

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

5 DATE: Tuesday, June 1, 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 Amy Bell, VTrans
13 Ashley Bishop, VTrans
14 Dan Currier, VTrans
15 Matthew Langham, VTrans
16 Jonathon Weber, Local Motion
17 Bob Henneberger, Seniors
18 Jon Rauscher, Winooski
19 Dennis Lutz, Essex
20 Dean Bloch, Charlotte
21 Deirdre Holmes, Charlotte
22 Chris Jolly, FHWA
23 Sam Andersen, GBIC
24 Elizabeth Ross, Burlington Alternate
25 Josh Arneson, Richmond
26 Joss Besse, Bolton
27

Wayne Howe, Jericho
Bruce Hoar, Williston
Chris Damiani, GMT
David Allerton, Milton
Robin Pierce, Essex Junction

28 **Staff**

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

29 1. Bryan Osborne called the meeting to order at 9:01 AM.
30

31 **2. Consent Agenda**

32 JUSTIN RABIDOUX MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA, SECONDED
33 BY DENNIS LUTZ. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
34

35 **3. Approval of May 4, 2021 Minutes**

36 Bryan Osborne asked for any changes, which there were none. DEAN BLOCH MADE A MOTION TO
37 APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MAY 4, 2021, SECONDED BY SAM ANDERSEN. THE MOTION
38 PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
39

40 **4. Public Comments**

41 None.
42

43 **5. Pre-Qualified Consultant Selection**

44 Marshall Distel, CCRPC staff, introduced the process and categories. Bryan Osborne noted there was a
45 great response to this and asked if that was typical. Marshall noted it was a bit higher than usual. Bryan
46 also asked about the contract extension piece for two years and how common that is. Eleni noted that this
47 was done in the last round (contracts extended twice for one-year periods) and it worked very well.
48 Marshall added there were two new topic areas, energy/climate and transit and that might have
49 contributed to the increased number of proposals. Justin noted 20 responses is a big number and
50 wondered if there were rankings available? He would have trouble backing the recommendations as he's
51 curious if there were close calls and if there was an effort to involve other consultants. Eleni apologized
52 for not sharing the scores with the TAC and clarified that, yes, we do have scoring and comments from
53 the selection committee meeting and that staff tried as best as they could to spread things around and
54 include more consultants this time around. Justin reiterated he doesn't have enough information to

1 support the recommendations. Dennis Lutz had the same concern as Justin. Dennis noted there was a firm
2 on the list for selection that he had problems in the past with meeting deadlines. He would like to see the
3 scoring. Bruce Hoar echoed Justin and Dennis. He would also like to know what categories each firm
4 applied for. Bryan asked whether there was any formal process to follow up at the end of a project to
5 assess the consultant's job as feedback for next time. Eleni responded that while there wasn't a formal
6 process, each project manager on the CCRPC staff knows how their consultants are performing and that
7 influences the proposal scores. Bryan asked if there were local consultants that might be able to do this
8 job that didn't submit a proposal in response to the RFQ? Dennis commented that it's up to the firms to
9 make that decision. He added it's important to communicate to the firms you didn't select as to why they
10 didn't get it. Eleni added that those discussions do take place often. Bruce asked if we have to use these
11 consultants on retainer and Eleni clarified that the answer was no, but a project had to go through an RFP
12 process to choose another consultant. Bryan asked how time sensitive this is, and Eleni said they would
13 like to have an answer by the middle of June. The TAC agreed to receive the scores and narrative via
14 email on Monday, June 7th and members will have until Friday, June 11th to return their responses and
15 votes.
16

