PROJECT PRIORITIZATION:

The demand for transportation improvements far exceeds the funds available. Good stewardship mandates that VTrans use limited dollars to preserve and improve Vermont's transportation assets in the most efficient manner. The Agency applies asset management principles to take a long-term view of the overall transportation network, and choose activities that minimize long-term costs.

The Agency developed a quantitative project prioritization method that assigns a numeric score to competing projects. Under that strategy, greater emphasis is placed on preserving bridges, pavement, culverts and other assets. Priority scores guide VTrans and other stakeholders as to which projects to postpone and which ones to accelerate.

Project prioritization is the result of legislation in 2005 and 2006. Sec. 48 of Act 175 of the 2006 Legislative Session (19 V.S.A. paragraph 10b(c)) directs the Agency of Transportation to explain how projects are prioritized and selected for inclusion in the annual budget. In 2006, VTrans worked with the state's various Regional Planning Commissions and the Chittenden County Metropolitan Planning Organization to assign a numerical score to transportation projects based on defined criteria. The scores drive the transportation program and are an essential part of the budget process.

The legislation reads:

> The agency of transportation, in developing each of the program prioritization systems schedules for all modes of transportation, shall include the following throughout the process:
>
> The agency shall annually solicit input from each of the regional planning commissions and the Chittenden County Metropolitan Planning Organization on regional priorities within each schedule, and those inputs shall be factored into the prioritizations for each program area and shall afford the opportunity of adding new projects to the schedules.
> *Each year the agency shall provide in the front of the transportation program book a detailed explanation describing the factors in the prioritization system that creates each project list.* (Emphasis added: This write-up satisfies that directive.)

The legislation builds on Section 53 of Act 80 of 2005 (19 V.S.A. paragraph 10g). That legislation requires the Agency to develop a numerical grading system to assign a priority rating to paving, roadway, and bridge projects. It requires the rating system to include asset management-based factors which are objective and quantifiable including:

- Safety
- Traffic volume
- Availability of alternate routes
- Future maintenance and reconstruction costs
- Priorities assigned by the regional planning commission or the MPO

The legislation also requires that the Agency consider the functional importance of the highway or bridge to the economy as well as its importance to the social and cultural life of the surrounding communities.

The Agency is prioritizing projects related to bridge, pavement, roadway, buildings, bike/pedestrian, park & ride lots, aviation, rail, and new public transit routes. Each Program Manager develops a method appropriate for the asset. Those methods take advantage of available data and technology.

The project prioritization and selection approach continues to evolve. In 2008, VTrans and the Directors of the Vermont Association of Planning and Development Agencies met several times to further improve the process. 2009 was the first year when the changes were in place. The results of the meetings are in a legislative report titled, *Project Prioritization and Addition of New Projects for the State Transportation Program*. In summary, the meetings resulted in the following:

- Increased local input in the selection of paving projects.
- Developed an approach for the regions and MPO to substitute a candidate project with a new project.
- Emphasized the importance of obtaining local input for project priorities. Although local input is not needed for Interstates and certain FHWA funded safety projects, it is an essential component of the VTrans project selection process for most other asset classes.
- Although the RPCs and MPO have flexibility in how they prioritize projects, they will, at minimum, use common criteria as specified by the Legislature.
- VTrans Program Managers will provide more information on candidate projects in order that each region has an accurate "big picture".

A close working relationship between VTrans and the RPCs/MPO assures the success of project prioritization and selection. The changing transportation environment will necessitate further changes over time.

The priorities balance Agency asset-management principles with regional priorities. Local transportation priorities are an important factor that helps determine where a project falls on the Agency's prioritization list. Each Regional Planning Commission (RPC) and the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) rank all projects in their region in order of importance. These rankings are given "weight" within the Agency's scoring process to reflect a region's needs.

Prioritization factors by project type

Paving:

The Paving Section is responsible for providing the traveling public with the best highway surface condition, with the funding available, using a variety of surface treatments. The Paving Section collects information about pavement surface condition with a specially equipped van that measures several factors including rutting, cracking, and pavement roughness. These data are analyzed for the entire State Highway network to determine the optimum treatment to maximize the pavement's life expectancy. These

factors are combined with regional priorities to develop the annual paving program. Factors for paving are:

- Pavement Condition Index (20 points)
    - Weighted based on condition; more points are assigned for higher levels of deterioration.
- Benefit/Cost (60 points)
    - The B/C is provided by the Pavement Management System, a.k.a. dTIMS. Factors include optimal treatment, traffic volume, and type of traffic (trucks).
- Regional Priority (20 points)
    - Does the regional planning commission support the project from a local land-use and economic-development perspective?

The results from these analyses are summarized for the three program funding categories/functional classifications: Interstate (90% Federal/10% State), State Highways (80/20), and Class 1 Town Highways (80/20).

