

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

5 DATE: Tuesday, May 4, 2021
6 TIME: 9:00 a.m.
7 PLACE: Meeting held remotely via Zoom
8

9 **Members Present**

10 Bryan Osborne, Colchester
11 Justin Rabidoux, South Burlington
12 Nicole Losch, Burlington
13 Amy Bell, VTrans
14 Matthew Langham, VTrans
15 Jonathon Weber, Local Motion
16 Bob Henneberger, Seniors
17 Jon Rauscher, Winooski
18 Barbara Elliott, Huntington
19 Sandy Thibault, CATMA
20 Kirsten Jensen, Milton
21 Dennis Lutz, Essex
22 Dean Bloch, Charlotte
23 Mary Anne Michaels, Rail
24 Andrea Morgante, Hinesburg

Wayne Howe, Jericho
Bruce Hoar, Williston
Sam Andersen, GBIC
Chris Damiani, GMT
Josh Arneson, Richmond
Kurt Johnson, Underhill

25 **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
Sai Sarepalli, Senior Transportation Planning Engineer
Chris Dubin, Senior Transportation Planner
Marshall Distel, Transportation Planner

26 **Guests/Public**

27 None
28

29 1. Bryan Osborne called the meeting to order at 9:01 AM and welcomed Sam Andersen from GBIC, who
30 will be the new Business representative as Seth Bowden has taken a new job with a different organization.
31

32 **2. Consent Agenda**

33 DENNIS LUTZ MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA, SECONDED BY
34 BRUCE HOAR. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
35

36 **3. Approval of Minutes**

37 Bryan Osborne asked for any changes, which there were none. JUSTIN RABIDOUX MADE A
38 MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF APRIL 6, 2021, SECONDED BY BOB
39 HENNEBERGER. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
40

41 **4. Public Comments**

42 None.
43

44 **5. Draft FY22 UPWP Work Plan and Budget**

45 Marshall Distel, CCRPC staff, described the process to develop the draft FY22 UPWP annual work plan
46 and budget, gave an overview of the funding history in the past few years, noted the availability of
47 FHWA funds for this fiscal year, and highlighted the project categories. Bryan Osborne asked if there is a
48 time limit for CCRPC to spend the FHWA funds from previous years that carried over into the FY22
49 program. Amy replied the funds need to be spent within four years, and Matthew Langham noted that the
50 oldest funds get spent first so the CCRPC hasn't been in a situation to return any funds. Dennis asked that
51 since it seems all submitted projects will be funded, can towns proceed with moving projects forward?
52 Charlie said yes. Dennis asked if any ARPA (American Rescue Plan Act) funds were included in the
53 FY22 UPWP. Eleni replied no, these are FHWA PL (planning) funds only. Charlie said the MPO isn't
54 getting ARPA funds directly as it goes to towns. He is also having conversations with towns about the

1 additional FHWA funds available in FY22 so they can consider any potential projects to add during the
2 FY22 UPWP mid-year adjustment. DENNIS LUTZ MADE A MOTION FOR THE TAC TO
3 RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE FY22 UPWP TO THE CCRPC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
4 AND BOARD, SECONDED BY JUSTIN RABIDOUX. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY
5

