



## **FY2022 UPWP Committee - Meeting 2 (Virtual Meeting via Zoom)** **February 25, 2021**

### **Members Present:**

Catherine McMains, Committee Chair  
Michael Bissonnette, Board  
Sharon Murray, Board  
Jaqueline Murphy, Board  
Amy Bell, VTrans  
Chris Jolly, FHWA  
Ravi Venkataraman, CWAC  
Karen Adams, CWAC  
Justin Rabidoux, TAC

Barbara Elliot, TAC  
Dean Pierce, PAC

### **Staff:**

Charlie Baker, CCRPC  
Forest Cohen, CCRPC  
Eleni Churchill, CCRPC  
Amy Irvin Witham, CCRPC  
Regina Mahony, CCRPC  
Marshall Distel, CCRPC

### **1. Welcome & Introductions**

Committee Chair Catherine McMains opened the meeting at 4:32 p.m. and introductions were made.

### **2. Review and approval of UPWP Committee Minutes – Meeting #1 (Action)**

Barbara Elliot made a motion, seconded by Michael Bissonnette to approve the January 28, 2021 UPWP Committee meeting minutes. All in favor except Sharon Murray abstained.

### **3. Review of FY22 Project Applications, Comments and Updates with a Focus on PL-Funded (Transportation) Projects**

Prior to moving forward with a review of the FY22 UPWP project spreadsheet, Eleni Churchill briefly explained that more PL funding would be available in FY22 than in previous years.

Chris Jolly provided more details about the FY22 funding. In FY21, approximately \$2.2 million in PL funding and \$467,000 in FTA planning funds were programmed to the CCRPC. However, significantly more funding is available in FY22. One of the biggest factors that will contribute to an increase in FY22 funding will come as a result of FTA funding availability. In previous years, there was a delay in the transfer of the FTA funds to the CCRPC. In FY22, the CCRPC will receive two apportionments of FTA funds within a six-month timeframe.

Between FY18 and FY20, the CCRPC has annually expended around \$2.5 million in PL funds, while the CCRPC was programmed around \$3 million in PL funding. There has been a gap between the money that was expended versus the money that had been programmed. Funds that have not been spent by the CCRPC are carried forward each year. CCRPC staff time availability and local match constraints often prevent the programmed funds from being fully expended on an annual basis.

Amy Bell added that CCRPC is a direct recipient of PL funds as an MPO. Sometimes we don't always know the exact level of PL funds that will be expended until the end of the year. Amy

compared the process to that of a savings account that continuously rolls over annually.

Charlie Baker explained that the bottom line in the UPWP spreadsheet increased from \$1.2 million to \$1.5 million to accommodate all eligible FY22 requests, while also lining up with staffing and local match constraints. The annual CCRPC staff cost equates to around \$1.6 million as an aggregate. GMT funds are also not shown on this table.

Justin Rabidoux asked about tracking the carryover funding. Chris said that FHWA and VTrans are able to track the carryover PL funds that have been unobligated.

Following the funding discussion, Eleni provided an overview of the UPWP project spreadsheet.

For the Queen City Park Road Bike/Ped Scoping, the requested budget increased from \$50,000 to \$60,000 after a draft scope of work was received from a consultant.

The Park and Ride Plan update is seen as a VTrans priority, as planning will also shortly be underway for the update to the statewide park and ride plan. Therefore, the budget increased from \$30,000 to \$50,000 to facilitate the development of a more robust plan.

The description for the I-89 Interchange Review in Bolton & Milton was revised to reflect a review of previous plans rather than a new analysis of the interchanges.

\$10,000 was added to both the Transportation-Related Water Quality Technical Assistance task and the generic Transportation Technical Assistance task to cover potential small project requests throughout the year.

A Regional Transit Funding Model task was added after a discussion with GMT. The study would be managed by the CCRPC and would seek to evaluate opportunities and models to fund regional transit. Charlie will make a request of Legislature to fund the local match.

Regina provided a brief overview of the three Bolton land use project requests. Regina stated that the land use projects are dependent on the availability of staff time so the UPWP Committee will see our recommendations on these at the March meeting.

For the Burlington Impact Fee Study, the budget was reduced budget from \$80,000 to \$40,000 to remove the non-transportation elements. The description was also revised to reflect the change.

Regina detailed how the Jericho land use project request was removed from consideration in FY22 due to a lack of funding for the fee-for-service request.

Eleni then provided an overview of the partner requests.

For the Carsharing as a COVID Response project, FHWA clarified that stipends cannot be provided to volunteers. However, hiring resident ambassadors would be an eligible initiative. CCRPC staff confirmed with CSVT that the budget request remains unchanged.

Justin asked about CCRPC staff availability to take on all of the FY22 project requests. Eleni replied by saying that the CCRPC staff hours calculation will be evaluated within the coming

weeks.

Chris added one additional comment with regards to the overall budget by highlighting how the CCRPC receives significantly more PL funds when compared to many other MPOs around the country. The reason for this is because Vermont is a minimum apportionment state and only has the one MPO. Therefore, the CCRPC is guaranteed a certain base level of PL funds as an MPO. The other factor is that CCRPC is also the only MPO within the state. If the White River Junction area ever gets above 50,000 urban population and a MPO is formed; the funding that CCRPC gets would be shared between the two MPOs. [Note – The urban population of the Lebanon-White River Junction is about 25,000.]

Barbara Elliot asked if CCRPC staff are supportive of all the projects. Eleni replied by saying yes, that there are no concerns with the projects from the staff's perspective. Questions and requested clarifications were brought up with municipalities and partner organizations after the first meeting.

Charlie outlined the financial and operational impacts of COVID on the CCRPC. Many staff members have not used much vacation time in the past 12 months when compared to a normal year. Therefore, there is a backlog of vacation days that may cut into staff availability during the upcoming summer months. This will be taken into consideration when allocating staff hours for FY22.

Karen Adams brought up her suggestion from the first meeting to evaluate the survey-related requests to identify areas of consolidation to achieve a greater level of efficiency. Eleni responded by saying that the survey-related requests were evaluated, but added that consolidation would likely not be feasible because the diverging target populations for these surveys.

#### **4. Next Steps & Adjourn**

Marshall provided a brief overview of the next steps. The CCRPC will work to assemble a full draft of the FY22 UPWP to be reviewed at the final UPWP Committee meeting on 3/25.

Dean Pierce suggested that the public comments be reviewed at the March meeting. Marshall will add this to the agenda.

Barbara made a motion, seconded by Dean to adjourn the meeting. Catherine adjourned the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marshall Distel