17 **6. Draft FY2022-2025 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

18 Christine Forde, CCRPC staff, gave a presentation on the Draft FY2022-2025 TIP, including what it is,
19 how projects get on the TIP, how to read the document, funding levels for each of the next four years,
20 reviewed TIP projects by use categories, and an update on the three phases of Circ Alternatives projects in
21 the draft TIP. Jonathon asked if the CCRPC maintains a list of projects to be added to the TIP later.
22 Christine said that the projects on the VTrans Project Selection and Prioritization System (VPSP2) are the
23 next ones to be added but there is no official waiting list. Dennis recognized the good presentation and
24 asked for clarification on the Circ Alts project for Susie Wilson and Route 15, shown as \$1.7 million,
25 which started as a \$7 million project and included other items including the Kellogg Road intersection. Is
26 that intersection still included? Christine said the CCRPC would follow up. Dean Bloch asked about the
27 status of the Williston Park and Ride. Christine said it's moving forward with construction shown on the
28 TIP in FY22. Bruce Hoar said he received some paperwork for signatures after he has further discussion
29 with the State. Bryan Osborne asked if there is any work currently happening on the VT2A Corridor
30 project, he saw someone with a clipboard in the area asking people questions, Bryan didn't know if
31 someone from VTrans has more information. Amy Bell will follow up. Jonathon asked if the Intervale
32 Avenue railroad crossing project had any relation to the Intervale Avenue path project that was scoped.
33 Christine said they are separate projects, this is for the railroad crossing only, there is no funding
34 associated with the path project. JUSTIN RABIDOUX MADE A MOTION THAT THE TAC ASK THE
35 BOARD TO WARN A PUBLIC HEARING FOR THEIR JULY MEETING FOR THE FY2022-2025
36 TIP; AND THAT THE BOARD APPROVE THE TIP, SECONDED BY DENNIS LUTZ. THE
37 MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
38

39 **7. 2023 Transportation Project Prioritization using VTrans Project Selection and Prioritization** 40 **System (VPSP2) and Pilot Transportation Equity Screen**

41 Christine Forde, CCRPC staff, gave a presentation on the 2023 Transportation Project Prioritization using
42 VTrans Project Selection and Prioritization System (VPSP2). This is Year 1 of the pilot effort and
43 includes Paving, Roadway, Traffic & Safety projects. She reviewed how the point values were assigned
44 for each criterion and shared the resulting transportation values after being scored by CCRPC and
45 VTrans. Christine and Bryan Davis then described the CCRPC's development and application of a pilot
46 transportation equity screen for the VPSP2 project list. The CCRPC engaged the Vermont Racial Equity
47 Association (VREA) to review the CCRPC's initial equity scores for projects relative to each other,
48 provide recommendations on how these projects should be scored in this first round of prioritization, and
49 provide advice about how to use the equity score either as a screen or as a number of points added to the
50 project scores. CCRPC staff presented a table showing the current VPSP2 transportation values without
51 the equity screen, the values with a 10-point equity screen, and the values with a 20-point equity screen.
52 Staff acknowledged this is only one type of equity screen process and was open to comments and
53 feedback. Jonathon pointed out that mobility and connectivity were separate on the qualification sheet

