



CHITTENDEN COUNTY RPC

Communities Planning Together

Transportation Advisory Committee Agenda

Tuesday, February 1, 2022

9:00 to 10:30 am

This is a virtual meeting only.

Join Remotely:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82462008536?pwd=NVIlaWlyZEU2aXRaNHUxZIY5cHoyZz09>

Meeting ID: 824 6200 8536

Password: 684952

One tap mobile: <tel:+16468769923>, [82462008536](tel:+182462008536)#, [1#684952](tel:+1684952)#

Dial by phone: 1-646-876-9923 **Meeting ID:** 824 6200 8536

Agenda

1. Call to Order, Attendance (1 min)

2. Consent agenda* (2 min)

Item 2a: TIP Amendments

Item 2b: Safety Performance Targets

3. Minutes of December 7, 2021* (Action Item – 1 min)

See attached minutes.

4. Public Comment Period (Information Item)

Members of the public are invited to raise issues of interest or concern to the TAC on items not on the agenda.

5. Transit Finance Study* (Information Item – 30 min)

In partnership with VTrans and GMT, the CCRPC contracted with Steadman Hill Consulting to analyze innovative approaches to financing public transportation in Vermont. Steven Falbel, Steadman Hill, will present the study process, alternatives evaluation and recommendations from the study. Full report is here:

<https://studiesandreports.ccrpcvt.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/Final-Funding-Report-11-23-21.pdf>.

6. Vermont and the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (Information Item – 20 min)

Costa Pappis, VTrans, will present the impacts of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act on Vermont. Additional resources posted on the Vermont League of Cities and Towns [website](#).

7. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports (Information Item – 1 min)

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

8. CCRPC Board Meeting Report (Information Item – 2 min)

The Board did not meet in December. In January the Board reviewed the Equity Assessment Report from consultant Creative Discourse, approved the FY22 UPWP Mid-Year Adjustment and Budget, heard a presentation on Vermont's

In accordance with provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, as amended, the CCRPC will ensure public meetings are accessible to all people. Requests for free interpretive or translation services, assistive devices, or other requested reasonable accommodations, should be made to Emma Vaughn, CCRPC Title VI Coordinator, at 802-846-4490 ext. 121 or evaughn@ccrpcvt.org, at least 3 business days prior to the meeting for which services are requested.

Climate Action Plan and the draft 2022 Comprehensive Energy Plan, and reviewed the legislative priorities.

9. Chairman's/Members' Items (Information Item – 5 min)

- **2021 Complete Streets** reporting due by Feb 9, please send [this form](#) for each project to bdavis@ccrpcvt.org.
- Reminder that **VT Clean Cities Coalition** can perform a free fleet analysis as described by Peggy O'Neill-Vivanco at the December TAC meeting (Peggy.ONeill-Vivanco@uvm.edu). Her presentation is posted [here](#).
- **VT Walk Bike Summit** – rescheduled for May 6, 2022 in Middlebury. Call for proposals and award nominations due Feb 4. More information at <https://vtwalkbikesummit.com/>.

* = Attachment

Next Meeting: Wednesday, March 2, 2022 due to Town Meeting

Potential Future Agenda Items:

- Title VI and racial equity update
- Traffic calming policies
- Bike lane design guidance
- Bike facility winter maintenance
- Elders and Persons with Disabilities update (June Summit)
- AID grant/ Bluetooth sensors update
- Burlington School District travel plans for 9 schools

Project List:

- Title VI program participation and Public Participation Plan implementation
- Participation in the Vermont Highway Safety Alliance
- Participation in the State's Rail Council
- Advanced Traffic Monitoring System through FHWA AID grant
- Regional Transportation Energy Planning
- Transportation Hazard Mitigation Planning
- ECOS MTP Plan (2023) Update
- Coordination with GMT on ADA and Elders & Persons with Disabilities advisory committees
- Regional Transit Funding Model
- E&D, ADA & Medicaid Call Center Feasibility Study
- Regional Park & Ride Plan
- Active Transportation Plan update/Close the Gaps in Regional Bike Facilities
- Chittenden County I-89 2050 Study
- I-89 Interchange Review (Bolton & Milton)
- North Winooski Avenue Parking Management Plan (Burlington)
- Queen City Park Road/Austin Drive Buke and Pedestrian Study
- 2021/2022 Way to Go!
- Greenride Bikeshare
- Richmond Road Path Study Update (Hinesburg)
- Property Transportation Plan: Reduce transportation emissions in commercial and affordable multi-unit sectors with Burlington Electric Department and Burlington 2030 District
- Richmond Bike/Ped/Trails Master Plan – Phase 2 (*Phase 1 Completed*)
- Richmond Village Sidewalks Scoping Study
- VT15 Corridor Pedestrian and Road System Study (Essex)
- City of Burlington School District School Travel Plan and Traffic Control Plan
- Shelburne Bicycling and Pedestrian Connectivity Study
- Winooski Traffic Calming Policy
- Winooski Parking Inventory, Analysis, and Management Plan
- South Burlington Bike/Ped Mapping Phase II
- South Burlington Swift and Spear St. Intersection Feasibility Study (*Completed*)
- Mary Street Sidewalk Feasibility study (South Burlington)
- Kimball Ave Path Feasibility Study for Crossing of Potash Brook (South Burlington)
- Form-Based Code for Williston's Growth Center
- CCRPC Bicycle Count Program Evaluation and Data Analysis
- Watershed Resiliency Mapping/Transportation Resiliency Planning Tool (TRPT; Bolton, Richmond, Huntington (and a little bit of Jericho, Essex and Williston)
- Westford Town Green Stormwater Treatment Assessment
- Right-of-Way Condition Inventory for Stormwater Retrofit Feasibility – Phase 2 (Burlington)
- LPM services for Underhill sidewalk construction on VT 15
- LPM services for Shelburne – Irish Hill Road Sidewalk and Pedestrian Bridge project
- Municipal Road General Permit (MRGP) Work
- Grants-In-Aid Coordination with Municipalities

In accordance with provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, as amended, the CCRPC will ensure public meetings are accessible to all people. Requests for free interpretive or translation services, assistive devices, or other requested reasonable accommodations, should be made to Emma Vaughn, CCRPC Title VI Coordinator, at 802-846-4490 ext. 121 or evaughn@ccrpcvt.org, at least 3 business days prior to the meeting for which services are requested.



CCRPC Transportation Advisory Committee

February 1, 2022

Agenda Item 2a: Consent Item

Transportation Improvement Program TIP Amendments

Issues: Make the changes listed below to the FY22 year of the TIP. The FY2022-2025 TIP has not yet been approved by FHWA so these changes will apply to both the FY2020-2023 TIP, which remains in effect, and the FY2022-2025 TIP. These projects will be funded outside of CCRPC's fiscal constraint limit.

Resurfacing VT2A, Colchester-Essex (Project HP156, Amendment FY22-17)

Description of TIP Change: Add a new project to the TIP in FY22 for resurfacing VT Route 2A from the Class 1 limit north of North Street, in Essex, to US Route 7, in Colchester. Work will also take place on VT Route 127, between its intersections with US Route 7 and VT Route 2A.

Add \$1,795,072 for construction in FY22. Preliminary engineering for this project was funded under regional project Design Scoping Projects (OT006).

This project is being funded outside of CCRPC's fiscal constraint limit. Adding a non-constrained project is defined as a Minor Amendment according to CCRPC's TIP Amendment Policy.

Note that this project will be advertised as a composite contract with the Essex NH 033-1(26) project, which will pave VT Route 289 (see below).

Resurfacing VT Route 289, Essex (Project HP157, Amendment FY22-18)

Description of TIP Change: Add a new project to the TIP in FY22 for resurfacing VT Route 289, from VT Route 117 to VT Route 2A. Work under this project will also include the VT Route 289 on- and off-ramps.

Add \$2,979,197 for construction in FY22. Preliminary engineering for this project was funded under regional project Design Scoping Projects (OT006).

This project is being funded outside of CCRPC's fiscal constraint limit. Adding a non-constrained project is defined as a Minor Amendment according to CCRPC's TIP Amendment Policy.

Note that this project will be advertised as a composite contract with the Essex-Colchester STP 0207(4) project, which will pave VT Route 2A (see above).

GMT Capital – Federal (Project TR003A, Amendment FY22-19)

Description of TIP Change: Increase the amount of federal funds in FY22 from \$50,000 to \$200,000.