Bridge:

The Asset Management and Performance Bureau inspects long bridges (greater than 20 feet) at least every two years as required by the Federal Highway Administration's National Bridge Inventory. Engineering factors from the inspection are combined with regional priorities, and other factors to produce a numeric score. Prioritization factors for bridges are:

- Bridge Condition (30 points)
    - Weighted based on condition of major inspected components (deck, superstructure, substructure, and culvert); more points assessed for higher levels of deterioration. The condition is determined at the most recent inspection.

- Remaining Life (10 points)
    - Correlates the accelerated decline in remaining life to condition.

- Functionality (5 points)
    - Compares roadway alignment and existing structure width, based on roadway classification, to accepted state standards. Too narrow or poorly aligned bridges are safety hazards and can impede traffic flow.

- Load Capacity and Use (15 points)
    - Is the structure posted or restricted? What is the inconvenience to the traveling public if the bridge is out of service? What is the average traffic use on the structure?

- Waterway Adequacy and Scour Susceptibility (10 points)

- Are there known scour issues or concerns? Is the structure restricting the natural channel? Are channel banks well protected or vegetated?

- Project Momentum (5 points)
  - Points are assigned if the project has a clear right of way, has all environmental permits, and the design is ready and waiting for funds to become available.

- Regional Input and Priority (15 points)
  - Does the regional planning commission support the project from a local land-use and economic-development perceptive?

- Asset – Benefit Cost Factor (10 points)
  - This compares the benefit of keeping a bridge in service to the cost of construction. The "benefit" considers the traveling public by examining the traffic volume and the length of a detour if the bridge were posted. For example, a bridge with a high traffic count that does not have a good detour around it would get a higher benefit score.

Assigned points are summed together to yield a maximum point value of 100.

Roadway:

Roadway projects include full depth highway reconstruction, realignment, increasing highway width, adding lanes, and more. Some of these projects take years to develop due to the time required to obtain permits and to purchase right of way. VTrans is currently working to reduce the backlog of large projects within this program. Factors in Roadway prioritization are:

- Highway System (40 points)
  - This factor looks at the Highway Sufficiency Rating and the network designation. Interstates are held to the highest standard, followed by non-Interstate primary and then off-primary roads. The Highway Sufficiency Rating considers traffic, safety, width, subsurface road structure, and more.

- Cost per vehicle mile (20 points)
  - This is the project cost divided by the estimated number of miles vehicles will travel on the project. This is a relatively easy method to get a benefit/cost ratio for comparing similar projects.

- Regional Priority (20 points)
  - The top RPC Roadway project is assigned 20 points. The score is reduced for lower RPC priorities. Projects listed as priority #10 and lower get two points.

- Project Momentum (20 points)

- This factor considers where the project is in the development process and anticipated problems such as right of way or environmental permitting. Some projects are so far along that they must be completed or the Agency would have to pay back federal funds.

- Designated Downtown project
  - Per 19 V.S.A. § 10g(l)(3), VTrans awards ten bonus points to the base score for projects within a designated downtown development district established pursuant to 24 V.S.A. § 2793.

Traffic Operations (Intersection Design):

- Intersection Capacity (40 points maximum)
  - This factor is based on Level of Service (LOS) for the intersection and the number of intersections that are in the coordinated system. Projects with a lower LOS and that are part of a larger coordinated system receive higher scores for this category.

- Accident Rate (20 points maximum)
  - This factor is based on the critical-accident ratio for the intersection. Projects with higher critical-accident ratios receive higher scores for this category.

- Cost per Intersection Volume (20 points maximum)
  - This factor uses the estimated construction cost and average-annual-daily traffic through the intersection. VTrans calculates the construction cost of the project for each anticipated user through the intersection. Projects with lower costs per intersection volume receive higher scores for this category.

- Regional Input and Priority (20 points maximum)
  - This factor is based on the ranking of projects from the RPCs/MPO. The RPCs/MPO rank the projects based on criteria they develop. Projects with higher regional rankings receive higher scores for this factor.

- Project Momentum (10 points maximum)
  - This factor considers:
    - Where the project is in the development process
    - Anticipated problems such as right of way or environmental permitting
    - Funding

Transportation Alternatives Project Selection Process:

Applications are received and are then reviewed by VTrans' Local Transportation Facilities (LTF) Section to ensure that the proposed projects meet eligibility requirements. Staff also offers comments related to the overall feasibility of the proposed project and the budget.

The applications and staff comments are then provided to the Transportation Alternatives Grant Committee for scoring. The scoring is based on the following criteria. The first five criteria are used for all proposed projects. The sixth criteria varies depending on whether or not the project is considered to be a bicycle/ pedestrian activity, a community improvement activity or an environmental mitigation activity.