1 presented last time but are shown together on the transportation values spreadsheet. Christine said that the
2 qualification sheet is a tool designed to help with scoring, but the workbook with the transportation values
3 is the actual scoring. Bruce asked why the Circ Alt projects can't be considered Asset Driven, and he also
4 said that Williston doesn't agree with the project ranked order. Christine said the asset driven projects are
5 data-driven and identified differently by VTrans but that doesn't mean the regional projects aren't
6 important. Bryan asked why the Lake Champlain Byway/Bikeway wasn't considered as a priority bike
7 corridor in the methodology, which only used the VTrans on-road priorities for extra points. Amy Bell
8 said the Lake Champlain Byway/Bikeway was a local not state priority. Bryan said the Town would like
9 to see this considered as a state priority. Christine said we could submit this as part of our comment
10 package with the scores. Jonathon asked if paths were considered as part of the health access points and if
11 not, could they be. Christine said paths were included in the health access criterion scoring. Bryan asked
12 when we could anticipate the scoring to impact the delivery of projects. Christine said projects would go
13 on the next capital program after existing funding commitments are fulfilled. The capital program has 4
14 years of projects which are in the TIP, so these VPSP2 projects would not advance for 4 years. Robin said
15 he was shocked that the train station got zero points in the equity screen since it serves all modes. Bob
16 Henneberger asked if age was considered in the equity screening process and suggested that it should be.
17 Sam Andersen agreed with both Robin and Bob. Dennis recognized the importance of data, but the
18 screening tool tends to favor urban areas since they have more people of different races living there. The
19 process needs to include more types of equity, not just race, and doesn't think that 20 points is realistic
20 but he's OK with 10 points from a transportation perspective. Justin has a similar concern and questioned
21 if this type of decision (*equity scoring*) is an appropriate role for the TAC or should be made by the
22 CCRPC Board instead. Christine said for this round the equity scores won't affect the Transportation
23 Values. Bryan asked if Amy or Matthew are involved in the equity screening process on behalf of
24 VTrans. Amy said that Michele Boomhower and Charlie Baker are leading the effort for VTrans and
25 RPCs, respectively. Charlie said that equity isn't currently part of the VPSP2 criteria, but it needs to be,
26 and this effort by CCRPC is the start of the process and doesn't have the level of work as the other
27 VPSP2 criteria. Jonathon noted that it seems like the scores by VREA are based on the ECOS Map and
28 his lived experience, and that in the future a committee could also provide more lived experience. He
29 asked if there will be a new screening process based on these comments by the June Board meeting.
30 Charlie said there won't be a new screen by then, we're taking feedback like this over the next 6 to 12
31 months. Bob offered a general observation that equity equals fairness, for example projects in rural towns
32 usually score lower than projects in other areas. Dennis said he's fine with the transportation value scores
33 as presented, and Robin agreed. DENNIS LUTZ MOVED TO APPROVE THE VPSP2
34 TRANSPORTATION VALUE SCORES AS PRESENTED AND FOR CCRPC TO PROVIDE
35 COMMENTS TO VTRANS ON THE SCORES AND THE METHODOLOGY, SECONDED BY
36 ROBIN PIERCE. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY. Staff noted the comments will include
37 those made about the Lake Champlain Byway, considering age in the equity screening tool, and
38 considering the train station as a multimodal facility. JUSTIN RABIDOUX MADE A MOTION THAT
39 THE CCRPC SEND COMMENTS TO VTRANS ON BOTH THE TRANSPORTATION VALUES
40 AND EQUITY SCREENING PROCESS, SECONDED BY SAM ANDERSEN. THE MOTION
41 PASSED UNANIMOUSLY. Dennis said we need better data, and this is a broader issue than what was
42 looked at, it's too narrow as it is, it's more than just racial equity. There are areas in Essex with low-
43 income populations. Robin said this doesn't seem like an equitable approach. Charlie said his sense is that
44 the legislature and administration may seek a racial equity process so this may warrant a larger
45 conversation. Jonathon said that the murder of George Floyd prompted this type of effort so we'll need a
46 value statement, so we understand equity for whom through this process. Bob asked if we could borrow
47 methodologies from other MPOs, states and federal government. Bryan Davis said yes, we are looking at
48 what other MPOs are doing, as well as the federal government, and welcome any resources from TAC
49 members. Chris Jolly said the federal government is doing some work and is evolving, but MPOs are
50 doing more.

51 52 **8. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports**

53 See bulleted list at the end of the agenda for current CCRPC projects. TAC members are encouraged to
54 ask staff for more information on the status of any of these on-going or recently completed projects.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

9. CCRPC Board Meeting Report

In May the Board heard a presentation on the Draft VELCO Long Range Transmission Plan, voted to approve the FY22 UPWP and budget, heard an update on the draft VPSP2 Transportation Equity Screen for Regionally Driven Transportation Projects, and heard updates on the CCRPC Equity Leadership Team, I-89 Study, CWSP Rule and Start Up, and the legislative update from the Executive Director.

10. Chairman's/Members' Items

The Vermont Agency of Transportation (VTrans) has issued a grant solicitation for new infrastructure projects that improve access and safety for bicyclists and pedestrians through the Bicycle and Pedestrian Grant Program. Materials, information, and recorded pre-application training webinar available at <https://vtrans.vermont.gov/highway/local-projects/bike-ped>. Applications must be received by 1:00 p.m., June 4, 2021. For more information contact Jon Kaplan at 802-498-4742 or Jon.Kaplan@vermont.gov.

The next TAC meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, July 6, 2021.

The meeting adjourned at 10:53 AM.

Respectfully submitted, Jason Charest and Bryan Davis

DRAFT