

## **Southern Windsor County Regional Planning Commission Transportation Project Priorities – March 2011**

The Southern Windsor County Regional Planning Commission (the RPC) has been evaluating and prioritizing transportation projects in the Region for more than 15 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.

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. All projects were consistent with policies established in local and regional plans.

- **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.

...

**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 8 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.

...

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.

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 accepted the TAC priorities based on the TAC’s recommendations.

# Southern Windsor County Regional Planning Commission

Transportation Project Prioritization - March 2011

PIN	FY13 RPC Priority	PROJECT NAME	PROJECT NUMBER	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	Comments
-----	-------------------	--------------	----------------	---------------------	----------

## BIKE & PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES

00F276	1 =	LUDLOW	STP BIKE(44)S	CONSTRUCTION OF A BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN PATH IN LUDLOW VILLAGE, BEGINNING AT THE FLETCHER FIELDS RECREATION AREA AND EXTENDING NORTHWESTERLY ALONG THE BLACK RIVER APPROX. 2.9 KILOMETERS TO BLACK RIVER UNION HIGH SCHOOL.	Combined with STP WALK( ).
05F252	1 =	LUDLOW	STP WALK( )	PROJECT IS FOR THE INSTALLATION OF AN ADAPTIVE RE-USE HISTORIC TRUSS BRIDGE ON THE LUDLOW STP BIKE(44) PROJECT, OVER THE BLACK RIVER.	Combined with STP BIKE(44)S.

## PARK & RIDE LOTS

09K250	1	SPRINGFIELD	CMG PARK(32)	CONSTRUCTION OF A PERMANENT PARK & RIDE FACILITY OFF US5 IN SPRINGFIELD, AT THE INTERSECTION WITH VT11.	
--------	---	-------------	--------------	---	--

## ROADWAY PROJECTS

84B024	1	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.	Slated for deletion, but VTrans intends to keep this project; reconsider project scope w/ VTrans & towns
04E080	n/a	WEATHERSFIELD	PLH TSDP(1)	ROADWAY REHABILITATION, INCLUDING GUARDRAIL REPLACEMENT AND RESURFACING, ON TH6 (STOUGHTON POND RD.), WHICH CROSSES THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS FLOOD CONTROL DAM IN WEATHERSFIELD.	Substantially complete as of fall 2010
97C010	n/a	CAVENDISH	STP 0146(9)SC	PROJECT IS FOR A SCOPING STUDY TO DETERMINE IMPROVEMENTS TO VT131 IN CAVENDISH, BEGINNING 3.800 MILES EAST OF THE VT103/VT131 INTERSECTION AND EXTENDING EASTERLY 0.500 MILE.	Deleted by FHWA; Selectboard agrees w/ deletion but requests minor safety improvements (signage); Vtrans agreed

## STATE HIGHWAY BRIDGES

00C266	1	WEATHERSFIELD	STP 0146( )S	REPLACEMENT OF BR15 (CULVERT) ON VT131 IN WEATHERSFIELD.	No local knowledge of problem at this location.
--------	---	---------------	--------------	--	---

PIN	FY13 RPC Priority	PROJECT NAME	PROJECT NUMBER	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	Comments
00C268	2	WEATHERSFIELD	STP 0146( )S	REPLACEMENT OF BR11B (CULVERT) ON VT131 IN WEATHERSFIELD.	No local knowledge of problem at this location.
00B256	3	LUDLOW	STP 013-3( )S	REPLACEMENT OF BR102 (CULVERT) ON VT100 IN LUDLOW.	No local knowledge of problem at this location.

**TOWN HIGHWAY BRIDGES**

(FOB & D&E projects only)

95J282	1	SPRINGFIELD	BRO 1442(26)	PROJECT IS FOR REPLACEMENT OF BR57 (Harry Hills Bridge) ON TH6 IN SPRINGFIELD, OVER GREAT BROOK.	BRIDGE POSTED; POOR SUPERSTRUCTURE; REHAB; 80/15/5% FUNDING SPLIT
10J068	2	LUDLOW	BRF 025-1(42)	REPLACEMENT OR REHABILITATION OF BRIDGE NO. 25 (Walker Bridge) ON VT103 IN LUDLOW, OVER THE BLACK RIVER.	Currently under D&E.
	3	LUDLOW		REPAIR/ REPLACE BRIDGE 54 ON POND STREET OVER THE JEWELL BROOK	Currently under D&E. Town has funding through the Structures Program; due to go into construction in Summer 2011.

Notes: Project priorities determined by the SWCTAC at the February 16, 2011 meeting.  
 SWCRPC Board approved these priorities at their March 15, 2011 meeting.  
 Town staff were consulted for input.

Southern Windsor County Regional Planning Commission

Town Bridge Pre-Candidate Projects - Prioritized in 2011

RPC Ranking in 2011	Town	Bridge Number	Road Carried	Road Name	Location	Bridge Type	Capital Program (FY12 Governor's Recommended)	RPC Comments
1	Cavendish	Br. 58	TH. 1 - Class 2	Depot Street	0.1 mi to Jct with VT131	2 Span Concrete T-Beam	Yes	In bad condition; Town may close one lane soon.
2	Springfield	Br. 62 (McD's)	VT11	Chester Rd	0.1 MI W JCT. VT.106	(3) Span Rolled Beam		PWD says it needs new decking; high traffic
3	Windsor	Br. 55	US5/ TH1	Main St	0.1 MI S JCT. VT.44	Conc Spandrel Arch		Recent work revealed poor support structure
4	Springfield	Br. 56	TH. 6 - Class 2	Main St (N)	0.25 mi to Jct with VT10	Concrete Slab	Yes	Ind Park Access Option; PWD not aware in bad condition
5	Chester	Br. 13	C2006	Green Mountain Tpk				In poor condition/see past inspection reports; 80 ft span; top town priority
6	Andover	Br. 28	C3036	Howard Hill Rd	0.08 MI TO JCT W VT11	Rolled Beam		Very low traffic; needs 1 new abutment & new deck w/in 5 years
7	Ludlow	Br. 26	VT.103 - Class 1	Main St	0.1 mi N Jct VT100 South	Rolled Beam	Yes	36 mile detour according to bridge conditions report

Notes:

Priorities determined by the SWCTAC at the February 16, 2011 meeting.  
 SWCRPC Board approved these priorities at their March 15, 2011 meeting.  
 Town staff were consulted for input.