

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

5 DATE: Tuesday, January 5, 2021
6 TIME: 9:00 a.m.
7 PLACE: Meeting held remotely via Zoom
8

9 **Members Present**

10 Bryan Osborne, Colchester
11 Justin Rabidou, South Burlington
12 Nicole Losch, Burlington
13 Amy Bell, VTrans
14 Matthew Langham, VTrans
15 Jonathon Weber, Local Motion
16 Josh Arneson, Richmond
17 Bob Henneberger, Seniors
18 Chris Damiani, GMT
19 Bruce Hoar, Williston
20 Jon Rauscher, Winooski
21 Barbara Elliott, Huntington
22 Dennis Lutz, Essex
23 Dean Pierce, Shelburne
24 Sandy Thibault, CATMA
25 Kirsten Jensen, Milton
26 Andrea Morgante, Hinesburg
27 Chris Jolly, FHWA
28 Seth Bowden, GBIC
29 Ashley Bishop, VTrans
30
31

Dave Allerton, Milton
Katherine Sonnicks, Jericho
Mary Anne Michaels, Rail
Joss Besse, Bolton
Larry Lewack, Charlotte
Richard Watts, Environment

32 **Staff**

Charlie Baker, Executive Director
Eleni Churchill, Transportation Program Manager
Bryan Davis, Senior Transportation Planner
Christine Forde, Senior Transportation Planner
Chris Dubin, Senior Transportation Planner
Jason Charest, Senior Transportation Planning Engineer
Sai Sarepalli, Senior Transportation Planning Engineer
Marshall Distel, Transportation Planner

33 **Guest**

Joe Segale, VTrans

34 1. Bryan Osborne called the meeting to order at 9:02 AM.

35 **2. Consent Agenda**

36 Bryan Osborne asked if the \$12.6 million in CMAQ funds is typical, and Matthew Langham replied yes
37 it's similar to previous years but noted that the actual amount is closer to \$12.3 million because of some
38 takedowns. He also noted that CMAQ and STP funds are interchangeable because our region is in air
39 quality attainment. ANDREA MORGANTE MADE A MOTION THAT THE TAC APPROVE THE
40 PROPOSED TIP AMENDMENTS AS PRESENTED IN THE AGENDA ITEM MEMOS, SECONDED
41 BY DENNIS LUTZ. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

42 **3. Approval of Minutes**

43 Bryan Osborne asked for any changes, which there were none. DENNIS LUTZ MADE A MOTION TO
44 APPROVE THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 1, 2020, SECONDED BY JUSTIN RABIDOUX. THE
45 MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

46 **4. Public Comments**

47 None. Andrea asked if the CCRPC's online calendar could include Zoom and other meeting links to make
48 it easier for the public to participate virtually. CCRPC staff will follow up on this request.
49
50

51 **5. Racial Equity Consultant Selection**

52 Bryan Davis, CCRPC staff, provided an update on the CCRPC's RFQ process in late fall 2020 to select a
53 racial equity consultant and shared the staff and Executive Committee's recommendation outlined in the
54 agenda memo. The consultant will provide a draft scope of work this week, but generally they are

1 expected to help provide training to CCRPC staff and Board, review CCRPC policies and plans through a
2 diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) lens, and help facilitate a regional equity forum to build shared
3 understanding, create a space for diverse thought and co-creation, and create momentum for change.
4 Dennis noted that some cities/towns have been doing some of this work already and cautioned against
5 duplicating existing efforts. Bryan noted the preferred consultant is based locally and we are aware of
6 some local efforts, so we will strive to connect and expand on existing DEI work as a shared opportunity
7 for the entire County. DEAN PIERCE MADE A MOTION THAT THE TAC APPROVE CREATIVE
8 DISCOURSE AS THE PREFERRED RACIAL EQUITY CONSULTANT AND THAT STAFF
9 ENGAGE IN CONTRACT NEGOTIATIONS. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY BRUCE HOAR
10 AND APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