1. **Please give a brief description of the project (200 words or less, be sure to indicate the primary facility type being applied for).** In this section you should describe the project as concisely as possible. The application reviewer should be able to determine exactly what it is you are proposing in the first three sentences. Example #1: Construct 500 ft of 5 ft wide concrete sidewalk on the east side of Main Street beginning at Center Street and extending to Shady Lane. Example #2: Scoping/feasibility study for 400 ft of 10 ft wide bituminous shared use path on the east side of Main Street from 111 Main Street to the intersection of Center Street. The nature of a proposed project's relationship to surface transportation should be discussed.

Score	Guidance
5	The description was concise and did not exceed the 200 word limit. The scope of the project was clear. The description included the type of project (scoping vs. construction), length and width of the project (if linear), as well as the primary surface material (if linear). The project has a strong relationship to surface transportation.
3	One of elements described above was missing
0	The project scope was not readily apparent and required further review of application material to determine the basic scope of what was proposed.

2. **What is the feasibility of this project? Describe the extent of project development completed to date. Applications for scoping/feasibility studies will not be scored on this criterion.** Address any issues, including environmental concerns, property ownership issues, or design challenges. Discuss whether or not the municipality will be willing to proceed to condemnation should property acquisitions be needed. Include any pertinent excerpts from completed feasibility documentation for the project. Discuss the long-term maintenance responsibilities and costs.

Score	Guidance
10	Some project design beyond scoping has already been completed (e.g. conceptual or preliminary plans)
6	A detailed scoping study has been completed for the proposed project which did not indicate any significant project development issues.
0	A scoping study was undertaken, but either lacked detail or identified significant project development challenges that may threaten the ability

	of the sponsor to complete the project.

3. **Will this project address a need identified in a local or regional planning document?**

Score	Guidance
5	Project is specifically called out in a municipal planning document such as Town Plan, Capital Program, or Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan
2	Project is consistent with the municipal or regional plan.
0	No planning documentation provided to support project.

4. **Does this project benefit a Designated Downtown, Designated Village, or Designated Growth Center recognized by the Vermont Department of Economic, Housing and Community Development?** A map showing the relationship between the project and the designated downtown, village or growth center should have been included as per the Project General Location section on page 1 of the Application Form. Important resource: Designated Downtown, Village and Growth Centers - http://accd.vermont.gov/strong_communities/opportunities/revitalization/downtown/list

Score	Guidance
10	All or part of proposed project is within the boundary of a designated downtown or village center
4	Proposed project leads up to, but is not within, a designated downtown or village center
0	Proposed project is not connected to a designated downtown or village center

5. **Is the project budget reasonable for the size of the project?** Project awards are capped at the initial amount awarded. For that reason, we recommend including a reasonable contingency in the estimate. Provide a detailed estimate of project costs according to the outline furnished in the application. Provide an explanation on how the estimate was developed such as an engineer's construction estimate, based on the VTrans Report on Share-Use Path and Sidewalk Unit Costs 2010, or other method. Discuss the project budget including the commitment of local matching funds.

Score	Guidance
10	Budget addresses all elements of project development and costs are consistent with VTrans Unit Cost Report or based on an engineer's estimate. Backup for construction costs is provided
5	Budget is incomplete or moderately high or low compared to typical project costs
0	Budget is missing major elements, contains ineligible costs and/or does not provide any backup data

6. Select the eligibility category (A, B, or C) that best fits your project and answer the corresponding questions for that category (choose only one category).

A. **Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities**

(10 Bonus points will be awarded for projects that are primarily bicycle and pedestrian facilities)

i. Will the project contribute to a system of pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities?

Score	Guidance
10	Proposed project fills in an important missing gap in an existing network of pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities.
8	Proposed project is the first of its kind in the community
5	Proposed project extends the limits of an existing network of pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities.
1	Proposed project primarily reconstructs existing facilities

ii. **Will the project provide access to likely generators of pedestrian and/or bicyclist activity?**

Score	Guidance
10	Project provides direct access to one or more of the following: school, densely developed neighborhood, large employer, downtown or village center. Include approximate number students, employees, etc. for major generators. Address how the project will affect the transportation needs of young children, older adults, and persons with disabilities.
5	Project provides access to an outlying area
0	Project is in an isolated area with little or no development

iii. **Will the project address a known, documented safety concern?**

Score	Guidance
10	Supporting documentation of pedestrian and/or bicycle safety problems provided: VTrans bike/ped crash data, police reports, school reports, a road safety audit report, etc.
4	General documentation of safety concerns provided
0	Anecdotal evidence or no documentation of safety concerns provided.

B. Community Improvement Activities

(i) **Explain how the project improves the economic wellbeing of the community and/or provide a benefit to State tourism?** Describe how the project will enhance the economic vitality of the community, surrounding region or the State in general.

