

Transportation Advisory Committee Agenda

Tuesday, May 3, 2022 9:00 to 10:00 am

 This is a virtual meeting only.

 Join Remotely:

 https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82462008536?pwd=NVIIaWlyZEU2aXRaNHUxZIY5cHoyZz09

 Meeting ID: 824 6200 8536

 Password: 684952

 One tap mobile: tel:+16468769923,,82462008536#,,1#,684952#

 Dial by phone: 1-646-876-9923

Agenda

1. Call to Order, Attendance (1 min)

2. Consent agenda (0 min)

No consent agenda this month.

3. Minutes of April 5, 2022* (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. Major TIP Amendment* (Action Item – 5 min)

The TAC will be asked to recommend that the Board approves the TIP amendments as described in the attached memo.

6. FY23 UPWP* (Action Item - 10 min)

As per the attached memo, the TAC will be asked to make a recommendation to the Board for the draft FY23 UPWP, which is available on the TAC webpage at https://www.ccrpcvt.org/about-us/committees/transportation-advisory-committees/transportation-advisory-committees/. More information about the UPWP process is at <a href="https://www.ccrpcvt.org/about-us/committees/transportation-advisory-us/

7. VPSP2 – Bridges* (Discussion Item – 30 min)

Christine Forde, CCRPC, will present the bridge project scores for this year's VPSP2 Bridge program.

8. VT Culverts – NEW Website! (Information Item – 20 min)

Pam Brangan, CCRPC, will demonstrate the new website and answer questions. https://www.vtculverts.org/

9. 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

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.



more information on the status of any of these on-going or recently completed projects.

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

In April the Board voted to warn a public hearing for a Major TIP Amendment, voted to warn a public hearing for the FY23 UPWP and Budget, heard a presentation from Green Mountain Transit, reviewed the Executive Committee nominations, heard updates from the Executive Director, and engaged in a discussion about the legislature's Transportation Bill language for CCRPC participation in a study committee to examine the governance of the Burlington International Airport.

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

- I-89 2050 Study Final Public Meeting May 10, 6-8 PM Via Zoom. <u>https://envision89.com/</u>
- <u>2022 VTrans Bicycle and Pedestrian Grant Program</u> is open. Applications must be received by 1:00 p.m., June 8. <u>https://vtrans.vermont.gov/highway/local-projects/bike-ped</u>
- Safe Streets and Roads for All: The Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL) established the new Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) discretionary program to support regional, local, and tribal initiatives through grants to prevent roadway deaths and serious injuries. The Department expects to release the notice of funding opportunity (NOFO) in May of 2022 for Round 1 funding.
 - SS4A website: <u>https://www.transportation.gov/SS4A</u>
 - Webinars with more info: <u>https://www.transportation.gov/grants/SS4A/webinars</u>
- Tier 2 Rivers and Roads Training, May 18 & 19, 8:30am 4:00pm, Milton Fire station, 47 Bombardier Rd, Milton, VT
- New VT Culverts web app is live: <u>https://vapda.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=2eedb2a33b674abc9926298aa4dd9047</u>
- * = Attachment

Next Meeting: Tuesday, June 7, 2022

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 (2021 Summit)
- AID grant/ Bluetooth sensors update
- Burlington School District travel plans for 9 schools

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.



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
- 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
- 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.

