay District/Traffic Impact Fees Update (Phase 2) has been removed from the FY21 UPWP for reconsideration in FY22.

Eleni referenced the original concerns about the low cost of the South Burlington multi-site intersection scoping request. However, after talking with South Burlington staff, it was found to be more of a feasibility study.

FHWA made a determination that the Scoping of Williston Road Utility Relocation Utility would not be eligible for PL funding. Justin Rabidoux said that a large driver of the project is a transportation issue, but putting the utility lines underground would not directly address any transportation problems.

The Shelburne Transit Study request has now been placed under GMT's UPWP tasks.

John asked about the link between Shelburne and South Burlington in terms of bike/ped connectivity. CCRPC staff will evaluate how the scope for the Shelburne Bicycling and Pedestrian Connectivity Study could be connected to both communities.

Eric Vorwald referenced his comments that he sent in to CCRPC staff about the large number of bike/ped asks and whether a larger county-wide study could be conducted. Is there any opportunity to combine some of the individual bike/ped efforts to achieve some efficiencies? Eleni referenced how the CCRPC will pursue bike/ped project efficiencies by working with Local Motion, the UVM TRC, and other TDM partners.

John stressed that the most climate-focused analysis should be focused on bike/ped connections in village centers rather than region-wide connections. A discussion then continued on the topic of prioritizing local vs regional bike/ped connections.

Eric outlined the Winooski Parking Inventory, Analysis, and Management Plan as a continuation of efforts related to the 2017 Downtown Parking Plan and to address wider concerns related to on-street parking, the expansion of metered parking, and other parking management initiatives.

CCRPC staff is still evaluating the cost for the second phase of the Winooski Phosphorus Control Plan.

The UPWP Committee then moved on to evaluating the partner project requests.

Jaqueline Murphy asked about the connection between Local Motion's request and the UVM TRC request. Eleni explained that the UVM TRC project would seek to develop a better understanding of how bicycle planning and transportation infrastructure decisions can be improved through the evaluation of existing bicycling data. Gaps will be identified in current data and recommendations/strategies will be recommended related to future data collection efforts. On the other hand, the Local Motion request is more closely related to on-the-ground bike/ped planning and support for municipalities through training programs, assistance with local transportation projects, and public education related to bike/ped needs.

John expressed concerns with the UVM TRC and their request. He would have liked to have seen the UVM TRC make more of an effort to meet with existing bike/ped professionals in the region to coordinate on projects and initiatives prior to making a funding request for the CCRPC's UPWP. Eleni explained how CCRPC staff met with the UVM TRC and revised their ask to better fit with the CCRPC's goals and priorities.

Jaqueline said it would be beneficial if the bike/ped advocates could work together on these efforts.

Eric clarified that the UVM TRC ask would not involve new counts, but rather an analysis of existing data. He asked about how their program would be developed over the timeline that is outlined and explained the need to better come together to align tasks/gaps. Eleni described how the UPWP planning dollars would be used to fund a graduate student.

Bryan Davis hears the concerns related to the idea of duplicative bike/ped work, but stressed that CCRPC staff will work with the partner organizations to ensure that the work is more complementary rather than duplicative.

Amy described the UVM TRC work that was conducted for VTrans and highlighted the importance of building upon their previous efforts.

Sharon noted that some of the proposed partner requests seem to be recurring. Is there an expectation that these will be funded annually? It could be a concern if these programs become dependent on UPWP funds.

John mentioned how Local Motion's annual request could directly be funding a staff person.

Amy said there's no guarantee for recurring funding, as it all depends on the requests that are solicited in any given year.

Jaqueline emphasized her feeling related to the importance of Colchester's request when compared to the repetitive annual requests from the partner organizations.

Karen asked about the goal of the UPWP funds. Should funding continue to go towards partner organizations, or to better support municipal projects?

Marshall outlined the ECOS goals and how the UPWP process has traditionally been aligned with supporting regional priorities through a combination of municipal and partner projects.

Charlie summarized how the program has shifted over the years. For example, instead of traditional traffic planning, TDM efforts have surged, we went through a period of investing in walkable community zoning bylaws, and, now, water quality projects have become more prevalent.

Chris said there are a lot of competing interests. In terms of the bike/ped efforts, if we pay to develop a program to collect data, we should also commit to supporting the program in the future.

Amy stressed the importance of project transferability to other parts of the region.

Karen would be interested in the breakdown of funding by fiscal year by project type. CCRPC staff will work on developing a breakdown of UPWP funding for the past few fiscal years.

Catherine said that while water quality requests are becoming a more prevalent UPWP ask, bike/ped and TDM efforts should continue to be an essential funding area to achieve progress related to tackling climate change.

Sharon asked about restructuring the program during the offseason to determine if the UPWP Committee should guide funding to certain priority areas. She also said that what the UPWP Committee funds should have applicability to other municipalities and initiatives.

Eleni said that it would be challenging to shift parameters annually, but the UPWP has been able to shift to accommodate new needs as they come.

John stressed that the UPWP Committee may be overthinking things. He said that we ask the municipalities to prioritize requests, understanding that some projects may not be funded. He also referenced that some of the partner organizations are more local than others. For example, VEIC is a large national firm while Old Spokes Home is a small local organization. John suggested that local partner requests should be prioritized on a different level than the bigger firms.

Eric asked for more information about CATMA's efforts. Eleni outlined how these funds support their staff efforts to conduct regional TDM initiatives.

Eric also asked about the VEIC ask and Charlie highlighted the EV focus and how these funds would allow their staff to support municipalities with EV-related efforts.

Eric referenced again how he would like to see efforts to combine some bike/ped planning to gain efficiencies.

There was a brief discussion about Colchester's request and the reluctance to fund the project in the previous fiscal year.

John would like more information about how the UVM TRC data would be used in the future. Eleni explained that it would be used to better understand "before and after" bike/ped data, similar to the level of data that we already have related to vehicles. There is a need to be able to have the same level of comparison with the bike/ped data.

4. Next Steps & Adjourn

Charlie outlined the next steps for the UPWP Committee, with the last meeting scheduled for 3/26 at 5:30 p.m. Barbara said that if funding becomes available, CCRPC staff should consider fully funding the Burlington School District (BSD) School Travel Plan and Traffic Control Plan.

CCRPC staff will look more closely at available funding and see about the possibility of adding funds back into Burlington's school-related request, as well as Colchester's stormwater request.

Chris highlighted the need to remain focused on matching project requests with the ECOS goals.

John asked about cutting the Way to Go! task and wondered what the consequences of that would be. While it used to be a fairly specific one week program, Eleni said that the program has been more effective since the focus has been shifted to a longer term program in schools. CCRPC staff will forward along results from previous years.

Catherine adjourned the meeting at 5:04 p.m.