Score	Guidance

0-10	Projects will be scored based on the potential for economic benefit to the community and/or benefit to State tourism.

(ii) Describe the anticipated impact to the public; degree of visibility, public exposure and/or public use.

Score	Guidance
0-10	Projects will be scored based on the potential for a significant impact / benefit to the public as well as the number of people that will benefit.

(iii)Answer one of the following (a, b, c, or d), based on the type of project:

a) Construction of turnouts, overlooks, and viewing areas as related to scenic or historic sites. *To what extent will the project provide a view of a highly unique and scenic area?*

Score	Guidance
0-10	Projects will be scored based on the effectiveness of the overlook; importance and permanence of the site to be viewed. Photo documentation of the view should be included in the application.

b) Preservation or rehabilitation of historic transportation facilities. *Describe the historic significance of the historic transportation facility and the importance of the facility to the State.*

Score	Guidance
0-10	Projects will be scored based on the strength of the relationship to a mode of transportation, historic significance of the site and the threat to the site if the project is not funded (urgency of the project). Please state whether the site is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

c) **Archeological planning and research related to impacts from a transportation project.** *Describe the associated transportation project and benefit of the proposed activities.*

Score	Guidance
0-10	Projects will be scored based on the need/urgency of the research (no existing data available in the project area). Projects must show that the research plan is well thought out and meets federal standards. The project must be related to an impact from a transportation project eligible under United States Code of Federal Regulations Title 23 – Highways (includes road, bridge and bikeway transportation projects.

d) Vegetation management in transportation rights of way to improve roadway safety, prevent against invasive species, and provide erosion control. *Describe the extent of the current problem; impact on the site and surrounding area.*

Score	Guidance
0-10	Projects will be scored based on the severity of the existing problem and the degree to which it has negatively impacted the surrounding area; Provide documentation of the existing problem.

C. Environmental Mitigation Activity

(i) Does the project involve implementation of an eligible environmental mitigation project under a river corridor plan that has been adopted by ANR as part of a basin plan, under a municipal plan adopted pursuant to 24 V.S.A. §4385, or under a mitigation plan adopted by the municipality and approved by the Federal Emergency Management Agency? (bonus point question)

Score	Guidance
10	Documentation was provided that the project qualifies for these bonus points
0	No documentation was submitted to support award of these bonus points.

(ii) Describe the environmental threat to the site or threat to wildlife that would occur if the project is not funded; severity of the current problem.

Score	Guidance
0-15	Projects will be scored based on the significance of the environmental threat and the severity of the current problem (urgency).

(iii)Describe how the project will mitigate the environmental impact from our transportation system described in question C. (ii) above.

Score	Guidance
0-15	Projects will be scored based on the projects link to transportation and how well the proposed mitigation measure is anticipated to address the environmental impact described in questions C.(ii) above.

The Transportation Alternatives Grant Committee members provide their scores which are then averaged. The committee meets to discuss the projects and then makes a recommendation to the VTrans Secretary for project awards.

Public Transit - New Services:

New Public Transit Route applications are solicited yearly through an open competitive process from all transit providers as funding is available. The primary purpose of the Transit New Start program is to fund transportation projects in nonattainment and maintenance areas which reduce transportation-related emissions. The Vermont Agency of Transportation (VTrans) accomplishes this through our Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) program administered by the Federal Highway Administration. Funding match is 80/20, federal and local and operations are limited to 3 years from date of service.

The Program Goals are to:

- Support cost-effective investments to preserve and maintain public transportation infrastructure.
- Invest in connectivity to other regions and to other alternative modes of transportation to improve accessibility and increase ridership in Vermont.
- Support the goals and objectives of the current Public Transportation Policy Plan.
- Maintain air quality attainment in Vermont.

Applications must document the purpose of the service, the intended market and how it will relate to the program goals. Feasibility studies provide this information as well as projected ridership and budget.

Proposals are rated based on the following measures: mobility improvements; environmental benefits; operating efficiencies; project coordination; regional connectivity; local financial commitment; and sustainability of funding continuation.

Aviation:

The Aviation Program prioritizes projects by scoring 14 airport and project factors. Safety is paramount. To maintain safety, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has stringent regulations that trigger airport improvements and projects. Projects are also initiated by the aviation community and by the Agency to meet our own standards.

Airport project descriptions, costs and scoring factors are maintained in the Airport Information Management System (AIMS) data base. AIMS is updated annually when the Capital Improvement Program is negotiated with the FAA for federal funding. Projects that are accepted by the FAA are presented to the Legislature in the Aviation Program's annual budget request for the state's 10 percent matching funds.

Burlington International Airport (BTV) projects are prioritized by BTV. The state provides an amount of transportation funds equivalent to 6% of the federal eligible project costs, which are 90% federally funded. These funds do not pass through VTrans, but go directly from the Federal Aviation Administration to BTV. The 6% state match is continued in this budget.