1		CHITTENDEN COUNTY RE	GIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION							
2		TRANSPORTATION	NADVISORY COMMITTEE							
2 3		Ν	IINUTES							
4										
5	DATE:	Tuesday, April 5, 2022								
6	TIME:	9:00 a.m.								
7	PLACE:	Virtual Meeting via Zoom								
8 9										
9		ers Present	Bruce Hoar, Williston							
10	Amy B	ell, VTrans	Kurt Johnson, Underhill							
11	•	Atkins, VTrans	Adam Wechsler, People with Disabilities							
12		w Langham, VTrans	Sandy Thibault, CATMA							
13	Bob He	enneberger, Seniors	Jon Rauscher, Winooski							
14	Bryan (Osborne, Colchester	Jonathon Weber, Local Motion							
15	Sam Ai	ndersen, GBIC	Chris Damiani, GMT							
16	Dennis	Lutz, Essex	Chris Jolly, FHWA							
17	Dean B	lloch, Charlotte								
18	Dierdre	e Holmes, Charlotte	Staff							
19	Andrea	Morgante, Hinesburg	Charlie Baker, Executive Director							
20	Adele (Gravitz, Shelburne	Eleni Churchill, Transportation Program Manager							
21	Barbara	a Elliott, Huntington	Bryan Davis, Senior Transportation Planner							
22	Josh Ai	renson, Richmond	Christine Forde, Senior Transportation Planner							
23	Nicole	Losch, Burlington	Chris Dubin, Senior Transportation Planner							
24	Chapin	Spencer, Burlington	Marshall Distel, Senior Transportation Planner							
25	Norm H	Baldwin, Burlington	Sai Sarepalli, Senior Transportation Planning Engineer							
26	Dave A	llerton, Milton	Jason Charest, Senior Transportation Planning Engineer							
27	Kirsten	Jensen, Milton								
28										

29 1. Bryan Osborne called the meeting to order at 9:00 AM. Bryan Davis noted that Adele Gravitz is a new TAC member representing Shelburne.

32 2. Consent Agenda

BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA, SECONDED
BY DENNIS LUTZ. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

35

31

36 3. <u>Approval of April 5, 2022 Minutes</u>

Barbara asked Dennis if he wanted a response to his question from last month about the Transportation
Resiliency Planning Tool really being a road resiliency planning tool. Dennis said it would be helpful to
hear a response from VTrans. SAM ANDERSEN MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES
OF MARCH 2, 2022, SECONDED BY BOB HENNEBERGER. THE MOTION PASSED
UNANIMOUSLY.

42 42

43 4. <u>Public Comments</u>

- 44 No comments from the public.
- 45

46 5. <u>FY23 UPWP Update</u>

- 47 Marshall Distel, CCRPC, provided an overview of the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) process,
- 48 historic funding levels by program (roadway, bike/ped, water quality, TDM, energy, other), and provided
- an update on the draft FY23 UPWP and budget. Note that these categories are imperfect, for example
- 50 roadway projects often include walk/bike improvements as well. There's been an increase in federal
- 51 funding, particularly noticeable in FY23. Marshall said that in the past energy work has been undertaken
- 52 by VEIC but they didn't put in a request this year. There were no specific energy requests this year but
- Ann Janda, CCRPC Senior Energy Project Manager, is doing work in-house. We will bring the FY23
- 54 UPWP and budget back to the TAC in May for approval.

2 Bryan Osborne asked how many consultants CCRPC has on retainer. Eleni said there are maybe 20-25

3 consultants prequalified for technical assistance, scoping, corridors, water quality, public transit, and

4 bike/ped. Dennis said Essex submitted a number of UPWP requests and it will be helpful to know if they

are funded or not so the Town can pursue other options. Charlie noted in the chat that staff and UPWP
 Committee recommended all transportation-related consultant projects be funded. More information

- 6 Committee recommended all transportation-related consultant projects be funded. More information
 7 about the process and draft documents are at https://www.ccrpcvt.org/about-us/commission/annual-work-
- 8 <u>plan-budget-finances/</u>. The presentation is posted on the <u>TAC webpage</u>.
- 9

10 6. <u>VPSP2 – Bridges</u>

Christine Forde, CCRPC, led a discussion of projects on this year's VPSP2 Bridge program. The presentation is posted on the <u>TAC webpage</u>. Today the goal is to review asset driven potential project list for state highway and town highway bridges, for TAC members to provide comments on the lists, and to identify State or Town Highway Bridges for consideration as Regionally Driven Potential Projects. Town Highway Bridge projects are managed by VTrans and require a local match of 5-10%. Vision is to develop a performance based, data driven project selection and prioritization framework that maximizes the "transportation value" delivered to Vermont taxpayers. Transportation value is determined using a

