

# Southern Windsor County RPC Transportation Project Priorities Methodology

January 2016



The Southern Windsor County Regional Planning Commission (the RPC) has been evaluating and prioritizing transportation projects in the Region for more than 20 years based on an established evaluation process. This evaluation process was developed by staff with the assistance of the regional Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC). The intent of the evaluation process is to determine how well projects correspond with the priorities established in the Regional Transportation Plan.

In 2005, the state Transportation Bill (H.523) was passed requiring the Agency of Transportation (VTrans) to develop a project prioritization system to serve as a basis for the annual transportation capital programming process. This legislation included a requirement for VTrans to use RPC priorities as a criterion in the state prioritization system. The RPC modified the previously established regional project evaluation process based on VTrans guidance, and established regional priorities in the summer of 2005 for the FY 2007 capital programming process. The RPC has continued to prioritize projects annually in response to both Legislation and VTrans guidance ever since.

## Criteria for Prioritizing Programmed Transportation Projects

The process used by the RPC includes the following criteria in evaluating programmed transportation projects:

- **Impact on Congestion & Mobility** – The impact on congestion and mobility are indicated by a LOW or HIGH. This determination is based on consideration of the identified problem and if the proposed solution will likely reduce congestion or improve mobility.
- **Alternative Routes** – Alternative routes are indicated by a YES or NO. A YES indicates that an alternative route is available to maintain a flow of traffic in the event the bridge or roadway section is closed or restricted.
- **Importance for Economy** – Importance for the economy is indicated by a LOW or HIGH. HIGH indicates that the bridge or highway segment serves a vital importance in the linkage of the local, regional or state economy. LOW would indicate a lesser importance. Factors considered for this criterion include location relative to the state truck network, National Highway System, regional economic development plans, local zoning bylaws, town plan objectives, etc.
- **Social / Cultural Importance** – The functional importance the highway segment or bridge in the social and cultural life of the surrounding communities is indicated by a YES or NO. YES indicates significant social or cultural importance, which might be based on historical resources, recreational opportunities, access to civic facilities, environmental considerations, etc.
- **Conformance with Local & Regional Plans** – The conformance with local and regional plans is indicated with a YES or NO.
- **Local Support** – Local support was determined through consultation with town managers, selectboards, TAC representatives and the general public.

The following additional criteria are only used to determine priorities if two projects are tied:

- **Sufficiency Ratings** – Roadway and bridge sufficiency ratings have been used by the RPC for years to understand the relative condition of each roadway section or bridge, with particular attention to the worst conditions. The most recent available ratings information from VTrans may be used as needed. For bridges, additional information including condition assessments of the decking, superstructure and substructure were also noted.

- **AADT** – Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) figures may be used as needed to estimate the traffic levels at each location, with particular emphasis on the most heavily traveled areas. The most recent data from VTrans or the RPC are used.
- **High Crash Location** – High Crash Locations (HCL) are indicated by a YES or NO. Particular emphasis is given to areas of significant safety concern. Recent and historic crash data from VTrans were used.

#### Criteria for Prioritizing Town Highway Bridge Pre-Candidate Needs

In autumn of 2009, the RPC was asked by VTrans to help to identify and prioritize “pre-candidate” projects for the Town Highway Bridge Program. Following VTrans guidance, the RPC worked with the TAC, town highway departments and other town officials to develop a list of the top 10 pre-candidate town bridge projects. Criteria used to evaluate Town Highway Bridge “pre-candidate” needs are similar to the above criteria, with a few modifications:

- **Structure Condition** – Based on VTrans’ most recently provided bridge inspection data, including the following sub-criteria:
  - **Deck Rating**
  - **Superstructure Rating**
  - **Substructure Rating**
  - **Culvert Rating**
- **AADT** – See above
- **High Crash Location** – See above
- **Impact on Congestion & Mobility** – See above
- **Alternative Routes** – Based on two sub-criteria:
  - **Alternative Routes** are indicated by a YES or NO. A YES indicates that an alternative route is available to maintain a flow of traffic in the event the bridge or roadway section is closed or restricted.
  - **Detour Length** is indicated in miles, based on data from VTrans.
- **Importance for Economy** – See above
- **Social / Cultural Importance** – See above
- **Conformance with Local & Regional Plans** – See above
- **Local Support** – See above

Town Highway Bridge “pre-candidate” needs are then added to the overall project prioritization list as a separate category.