Scoring weights for state-owned airports are:

- Airport Activity (number of operations and based aircraft) (0 to 100 points)
- Population served & local government support (0 to 24 points)
- Economic Development (0 to 40 points)
- Project Type (runway type, paving, navigation, etc.) (0 to 120 points)
- FAA Priority & Standards ranking (0 to 120 points)
- Previous Federal/State Funding (0 to 200 points)
- Cost/Benefit for Projects less than $75,000 (100 points)
- Resource Impacts (0 to 40 points)
- Local Interest/Support (0 to 20 points)

The scores are totaled, ranked by priority, and made available to the public. The VTrans Aviation Section selects vendors to complete the projects that are funded.

Rail:

VTrans owns 305 miles of active rail line that is leased to private operators. The rail operator is responsible for maintaining the track and bed. VTrans, however, is responsible for the bridges over water and sometimes contributes towards track upgrades. To remain viable and provide increased support for Vermont's economy, most of the lines require substantial work to support higher weight limits, double-stack containers, and higher-speed passenger service. As with other assets, the needs are greater than the available funds. This necessitates hard choices among competing projects.

The Agency collaborates with the Rail Advisory Council to identify broad priorities. Prior to initiating new projects, it is necessary to assure that the current system is preserved. Preservation of the current system represents a significant challenge due to the age of the infrastructure and it is the Agency's number one rail priority.
The second priority is to improve the infrastructure to a modern standard that supports the efficient movement of people and goods. Once identified, new projects are subjected to the following evaluation system for prioritization:

The following criteria are used to evaluate each project:

- General safety: Safety of the rail system is critical to evaluating projects. Safety can involve bridge condition based on inspection, rail crossings, ROW, security, etc.
- Railroad freight operations: This measures the increase in ton-miles or car-miles and economic impact.
- Railroad passenger operation: Does the project increase the efficiency of the passenger rail service or expand passenger rail service and will the improvement have the potential to increase ridership.
- Line conditions: Consideration is given if the project increases the Federal Rail Administration track condition. Does the proposed project address clearance and/or weight limitations
- Priority Route: Consideration is given if the project is on one of the rail priority routes based on the State Wide Rail Plan.
- Vermont-based activity: Consideration is given for carloads and passengers in Vermont and/or rail jobs created in Vermont.
- Economic Development : Consideration is given to projects that fit into regional economic development plans
- Documented non-state funding opportunities: Does the project have a source of funding that doesn't require a state match.
- Resource Impacts: Does the project require environmental mitigation or mitigate environmental issues.
- Regional scope: Consideration is given if the project increases competition, partners with other states, or improves intermodal connections.
- Utilization of resources: Consideration is given if the project schedule is one year or less.

Safety:

VTrans runs a Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) to enhance safety on all Vermont roads. The prioritization process starts with determining high-crash locations from reported crashes, crash severity, road geometry, and anecdotal information.

The Agency scores each location and sorts the list. Agency staff closely reviews the top 50 crash locations, and determines possible improvements. A cost/benefit analysis is conducted to determine the maximum safety improvement for limited dollars. Most high-crash sites get a low-cost improvement such as signs/lines, but a few are targeted for more expensive geometric improvements based on the severity and types of crashes.

The crash analysis is for both state- and town-owned roads. HSIP projects are considered on all public highways.

Highways:	**As defined in 19 V.S.A. Chapter 3 Sec.302**
Class 1	Class 1 town highways are those town highways which form the extension of a state highway route and which carry a state highway route number. The agency shall determine which highways are to be class 1 highways.
Class 2	Class 2 town highways are those town highways selected as the most important highways in each town. As far as practicable they shall be selected with the purposes of securing trunk lines of improved highways from town to town and to places which by their nature have more than normal amount of traffic. The selectmen, with the approval of the agency, shall determine which highways are to be class 2 highways.
Class 3	Class 3 town highways are all traveled town highways other than class 1 or 2 highways. The selectmen, after conference with a representative of the agency shall determine which highways are class 3 town highways. The minimum standards for class 3 highways are a highway negotiable under normal conditions all seasons of the year by a standard manufactured pleasure car. This would include but not be limited to sufficient surface and base, adequate drainage, and sufficient width capable to provide winter maintenance, except that based on safety considerations for the traveling public and municipal employees, the selectboard shall, by rule adopted under 24 V.S.A. chapter 59, and after following the process for providing notice and hearing in section 709 of this title, have authority to determine whether a class 3 highway, or section of highway, should be plowed and made negotiable during the winter. However, a property owner aggrieved by a decision of the selectboard may appeal to the transportation board pursuant to subdivision 5(d)(8) of this title.
Class 4	Class 4 town highways are all other town highways. The selectmen shall determine which highways are class 4 town highways.

