

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

5 DATE: Tuesday, November 1, 2022
6 TIME: 9:00 a.m.
7 PLACE: Virtual Meeting via Zoom
8

9 **Members Present**

10 Bryan Osborne, Colchester
11 Amy Bell, VTrans
12 Matthew Arancio, VTrans
13 Matthew Langham, VTrans
14 Chris Jolly, FHWA
15 Bob Henneberger, Seniors
16 Norm Baldwin, Burlington
17 Deirdre Holmes, Charlotte
18 Barbara Elliott, Huntington
19 Aaron Martin, Essex
20 Ravi Venkataraman, Richmond
21 Tom DiPietro, South Burlington
22 Adam Wechsler, People with Disability
23 Katie Martin, CATMA
24 Bruce Hoar, Williston
25 Jonathon Weber, Local Motion
26 Mary Anne Michaels, Rail
27 Chris Damiani, GMT
28 Jon Rauscher, Winooski

Wayne Howe, Jericho
Kurt Johnson, Underhill
Sam Andersen, GBIC

Staff

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

Guests

Patrick Murphy, VTrans
Carolyn Cota, VTrans
James LaCroix, VTrans

30 1. Bryan Osborne called the meeting to order at 9:00 AM.
31

32 **2. Consent Agenda**

33 No consent agenda this month.
34

35 **3. Approval of October 4, 2022 Minutes**

36 BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 4, 2022,
37 SECONDED BY BOB HENNEBERGER. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
38

39 **4. Public Comments**

40 No comments from the public.
41

42 **5. Statewide Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Plan**

43 Patrick Murphy, VTrans, provided an update on electric vehicle (EV) adoption strategies and greenhouse
44 gas emission goals in the State's Climate Action Plan, and offered the State's perspective on the National
45 Electric Vehicle Infrastructure (NEVI) guidelines, the funding available for fast charging needs, and how
46 the State has prioritized planned investments within this context. Patrick shared the differences in
47 charging time, capital costs, and operating costs for charging equipment. Sam asked about the wide
48 ranges in costs within each charging equipment level. Patrick explained that some systems are "smarter"
49 than others and can regulate charging times, collect data, provide payment collection, etc. which can
50 affect the cost. Single family chargers are on the less expensive side.
51

52 Patrick shared information about the State's continued investment in electric vehicle charging, beginning
53 in 2014 with \$200,000 in the launch of the Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment (EVSE) Program. The
54 FY23 State budget includes \$10 million appropriated for community charging needs and \$6.25 million for

1 fast charging along highway corridors. Through the NEVI formula program guidance, Vermont is
 2 receiving \$21.2 million and must follow rules around how funds are used, with priority along interstates.
 3 For example, there must be charging stations within 50 miles of each other, and within 1 mile from the
 4 exit or highway intersection. Some guidance is yet to be determined (e.g., minimum equipment standards,
 5 Buy America requirements). Note that out of the \$7.5 billion approved, there is \$1.25 billion set aside for
 6 competitive corridor grants and another \$1.25 billion for community charging grants.
 7

8 Vermont currently doesn't have sites eligible for funding. Meeting federal guidance would require adding
 9 or upgrading about 15 fast charging locations. Sites with other amenities (e.g., restrooms, food, etc.) are
 10 desired. Location prioritization factors include highway traffic volumes, travel services and other
 11 employment, walkability, environmental justice factors, multifamily housing, 3-phase power, proximity
 12 to federally designated EV corridor, and distance to qualifying EV charging stations with four 150kW
 13 DCFC ports. Updating the plan is required annually. Next steps include surveying property owners for
 14 interest in participating, contracting to upgrade 5-6 existing and planned locations, issuing an RFP for
 15 further buildout of alternative fuel corridors, conducting public engagement, and continuing to evaluate
 16 and redevelop statewide plans.
 17

18 Bryan Osborne asked that if 80% of charging would occur at home, then the challenge is capturing the
 19 other 20%. If subsidies are likely required, then how sustainable is that model and what opportunities
 20 exist for investment into this so people can privately finance charging? Patrick said the intent behind this
 21 level of investment is to jump start private investment. This is an initial public investment in partnership
 22 with private investment and requires a 20% match. Patrick notes that 25-30% of chargers that show up on
 23 current maps may not be working so that's another key piece to address, the system needs to be reliable.
 24 Some automakers are requiring investment in charging in their service areas. In addition, funds through
 25 the Inflation Reduction Act are also available. Bryan asked about the national perspective on the
 26 transition away from fossil fuel vehicles to electric vehicles and if the electric grid can support the
 27 transition or to what extent that infrastructure will need upgrading. Patrick said it's not really an issue in
 28 Vermont since we have excess capacity but the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) will help to
 29 build out that infrastructure.
 30