- 18 workbook that scores projects on eight criteria.
- 19

20 The list is created by asset management software, not a person, so the TAC should review and determine 21 if these are the priorities. Jonathon asked if sidewalk conditions are included as part of the bridge deck 22 rating, like the Winooski River bridge? Christine says probably not, but sidewalks would be included as 23 part of reconstruction. Jonathon asked so a town could improve sidewalks but it wouldn't factor into 24 rating? Andrea asked if a bridge doesn't have a sidewalk, could it be added? Christine responded that if a 25 bridge were rehabbed, sidewalks would be looked at. If a sidewalk already exists it would be included, 26 but if not, then there are other factors that would be considered. Jon Olin in chat notes that walk/bike 27 improvements must be considered in bridge replacements per complete streets law. Barbara asked if the 28 TAC is being asked to approve the list, or if individual towns should get back to CCRPC? Christine says 29 we are looking for comments at this point rather than approval. It's important to hear if a town isn't 30 interested in pursuing a project on the list. Next month we'll look at project scores and discuss further.

31

32 Christine then shared the list of regionally driven projects. Nothing in the County is rated less than "fair" 33 in the three categories shown. For this list we'd like a municipality to confirm they're OK with it. Adele 34 asked for the Shelburne project if there would be a required match? Christine says yes. Whether or not it's 35 selected is a big unknown, and could be several years out, so match needed is not immediate. Christine 36 expects maybe one or two bridges would be added to the construction list. The next important step is the 37 scoring process. Note that Main Street bridge in Burlington is on the list. Jonathon says Queen City Park 38 Road bridge is likely on the list for walk bike reasons, but probably other reasons too? Christine said there 39 is a multimodal rating that feeds into scoring, not just bridge condition. Norm said the Queen City Park 40 Road bridge is a joint venture with South Burlington, there have been recent issues of vehicle causing 41 damage to railing. This project has been important to Burlington for a while.

42

43 Barbara asked if there is a reason why channel ratings aren't included in the table? Christine said we have

- 44 that information but it wasn't included in the table as a way to keep it simple. Amy provided more 45 background saving the information comes from bridge inspection reports, so if there are sidewalks t
- background saying the information comes from bridge inspection reports, so if there are sidewalks thenthose conditions are included as well. Inspections consider the whole bridge and all of the elements.
- those conditions are included as well. Inspections consider the whole bridge and all of the elements.What's shown here is just a small snapshot of some of the information, all inspections are available in a

47 what's shown here is just a small snapshot of some of the information, all inspections are available in a 48 public portal online. Christine screenshared the VTrans Bridge Inspection Map which has all of the bridge

- 49 information including inspection reports.
- 50 https://vtrans.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=968633edde4d40f6b5150d4393b9b1ff
- 51

52 Kurt notes that work has been completed on Bridge 8 in Underhill but the condition shown is prior to that

- repair. He will connect with Christine about timing since some planning for Bridge 7 is underway for a
- 54 structure grant, so need to decide based on timing whether to use that grant or this process. Christine notes

3

1 that if repairs aren't extensive, structures grants can be a better option for towns rather than federally funded rehab project.

2 3

16

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

4 7. Water Quality Updates

5 Chris Dubin, CCRPC, said that MS4 data updates have been uploaded to DEC portal ahead of the April 1 6 deadline, and the CCRPC dashboard also reflects those changes, which mainly includes work by

7 municipalities related to the municipal roads general permit (MRGP).

8 https://ccrpc.maps.arcgis.com/apps/opsdashboard/index.html#/2a653ecb1d0c41ebbcad545c8010bd04 9

10 Also, FY22 grants in aid program is active and CCRPC is ready to meet with interested towns on site 11 selection. Please contact cdubin@ccrpcvt.org. 12

13 Finally, Chris said that CCRPC is working with Winooski to create an ADA Transition Plan and asked if 14 any municipalities have completed ADA Transition Plans, specifically the data collection aspect, and 15 could share their data collection framework and process.

