1. **Consent Agenda:** No consent agenda.

2. **Approval of Minutes**
   Bryan asked for any changes, which there were none. **AMY BELL MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 3, 2019, SECONDED BY BOB HENNEBERGER. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

3. **Public Comments**
   None.

4. **VTrans’ Project Selection & Prioritization Processes Update**
   Christine Forde, CCRPC staff, presented an update on the VTrans Project Selection and Prioritization Process (VPSP2). She briefly described the current project selection and point system and noted the inability within the existing framework to add new projects to the VTrans Capital Program. The vision of the VPSP2 is to develop a performance-based, data driven project selection and prioritization framework that maximizes the “transportation value” delivered to Vermont taxpayers. Four stakeholder workshops were held resulting in five modes being identified with eight weighted evaluation criteria. Note that existing grant programs will stay the same (application process and ranking) regardless of VPSP2.

   Questions/comments from TAC members, answers from Christine and extensive discussion on VPSP2 are summarized below:

   How do freight movements fit into this framework? It’s not a specific factor but was part of the discussion. Keeping assets in good condition, reducing congestion, increasing mobility, economic access,
etc. would benefit movement of freight. Note that freight movement is a federal performance measure so it may be called out specifically in VPSP2.

Existing business is noted in the worksheet but what about future business development? Growth areas are defined by regional plans, provide access to jobs, and to attract and retain businesses and workforce. There’s room to add more language about future opportunities as part of the growth centers language. Note that multimodal infrastructure includes all modes, not just on roadways. Also note that the five modes aren’t being compared to each other but rather are all included in the process.

Is recreation and recreational economic development being considered? The colorful handout is the workbook for roadways but keep in mind that there’s another workbook for walkways/trails/paths.

There are two proposed ways to add new projects to the capital program: by being Regionally Driven, and through Harmonization. These are added to the existing three “categories” of being Asset Driven, Safety Driven, and Grant Based.

For Asset Driven Projects, VTrans will provide a list of asset projects for RPCs to rank. The RPC ranking will account for 20% of the project score (VTrans gets 80% of the project score). For Modernization and Expansion Projects, RPCs will identify transportation needs and those needs will be scored using the VPSP2 “qualification sheet.” RPCs will determine the highest value needs and send that lists to VTrans for either Harmonization or for consideration as new Regionally Driven projects.

How is harmonization being defined? The needs identified by RPCs will get mapped. The Asset Driven projects identified by VTrans will also get mapped and if there is alignment between an asset project and regionally identified needs, the needs may be incorporated into the asset project. For example, if a failed culvert is located on a roadway slated for paving, those two projects are harmonized, meaning incorporated.

Who at the RPC does prioritization? Staff will do the initial project scoring and then bring it to the TAC for review and discussion, and ultimately make a recommendation to the Board for approval.

For projects that have already gone through the scoping (project development) process, those will be brought into the process at the Projects/Needs mapping stage.

In the previous failed culvert example, how would environmental needs such as aquatic organism passage, stormwater retention, etc. be included? The VPS2 workbook has criteria for environment where environmental benefits would be scored.

Dennis noted that if a culvert is a $5,000 project, it will never make it through this process and the capital list would be endless; as a standalone project it wouldn’t belong in this process. Christine pointed out that this is where harmonization becomes important.

What happens when there are multiple benefits under one criterion, how are they scored? Christine said they cannot get more than the maximum number of points for that criterion.

Stormwater projects are currently in the roadway mode but remember that grant programs are also a way to address specific projects (like a failed culvert).

Karen said it seems like projects can move through the prioritization process alone rather than through harmonization, correct? Yes.

Chris Jolly reminded the group that the capital budget committee gets together at the beginning of every year to divvy up funds for various transportation programs, so while this process is important to prioritization, it’s important to remember that everything has to be funded with the budget available.

Dennis noted that with so many projects in each town, it’s important to consider which funding opportunities exist and to seek funds for various projects through the most appropriate source considering grant programs, the state capital program, using local funds, or other ways.

Bob asked how someone would know if VTrans is going to do work on a particular roadway segment that could include a culvert project and therefore not need to fill out the “big form.” Christine said the mapping process should identify all needs.
Andrea asked if the state’s complete streets policy is included, and Christine said yes, complete streets projects score highly because they improve the “transportation value” of a project. Is complete streets mentioned specifically in VPSP2? Christine said it isn’t but maybe it should be.

What is the implementation timeline of VPSP2? There is currently a soft rollout with testing using a select number of sample projects, but VPSP2 won’t replace the existing process for a couple of years. In the spring there will be some side-by-side project prioritization comparisons using this new method and the current process.