DEFINITIONS	
Candidate Project	Projects approved by the legislature that are not anticipated to have significant expenditures for preliminary engineering and/or right-of-way expenditures during the budget year, and funding for construction is not anticipated within a predictable time-frame.
Development & Evaluation Project	Projects approved by the legislature that are anticipated to have preliminary engineering and/or right-of-way expenditures during the budget year. The agency is committed to delivering these projects to construction on a timeline driven by priority and available funding. Construction funding in years 3 and 4 may be shown on the Statewide D&E project (in Front of the Book), with comment that the projects funded for construction will be selected from the D&E list.
Front of Book Project	Projects approved by legislature that are anticipated to have construction expenditures during the budget year and/or the following three years, with expected expenditures shown over four years.
Shelf Project	Projects projected to be ready for construction during the budget year, but have no state or federal funds identified for construction during the budget year.
SCOPING	First phase in the project development process. Defines a project to solve a transportation problem
ENHANCEMENT PROJECTS	Competitive grant program for local transportation-related projects in ten specific categories.
Obligated	A commitment by the Federal Government to reimburse the State for eligible expenditures on a project up to the amount obligated.
Unobligated	Unobligated Funds

FY2016 Transportation Program
Glossary and Miscellaneous Information

ACRONYMS	
ABRB	ALBANY-BENNINGTON-RUTLAND-BURLINGTON [RAILROAD]
CDL	COMMERCIAL DRIVER'S LICENSE
CE	CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION
CFC	CHLOROFLUOROCARBON
DBE	DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS ENTERPRISE
D&E	DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION
DMS	DYNAMIC MESSAGE SIGNS
DTA	DISTRICT TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATOR (DISTRICT ENGINEER)
EA	ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESMENT
EIS	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
FHS	FEDERAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM
FRA	FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION
GARVEE	GRANT ANTICIPATION REVENUE VEHICLES - BONDS
HOV	HIGH OCCUPANCY VEHICLE
IM	INTERSTATE MAINTENANCE PROGRAM
ISTEA	INTERMODAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EFFICIENCY ACT (1991)
JARC	JOB ACCESS REVERSE COMMUTE
JTOC	JOINT TRANSPORTATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
MTBE	METHYL TERTIARY BUTYL ETHER
MUTCD	MANUAL ON UNIFORM TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES - Fed. Sign regulations
NEPA	NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (1969)
NTSB	NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD
OBDS	OFFICIAL BUSINESS DIRECTIONAL SIGN
PE	PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING
PONTIS	BRIDGE MAINTENANCE SYSTEM -Latin for bridge
RABA	REVENUE ALIGNED BUDGET AUTHORITY
ROW	RIGHT OF WAY
SIB	STATE INFRASTRUCTURE BANK
SHS	STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM
SOV	SINGLE OCCUPANCY VEHICLE
STIP	STATEWIDE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
STP	SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM
TEA-21	TRANSPORTATION EQUITY ACT FOR THE 21ST CENTURY - 6 yr. Fed. Authorization
TH	TOWN HIGHWAY
TIP	TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
TOD	TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT
TR BUILDINGS	TRANSPORTATION BUILDINGS
VTR	VERMONT RAILWAY
ORGANIZATIONS	
CCRPC	CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
CCTA	CHITTENDEN COUNTY TRANSIT AUTHORITY - PUBLIC TRANSIT
MPO	METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION ORGANIZATION
RPC	REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
RPO	REGIONAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION
RTA	REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY
CCMPO	CHITTENDEN COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
FHWA	FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
FTA	FEDERAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY

PROJECT PREFIXES

AIR	-	AIRPORT PROGRAM
BHF	-	BRIDGE REHAB. - FEDERAL - PRIMARY, ON-SYSTEM
BHO	-	BRIDGE REHAB. - FEDERAL - OFF-SYSTEM
BRF	-	BRIDGE REPLACEMENT - FEDERAL - PRIMARY, ON-SYSTEM
BRS	-	BRIDGE REPLACEMENT - FEDERAL - SECONDARY
BRZ, BRO	-	BRIDGE REPLACEMENT - FEDERAL - OFF-SYSTEM
CMG	-	CONGESTION MITIGATION & AIR QUALITY 100% FEDERAL
ER	-	EMERGENCY RELIEF
F	-	FEDERAL-AID PRIMARY
F-EGC	-	FEDERAL-AID PRIMARY - ECONOMIC GROWTH CENTER
HES	-	HAZARD ELIMINATION
HPP	-	HIGH PRIORITY
IM	-	INTERSTATE MAINTENANCE
IMG	-	INTERSTATE MAINTENANCE, 100% FEDERAL
IR	-	INTERSTATE 4R
M	-	URBAN
M-EGC	-	URBAN - ECONOMIC GROWTH CENTER
NH	-	NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM
NHEGC	-	NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM - ECONOMIC GROWTH CENTER
NHG	-	NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM, SIGNALS & SIGNS
PLH	-	PUBLIC LANDS HIGHWAYS
RAIL	-	RAILROAD PROGRAM
RS	-	RURAL SECONDARY
RSEGC	-	RURAL SECONDARY - ECONOMIC GROWTH CENTER
SB	-	SCENIC BYWAYS
ST	-	STATE ONLY
STP	-	SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM
STPG	-	SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM, SIGNALS & SIGNS
TCSP	-	TRANSPORTATION & COMMUNITY SYSTEMS PRESERVATION GRANTS
TH	-	TOWN HIGHWAY BRIDGE, STATE & LOCAL FUNDS ONLY