GMT receives FTA Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Funds each year that are divided between two separate projects -- Capital (Project TR003A) and Operating (Project TR002). GMT proposed to increase the amount to Capital (TR003A) to cover necessary preventative maintenance activities. Note that GMT anticipates additional 5307 funds may be available in FY22 so we are not proposing to reduce funding in project TR002 at this time.

GMT Capital – Facility and Bus Heavy Repairs (Project TR078, Amendment FY22-20) and GMT Preventative Maintenance, Safety, and Equipment Replacements (Project TR046, Amendment FY22-21)

Description of TIP Change: Add CMAQ as a funding source, along with STP Transfer, to both of these projects. This change will increase funding flexibility for these projects.

East-West Alternative Transportation Crossing, South Burlington (Project BP117, Amendment FY22-22)

Description of TIP Change: Add a new project to the TIP in FY22 for an East-West Alternative Transportation Crossing in South Burlington. Add \$240,000 in federal funds for PE in FY22.

South Burlington was awarded a RAISE (Rebuilding American Infrastructure with Sustainability and Equity) grant of \$9,768,834 to construct an Alternative Transportation Crossing of I-89 near Exit 14.

Lindenwood Dive Closed Drainage System and Stormwater Treatment, South Burlington (Project OT046, Amendment FY22-23)

Description of TIP Change: Advance \$96,610 from FY21 to FY22. This amendment changes the FY20 TIP to match the FY22 TIP, which was approved by the CCRPC Board on July 21, 2021. This project will be constructed in 2022.

VT128 Culvert BR1 Carrying Alder Brook, Essex (Project BR060, Amendment FY22-24)

Description of TIP Change: Move \$400,000 in federal funds for construction from FY21 to FY22 and add \$60,000. This project did not advance to construction in FY21 but will be constructed in 2022.

Exit 16 Improvements, Colchester (Project HP102, Amendment FY22-25)

Description of TIP Change: Change the FY20-23 TIP to match FY22-25 TIP as follows – increase federal funds for construction in FY22 from \$2,965,140 to \$4,000,000, add \$6,090,000 in FY23, and add \$2,997,712 in FY24. The project is scheduled to begin construction in 2022.

Stormwater System Retrofit with Infiltration Systems and Stabilized Outfalls for Three Cul-de-sacs, Essex (Project OT040, Amendment FY22-26)

Description of TIP Change: Change the FY20-23 TIP to match FY22-25 TIP as follows -- move \$189,104 from FY20 to FY22. This project is scheduled to be constructed in 2022.

US2 Paving, Bolton-Richmond (Project HP148, Amendment FY22-27)

Description of TIP Change: Change the FY20-23 TIP to match FY22-25 TIP as follows -- \$962,838 in FY22, \$7,308,000 in FY23, and \$6,593,440 in FY24. This project is scheduled to begin construction in 2022.

US7 Paving, Charlotte-South Burlington (Project HP149, Amendment FY22-28)

Description of TIP Change: Advance construction from FY23/24 to FY22/23 as follows -- \$4,000,000 in FY22 and \$3,879,517 in FY23. This change results in an increase in construction cost of \$728,474 which is a 10% increase. This project is scheduled to begin construction in 2022.

Staff Recommendation: Recommend that the Board approve the proposed TIP Amendments.

For more information contact: Christine Forde
cforde@ccrpcvt.org or 846-4490 ext. 113



CCRPC Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC)

February 1, 2022

Agenda Item 2b: Consent Item

Safety Performance Targets for the Metropolitan Planning Area

Background:

The Federal Transportation Acts (MAP-21 and FAST Act) placed considerable emphasis on system performance and directed State Departments of Transportation (DOTs), MPOs and Transit Providers to evaluate how well the transportation system is doing. At the national level, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) have established a Transportation Performance Management (TPM) program, a strategic initiative designed to achieve national transportation performance goals. The intent is to measure progress against the national goals through a reliable data-driven process. FHWA has established measures in the following areas: Safety, Infrastructure Condition (Pavement & Bridges), Congestion, System Reliability (NHS Performance), Freight Movements (Interstate), and Environmental Sustainability. Once the *measures* were established, it was up to state DOTs and MPOs to set quantifiable *targets* to gauge progress towards national goals. The schedule to establish targets, varies by measure. Federal regulations generally have state DOTs set performance targets in various categories (safety, asset condition, system performance, etc.) and then give MPOs another 180 days to either adopt the State targets or establish their own.