Dean said that sometimes towns don’t know of VTrans projects until later in the process. Charlie noted that the intent is for the VPSP2 process to be more open and transparent about how projects are added to the list and approved by appropriate entities.

Dennis questioned why not just use the state form for projects if they’re all going to be compared? Christine said the qualification sheet is intended to be a simplified version of the state sheet to make it easier.

Nicole asked whether the state projects are included on the needs mapping so that all projects (state and local) are on the same map? Christine said yes, the intent is for all needs/projects to be mapped but will confirm with VTrans.

Bryan noted that restrictions in some of the grant programs can be challenging, is there any consideration of using this new process to update and streamline these programs? Not at this time.

Dennis asked if CCRPC can map Chittenden County projects and state projects as an “internal” map to help towns make better decisions and work together. Charlie said that yes, this can be completed to help with coordination. RPCs will be responsible for mapping the needs for all of the county, so we’ll look into including the VTrans needs as well. Bryan noted that since Modernization and Expansion within the VPSP2 process is for new projects only, what happens to projects that are already in the system; is there a chance for reevaluation of them? Christine said that projects already in the capital program will have their transportation value calculated and those with a low value can be considered for removal.

Eleni noted recent conversations with VTrans indicate that they would use the transportation value of a project, currently within the VTrans program, to rank/prioritize all projects and this might lead to the elimination of the existing “candidate list” since those projects would either advance within the program based on their score, or be eliminated.

Dean noted that the economic access criteria seems dated and that recreational development has economic development potential, can this criterion be considered for update? Christine said this is an opportunity for people to contribute improvements to language.

Christine is interested in comments from TAC members on the qualification sheet language, as well as other improvements and thoughts.

For next steps all RPCs are looking at the qualification sheet and testing it with various projects. This process won’t be standalone for at least a year, more likely two years. Christine is currently working the MTP projects through this process, and VTrans is also testing this process with projects.

The qualification sheet handout out is generally for roadway projects, there may be a variation for different types of projects like recreation.

Karen asked if there are there other mobility questions besides the one included? These are still being developed.

Note that the Transportation Value is what comes out of the VPSP2 Workbook. Project costs will also be considered as part of the process.

Will the 20% value from the RPC change in the new process? For asset driven projects, it does not change.
For roadway projects currently in the capital program that are not asset management projects, does RPC have 20% of the project scores? Moving forward non-asset projects will be scored with the VPSP2 Workbook.

Dennis pointed out that the new scoring sheet is intended to “round out” projects, and it will be helpful to see how various projects may shift using the new sheet.

Does the state’s worksheet include growth centers and areas planned for growth, as the RPC sheet does? Christine will look into this.

There will be more discussion to come as CCRPC and VTrans test this new prioritization process using VPSP2.

5. **Winooski’s East Allen Street Scoping Study**

Jason Charest, CCRPC staff, provided an overview of this project which provides a vision for increased safety and mobility for all roadway users, improved streetscape amenities, and enhanced economic development opportunities along the major gateway corridors in Winooski. He reviewed the short- and long-term alternatives for three focus areas: Barlow/Cascade Way intersection; East Spring Street intersection; and 3-4 lane section from the railroad tracks to Exit 15. More information on the project website: [East Allen Street Gateway Scoping Study »](https://www.localmotion.org/join_our_team)

6. **Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports (Information Item):**

Bryan noted that the project list on the back of the agenda identifies current projects, and TAC members can follow up with staff about these or other projects.

7. **CCRPC Board Meeting Report**

There was no December Board meeting but the CCRPC hosted the annual Legislative Breakfast on December 10 with the theme of *When Chittenden County Prospers, Vermont Prospers*. Highlighted initiatives and projects included Chittenden County housing, Act 250/permit system reform, water quality funding, transportation investments, I-89 Study, Transportation and Climate Initiative, population health, workforce investment, and substance use disorder.

8. **Chairman’s/Members’ Items:**

Dennis notes recent signal changes at Susie Wilson and Pinecrest that include pedestrian crossing changes and signage. Please send observations and comments on operation to Dennis because the Town can make adjustments as needed.

Karen notes that Local Motion is looking for a Livable Streets Manager. Visit [https://www.localmotion.org/join_our_team](https://www.localmotion.org/join_our_team) for more information.

DENNIS LUTZ MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN, SECOND BY BOB HENNEBERGER, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

The meeting adjourned at 10:52 AM.

Respectfully submitted, Bryan Davis