11 12 **6. VTrans Proposed Congestion Policy Update**

13 Joe Segale, VTrans, gave a [presentation](#) on the Agency's consideration of using volume to capacity ratio
14 (V/C) as a congestion measure rather than the current level of service (LOS) congestion policy
15 framework. There are several reasons for considering this change including: allow for more congestion in
16 villages, downtowns, growth centers and other areas planned for growth; shift emphasis from road
17 capacity to multimodal improvements and TDM strategies; V/C ratio is a more effective measure to
18 assess roadway capacity than LOS; simplify the traffic impact assessment process, especially for small
19 developments. Using V/C meets Act 250 Criterion 5 language. VTrans proposes V/C thresholds for three
20 different land use types: high access, high mobility, and balanced access and mobility. VTrans has not
21 adopted V/C as policy so are seeking feedback. Bryan Osborne is happy to see this consideration. He
22 asked that if this policy allows for more congestion, will planned projects that address congestion be
23 delayed even further? Joe replied that there's still a need for forecasting to anticipate when projects need
24 to be completed. Dennis said he also likes this policy change but has some concerns. The intersection of
25 Susie Wilson and Kellogg roads has a current V/C ratio of about 1.0, so would VTrans decide not to fund
26 improvements because it's not over 1.0. With this intersection as an example, Dennis asks if the proposed
27 V/C thresholds are the right ones. Andrea asked at what point to signals and roundabouts come into play,
28 and asked how does the public learn that congestion is okay? Joe said his current outreach is focused on
29 transportation partners rather than the public, but perhaps the RPCs and others could help with the public
30 education. He noted that V/C would be used as an initial screening process and that roundabouts and other
31 improvements would be considered in a next step to develop alternatives. Andrea said the public needs to
32 understand that improvements include changes for walking and biking, not just vehicles. Eleni agreed and
33 noted that Joe's slide with the chart showing potential mitigation measures could add roundabouts. Bryan
34 asked that when VTrans collects fees from Transportation Improvement Districts (TID), do developers
35 then get a "pass?" Joe replied that developers would still pay an impact fee for their projects. Bryan asked
36 that if a project reaches a point of failure, might Act 250 deny other projects. Joe responded that once a
37 developer pays their impact fee, a project can move forward. Bryan asked if a project takes longer to be
38 completed, does that lower the developer's impact fee? Joe replied no, it's not dependent on when a
39 project is completed, it's based on the impacts, but note that a project may start later depending on when
40 the congestion threshold is reached. Bryan asked if there might be impacts to development patterns using
41 V/C ratio, meaning would developers pursue projects in less congested areas. Joe responded they haven't
42 done that sort of analysis. Dean Pierce asked if VTrans has adopted a standard reference for V/C in
43 different settings. Joe said nothing is adopted yet but V/C would use the same analysis as LOS outlined in
44 the Highway Capacity Manual. He will think of a simpler analysis process for towns and developers to
45 use though. Justin asked how we can convey to the public what V/C "means." People generally
46 understand LOS A, B, C etc. because it's simple. Joe suggests saying something like an intersection is at
47 85% capacity, which people could understand. Jonathon asked if there is an assessment of mitigation
48 measures and whether there is a type of point structure assigned. Joe responded that a project needs to
49 show how the improvement strategies impact traffic, but there aren't points involved and he noted that
50 assessing non-auto modes is less specific. Sandy asked if there is guidance in the TDM manual, and Joe
51 said that document does provide some guidance on estimated percent reductions. The TAC reviewed the
52 slide showing the LOS – V/C chart showing speed and traffic volumes. Comments were made about the
53 correlation of LOS to V/C, the chart doesn't show the length of time congestion occurs, and that it doesn't

1 convey roadway safety and context. Bryan Osborne asked if using V/C, which allows for more
2 congestion, would impact our air quality attainment status. Jason Charest noted impacts to air quality as
3 more vehicles on the road are electric.

4 5 **7. Federal Aid Funding and Highway Legislation**

6 Chris Jolly, FHWA, provided an update on the federal transportation budget and implications for
7 Vermont and local towns. Congress reauthorized the FAST Act in September effective FY21 (10/1/20 to
8 9/30/21). Vermont's FY21 federal-aid apportionment is about \$222 million, broken out as follows:

9 National Highway Performance Program (NHPP)	\$124.1
10 Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG)	\$62.1
11 Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)	\$12.2
12 Rail Crossing	\$1.2
13 Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality (CMAQ)	\$12.6
14 National Highway Freight Program	\$7.6
15 Metropolitan Planning (PL)	\$2.2

16
17 The recently passed "COVID Relief" legislation provided the remaining funding for FY21 as well as new
18 funding for the Scenic Byways Program. Under the Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental
19 Appropriations part of the bill, \$9.8 Billion from the general fund was provided for STBG activities and
20 certain revenue losses associated with VTrans operations. This is 100% funding and it's estimated that
21 VTrans should get about \$50 million. Discretionary Programs including BUILD (Better Utilizing
22 Investments to Leverage Development) and INFRA (Investment For Rebuilding America) are funded
23 through FY21. Chris noted that a new multiyear Highway Bill is needed to replace the FAST Act for
24 FY22 which starts October 1, 2021. It's unclear if there will be an additional infrastructure stimulus bill in
25 addition to the typical federal-aid highway program.

26 27 **8. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports**

28 See the project list on the back of the agenda. TAC members are encouraged to contact CCRPC staff with
29 any questions.

30 31 **9. CCRPC Board Meeting Report**

32 There was no Board meeting in December.

33 34 **10. Chairman's/Members' Items:**

- 35 • **FY22 UPWP program** materials posted at [https://www.ccrpcvt.org/about-](https://www.ccrpcvt.org/about-us/commission/annual-work-plan-budget-finances/)
36 [us/commission/annual-work-plan-budget-finances/](https://www.ccrpcvt.org/about-us/commission/annual-work-plan-budget-finances/). UPWP requests are due on January 22 with
37 adoption planned by the CCRPC Board in May 2021.

38
39 The next TAC meeting is scheduled for February 2.

40
41 DEAN PIERCE MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN, SECONDED BY DENNIS LUTZ, APPROVED
42 UNANIMOUSLY. The meeting adjourned at 10:27 AM.

43
44 Respectfully submitted, Bryan Davis