Safety Measures and Targets

Targets for the Safety Measures tabulated below are established every year by VTrans, in collaboration with the CCRPC. The TAC and the Board have reviewed and accepted these targets beginning with the first statewide safety targets established in the summer of 2017 and reported to FHWA in the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) report. The CCRPC is asked again to review and take action on the statewide targets set in the 2021 HSIP annual report.

Under federal regulations the CCRPC can either:

1. Accept the state targets for each performance measure and support them through programming; or
2. Define their own quantifiable targets for the MPO area.

The last two calendar years' and CY 2022 statewide safety measures and targets are listed below:

VTrans Safety Performance Measures	2020 Targets (5 Year Averages)	2021 Targets (5 Year Averages)	2022 Targets (5 Year Averages)
Number of Fatalities	58	58	58
Fatality Rate (Fatalities per 100M VMT)	0.82	0.82	0.82
Number of Serious Injuries	275	275	260
Serious Injury Rate (Serious Injuries per 100M VMT)	3.70	3.65	3.70
Total Number of Non-motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries	36	36	35

**Staff
Recommendation:**

The TAC recommends that the CCRPC Board accepts the VTrans statewide safety targets as reported in the 2021 HSIP Annual Report for the metropolitan planning area.

The factors considered to reach this recommendation are listed below:

1. The regional level data on fatalities and injuries fluctuates (sometimes wildly) from year to year making it difficult to establish a clear, reasonable data-driven target.
2. There are no practical policy or financial consequences for the CCRPC to set regional targets.
3. Safety is important and the CCRPC is committed to incorporate the federal safety performance measures into the ECOS/MTP report (together with other transportation measures) and track and report regional safety data annually as part of the ECOS Scorecard.
4. The CCRPC will have an annual opportunity to set safety targets for the MPO area, if it so chooses.

Staff contact:

Sai Sarepalli, PE, ssarepalli@ccrpcvt.org

CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MINUTES

DATE: Tuesday, December 7, 2021
TIME: 9:00 a.m.
PLACE: Hybrid Meeting: In-person at CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal St. Winooski, VT, and
virtually via Zoom

Members Present

Bryan Osborne, Colchester
Dennis Lutz, Essex
Robin Pierce, Essex Junction
Amy Bell, VTrans
Ashley Atkins, VTrans
Matthew Arancio, VTrans
Jonathon Weber, Local Motion
Bob Henneberger, Seniors
Deirdre Holmes, Charlotte
Sam Andersen, GBIC
Wayne Howe, Jericho
Barbara Elliott, Huntington
Andrea Morgante, Hinesburg
Sandy Thibault, CATMA
Josh Arneson, Richmond
Ravi Venkataraman, Richmond
Nicole Losch, Burlington
Adam Wechsler, People with Disabilities

Kurt Johnson, Underhill
David Allerton, Milton
Lisa Schaeffler, Williston
Jon Rauscher, Winooski
Mary Anne Michaels, Rail

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
Chris Dubin, Senior Transportation Planner
Sai Sarepalli, Senior Transportation Planning Engineer
Ann Janda, Senior Energy Project Manager

Guests

Peggy O'Neill-Vivanco, VT Clean Cities Coalition
Zoe Neaderland, VTrans

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

2. Consent Agenda

No consent agenda this month.

3. Approval of November 2, 2021 Minutes

Bryan asked for any changes. Nicole asked that she be added to the attendance list for the November meeting. SAM ANDERSEN MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 2, 2021, SECONDED BY BOB HENNEBERGER. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. Public Comments

No comments from the public. David Allerton asked about the Route 7 Corridor Study by VTrans and if there was additional information about the project. Amy Bell responded that there have been several previous studies of the Route 7 corridor between I-89 exits 17 and 18 and this project will compile those efforts, identify corridor improvement needs, and provide short and long term recommendations as part of upcoming VTrans projects. Katherine Otto is the VTrans staff lead.