Explanation of the Multiyear Transportation Program

		(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)		(11)		(12)
PROJECT INFORMATION	**PHASE AND FUNDING**	**ESTIMATED TOTAL COST**	**ACTUAL EXPENDED THRU FY 2014**	**ESTIMATED CURRENT YEAR FY 2015**	**ESTIMATED BUDGET YEAR FY 2016**	**PROJECTED FY 2017**	**PROJECTED FY 2018**	**PROJECTED FY 2019**	**ESTIMATED COST TO COMPLETE**
(1)	PE		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
(2)	ROW		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
(3)	CONSTR		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	OTHER		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Route:	TOTAL		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
(4)	Description:	**(13)**							
Year Added: **(5)**									
Project Manager: **(6)**	Comments:	**(14)**							

Key:

(1)	**Program**	Major Program Category
(2)	**Project Name**	The official name of the project, usually the town(s) in which the project is located.
(3)	**Project Number**	A unique number, generally reflecting the Federal appropriation and route system number.
(4)	**Route**	Route number or street name for highway projects; or name of airport or railroad.
(5)	**Year Added**	The Fiscal Year in which a project first appeared in the Transportation Program.
(6)	**Project Manager**	Name and phone number of the person to contact for project-related information.
(7)	**Estimated Total Cost**	The estimated total cost of the project.
(8)	**Actual Expended thru FY2013**	The actual amount expended on the project through 6/30/2013.
(9)	**Estimated Current Year FY2014**	The amount anticipated to be expended in the current state fiscal year (ending 6/30/2014).
(10)	**Estimated Budget Year FY2015**	The amount anticipated to be expended in the state fiscal year 2015 (ending 6/30/2015).
(11)	**Projected Cash Requirements**	The estimated costs for each year of the Multiyear Transportation Plan.
(12)	**Estimated Cost to Complete**	The estimated cost to complete the project.
(13)	**Description**	A description of the type of project and its location.
(14)	**Comments**	General comments regarding project status, etc.

Projects Added in FY2015

Project Name	Project Number	Description	Reporting Format
Paving			
BELVIDERE-BERKSHIRE	STP SURF(53)	Resurface VT118	Front Of Book
BENNINGTON-WILMINGTON	NH SURF(51)	Resurface VT9	Front Of Book
BETHEL-BROOKFIELD	IM SURF(54)	Resurface I-89, NB&SB	Front Of Book
CHELSEA-VERSHIRE	STP 2955(1)	Resurface VT113	Candidate
ESSEX	STP 2912(2)	Slope stabilization	Front Of Book
ESSEX JCT.	STP 2956(1)	Resurface Class I Routes	Front Of Book
JOHNSON-HYDE PARK	STP SURF(52)	Resurface VT100C	Front Of Book
MANCHESTER-RUTLAND TOWN	NH SURF(50)	Resurface US7	Front Of Book
MIDDLEBURY-STARKSBORO	STP 2953(1)	Resurface VT227	Front Of Book
NORWICH-FAIRLEE	IM SURF(48)	Resurface I-91, NB-only	Front Of Book
ROCKINGHAM-CLARENDON	NH SURF(49)	Resurface VT103	Front Of Book
ST. ALBANS CITY	STP 2957(1)	Resurface Class I Routes	Front Of Book
STATEWIDE	STP CRAK(33)	Crack sealing	Front Of Book
STATEWIDE	STP FWDT(12)	Falling Weight Deflectometer	Front Of Book
STATEWIDE	STP PAVE(15)	Roadway surface inventories	Front Of Book
SWANTON	STP 2958(1)	Resurface Class I Routes	Front Of Book
WATERFORD	IM SURF(47)	Resurface I-93, NB & SB	Front Of Book
WORCESTER-ELMORE	STP 2954(1)	Resurface VT12	Front Of Book
Roadway			
BRANDON-GOSHEN	ER STP 0162(22)	Repair VT73 due to T. S. Irene	Front Of Book
CAMBRIDGE	STP 0235(21)	Repair drainage & slope	Front Of Book
CHESTER	ER 016-1(34)	Stabilize embankment & channel	Front Of Book
COLCHESTER		Improve Prim Rd./W. Lakeshore	D & E
COLCHESTER	NH 028-1(31)	Improve US2/US7; I-89 Exit #17	D & E
COLCHESTER	STP 5600(19)	Improve VT2A corridor	D & E
ESSEX		Safety enhancements/armoring	Candidate
ESSEX	STP 5400(11)	Improve TH3/TH5 & VT15/TH3	D & E
ESSEX JCT.	STP 5300(14)	Widening, bike lanes, etc.	Front Of Book