17 8. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports

18 See bulleted list at the end of the agenda for current CCRPC projects. TAC members are encouraged to 19 ask staff for more information on the status of any of these on-going or recently completed projects. 20

21 9. CCRPC Board Meeting Report

22 In March the Board heard a presentation on the Transportation Resilience Planning Tool, heard updates 23 from the Executive Director, and the Board Development Committee was charged with developing a slate 24 of officers for FY23. 25

26 10. Chairman's/Members' Items

- Town Highway Structure and Class 2 Grant: deadline for grant applications will be April 15, • 2022 to John.Wilkin@vermont.gov. If you didn't receive the forms via email please contact Ashely Atkins: ashley.atkins@vermont.gov
 - Mud Season Damage to Gravel Roads: VTrans willing to meet with towns to discuss/document damage for potential FEMA reimbursement. Please contact ashley.atkins@vermont.gov
- GMT Public Hearing for Service Changes: GMT is holding a public hearing for potential changes to the #6 Shelburne, #7 North Ave and #86 Montpelier LINK routes. Please visit this link for public hearing information as well as a Montpelier LINK specific survey: https://ridegmt.com/permanent-service-changes-public-hearings/
- Tier 2 Rivers and Roads Training, May 18 & 19, 8:30am 4:00pm, Milton Fire station, 47 Bombardier Rd, Milton, VT
- 39 New VT Culverts web app is live: • 40 https://vapda.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=2eedb2a33b674abc9926298aa 41 4dd9047
 - **Continue virtual only meetings?** •
- 42 43

44 Barbara appreciates the virtual meetings, which cut down on single occupant vehicle trips. Bryan Osborne 45 notes that meetings go faster when they are virtual, and more people are able to participate.

46

47 Christine said there might be a major TIP amendment for the Champlain Parkway project. Bids were 48 received and we anticipate needing to add funds to the TIP. Due to timing this may be warned by the

49 CCRPC Board in April for a public hearing in May. Normally we'd present this to the TAC today but

50 don't have the information available at this time since the City is still reviewing bids. We would present

51 this to the TAC in May before the May Board meeting. Bryan asked for a quick overview of the project,

52 and Christine replied that the project is a continuation of I-189 across Shelburne Road and joining Pine Street into downtown Burlington. Norm Baldwin, Burlington City Engineer, said the Parkway is broken into two bids, phase one from Home Ave to Kilburn St, and phase two would be all the connections that make it operable, including the I-189 extension, and from Kilburn to Main Street. Bids came in substantially higher. City is in the process of reviewing bids, and working with state and federal partners about what their position will be to advance this project forward. It's premature now to share any details until city is more clear on FHWA and VTrans positions, but wanted the TAC to be aware of the changes coming up. DPW will go to City Council on April 11 to share what they know, and anticipate getting answers from FHWA and VTrans before going to Council.

Dennis said Essex is seeing same thing with project costs so we'll need to consider this going forward.
 Bryan says Colchester hasn't put anything out to bid but engineers are seeing 6-7% higher costs than
 expected.

Ashely Atkins said she should be the District 5 contact for the Town Highway Structure and Class 2
Grants, and reporting Damage to Gravel Roads. <u>ashley.atkins@vermont.gov</u> Jim Cota is the contact for
District 8, which includes Westford. jim.cota@vermont.gov

Andrea notes that in spring, during rainy nights, be aware of amphibian movements, and hopes that futureroadway projects can help mitigate the decimation of them.

21 The next TAC meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, May 3, 2022.

22
23 BRUCE HOAR MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN, SECONDED BY DANDY THIBAULT,
24 UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED. THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:48 AM.

2526 Respectfully submitted, Bryan Davis

17

20



CCRPC Transportation Advisory Committee May 3, 2022 Agenda Item 5: Action Item

Transportation Improvement Program TIP Amendments

Issues:

Approve the TIP Amendments listed below. 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.

Champlain Parkway – Burlington (Project HC001, Amendment FY22-33)

Description of TIP Change: Increase construction amount from \$35,000,000 to \$62,747,145. This is a 79% increase in project cost which is defined as a Major Amendment according to CCRPC's TIP Amendment Policy and requires a Public Hearing.

