

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

5 DATE: Tuesday, January 7, 2020
6 TIME: 9:00 a.m.
7 PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal St. Winooski, VT
8

9 **Members Present**

10 Bryan Osborne, Colchester, TAC Chair
11 Nicole Losch, Burlington
12 Matthew Langham, VTrans
13 Amy Bell, VTrans
14 Jim Dieser, VTrans District 5
15 Chris Jolly, FHWA
16 Dave Allerton, Milton
17 Andrea Morgante, Hinesburg
18 Dean Bloch, Charlotte
19 Dennis Lutz, Essex
20 Josh Arneson, Richmond
21 Jon Rauscher, Winooski
22 Brian Bigelow, Underhill
23 Joss Besse, Bolton
24 Karen Yacos, Local Motion
25 Bob Henneberger, Seniors
26 Mary Anne Michaels, Rail
27

Staff

Charlie Baker, Executive Director
Eleni Churchill, Transportation Program Manager
Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
Bryan Davis, Senior Transportation Planner
Christine Forde, Senior Transportation Planner
Jason Charest, Senior Transportation Planning Engineer

28 Bryan Osborne called the meeting to order at 9:00AM, calling for a round of introductions.
29

30 **1. Consent Agenda:** No consent agenda.
31

32 **2. Approval of Minutes**

33 Bryan asked for any changes, which there were none. AMY BELL MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE
34 THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 3, 2019, SECONDED BY BOB HENNEBERGER. THE MOTION
35 PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
36

37 **3. Public Comments**

38 None.
39

40 **4. VTrans' Project Selection & Prioritization Processes Update**

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

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

50 How do freight movements fit into this framework? It's not a specific factor but was part of the
51 discussion. Keeping assets in good condition, reducing congestion, increasing mobility, economic access,

- 1 etc. would benefit movement of freight. Note that freight movement is a federal performance measure so
2 it may be called out specifically in VPSP2.
- 3 Existing business is noted in the worksheet but what about future business development? Growth areas
4 are defined by regional plans, provide access to jobs, and to attract and retain businesses and workforce.
5 There's room to add more language about future opportunities as part of the growth centers language.
- 6 Note that multimodal infrastructure includes all modes, not just on roadways. Also note that the five
7 modes aren't being compared to each other but rather are all included in the process.
- 8 Is recreation and recreational economic development being considered? The colorful handout is the
9 workbook for roadways but keep in mind that there's another workbook for walkways/trails/paths.
- 10 There are two proposed ways to add new projects to the capital program: by being Regionally Driven, and
11 through Harmonization. These are added to the existing three "categories" of being Asset Driven, Safety
12 Driven, and Grant Based.
- 13 For Asset Driven Projects, VTrans will provide a list of asset projects for RPCs to rank. The RPC ranking
14 will account for 20% of the project score (VTrans gets 80% of the project score). For Modernization and
15 Expansion Projects, RPCs will identify transportation needs and those needs will be scored using the
16 VPSP2 "qualification sheet." RPCs will determine the highest value needs and send that lists to VTrans
17 for either Harmonization or for consideration as new Regionally Driven projects.
- 18 How is harmonization being defined? The needs identified by RPCs will get mapped. The Asset Driven
19 projects identified by VTrans will also get mapped and if there is alignment between an asset project and
20 regionally identified needs, the needs may be incorporated into the asset project. For example, if a failed
21 culvert is located on a roadway slated for paving, those two projects are harmonized, meaning
22 incorporated.
- 23 Who at the RPC does prioritization? Staff will do the initial project scoring and then bring it to the TAC
24 for review and discussion, and ultimately make a recommendation to the Board for approval.
- 25 For projects that have already gone through the scoping (project development) process, those will be
26 brought into the process at the Projects/Needs mapping stage.
- 27 In the previous failed culvert example, how would environmental needs such as aquatic organism
28 passage, stormwater retention, etc. be included? The VPS2 workbook has criteria for environment where
29 environmental benefits would be scored.
- 30 Dennis noted that if a culvert is a \$5,000 project, it will never make it through this process and the capital
31 list would be endless; as a standalone project it wouldn't belong in this process. Christine pointed out that
32 this is where harmonization becomes important.
- 33 What happens when there are multiple benefits under one criterion, how are they scored? Christine said
34 they cannot get more than the maximum number of points for that criterion.
- 35 Stormwater projects are currently in the roadway mode but remember that grant programs are also a way
36 to address specific projects (like a failed culvert).
- 37 Karen said it seems like projects can move through the prioritization process alone rather than through
38 harmonization, correct? Yes.
- 39 Chris Jolly reminded the group that the capital budget committee gets together at the beginning of every
40 year to divvy up funds for various transportation programs, so while this process is important to
41 prioritization, it's important to remember that everything has to be funded with the budget available.
- 42 Dennis noted that with so many projects in each town, it's important to consider which funding
43 opportunities exist and to seek funds for various projects through the most appropriate source considering
44 grant programs, the state capital program, using local funds, or other ways.
- 45 Bob asked how someone would know if VTrans is going to do work on a particular roadway segment that
46 could include a culvert project and therefore not need to fill out the "big form." Christine said the
47 mapping process should identify all needs.