5. CCRPC Energy Program / VCCC Fleet Conversion Analysis

Ann Janda, CCRPC, introduced herself as new staff working on the CCRPC energy implementation program. There currently aren't many grants available but some may be coming with the new legislative session ahead and the focus on the Climate Action Plan. The federal infrastructure bill will provide \$21 million over five years for a new vehicle electrification program so there will need to be a plan. Peggy O'Neill-Vivanco introduced herself and role at the Vermont Clean Cities Coalition (VCCC), which is housed at UVM's Transportation Research Center. Their work is grant funded from the Department of Energy (DOE) and includes work on light, medium and heavy duty vehicles, idle reduction, fuel

1 economy, conversion to electric, and fuel infrastructure. She gave an overview of various fleet conversion
2 analysis tools and showed a sample fleet analysis. She noted that idle reduction is the lowest hanging fruit
3 on fuel and emissions savings, and there are devices to help with this effort. When working with entities
4 Peggy starts with a fuel analysis questionnaire to get data, discover needs, also asks about e-bikes and off-
5 road vehicles since some businesses and others are starting to use e-bikes for deliveries. Peggy showed
6 several resources including: the [FuelEconomy.gov](https://fuel-economy.gov) website has tools such as vehicle comparisons;
7 [Alternative Fuels Data Center](https://alternativefuelsdatacenter.org) website is sponsored by the DOE and has a vehicle cost calculator and
8 fuel/energy cost comparisons; [AFLEET](https://afleet.org) site is run by Argonne National Laboratory and has
9 tools/estimators including heavy duty vehicle emissions calculator. Peggy said she is working to get
10 demos of different electric vehicles, especially heavy duty. Peggy is happy to meet with anyone to discuss
11 further and Ann encouraged TAC members to people to sign up for the VCCC newsletter.
12 poneillv@uvm.edu, <https://vtccc.w3.uvm.edu/>
13

14 Andrea asked if anybody is doing an economic analysis of what will happen to convenience stores with
15 switching to electric vehicles and workplace charging? Peggy said that nationally and in rural places the
16 focus is on how to place infrastructure so it's accessible, such as siting it near fueling stations with
17 convenience stores, well lit areas with restrooms, places that support local economies. Andrea asked if
18 anyone is looking at snowmobiles and ATVs? Peggy said not ATVs but electric snowmobiles are coming
19 out, there have been supply chain issues. Some places locally are using electric snowmobiles to groom
20 cross county trails.
21

22 **6. Vermont Freight Plan – final draft**

23 Zoe Neaderland, VTrans, gave a short overview of the process to update the Vermont Freight Plan and
24 the strategic initiatives. The Plan and update are required but also necessary for an efficient system. Both
25 the VTrans Rail Plan and Freight Plan updates were coordinated with each other. Zoe focused on the final
26 two chapters: Ch 7 Needs Assessment, Key Trends and Issues includes the 40 initiatives grouped in 7
27 packages; and Ch 8 Implementation – Funding Sources. Comments are due December 8 so she is ready to
28 answer any questions and accept comments from the TAC on the final draft Plan before it is submitted to
29 FHWA. More information, including the four page summary, full 64 page plan, and technical memos
30 which provide a range of materials, are on the project webpage at
31 <https://vtrans.vermont.gov/planning/freight>.
32

33 Andrea asked if there is a difference between freight that moves internally to Vermont versus through the
34 state, and any analysis with what's happening with dairy and agriculture freight movement? Zoe said yes,
35 that is included in the executive summary and the plan itself. There is also an analysis by commodity type
36 including agriculture, but it may not be finer grained by specific type, like dairy. Technical memo 3 may
37 include more detailed information.
38

39 **7. CCRPC I-89 2050 Study**

40 Jason Charest and Eleni Churchill, CCRPC, provided an update on the I-89 2050 Study and the results of
41 strategic modeling of transportation demand management (TDM) strategies, and how these and other
42 investments can help meet the goal of the study. More information is available at <https://envision89.com/>.
43 Context and background: The Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) investments for 2050 include
44 \$420 million for new investments. The \$74 million line for interstate and interchange projects is a
45 placeholder for any improvements, including additional TDM improvements. The strategic model is a
46 tool to help evaluate TDM/bike/ped/transit possibilities (known as Bundle 2) to meet the future needs of
47 I-89, rather than make changes to the interstate and interchange. Since Travel Demand Models are
48 insensitive to many TDM policies and investments, the strategic model is an econometric tool that can
49 evaluate and assess complex investments at household decision level. The TDM focus group met three
50 times in the fall to inform policies and investments in the model, review results, and provide direction on
51 which investment packages to advance as part of the I-89 study Bundle 2. Remember that the model is
52 just a tool to help in the process. The model area defined different zones as part of analysis, and the team
53 could choose drivers of change and areas that relate to the goals of the study such as vehicle miles