This project will be constructed in two phases. Phase 1 is from Home Avenue to Kilburn Street. Modify the TIP to reflect the following funding schedule for Phase 1:

- FY22- Reduce TIP funds from \$9,389,581 to \$6,434,148. CCRPC releases \$2,955,433 to be applied in FY25.
- FY23 Increase TIP funding from \$10,000,000 to \$14,983,127. (Funds to come from Exit 17 – see detail below)
- FY24 Increase TIP funding from \$9,960,419 to \$15,302,234 (Funds to come from Exit 17 – see details below)
- FY25 Add \$9,320,428. These funds will come from outside CCRPC's fiscal constraint limit.

Phase 2 is from I-189 to Home Avenue and Kilburn Street to Main Street. Construction of this phase will begin in FY26 as detailed below. Note that this Phase is not part of the FY22-25 TIP Fiscal Constraint Limit.

- FY26 \$11,531,428
- FY27 \$5,718,068
- FY28 \$1,457,713

Reason for Change: The project received one bid which was approximately 57% over the engineer's estimate for the work. There were a number of factors that contributed to the significantly higher than estimated bid pricing including the following:

- Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) is providing additional funding for infrastructure projects throughout the country which is creating an increased demand on contractor services. This appears to be contributing to contractors being more regional and selective about projects they bid.
- A small bidding field likely lead to generally higher unit pricing.
- During the bid advertisement period Russian military forces invaded Ukraine.
 Since this action, a surge in energy costs has been seen and is anticipated to continue.
- Additionally during the advertisement period the inflation rate in the US was announced to increase to 7.9%.

Issues (Cont'd)

- Ongoing inflation, supply constraints, high demand and labor shortages will likely maintain inflation for longer and contractors are likely anticipating material costs to remain high or increase further.
- Since IIJA provides a funding source for five years, rebidding the initial phase is not anticipated to result in more competition nor a decrease in the contractor's estimate to construct the project.
- Local and State projects have seen significant increases in bid pricing this season
- The bid analysis identified several items with pricing higher than the Engineer's Estimate unit price. Most of these items are anticipated to be inflated by the contractor to provide some protection from inflation of the unit costs over the life of the project.
- The bid analysis identified that some unit items are trending higher than the historical average pricing of those unit items.

Exit 17 Improvements, Colchester (Project BT050, Amendment FY22-34)

Description of TIP Change: Change TIP funding for this project to align with the State FY23 Transportation Capital Program and maintain fiscal constraint. The TIP has construction funds for this project beginning in FY22 and the Capital Program delays construction to begin in FY24. Change the TIP as follows:

- FY22 Reduce funding from \$900,000 to \$600,000 for ROW. Release \$300,000 to be applied in FY25.
- FY23 The TIP has \$15,225,000 but no funds are needed. Transfer \$4,983,127 to Champlain Parkway and release \$10,241,873 to be applied in FY25.
- FY24 Reduce funding from \$10,187,145 to \$4,000,000. Transfer \$5,341,815 to Champlain Parkway and release \$845,330 to be applied to FY25.
- FY25 Add \$16,800,000 -- \$14,361,636 to come from released funds and \$2,438,364 to be funded outside of CCRPC's fiscal constraint limit.
- FY26 Add balance of construction funds \$4,388,272 (outside of FY22-25 TIP Fiscal Constraint Limit).

Bridge 23 on US2, Williston (Project BR067, Amendment FY22-35)

Description of TIP Change: Add a new project to the TIP in FY22 to replace Bridge 23 on US2 over an unnamed tributary with related approach and channel work. This is a Major Amendment according to CCRPC's TIP Amendment Policy because it is a new project.

Add \$280,000 for PE in FY22 and \$8,000 for right-of-way in FY24. Construction schedule to be determined.

StaffThe TAC recommends that the Board approves the TIP amendments.Recommendation:

For more

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



CCRPC Transportation Advisory Committee May 3, 2022 Agenda Item 6: Action Item

FY 2023 Unified Planning Work Program

Background:

The CCRPC's Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) is a federally mandated document serving as the annual work plan for local and regional transportation projects and other planning activities. Updated annually, the UPWP describes our numerous programs and identifies the transportation, land use and other planning activities and projects that the CCRPC is engaged in collaboration with its member municipalities and other state and regional partners and agencies.