#### Local and Regional Comments

Comments are also listed with each project on the attached spreadsheet. They consist of additional information gathered to help evaluate projects and/or documenting input collected during the consultative process. RPC staff contacted all town managers or other town representatives to get input into the regional evaluation process, to determine local support and to re-evaluate last years’ priorities.

#### Determining priorities – TAC and RPC Board

The TAC then meets to determine priorities based on the above criteria, goals and policies of the Regional Transportation Plan, and local knowledge. Then, the RPC Board of Commissioners accepts the TAC priorities based on the TAC’s recommendations.

## Southern Windsor County Regional Planning Commission Project Prioritization for FY 2018

Notes: Project prioritization follows guidance from the Legislature and VTrans.  
PC = Pre-Candidate Town Highway Bridge List

Project timeline - Candidate > D&E > Front of Book  
FOB = Front of Book

D&E =Development and Evaluation  
N/R= Not Ranked

2016 RPC RANK	PROJECT TIMELINE	TOWN	PROJECT NUMBER	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	RPC/ TOWN COMMENTS	PIN
---------------	------------------	------	----------------	---------------------	--------------------	-----

### PAVING

1	FRONT OF BOOK	ROCKINGHAM-CLARENDON	NH SURF(49)	RESURFACE VT 103 BEGINNING AT THE US 5/VT 103 INTERSECTION IN ROCKINGHAM AND EXTENDING NORTHERLY 42.036 MI. TO THE VT 103/US 7 INTERSECTION IN CLARENDON. OMIT CHESTER AND LUDLOW CLASS I .		14V169
2	FRONT OF BOOK	CAVENDISH-WEATHERSFIELD	ER STP 0146(14)	REHABILITATION OF VT131 IN CAVENDISH AND WEATHERSFIELD, BEGINNING AT THE VT103 INTERSECTION AND EXTENDING EASTERLY 8.974 MILES TO THE VT106 INTERSECTION. INCLUDES IMPROVEMENTS TO AREAS THAT SUSTAINED SUBSTANTIAL DAMAGE AS A RESULT OF TS IRENE.		12C226
3	New project (first requested in 2012)	WEST WINDSOR		RESURFACE VT-44.	2012 Request from Tom Kenyon. Try to coordinate project with sewer work by West Windsor along VT-44 and I-91 bridge work if possible.	None
4	FRONT OF BOOK	CHESTER-SPRINGFIELD	STP 2942()	RESURFACE VT10 IN CHESTER AND SPRINGFIELD, BEGINNING AT THE VT103 INTERSECTION AND EXTENDING EASTRLY 4.373 MILES TO THE VT106 INTERSECTION.	Was previously scheduled for construction in 2015, but was pushed out since the quick paving job in 2013 is doing well. 2/4/2015 Chester Selectboard has some safety concerns - especially the steep curve about 2 miles in.	11B336

### ROADWAY PROJECTS

1	D&E	CAVENDISH-LUDLOW	NH F 025-1(30)	RECONSTRUCTION OF VT 103 IN CAVENDISH AND LUDLOW, BEGINNING 0.896 MILE NORTH OF THE VT131 INTERSECTION AND EXTENDING NORTHERLY 1.131 MILES, INCLUDING THE REPLACEMENT OF BRIDGE NOS. 23 AND 24.	"Smithville Reconstruction". Was slated for deletion in 2011, but VTrans kept the project. Project scope to be reconsidered with VTrans & towns. Project has been moved from Front of Book in 2014 rankings to D&E	84B024
2	D&E	SPRINGFIELD	STP CULV(47)	REPLACEMENT OF BRIDGE NOS 48A AND 48B (CULVERTS) ON US5 IN SPRINGFIELD		13C346

### SAFETY & TRAFFIC OPERATIONS

1	FRONT OF BOOK	LUDLOW	HES SGNL(44)	INSTALLATION OF A NEW TRAFFIC SIGNAL AT THE INTERSECTION OF VT103 AND VT100 NORTH IN LUDLOW .	Connected to Act 250 permit conditions.	13B020
2	D&E	SPRINGFIELD	STP 016-2(23)	PROJECT IS FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO THE INTERSECTION OF US5 & VT11 AND US5 & I91 SB OFF RAMP IN SPRINGFIELD.	Safety improvements around I-91 Exit 7. Project being done through the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP). Outreach first started in 2014.	14T189