1 traveled (VMT), congestion, emissions, etc. Scenario testing looked at six packages of investments, with
2 a number of “levels” in each, for year 2050, plus no change. There are 432 possible scenarios in the
3 model based on the packages and levels. Two draft scenarios were selected, which are similar except that
4 the Low Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled (DVMT) scenario has fewer ride hailing opportunities, and the
5 Low GHG Emissions scenario has more electric vehicles (EV) for non-household vehicles. Jason noted
6 that the scenario view can goal-seek solutions meaning that you can select desired results in the model
7 and see the set of policies to achieve those goals. Next steps are to finalize the strategic model results, use
8 the Bundle 2 transportation network as the base to run bundles 3, 4, 5, then evaluate possible capacity
9 increase of the I-89 mainline, and provide opportunities for public comment in 2022.

10
11 Jonathon asked for an explanation of how the analysis findings affect whether or not to consider capacity
12 increase on I-89. Eleni said the hope is that focusing on the TDM bundle will reduce the need for capacity
13 expansion. It’s also incumbent on all of us to change our behaviors. We haven’t yet developed “triggers”
14 like annual average daily traffic (AADT) to help us understand if more capacity is actually needed and
15 how to plan for that. Andrea asked that when we talk about capacity changes on I-89, is there thought on
16 including other modes so instead of adding a lane, could we change modes within the right-of-way. Eleni
17 asked if Andrea meant something like adding a separate path along I-89? If so, that idea came up and we
18 need further discussion with VTrans on whether that’s allowed or not. There are examples of this but it’s
19 generally not preferred. It’s a state not federal decision. Dennis said his concern is that what happens with
20 I-89 is at the state level, not the municipality, but modeling depends on things not related to transportation
21 like land use. Pricing for housing is an issue, if people choose to live in areas with cheaper housing, then
22 TDM inputs don’t matter. The model is useful but it doesn’t account for those kinds of personal decisions.
23 Eleni agrees and the model provides opportunities for different scenarios, and we can talk to the state
24 when they are working on other plans, etc. Ravi asked how the model accounts for Route 2 and other
25 routes that help people get from A to B on the corridor. Eleni said the strategic model doesn’t include that
26 but the travel demand model does. Sam followed up on Dennis’s comment and said that the model
27 doesn’t take age demographics into account, which are severely impacting the workplace and workforce
28 shortage. We may not be able to model it but discussion is needed. This group needs to keep this in mind
29 as we talk about bike ped, and what transit opportunities are. Jonathon said it’s important to acknowledge
30 that part of the problem with land use is the result of the capacity that’s been built into the system that
31 supports living further from employment centers. How does I-89 decisions take induced demand into
32 consideration? Eleni said it is taken into account, we haven’t looked at adding lanes to I-89 yet, and we
33 are gathering information from other states on this. Jason noted that we’re not the only place trying to
34 figure this out but there is emerging consensus that if you make it easier to travel by adding capacity, then
35 it does fill up. The diverging diamond interchange (DDI) alternative at Exit 14 represents reduced
36 capacity demand, so it could lead to thinking that reducing capacity could lead to decreased demand.
37 Jonathon said yes and if better TDM options and facilities exist then that reduces demand. It doesn’t make
38 sense to build expensive capacity that fills up and then we’re in the same situation. Charlie reminded the
39 TAC that this is the same conversation we had 18 months ago, and we did a deep dive into induced
40 demand so that information is available. Ashley asked how reducing capacity will improve travel times,
41 we don’t want to lose sight of the mission and vision of the project. Charlie replied that decreasing travel
42 time wasn’t a specific objective, but more reliable travel time may have been an objective. Eleni said we
43 know there is congestion during peak hours now, and demand might be changing in the future based on
44 telework, changes in transit, etc. Reliability of travel is part of the goals. Sandy in chat: Consider/Explore
45 addition of a “High Occupancy Lane” for transit, microtransit, carpool, vanpool (this may encourage
46 sustainable travel). Jonathon added: Also transit signal priority.

47 48 **8. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports**

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

51 52 **9. CCRPC Board Meeting Report**

1 In November the Board heard a presentation on, and voted to accept the FY21 audit report, heard a
2 presentation on telework trends from CATMA, voted to approve using the 2018 ECOS Plan forecasts for
3 the 2023 ECOS Plan update, discussed the legislative breakfast topics, and heard an update from the
4 Executive Director.