The Board of Directors of the CCRPC has established a committee process for the development of the UPWP. The FY 23 UPWP Committee members appointed by the Chair are listed below:

Board: Chris Shaw, South Burlington (Chair); John Zicconi, Shelburne; Mike Bissonette, Hinesburg; Jaqueline Murphy, Colchester
PAC: Cathyann LaRose, Colchester
TAC: Robin Pierce, Essex Junction; Barbara Elliott, Huntington
CWAC: David Wheeler, South Burlington; Chelsea Mandigo, Essex Junction
VTrans: Amy Bell
FHWA: Chris Jolly
GMT: Chris Damiani

The 12-member UPWP Committee met in January, February and March to determine how best to allocate our funds to develop the FY 23 UPWP. The CCRPC received \$1.8 million in project requests for FY 23 and will be able to fund all the requests for new consultant and partner-funded transportation projects and initiatives. Due to the increase in federal funding, no municipal or partner transportation projects were removed from the draft FY 23 UPWP. Please see below for a table indicating the funding categories for the new FY 23 UPWP projects. Note over \$400,000 that we dedicate each year for GMT transit planning is not included in the table below.

FY23 UPWP Requests by Program Category:

FY23 UPWP Funding Categories (New Projects/Initiatives)								
Roadway/Misc.	\$228,000							
Bike/Ped	\$500,350							
Water Quality	\$455,613							
TDM	\$357,548							
Energy	\$0							
Other (Tech assist, planBTV: New North								
End, Richmond Official Map, etc.)	\$268,000							
Total	\$1,809,511							

UPWP Committee Recommendation:	On March 30, the UPWP Committee recommended to advance the FY 2023 UPWP to the Executive Committee and Board.
Exec. Committee Recommendation:	On April 6, the Executive Committee recommended that the Board warn a public hearing for the draft FY23 UPWP and Budget at their May 18 th meeting.
Staff Recommendation:	RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE FY 2023 UPWP TO THE CCRPC BOARD
Information contact:	Marshall Distel, mdistel@ccrpcvt.org or 802-861-0122

CHITTENDEN COUNTY RPC

Communities Planning Together

Chittenden County Transportation Advisory Committee May 3, 2022 Agenda Item 7: Action Item

2024 Transportation Project Prioritization using VTrans Project Selection and Project Prioritization System (VPSP2) -- Year 2 Bridges

Issues: The annual project prioritization scores for State Highway Bridges and Town Highway Bridges, using VPSP2, and the list of recommended Regionally Driven Bridge Potential Projects, are due to VTrans on June 1.

VTrans identified 10 Asset Driven Potential Projects in Chittenden County, shown below in the nonshaded columns. The Preliminary Transportation Value is calculated using the VPSP2 Workbook, which is attached to this item. The rows shaded in pink in the VPSP2 Workbook are CCRPC inputs to the project score.

CCRPC identified six Regionally Driven Potential Projects, indicated by green shading below. These projects have been scored with the VPSP2 workbook and Preliminary Transportation Value scores are included in the table below. Note that CCRPC staff estimate the VTrans inputs in the VPSP2 Workbook and they may change.

	Preliminary Transportation									
Municipality	Aunicipality Program Route Bridge Number									
Burlington	Town Highway	US-7	150	67						
Williston	Town Highway	Industrial Avenue	17	59						
S. Burlington	State Highway	VT-116	31	47						
Burlington	Town Highway	Queen City Park Road	2	42						
Underhill	State Highway	VT-15	11	40						
Westford	Town Highway	Cambridge Road	22	40						
Huntington	Town Highway	Main Road	9Н	40						
Underhill	Town Highway	Pleasant Valley Road	7	39						
Shelburne	Town Highway	Bay Road	7	39						
Hinesburg	State Highway	VT-116	21	36						
Huntington	Town Highway	Main Road	10	36						
Hinesburg	Town Highway	Charlotte Road	6	34						
Charlotte	Town Highway	Lake Road	27	33						
Charlotte	Town Highway	Dorset Street	31	28						
Jericho	Town Highway	Macomer Place	38	27						
Colchester	Town Highway	Pond Road	14	22						