Notes: Project prioritization follows guidance from the Legislature and VTrans.  
PC = Pre-Candidate Town Highway Bridge List

Project timeline - Candidate > D&E > Front of Book  
FOB = Front of Book

D&E =Development and Evaluation  
N/R= Not Ranked

2016 RPC RANK	PROJECT TIMELINE	TOWN	PROJECT NUMBER	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	RPC/ TOWN COMMENTS	PIN
---------------	------------------	------	----------------	---------------------	--------------------	-----

**STATE HIGHWAY BRIDGES**

1	CANDIDATE	CHESTER	BF 025-1( )	SCOPING TO EVALUATE ALTERNATIVES FOR BR14 ON VT103 IN CHESTER (north of Gassetts), OVER THE WILLIAMS RIVER AND THE GREEN MOUNTAIN RAILROAD.	2015 - Town has no particular comments except that it is on a major route in the area.	12B580
2	D&E	LUDLOW	STP DECK(39)	REPLACEMENT OF DECK AND MINOR RELATED WORK ON BRIDGE 99 ON VT100 IN LUDLOW OVER BRANCH BROOK	Scoping started 2015	15B109

**TOWN HIGHWAY BRIDGES**

1	FRONT OF BOOK	LUDLOW	BRF 025-1(42)	REPLACEMENT OR REHABILITATION OF BR25 (Walker Bridge) ON VT103 (Main St) IN LUDLOW, OVER THE BLACK RIVER.	2/4/2016 (Town Manager and Road Foreman). Regional Concerns meeting in Spring 2012. Construction delayed and most likely will not occur until 2017 or later. Project cost recently went up from \$750k (Jan 2013) to \$3.2 million (Jan 2016). Significant temporary repairs made in 2015 - add 3 plates and repave. Top town priority.	10J068
2	Candidate	SPRINGFIELD	BF 2500( )	SCOPING TO EVALUATE ALTERNATIVES FOR BRIDGE NO. 62 (McDs) ON VT11 (River St) IN SPRINGFIELD, OVER THE BLACK RIVER.	2/12/2016 (Town Manager and Road Foreman). Top town priority. Cannot do small fixes anymore. Needs new decking. Very high traffic volume and vital connection for traffic through town.	12J656
3	FRONT OF BOOK	CAVENDISH	BO 1442 (38)	SCOPING TO EVALUATE ALTERNATIVES FOR BR58 ON TH1 (Depot St) IN CAVENDISH, OVER THE BLACK RIVER.	2/10/2016 (Town Manager) - Scoping started - VTrans reached out to town for initial questionnaire in Feb 2014. Scoping nearly completed. Bridge was closed to traffic December 2015. Construction planned for 2018	13J302
4	Candidate	NORTH SPRINGFIELD	BO 1442( )	SCOPING TO EVALUATE ALTERNATIVES FOR BRIDGE NO. 56 (Willard) ON TH6 (Main St North Springfield) IN SPRINGFIELD, OVER GREAT BROOK.	2/12/2016 (Town Manager and Road Foreman). Need for this bridge replacement for ongoing access to the Industrial Park. In 2015 the bridge became posted for 5 tons.	12J654
5	Candidate	CHESTER	BO 1442( )	SCOPING TO EVALUATE ALTERNATIVES FOR BRIDGE NO. 62 ON TH18 (Thompson Rd) IN CHESTER, OVER THE WILLIAMS RIVER.	2/11/2016 (Town Manager and Road Foreman). Beyond the Town's ability to fix - particularly with issues of proximity to VT-103 (within 10ft of the fog line). May need to relocate bridge. Serves 2 homes and a dairy farm. Scoping started in 2015	12J616
6	Candidate	LUDLOW VILLAGE	BO 1443( )	SCOPING TO EVALUATE ALTERNATIVES FOR BRIDGE NO. 57 ON TH324 (Mill St) IN LUDLOW VILLAGE, OVER THE BLACK RIVER.	2/10/2016 (Town Manager and Road Foreman). Town Priority 4. Town wants to keep the bridge on the list, but low priority. Currently closed to traffic. Served as pedestrian bridge until damaged by Irene so now no one can use the bridge. Historic metal truss. Want to replace bridge with a pedestrian bridge, but since historic, need to restore.	12J638

Notes: A map of all bridge locations is available at <http://swcrpc.maps.arcgis.com/home/>

Project priorities determined by the SWCTAC at the February 24, 2016 meeting.