6 **6. Traffic Impact Studies 101**

7 Jason Charest, CCRPC staff, presented an overview of traffic impact studies, the background and process,
8 and pointed out common issues for which municipal reviewers should be aware. He suggested that if
9 there is sufficient interest, a separate workshop could be planned to go into more detail. Sam Andersen
10 asked if transportation impact fees are one-time fees, and Jason replied yes. He noted the CCRPC is
11 available to towns to help review traffic impacts studies, and that earlier in the process is better rather
12 than waiting until the Act 250 review process. Andrea asked that with the increase in deliveries, is data
13 available on the number of delivery vehicles like UPS, FedEx, and USPS, are they tracked separately than
14 other trucks? Jason said he hasn't seen them tracked separately. Andrea asked that when a town is
15 considering a zoning change, can there be a traffic impact study on the proposed zoning change rather
16 than waiting for a developer to propose a project? Also, could fees be used for traffic mitigation rather
17 than improving impacts to traffic? Jason suggested this would be part of a build out analysis rather than a
18 traffic impact study. Andrea asked if a build out analysis would look at traffic data. Justin noted that video
19 detection software can classify trucks versus cars versus bikes/peds but not necessarily types of trucks,
20 like bread delivery truck versus UPS truck. He also noted that South Burlington worked with the CCRPC
21 to look at what improvements might be needed for expected build out, so yes the CCRPC can help earlier
22 in the process rather than a town being reactive. Dennis said that Essex did a build out process for the
23 Susie Wilson corridor. He said that Essex has different types of impact fees including a weight impact fee
24 and gravel fee. He said the Route 15 and Allen Martin Parkway will eventually need a signal but
25 improvements could also be phased in over time. A signal impact fee would be so high no one would be
26 willing to pay. There's a lot of traffic coming from outside of town so it's not fair to only charge the
27 locals, it's an imperfect process. Jonathon Weber asked if there is treatment and analysis for people
28 bicycling and walking? Jason said that walk, bike and transit are seen as ways to reducing vehicles trips,
29 and reduces the need to do mitigation and pay a fee. Jonathon noted the Burton/Higher Ground study,
30 which wasn't a CCRPC study, didn't talk about walk/bike except to note that no facilities exist. Jason said
31 that project is an example of the CCRPC being in the process too late. He also noted the CCRPC is
32 working with the City on a scoping project for Queen City Park Road near that site. He said that the ITE
33 Trip Generation Manual hasn't yet focused on estimating walk/bike trips and that it will take time to
34 recover from auto-centric planning. Andrea asked if we can use a predictive model to anticipate needed
35 changes like new bus routes so a signal wouldn't be needed, can we predict the future rather than reacting
36 to the past. Bryan Osborne, in reflecting on Act 145, asked if the links in the presentation also include a
37 map of where there are impact fees, and what those fees are? Jason said yes. Amy clarified that those
38 resources only show places where fees have been applied to a project, not just where there is a fee policy
39 in place. Dennis asked what happens to the fees? Matthew replied that they are held in escrow until a
40 project starts, but he isn't sure of the escrow timeframe. Amy said she thinks it's between 6-8 years.
41 Dennis said that fees are being collected for the Route 2A/289 intersection project, what happens to those
42 funds after the 6-8 years when the project is already built and it won't need upgrading again for another
43 20 years. Amy said she isn't sure, Joe Segale at VTrans is a good resource for these questions. Jason said
44 the funds are returned if they're not used.
45

46 **7. VPSP2 Proposed Project List: Transportation Equity Screen**

47 Bryan Davis, CCRPC staff, said that at the April TAC meeting Christine Forde gave a detailed overview
48 of the VPSP2 process and the regional project scoring. The CCRPC hoped to receive VTrans scores on
49 the project list by today's meeting for TAC consideration, but we did not receive those scores. Bryan said
50 that as outlined in the agenda memo for this item, transportation equity is not currently part of the VPSP2
51 criteria, but is necessary to ensure public funds are being allocated to projects that minimize burdens and
52 maximize benefits, particularly to traditionally underserved populations. Between the April and May TAC
53 meetings CCRPC staff engaged in a process to begin to qualitatively evaluate the equity impact of each of
54 the 17 selected projects on people living in and near the project area, as well as people who would use the

1 transportation facility. The general outline of the Equity Screening Process is included in the agenda item
2 memo. Bryan acknowledged there is room for improvement in this process and staff offers this as a
3 starting point to developing a transportation equity screen. CCRPC is working with Mark Hughes of
4 Vermont Racial Equity Association as well as the Transportation Equity Coalition assembled by Old
5 Spokes Home to identify and integrate improvements into this screening process. Based on their
6 feedback, as well as input from the TAC, the CCRPC will re-screen the projects before presenting the
7 VPSP2 project recommendation at the CCRPC Board meeting. The floor was opened for discussion.
8

