Members Present:
Catherine McMains, Committee Chair
John Zicconi, Board
Jaqueline Murphy, Board
Sharon Murray, Board
Amy Bell, VTrans
Chris Damiani, GMT
Chris Jolly, FHWA
Annie Costandi, CWAC
Eric Vorwald, PAC

Justin Rabidoux, TAC

Staff:
Charlie Baker, CCRPC
Eleni Churchill, CCRPC
Regina Mahony, CCRPC
Marshall Distel, CCRPC
Bryan Davis, CCRPC
Amy Witham, CCRPC
Forest Cohen, CCRPC

1. Welcome & Introductions

Committee Chair Catherine McMains opened the meeting shortly after 4:00 p.m. Introductions were then made. A change was made to agenda to review and approve the UPWP Committee Minutes from the second meeting prior to reviewing the breakdown of MPO consultant funding.

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

Sharon Murray made a motion, seconded by Eric Vorwald to approve the minutes from the second UPWP Committee meeting that was held on 2/19. All in favor. Motion passed.

3. Review breakdown of MPO consultant funding for FY 2018 – FY 2021

Marshall Distel provided an overview of MPO consultant funding. The funding overview was representative of consultant funding dedicated towards transportation-related projects in FY 2018 – FY 2021. Funding related to land use projects, CCRPC staff time, and other non-transportation-related projects included as part of the CCRPC’s annual budget were not discussed.

Marshall shared an overview of each funding category, which included: Roadway projects, Bike/Ped projects, Water Quality, TDM, ITS, and Other projects. For FY18-FY20, roughly $1.25 million had been dedicated for consultant-funded transportation projects. After the second FY21 UPWP Committee meeting, FHWA informed CCRPC staff that about $1.4 million would be available for FY21, which would avoid the need for some of the project funding cuts that were discussed in the previous UPWP Committee meeting.

4. Review of Draft FY 2021 UPWP and Budget

Charlie Baker gave an reviewed the draft FY21 UPWP with an emphasis on the new projects and any changes proposed since the last Committee meeting.
John Zicconi asked about the increase in funds from FHWA. After coordinating with FHWA, Charlie explained that CCRPC will be allocated enough funding to make all of the previously discussed projects fit within the annual budget.

Eric Vorwald raised a question about CarShare VT’s task aimed at developing carshare models in rural communities. Given that having a physical CarShare VT vehicle in an urban center like Winooski wasn’t successful, Eric questioned whether the same model would have any chance at being viable in rural areas. Marshall explained that the rural CarShare VT evaluation would be focused on exploring new opportunities to incorporate carshare technology into existing vehicles rather than simply allocating a new vehicle owned by CarShare VT.

Eleni Churchill explained that $10,000 was added to the South Burlington Bike/Ped Mapping Project in consultant costs. This was originally anticipated to be CCRPC staff time only.

John asked about the phasing related to the Burlington School District Travel Plans. They were going to phase this, now with the extra funding, what will be different with this project? What did Burlington do to tighten up the budget? Eleni explained that the funding was originally reduced upon a recommendation by CCRPC staff from $40,000 to $30,000. CCRPC staff had not worked with Burlington to reduce the overall scope of the project. With the additional FHWA funding, the original $40,000 request will be retained.

With regards to the I-89 study, Eleni mentioned that new funds may need to be being added to the project. The current FY21 funding from CCRPC stands at $150,000. Based on conversations with VTrans, another $40,000 of non-PL funds may be added for additional modeling work to be completed by a subconsultant.

Eleni highlighted the addition of the Exit 17 park and ride evaluation. Following a recommendation from the Grand Isle County Park and Ride Scoping Study completed by Northwest RPC and VTrans, CCRPC will work with a consultant to review and conduct outreach related to the location of the preferred alternative, which was selected to be in Colchester. Funding for this project with be provided by VTrans using non-PL funds.

The City of Winooski PCP project budget will be bumped up to $30,000 based on discussions with the project consultant. Eric mentioned that this was originally requested to be $40,000. Therefore, the cost is still down from the original request. It was noted that staff had follow-up conversation with the consultant to confirm that $30,000 would be sufficient.

Charlie stated that the Colchester stormwater request will be fully funded at $120,000.

Bryan Davis mentioned that a bike/ped collaboration meeting between Local Motion, UVM, and Old Spokes Homes has been scheduled for 4/14 to better coordinate on upcoming bike/ped projects.

Chris Jolly asked how the FTA money has been lumped into the UPWP. Charlie explained that the CCRPC had moved to a consolidated PL format rather than calling out the specific projects receiving the FTA funding.
Chris asked a follow up question about the Exit 17 park and ride project. Eleni explained that a scoping study was conducted and outlined how the CCRPC would be investigating if the preferred alternative should be located in Colchester.

John asked about the existing park and ride north of Exit 17 on Route 7 versus the proposed park and ride on Route 2. Eleni explained that they would serve different travel sheds. John asked about the distance between the two park and rides. If we already have a park and ride there, why would we develop another nearby?

Amy Bell said that VTrans found that the existing park and ride on Route 7 is only serving traffic from Milton rather than Grand Isle. Moreover, none of the commuter link services can serve the existing park and ride, while a new lot off Route 2 would offer public transit connectivity.

**Recommendation to advance FY 2021 UPWP and Budget to the Executive Committee and Board (Action)**

Sharon Murray made a motion seconded by Justin Rabidoux, to advance the FY 2021 UPWP and Budget to the Executive Committee and Board with the changes that were discussed during the third UPWP Committee Meeting. All in favor. Motion passed.

5. **Next Steps & Adjourn**

Charlie outlined the overall next steps in the process, with draft UPWP documents being shared to the TAC, CWAC, and Executive Committee. The FY 21 UPWP will ultimately be an action item on the Board agenda in May.

Following this overview, Catherine adjourned the meeting shortly after 5:00 p.m.