5
6 **10. Chairman's/Members' Items**

- 7 • **Vermont Better Roads Program:** the use of erosion control and maintenance techniques that
8 save money while protecting and enhancing water quality around the State. **Applications for**
9 **funding will be accepted until December 17, 2021.** Funding will be awarded after the
10 legislative appropriations process, which is expected to be July 2022. For the most up-to-date
11 information or to download a copy of the application, please visit the AOT website at
12 <http://vtrans.vermont.gov/highway/better-roads>
13 • **VLCT is hosting a webinar on December 9 on the new federal Infrastructure Investment**
14 **and Jobs Act (IIJA):** <https://www.vlct.org/event/what-does-infrastructure-bill-mean-your-town>

15
16 The next TAC meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, January 4, 2021.

17
18 SAM ANDERSEN MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN, SECONDED BY NICOLE LOSCH,
19 UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED. THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 10:39 AM.

20
21 Respectfully submitted, Bryan Davis



CCRPC Transportation Advisory Committee

February 1, 2022

Agenda Item 5: Information Item

Transit Financing Study

Background:	With the passage of the federal Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, there is expected to be a 35% increase in transit funding above the FAST Act investment levels; additional resources at the local level to serve as matching funds will likely be needed. Rather than continuing to lean on existing sources of revenue, this renewed need for local funding offers the opportunity to overhaul how transit is funded both in the Chittenden County metropolitan area and in other parts of Vermont.
Study Overview:	In partnership with VTrans and GMT, the CCRPC contracted with Steadman Hill Consulting to analyze innovative approaches to financing public transportation in Vermont. The overall goals of the study (see full report here: https://studiesandreports.ccrpcvt.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/Final-Funding-Report-11-23-21.pdf) consisted of the following: Conduct research on the means of funding public transit; Evaluate potential for alternative funding sources in Vermont; Recommend options for the Vermont Legislature to consider. Steadman Hill was tasked with evaluating transit funding sources to replace local funding based on property taxes, state funding from T-fund and fare revenue (suspended since March 2020).
Funding Alternatives for Consideration:	Sales Tax – a very common means of funding public transit nationally. Payroll Tax on Employers – not common in the US, but acknowledges role of transit in job access. Business Revenue Assessment – in lieu of payroll tax, recognizes how transit supports economy. County Property Tax – spreads burden among all landowners, not just those in “served” towns. Income Tax – progressive option, but very challenging politically. Utility Fee – small fee on all households and potentially larger fee on commercial users. Property Transfer Tax – progressive but spread widely only in the long run. Mortgage Recording Fee – successful in NY, progressive but may miss very wealthy.
Evaluation Summary:	Each alternative was evaluated for its potential to generate a target of \$21 million to support public transit statewide. The table below (on the next page) summarizes the impacts of the alternatives along four evaluation criteria: stability of revenue, ease of implementation, political feasibility and equity. A +2 indicates a strong advantage or positive impact, +1 a moderate advantage or positive impact, 0 indicates a neutral impact, –1 indicates a moderate disadvantage or negative impact and –2 a strong disadvantage or negative impact. The Total column indicates that the utility fee is the most favorable option, followed by the county property tax, but different weighting of the criteria or judgments about scoring would produce different results.

**Evaluation
Matrix:**

Potential Funding Source	Rate/ Rate Increase	Stability of Revenue	Ease of Implementation	Political Feasibility	Equity	Total Score
Sales Tax	0.25%	-1	+2	-1	-2	-2
Payroll Tax on Employers	0.20%	+1	-1	0	+1	+1
Business Revenue Assessment	TBD <0.20%	0	-2	-1	+1	-2
County Property Tax	\$0.23 per \$1,000	+2	+1	-1	+1	+3
Income Tax	0.05%	0	+2	-2	+2	+2
Utility Fee	\$3 per HH per month	+2	+1	0	+1	+4
Property Transfer Tax	0.55%	0	+2	-1	+1	+2
Mortgage Recording Fee	\$0.75 per \$100	0	-1	-1	0	-2

Next Steps:

The study will be presented to the GMT Board, CCRPC Board, and the Legislature.

**Information
Contact:**

Marshall Distel, (802) 861-0122, mdistel@ccrpcvt.org