9 Bryan Osborne asked if there are no points as part of the current scoring, then how will it work to
10 potentially change the priority order of projects? Dennis asked how it will be used to rank regional versus
11 local projects, which is more important? Andrea agreed that this is late in the process for this type of
12 screen, noted this pilot round of VPSP2 is for roadway, traffic and safety projects, and that it's important
13 to look at the bigger context. Bryan Osborne asked if the state is doing this screen as well. Bryan Davis
14 noted that there is language in the Transportation Bill for the state and all RPCs to develop and engage in
15 transportation equity screening, and all parties would work together. Dennis noted the number of projects
16 screened as "high," "medium" and "low," and he's not sure this screen would change the order but going
17 forward would like to better understand and see how those ratings are defined, explain why some are
18 high, medium, low. Charlie acknowledged Dennis's question about wanting more description of why a
19 project would get more "points," as he thinks eventually points will be assigned as part of this screen.
20 Incorporating points may change the point range and max points, and we don't necessarily need to stay
21 with a 100-point system. Another issue is that we're used to doing things this way and that we haven't
22 looked at the bigger picture of where we're doing projects, for example in white, suburban towns because
23 those communities are the most vocal, and we may not be addressing projects in other areas. Bob
24 suggested that we also look at data about percent of population isolated because of age, and Bryan noted
25 that yes, there is other data to be considered, and racial data should be disaggregated as well. Andrea
26 would like a better understanding of the exact criteria being used, for example a recommended
27 "improvement" may mean more traffic so it would have impacts on a community or certain populations.
28 Kirsten said they hear more complaints from some neighborhoods, there may be complaints from other
29 areas, but we're not hearing them so they don't get addressed. She also said there are UVM faculty
30 working on similar issues who might be interested in the CCRPC's work and be able to provide input into
31 the process. Jonathon asked for an example of a "low" positive impact project, and Bryan said staff
32 identified the Williston Mountain View Road Bicycle/Pedestrian Facilities project as having a low
33 positive impact based on factors such as majority housing type (single family), not a very diverse
34 population in the project area, it's not a current high crash location, there's no existing transit service, it
35 has a high opportunity index as defined by HUD (e.g., area has high home ownership, very low poverty,
36 moderate job access, moderate school proficiency), the proposed improvement (widening shoulders to
37 create new bike lanes) may not provide the level of comfort and safety to attract new cyclists, etc. Dennis
38 asked if equity is already included in some of the VPSP2 criteria, or could it be added to and change the
39 point value of existing criteria like "mobility and access." Christine noted that equity isn't included in the
40 current VPSP2 criteria. Charlie said equity would likely become its own criteria. Jonathon suggested that
41 equity could be used as a multiplier effect on the existing criteria. Andrea asked why the Route 2A/116
42 project is ranked as high positive? Charlie said because of the number of low-income residents in the area.
43 Christine said that project hasn't been scoped yet so screening could change based on additional
44 information. Bruce asked why are there zero points for mobility for the Mountain View Road project?
45 Christine said we could revisit that scoring. Bryan Osborne asked VTrans staff if they are having internal
46 discussions and if they are thinking of numeric values? Amy said that's where they will probably end up,
47 but they haven't had conversations yet, they need to get the right people at the table. Charlie said CCRPC
48 will help VTrans, and that the transportation bill has equity language in it but it hasn't passed yet. As part
49 of the T-bill a report with recommendations about how to incorporate equity into transportation project
50 decisions would be due to the legislature by January 15, 2022.
51

52 **8. Request for RFQ Reviewers**

53 Marshall Distel, CCRPC staff, noted that the CCRPC released a Request for Qualifications to solicit
54 consulting firms interested in being pre-qualified to work on CCRPC project, and he is asking for one

1 volunteer to help review the 20 proposals received so that a recommendation could be brought to the June
2 Board meeting. Nicole Losch volunteered.

3
4 **9. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports**

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

7
8 **10. CCRPC Board Meeting Report**

9 In April the Board recognized the life and sudden passing of Marty Illick, a long-time CCRPC Board
10 member and passionate advocate for the Lewis Creek watershed and beyond. She is already missed. The
11 Board reviewed the draft FY22 UPWP, heard a presentation from VEIC and VTrans on electric vehicles,
12 reviewed the initial VPSP2 project list, approved updates to the TIP amendment policy, learned of
13 appointments to the Equity Leadership Team, reviewed nominations for FY22 Board Leadership
14 positions, and heard Executive Director updates.

15
16 **11. Chairman's/Members' Items:**

17 • **VTrans 2021 VTrans Bicycle and Pedestrian Grant Program**

18 The Vermont Agency of Transportation (VTrans) has issued a grant solicitation for new
19 infrastructure projects that improve access and safety for bicyclists and pedestrians. Materials and
20 information at <https://vtrans.vermont.gov/highway/local-projects/bike-ped>. Applications must be
21 received by 1:00 p.m., June 4, 2021. A pre-application training webinar will be offered on April
22 27. For more information contact Jon Kaplan at 802-498-4742 or Jon.Kaplan@vermont.gov.

23 • **Way to Go! Spring Challenge May 1-16**

24 Spring is here, so it's a great time to Get Up and Go! Take the challenge to walk, bike, roll, bus,
25 or carpool May 1-16. Whether you're getting healthy, supporting a clean, green Vermont, or
26 doing your part to battle pollution, you can earn points to win awesome prizes. Learn more and
27 sign up here <https://www.connectingcommuters.org/waytogo/>.

- 28 • Bryan Davis reminded the TAC that the CCRPC is working with the UVM Transportation
29 Research Center to understand progress made on the 2017 Regional Active Transportation Plan,
30 and that he sent around a survey link for towns to indicate types of projects being planned or
31 constructed. Survey link: https://qualtrics.uvm.edu/jfe/form/SV_5oQFYjCSJhyiggS

32
33 The next TAC meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, June 1.

34
35 BRUCE HOAR MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN, SECONDED BY BOB HENNEBERGER,
36 APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY. The meeting adjourned at 10:42 AM.

37
38 Respectfully submitted, Bryan Davis