Project priorities confirmed and approved by the SWCRPC Board at the March 22, 2016 meeting.

Project prioritization follows guidance from the Legislature and VTrans.

"PC" - In previous years SWCRPC has prioritized "Candidate" bridges with the Pre-candidates. From 2015 onwards they will be prioritized with the FOB and D&E projects

Starting 2014, no longer rank Bike & Pedestrian Facilities, Park & Ride Lots

**Southern Windsor County Regional Planning Commission  
 Prioritization of Pre-Candidate Town Highway Bridge Projects in 2016**

2016 RPC Rank	Town	Bridge Number	Road Name	Location	Features Intersected	RPC/ Town Comments	StrNum
1	Andover	Br. 9 (High)	Weston-Andover Rd	3.8 mi N Jct VT 11. (west of campground)	Trout Brook	2/4/2016 (Town Clerk and Road Foreman) Added to list by town in 2012. High town priority. Approaches fixed a few years ago but problem recurring (big bumps on both approaches to bridge). Will need replacement in about 3 years according to Mark Pickering. At the moment they are just doing patches to keep it going. Town may also try to apply for funds through Structures program.	200132000 914012
2	Ludlow	Br. 26 (Vail)	Main St (VT-103)	0.1 mi N Jct VT100 South	Jewell Brook	2/4/2016 (Town Manager and Road Foreman). Town Priority 3 (after Walker and Br 17). Critical for getting through town.	200025002 614102
3	Windsor	Br. 55	Main St (US-5)	0.1 MI S JCT. VT.44	Mill Brook	2/11/2016 (Town Manager). The bridge was given a cursory inspection after Irene. While it was not determined that repairs were required as a result of the storm the retaining wall, apparently owned by the American Precision Museum just upstream (and attached to the bridge) suffered considerable damage. The end result is that the bridge is in marginally worse condition, the retaining wall is in poor condition.	200113005 514232
4	Springfield	Br. 79	Park Street	Near Main Street	Black River	2/12/2016 (Town Manager and Road Foreman). Town top priority after McDonalds Bridge. Deck issue. Important connection within town.	101418007 914181
5	Ludlow	Br.17	Pleasant St Extension	0.1 mi Jct VT103	Black River	2/4/2016 (Town Manager and Road Foreman). Town Priority 2 (after Walker which is a Candidate). Process access to 75 jobs and west side of town.	101410001 714101
6	Weathersfield	Br.63	Ascutney Basin Road	0.02 mi to Jct with VT106	N Br Black River	2/10/2016 (Town Manager). Needs work. Bridge approach (apron) moved during Irene. Bridge now sealed concrete rather than asphalt on top of concrete. If do work, would also need to upgrade to current hydraulic standards	101420006 314201
7	Windsor	Br. 24	Brook Road	0.3 mi to Jct with TH16	Mill Brook	2/11/2016 (Town Manager) - Bad alignment. Bridge deck needs a lot of work. Spaulded down to the rebare. Rusting out. Problems getting worse	101423002 414231

The following towns did not have any bridges for the pre-candidate list this year - Reading(2/16/2016 SB Chair), Cavendish (2/11/2016 Town Manager), Chester (Town Manager and Road Foreman 2/11/2016), and West Windsor (2/11/2016 Road Foreman).

Baltimore has no bridges.

No bridges were removed from the previous year

**Notes:**

A map of all bridge locations is available at <http://swcrpc.maps.arcgis.com/home/>

Priorities determined by the SWCTAC at the February 24, 2016 meeting.

Priorities confirmed and approved by the SWCRPC Board at the March 22, 2016 meeting.

Project prioritization follows guidance from the Legislature and VTrans.

In previous years SWCRPC has prioritized "Candidate" bridges with the Pre-candidates. From 2015 onwards they will be prioritized with the FOB and D&E projects.