31 Sam asked if there is software being developed for residents of multi-unit buildings so they can tell when
 32 their vehicle is charged and ready to be moved so others can charge. Patrick said yes, there are different
 33 charging apps and part of the investments are to determine which are most useful, and which can also be
 34 applied to employer locations as well. The smart systems are able to have different time slots and costs
 35 for different audiences if needed.
 36

37 Jonathon asked if chargers will be installed in existing or new parking spaces. Patrick said the State has
 38 been clear that they don't want any new parking, which would also trigger National Environmental Policy
 39 Act (NEPA), so these will be in existing sites. They may have to make some changes based on heavy duty
 40 charging needs.
 41

42 **6. Winooski River Bridge Project Update and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

43 **Amendment**

44 Christine said this project was awarded a \$24.8 million federal RAISE grant. This topic is a presentation
 45 from Carolyn Cota and James LaCroix from VTrans but it also requires action by the TAC to amend the
 46 TIP to add funds for project design. Right-of-way and construction amendments will be added later when
 47 more information is known.
 48

49 Bryan asked if the cost would be shared by Winooski and Burlington, Christine said yes.
 50 Sam said the cost seems expensive for design only. Bryan noted that given the total project cost, the
 51 design cost seems reasonable.
 52

1 Carolyn is the structures program manager and James LaCroix, structures design engineer at VTrans. The
 2 project received the \$24.8 million RAISE grant but the total project cost is \$46 million. In order to receive
 3 the funds, the project needs to be in the TIP, and the State has to fill out the grant application. There is a
 4 tight timeframe with these grants, construction funds need to be obligated prior to September 30, 2026,
 5 and all funds have to be expended by September 30, 2031. To do this, the State is pursuing a design-build
 6 process. James said that design-build helps get a Request for Proposals (RFP) out sooner, when design
 7 and right-of-way are ready. This will also be a progressive design-build which allows the team to carry
 8 design a bit further since community need for this bridge is high and allows their needs to be heard deeper
 9 into the design process. They're currently working to develop solicitation for proposals to be owners'
 10 representatives (State and communities) and to help develop the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) and
 11 RFP. During that time plans will also progress through NEPA and there will be public outreach to
 12 understand community needs for the bridge and timing of construction. Consultant should be on board in
 13 early 2023. The TIP amendment will help pay for the owners' representative, which is necessary to get
 14 started. Carolyn said eventually the total project amount needs to be in the TIP. Matthew Langham said
 15 once the State knows the project schedule a little better, then they'll ask for another TIP amendment.

16
 17 Bryan Osborne said this will need extensive public outreach to understand how and when to close the
 18 bridge and asked if the cost estimate includes a temporary bridge? James said that the grant application
 19 mentioned lateral slide and accelerated bridge construction so these have to be shown, if those aren't
 20 feasible then need to get federal permission for another process. If design shows that lateral slide isn't
 21 feasible then they'll pursue that permission. A lateral slide is building a new bridge on temporary
 22 supports, building the permanent supports, then sliding the new bridge onto the permanent supports. This
 23 is a way to limit disruption and traffic impacts. A similar project was completed in Hartford.
 24 Katie asked about the difference in timeframe between lateral slide and regular on-alignment
 25 construction. James said he hesitates to answer but in general a lateral slide could have 14-21 closure
 26 days, whereas on-alignment construction could be 40 closure days. Carolyn said there will be disruption
 27 no matter the construction method, but the goal is to minimize it as much as possible. Jonathon said the
 28 detour will have greater impact for people walking and biking. James agreed and said they will do their
 29 best to address these impacts and work with the community to work on these kinds of details.

30
 31 SAM ANDERSEN MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED TIP AMENDMENT AS
 32 DESCRIBED IN THE MEMO, SECONDED BY JONATHON WEBER. THE MOTION PASSED
 33 UNANIMOUSLY.

34
 35 **7. 2023 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Update**

36 Eleni Churchill, CCRPC, reminded the TAC of the draft MTP plan update in September, and since then
 37 staff has been updating various sections and plan to bring a draft plan in December. Christine Forde,
 38 CCRPC, then described the MTP financial plan. The MTP is fiscally constrained and will include a list of
 39 projects. The process is to calculate the funding expected to be available to the State, and then how much
 40 is expected for Chittenden County. The next step is to determine the set-aside for system preservation,
 41 which is about 70%. The remaining amount is available for new projects. She shared slides showing
 42 previous funding available from the past 10 years and what is expected through 2050. There is about \$440
 43 million in constant dollars for new projects available. This is \$734.8 million adjusted for inflation and
 44 will be included in the MTP.

45
 46 Bryan Osborne noted that the MTP is a long-term plan and asked if there has been consideration of the
 47 current state of the economy, such as inflation rates, which impact construction and other costs, is this
 48 plan too long term to consider these types of impacts? Christine said that the hope is that the rate comes
 49 down over time, and these figures should be taken as a planning level estimate based on what we know
 50 and the information we have.