VPSP2 Transportation Value Scores for Chittenden County State and Town Highway Bridges Asset Driven and Regionally Driven (shaded green) Potential Projects

Staff Recommendation:	Recommend that the TAC review the Asset Driven and Regionally Driven Potential Project lists and scores and recommend that the Board approve the lists and scores.
For more information contact:	Christine Forde cforde@ccrpcvt.org
Attachments:	VPSP2 Transportation Value Scores for Chittenden County State and Town Highway Bridges – Asset Driven and Regionally Driven Potential Projects

VPSP2 Transportation Value Scores for Chittenden County State and Town Highway Bridges Asset Driven and Regionally Diven (shaded green) Potential Projects

		Potential Project Name	Burlington	Underhill	S. Burlington	Underhill	Westford	Hinesburg	Huntington	Jericho	Charlotte	Charlotte	Shelburne	Colchester	Hinesburg	Williston	Burlington	Huntington
		Program	Town Highway	State Highway	State Highway	Town Highway	Town Highway	State Highway	Town Highway	Town Highway	Town Highway	Town Highway	Town Highway	Town Highway	Town Highway	Town Highway	Town Highway	Town Highway
			Bridges	Bridges	Bridges	Bridges	Bridges	Bridges	Bridges	Bridges	Bridges	Bridges	Bridges	Bridges	Bridges	Bridges	Bridges	Bridges
		Route	US-7	VT-15	VT-116	Pleasant Valley Road	Cambridge Road	VT-116	Main Road	Macomer Place	Lake Road	Dorset Street	Bay Road	Pond Road	Charlotte Road	Industrial Avenue	Queen City Park Road	Main Road
		Town	Burlington	Underhill	S. Burlington	Underhill	Westford	Hinesburg	Huntington	Jericho	Charlotte	Charlotte	Shelburne	Colchester	Hinesburg	Williston	Burlington	Huntington
		Bridge Number	150	11	31	7	22	21	10	38	27	31	7	14	6	17	2	9H
		Safety Asset	20 12	0 15	0 17	10 12	0 12	0	0 12	0	0 12	0	5	0 12	0 12	20 12	10	10 12
		Mobility/Connectivity	6	6	6	2	6	6	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4	4	2
		Economic Access	10	10	10	1	10	6	6	8	3	8	8	1	10	9	6	6
Preliminary Tra	ansportation Value	Resiliency Environmental	6 0	4	6 0	6 0	2	4	8	8	1 10	1 0	2	2	2	6 0	0	2
		Regional	8	0	3	3	5	0	3	0	5	3	8	0	3	3	8	3
		Health Access	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	0	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
		Transportation value	67	40	47	39	40	36	36	27	33	28	39	22	34	59	42	40
Project	S3	Weighted Avg AADT	31300	8100	5900	1000	940	3700	420	10	550	200	3000	75	1800	11900	1900	2100
Geometry	<u>\$4</u> \$5	Existing shoulder width Proposed shoulder width	2	6 8	8	2	2 4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0 4	0
	S8	Segment Fatal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Safatu Data	S9	Segment Injury	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1
Safety Data	S10	Segment Property Damage Only	14	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
	\$15	Is shoulder to be widened?	Increase	Increase	None	Increase	Increase	Increase	Increase	None	None	Increase	Increase	Increase	Increase	Increase	Increase	Increase
	A1	Customer Service Level	4	3	2	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
	A2	Is this a new asset or a new capacity project?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Asset	A3	Right time: <=5 yrs.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Condition	A4	Right time >= 5 yrs.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	A5a	Does this project replace?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No
	A5b A5c	Does this project rehabilitate? Does this project preserve?	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No	Yes	Yes No	Yes	Yes No	No No	Yes No	No No	No No	Yes	Yes No	Yes No	No	Yes No
			110	No	NO	No	110	NO	NO	NO	No	No	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	110
	МЗа	Does the project enhance or improve connectivity for bicyclist/pedestrian?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	M3b	If yes is it on a high priority bike corridor? Does project enhance or improve	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	M4a	connectivity for transit users? If yes does the project incorporate	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Mobility and	M4b M4c	transit improvements? Does project connect or is on transit	No Yes	No Yes	No Yes	No	No	No Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No Yes	No Yes	No
Connectivity	M1c M5a	route? Does the project enhance or improve intermodal connections?	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
	 M5b	if yes connect to a park and ride?	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
	M5c	If yes does the project connect to a train station?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	M5d	If yes connect to a airport?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	M5e	if yes connect to a bus station/intermodal center?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
	EA1	Designated Growth Center	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	EA1	Designated Downtown	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	EA1	Town Center	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
	EA2	Village Center Are there other Growth Areas in	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No
Economic Access	EA3	Regional Plans or CEDS? Other areas not included above that are	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	EA4	important to the existing or future local or regional economy?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
	EA6	AADT scoring	4	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1
	EA5	Annual average truck trip scoring	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Resiliency	R1 R2	Vulnerability score Mitigations	6 2	4	2	6 2	2	2	8	8	1 2	1 4	2	2	2	6	2	2
	E1	Dual benefit for wildlife or aquatic organism passage?	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
	E2	Primary benefit for wildlife or aquatic organism passage?	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE

		Potential Project Name	Burlington	Underhill	S. Burlington	Underhill	Westford	Hinesburg	Huntington	Jericho	Charlotte	Charlotte	Shelburne	Colchester	Hinesburg	Williston	Burlington	Huntington
			Town Highway	State Highway	State Highway	Town Highway	Town Highway	State Highway	Town Highway	Town Highway	Town Highway	Town Highway	Town Highway	Town Highway	Town Highway	Town Highway	Town Highway	Town Highway
		Program	Bridges	Bridges	Bridges	Bridges	Bridges	Bridges	Bridges	Bridges	Bridges	Bridges	Bridges	Bridges	Bridges	Bridges	Bridges	Bridges
		Route	US-7	VT-15	VT-116	Pleasant Valley Road	Cambridge Road	VT-116	Main Road	Macomer Place	Lake Road	Dorset Street	Bay Road	Pond Road	Charlotte Road	Industrial Avenue	Queen City Park Road	Main Road
		Town	Burlington	Underhill	S. Burlington	Underhill	Westford	Hinesburg	Huntington	Jericho	Charlotte	Charlotte	Shelburne	Colchester	Hinesburg	Williston	Burlington	Huntington
		Bridge Number	150	11	31	7	22	21	10	38	27	31	7	14	6	17	2	9H
	E3	Design incorporate potential for EV charging stations?	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
	E4	Design supports operational efficiency?	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
	E5	Design features address Transportation Demand Management (TDM)?	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Environment	E6	Include installation of stormwater features beyond required by permit?	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
	E7	Eliminate direct discharge?	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
	E8	Prevent future or existing erosion?	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
	E9	Project design gains credit towards TMDL load allocations?	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
	E10	Greater than 10% reduction in impervious footprint?	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
	E11	Project preserve a cultural resource (i.e. historic bridge)?	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
	E12	Project mitigate impacts to cultural resources?	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
	R1	Project identified in regional plan?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Designal	R2	Municipality engagement in project planning?	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Regional	R3	Will project improve sense of community?	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No
	R4	Key community features	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Health Access	H1	Is project enhancing the opportunity for physical activity?	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	None	None	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	High	Low
	H2	Is project enhancing or improving health access to healthy food destinations?	Low	Low	None	Low	Low	Low	Low	None	None	Low	Low	None	None	Low	Low	None
	Н3	Is project increasing the opportunity for physical activity?	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	None	None	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	High	Low

VPSP2 Transportation Value Scores for Chittenden County State and Town Highway Bridges Asset Driven and Regionally Diven (shaded green) Potential Projects