

Richmond Transportation Committee

Meeting Minutes – August 8, 2023

Committee members present: Chris Cole (Chair), Cathleen Gent (Vice Chair), Jon Kart, Allen Knowles, Susan Wells, and Keith Jennings

Others present: Keith Osborne (Town Planner), Jason Charest Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission

All attended remotely.

A quorum was reached and the Chair convened the meeting at 5:33 PM.

Abbreviations used in RTC minutes: ARPA = American Rescue Plan Act of 2021; CCRPC = Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission; D&K = Dubois and King; GMT=Green Mountain Transit; PPL = Project Pipeline Document; RTC = Richmond Transportation Committee; RVC=Riverview Commons; SB = Selectboard; TAP=Transportation Alternatives Program; THBC = intersection of Thompson Rd, Huntington Rd, Bridge St, and Cochran Rd; UPWP = Unified Planning Work Program; VDH = VT Dept. of Health; VTRANS=Vermont Agency of Transportation;

- 1. Welcome and Public Comments:** No public comments for items not on the agenda.
- 2. Revisions to Agenda:** No revisions to the agenda
- 3. Approve Minutes from July 25 2023, meeting:** There were no corrections or additions to the minutes. **Motion by Gent, seconded by Kart, to approve the minutes. Passed unanimously.**
- 4. In-Progress Projects – Jason Charest – CCRPC**

a) Cochran Road Corridor Study.

Jason will be CCRPC's manager for the Cochran Road Corridor Study.

Step 1: getting Richmond's buy-in on the selected consultant—WSP (A Boston-based company, but WSP's public engagement specialist is based in Vermont). It's a new one to Richmond. WSP is one of several consultants on retainer by the CCRPC. We will get to see the WSP's qualifications and the qualification of the specific staff assigned to the project soon. Cole states he believes that WSP is one of the top-10 transportation consultants in the US. There was consensus among the committee to accept CCRPC's recommendation of WSP as the project consultant.

Jason expects that the initial meeting could be during the RTC's Sept 12 meeting, and possibly by the August 22nd meeting.

Step 2: meet with the consultant, review the UPWP application, make sure there is agreement on the project. Then WSP will develop a scope of work, and if Richmond agrees with it, CCRPC will issue the go-ahead for the project.

Future steps will include public engagement; development of alternatives; public review of the alternatives; selection of preferred alternative(s); getting the Selectboard's endorsement for the recommended alternatives. Scoping would come after the Selectboard makes its selections.

The Project's advisory committee will likely be the RTC with the public invited to participate. Susan noted that there are members of the public that want to be involved. Keith Osborne suggested that he and Cathleen work with WSP and CCRPC in advance of project meetings to develop agendas, identify questions, and organize the meetings.

b) Route 2 Pinch Points Scoping Project

Stantec's technical feasibility memo provided by the consultant has high contingency levels because there are many details that have not yet been settled.

Location 1: there was general consensus that the retaining wall at location 1 should be removed.

Location 6/7: there was general consensus that the existing culvert is too small and could be compromised by a heavy rain/flood event.

Location 8: If VTrans removes the offset blocks from the existing guardrail it will provide an additional 6" of shoulder. RTC will ask the Selectboard to communicate the need for this to the VTrans Secretary. Cathleen noted that sheet piling option might be needed to achieve safer travel here.

Location 9: the largest pinch-point not caused by a culvert. Sheet piling is the only fix proposed.

Locations 10 & 11: The section immediately leaving the village. Additional investigation is needed, but Stantec believe a retaining wall might be possible here to gain wider shoulders.

Next steps for this project will be submitting the pinch point report to VTrans's VPSP2 project selection program with some or all of the proposed fixes recommended. Jason will ask Stantec to finalize the report.

c) THBC Intersection

The committee discussed the consultant's preferred alternative (two-way stop and an island) and a 4-way stop alternative (alt #2 in the report). The estimated cost for the consultant's alternative is \$72,000. This estimate does not include a lighted crosswalk.

Chris recommended that the Committee invite public participation at the meeting where these alternatives will be discussed. Keith Osborne recommended that this topic should be discussed at the next two or three meetings to ensure that the public gets the opportunity to weigh in.

Keith Jennings asked if the two options could be tested. Susan asked about including other options for narrowing the road to further slow vehicle speed through the intersection.

5. General Updates

a) Share the Road update

Susan reached out the CCRPC and Local Motion for support in developing a share the road campaign. Mary Catherine of Local Motion reported that there are standards for sign design and placement (in the manual of uniform traffic control) that may make development of multiple creative signs cost prohibitive. The committee will meet again next week.

b) Western Gateway update

Cathleen reported that a public meeting is coming up on 8/10 to review the proposed alternatives.

6. Agenda Items for Next Meeting

- Develop recommendations for the Selectboard from the pinch point study.
- Present the 2-way and 4-way stop alternatives at THBC to the public at the next 2-3 meetings with a goal of develop a recommended alternative to present to the Selectboard in the future.

7. Adjourn motion to adjourn by Gent, seconded by Wells. Approved unanimously at 7pm.