51
 52 Jason Charest, CCRPC, then shared the results of the modeling for the MTP. There are caveats with the
 53 model, in particular it is only tool and can't be used to predict what will happen in the future. There were

1 four alternatives modeled for the MTP: 2020 existing conditions, 2050 with TIP projects, 2050 with the
 2 2018 MTP projects, and 2050 with the 2023 MTP projects. Jason shared a series of slides showing the
 3 modeling results for these alternatives relating to vehicle miles traveled (VMT), VMT per capita, delay
 4 per capita, transit/walk/bike mode split, and daily vehicle work trips. Jason explained volume to capacity
 5 ratio (v/c ratio), which takes the volume of vehicles on a roadway and divides it by the roadway capacity.
 6 This gives a ratio of how much roadway capacity is being used/is still available. He then shared a series of
 7 maps showing the modeling results for the four alternatives modeled related to v/c and level of delay (per
 8 mile). Katie asked if there a target goal for the v/c ratio? Jason said no but it helps us consider which
 9 projects to pursue for further study. Jonathon said he's pleased to see movement away from adding
 10 capacity and looking to move people to other modes.
 11

12 **8. FY2024 UPWP Solicitation**

13 Marshall Distel, CCRPC, announced the upcoming FY2024 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP).
 14 This is our annual solicitation of projects to be considered for next year's CCRPC work program.
 15 Information and materials will be released later in November. Marshall noted that we've tried to
 16 streamline the application process and he expects to release the materials on November 18, with requests
 17 due January 20. He reviewed the matching fund requirements and process to develop the UPWP
 18 throughout the spring. He asked if there are two TAC members interested in serving on the UPWP
 19 Committee. Kurt Johnson and Barbara Elliott volunteered.
 20

21 **9. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports**

22 See bulleted list at the end of the agenda for current CCRPC projects. TAC members are encouraged to
 23 ask staff for more information on the status of any of these ongoing or recently completed projects.
 24

25 **10. CCRPC Board Meeting Report**

26 In October the Board approved the municipal dues increase, approved the Regional Park and Ride Plan,
 27 approved the Bolton Enhanced Energy Plan, was introduced to McKenzie Spear, our new Business Office
 28 Associate, heard an update on Anne Nelson Stoner, our new Equity and Engagement Manager, and
 29 Darren Schibler, our new Planner, and heard Executive Director updates on formation of the Equity
 30 Advisory Committee and other items.
 31

32 **11. Chair/Members' Items**

- 33 • **VTrans 2023 Transportation Alternatives** grant program: projects must relate directly to
 34 surface transportation; note that 50% of grant program funds are reserved for environmental
 35 mitigation projects relating to stormwater and highways, including eligible salt and sand shed
 36 projects. Virtual informational workshop will be held on November 16 and **applications are due**
 37 **by e-mail (preferred) to Scott.robertson@vermont.gov by December 14, 2022.** More
 38 information: <http://vtrans.vermont.gov/highway/local-projects/transport-alt>
- 39 • **Animating Infrastructure Grant Program:** The Vermont Arts Council is offering a funding
 40 opportunity for communities to integrate works of public art into upcoming infrastructure
 41 projects. Grants of up to \$15,000 are available. [Workshop](#) scheduled for November 15, with
 42 **project pitches due December 12.** More information at
 43 <https://www.vermontartscouncil.org/grants/organizations/animating-infrastructure>.
- 44 • **[EV Expo at the REV Conference](#)** October 27 & 28 at the DoubleTree Hilton in South
 45 Burlington. Check out new vehicles. Potential opportunity to attend just the EV Expo without
 46 having to register for the whole conference. Contact Peggy O'Neill-Vivanco [Peggy.O'Neill-](mailto:Peggy.O'Neill-Vivanco@uvm.edu)
 47 [Vivanco@uvm.edu](mailto:Peggy.O'Neill-Vivanco@uvm.edu).
- 48 • **Diesel Emissions Reduction Act (DERA)** funding may be coming this fall:
 49 <https://dec.vermont.gov/air-quality/mobile-sources/diesel-emissions/vt-diesel-grant>. Contact
 50 Leigh Martin at (802) 261-0713 or leigh.martin@vermont.gov.
- 51 • **NOTE:** in December we will have Chris Bruntlett from the [Dutch Cycling Embassy](#) speak about

1 the Dutch experience with bicycle infrastructure design, maintenance, policy, education and
2 more. Here is an article about [Bicycle's Conquest of Amsterdam](#) to set the stage.

3

4 The next TAC meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, December 6, 2022.

5

6 BRUCE HOAR MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN, SECONDED BY JONATHON WEBER,
7 APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY. The meeting adjourned at 10:27.

8

9 Respectfully submitted, Bryan Davis