- 1 Andrea asked if the state's complete streets policy is included, and Christine said yes, complete streets
2 projects score highly because they improve the "transportation value" of a project. Is complete streets
3 mentioned specifically in VPSP2? Christine said it isn't but maybe it should be.
- 4 What is the implementation timeline of VPSP2? There is currently a soft rollout with testing using a
5 select number of sample projects, but VPSP2 won't replace the existing process for a couple of years. In
6 the spring there will be some side-by-side project prioritization comparisons using this new method and
7 the current process.
- 8 Dean said that sometimes towns don't know of VTrans projects until later in the process. Charlie noted
9 that the intent is for the VPSP2 process to be more open and transparent about how projects are added to
10 the list and approved by appropriate entities.
- 11 Dennis questioned why not just use the state form for projects if they're all going to be compared?
12 Christine said the qualification sheet is intended to be a simplified version of the state sheet to make it
13 easier.
- 14 Nicole asked whether the state projects are included on the needs mapping so that all projects (state and
15 local) are on the same map? Christine said yes, the intent is for all needs/projects to be mapped but will
16 confirm with VTrans.
- 17 Bryan noted that restrictions in some of the grant programs can be challenging, is there any consideration
18 of using this new process to update and streamline these programs? Not at this time.
- 19 Dennis asked if CCRPC can map Chittenden County projects and state projects as an "internal" map to
20 help towns make better decisions and work together. Charlie said that yes, this can be completed to help
21 with coordination. RPCs will be responsible for mapping the needs for all of the county, so we'll look
22 into including the VTrans needs as well. Bryan noted that since Modernization and Expansion within the
23 VPSP2 process is for new projects only, what happens to projects that are already in the system; is there a
24 chance for reevaluation of them? Christine said that projects already in the capital program will have their
25 transportation value calculated and those with a low value can be considered for removal.
- 26 Eleni noted recent conversations with VTrans indicate that they would use the transportation value of a
27 project, currently within the VTrans program, to rank/prioritize all projects and this might lead to the
28 elimination of the existing "candidate list" since those projects would either advance within the program
29 based on their score, or be eliminated.
- 30 Dean noted that the economic access criteria seems dated and that recreational development has economic
31 development potential, can this criterion be considered for update? Christine said this is an opportunity
32 for people to contribute improvements to language.
- 33 Christine is interested in comments from TAC members on the qualification sheet language, as well as
34 other improvements and thoughts.
- 35 For next steps all RPCs are looking at the qualification sheet and testing it with various projects. This
36 process won't be standalone for at least a year, more likely two years. Christine is currently working the
37 MTP projects through this process, and VTrans is also testing this process with projects.
- 38 The qualification sheet handout out is generally for roadway projects, there may be a variation for
39 different types of projects like recreation.
- 40 Karen asked if there are there other mobility questions besides the one included? These are still being
41 developed.
- 42 Note that the Transportation Value is what comes out of the VPSP2 Workbook. Project costs will also be
43 considered as part of the process.
- 44 Will the 20% value from the RPC change in the new process? For asset driven projects, it does not
45 change.

1 For roadway projects currently in the capital program that are not asset management projects, does RPC
2 have 20% of the project scores? Moving forward non-asset projects will be scored with the VPSP2
3 Workbook.

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

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

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

10

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

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

18

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

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

22

23 **7. CCRPC Board Meeting Report**

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

29

30 **8. Chairman’s/Members’ Items:**

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

34

35 Karen notes that Local Motion is looking for a Livable Streets Manager. Visit

36 https://www.localmotion.org/join_our_team for more information.

37

38 DENNIS LUTZ MADE A MOTION TO ADJUOURN, SECOND BY BOB HENNEBERGER,
39 APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

40

41 The meeting adjourned at 10:52 AM.

42

43 Respectfully submitted, Bryan Davis