



## **FY2023 UPWP Committee - Meeting 3 (Virtual Meeting via Zoom)** **March 30, 2022**

### **Members Present:**

Chris Shaw, Board, Committee Chair  
Michael Bissonnette, Board  
Matthew Arancio, VTrans  
Amy Bell, VTrans  
Chris Jolly, FHWA  
David Wheeler, CWAC  
Chelsea Mandigo, CWAC  
Robin Pierce, TAC  
Barbara Elliot, TAC

Cathyann LaRose, PAC  
Chris Damiani, GMT

### **Staff:**

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

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

Chris Shaw opened the meeting shortly after 5:30 p.m.

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

Barbara Elliot made a motion, seconded by Amy Bell to approve the February 26, 2022 UPWP Committee meeting minutes. The motion carried unanimously.

### **3. Review of Draft FY 2023 UPWP**

Eleni Churchill shared the draft FY23 UPWP document and walked through changes since the last Committee meeting.

Regina Mahony highlighted the land use requests and noted that this year's requests exceeded the available CCRPC staff time. The Bolton zoning bylaw assistance request was not included in the draft UPWP.

The planning assistance request from South Burlington is recommended for a change. While the City originally requested over 150 hours of CCRPC staff time. The CCRPC staff recommendation is to reduce this to 50 hours. Barbara Elliot asked about CCRPC staff hours in the project spreadsheet for this project. Charlie Baker noted that the staff hours have not yet been added to the draft.

Regina described two pending projects that are dependent on EPA and legislative action respectively, the Brownfields 2022 Petro/Hazardous project and the Energy

Implementation – Buildings project.

Chris Shaw asked about the South Burlington Planning request and suggested that the spreadsheet be updated to reflect that the project is not deleted, but rather the hours have been reduced. Charlie noted that this change would be reflected in the next UPWP draft.

Eleni briefly highlighted the partner organization requests with no changes since the last Committee meeting.

Regina described the Milton Downtown Core Development Design Charrette noting that staff will be working with the Town to identify deliverables for this project and it is likely to start midyear in FY23.

Chris Jolly asked about the Class 1 Feasibility Analysis within the Transportation Technical Assistance line. Eleni described the request from Williston that will consist of a cost-benefit evaluation to take over Rt 2 as a Class 1 Town Highway.

Eleni described the two separate lines in the UPWP for the Chittenden County I-89 2050 Study, one includes VTrans funding, and the other is MPO funding. Chris Shaw asked Eleni to clarify the funding for this, which Eleni and Amy Bell responded to.

The All-Hazards Mitigation Plan Update line will be removed from the spreadsheet, as the project was completed last year.

Charlie provided some details about the Burlington South End Intercept Facility and TOD Technical Feasibility Study, which is a FY22 mid-year addition to the UPWP. Staff is recommending adding another \$7,000 of FY23 UPWP funding to this project.

Eleni then moved on to highlight the water quality projects.

Regina described a Vermont Department of Health project that will provide CCRPC with funding to help municipalities plan for hot weather events. The task information and deliverables are still pending for this project.

Chris Shaw asked why the Transportation Resiliency Planning & Mapping project was highlighted as being removed from the UPWP. Eleni described how the work to create the resiliency planning tool has been completed.

Charlie reviewed another staff recommended a change of moving the \$25,000 in consultant funding for the Burlington Equity task to the more generic equity task, 8.1.1. The City did not request those funds, but staff had included them in the previous draft thinking it might be needed.

Cathyann LaRose asked for additional information about the removal of the Bolton planning request. Regina responded that CCRPC staff have provided assistance to Bolton in previous years, while municipalities like Charlotte and Hinesburg have not been provided with planning assistance in recent years. CCRPC staff may reconsider the Bolton request at the mid-year adjustment if staff hours become available.

Chris Jolly asked about projects from FY21 that may have been carried forward to FY22 and now to FY23. Eleni mentioned one project that has unexpectedly been carried forward, which is the second phase of the Traffic Impact Fee Overlay District. Charlie also described how some other projects have been carried forward due to changing municipal priorities.

#### **4. Review breakdown of MPO consultant funding for FY 2019 – FY 2023**

Marshall Distel shared some graphics and tables to provide an overview of MPO consultant funding from FY 2019 – FY 2023.

In FY19 and FY20, CCRPC allocated about \$1.25 million for consultant-funded transportation projects. Which increased to \$1.4 million in FY21, \$1.5 million in FY22 and now \$1.8 million in FY23.

Chris Jolly asked whether CCRPC staff time costs are included in these figures. Marshall responded that CCRPC staff time and other non-transportation-related funding are not included in these figures.

Funding for TDM and Bike/Ped projects has grown significantly in recent years, while funding for traditional intersection and corridor studies has been making up a significantly smaller share of the available funding.

Chris Shaw asked to clarify what category the UVM Commuter Trip Reduction Program would be classified as within the tables. Marshall described how the majority of the partner organization projects have been added to the TDM category within the funding tables, with the exception of the Local Motion funding, which has been added to the Bike/Ped category.

Marshall then described the funding breakdown by regional, municipal and partner projects.

Chris Jolly asked about consultant spending in terms of the pre-qualified list versus separate RFPs. Eleni described how the majority of the funding has been allocated to pre-qualified consultants, with only a few projects being awarded through separate RFPs over the past couple of fiscal years.

#### **5. Recommendation to advance FY 2023 UPWP to the Executive Committee and Board**

Charlie led a brief discussion about the budget and described how the CCRPC still anticipates having a little under \$400,000 in excess MPO funding after allocating new funds in FY23.

Barbara Elliot made a motion, seconded by Michael Bissonnette, to advance the FY 2023 UPWP with the recommended edits discussed at this meeting to the Executive Committee and Board. The motion carried unanimously.

## **6. Next Steps & Adjourn**

Charlie outlined next steps, with the UPWP being presented to the Executive Committee, Board, the Transportation Advisory Committee and the Clean Water Advisory Committee prior to final approval at the May Board meeting.

The meeting was adjourned shortly before 6:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marshall Distel