Projects Added in FY2015

Project Name	Project Number	Description	Reporting Format
MILTON	IM 089-3(75)	Repair sinkhole, MM 104.25	Under Statewide
MILTON	IM CULV(50)	Replace culvert	Under Statewide
STATEWIDE	ST CULV(401)	Replace/extend culverts	Under Statewide
STOWE	STP 0235(20)	Construct 2 trails	Front Of Book
WILLISTON		Multi-modal facility	Candidate
WILLISTON	NH 5500(18)	Improve I-89/VT2A	D & E
WOODFORD-SEARSBURG		Truck chain-up areas	Candidate
Safety & Traffic Operations			
BENNINGTON	HES 1000(19)	Improve VT7A/VT67A safety	D & E
BRATTLEBORO	NHG SIGN(53)	Sign replacement	Front Of Book
COLCHESTER		Improve Mill Pond/Severence	D & E
DERBY		Improve US5/I-91 Exit #28 Ramps	Candidate
DERBY		Improve US5/VT105	Candidate
ESSEX	STP 5400(10)	Improve VT117/TH1 jct.	D & E
HYDE PARK	HES 030-2(34)	Modify roundabout	Front Of Book
PLAINFIELD		Improve US2/Main St. intersect	D & E
RUTLAND TOWN	NHG 019-3(60)	Replace strain pole foundation	Front Of Book
SPRINGFIELD	STP 016-2(23)	Improve VT11/US5/I-91 Exit #7	Front Of Book
ST. ALBANS		Improve VT104/I-89 Exit #19	Candidate
STATEWIDE	HES HRRR( )	High Risk Rural Roads	Front Of Book
STATEWIDE	HES MARK(404)	Class II centerline markings	Front Of Book
STATEWIDE	HES SHSP (13)	Educational initiatives	Under Statewide
STATEWIDE	HES SHSP(14)	SHSP promotion/education	Under Statewide
STATEWIDE	HES TIMS (1)	Traffic Incident Management/Tr	Under Statewide
STATEWIDE	IMG MARK(115)	Install pavement markings	Front Of Book
STATEWIDE	STP MARK( )	Pavement markings	Front Of Book
STATEWIDE	STP SGNL( )	Traffic signals	Front Of Book
STATEWIDE - NORTH REGION	STP HRRR(22)	Signs, markings, guardrail	Front Of Book
STATEWIDE - NORTH REGION	STPG MARK(302)	Pavement markings	Front Of Book
STATEWIDE - SOUTH REGION	STP HRRR(23)	Signs, markings, guardrail	Front Of Book
STATEWIDE - SOUTH REGION	STPG MARK(303)	Pavement markings	Front Of Book

Projects Added in FY2015

Project Name	Project Number	Description	Reporting Format
WILLISTON	STP 5500(16)	Install vehicle detection	Front Of Book
WILLISTON	STP 5500(17)	Improve VT2A/Industrial Ave.	D & E
Park & Ride Lots			
COLCHESTER	CMG PARK(47)	Park & Ride off US7	Front Of Book
Bike & Pedestrian Facilities			
BURLINGTON	STP SDWK(19)	Shared-use path	Front Of Book
COLCHESTER		Improve Mill Pond/Severence	Candidate
COLCHESTER	STP SDWK(20)	Sidewalk on Mountain View Dr.	Front Of Book
DOVER	STP BP14(1)	Shared-use path	Front Of Book
DOVER	STP BP14(16)	Scoping for Valley Trail	Front Of Book
ENOSBURG FALLS	STP BP14(19)	Sidewalk study	Candidate
ENOSBURG FALLS	STP BP14(9)	Construct sidewalk	Front Of Book
ESSEX		Shared-use path	Candidate
ESSEX JCT.	STP BP14(23)	Main St. sidewalk scoping	Candidate
ESSEX TOWN	STP BP13( )	Shared-use path	Front Of Book
ESSEX TOWN	STP BP14(7)	Towers Rd. sidewalk	Candidate
HARTFORD	STP BP13(2)	Sykes Mountain Ave. sidewalk	Front Of Book
HARTFORD	STP BP14(4)	Sidewalk along US5	Front Of Book
HYDE PARK	STP BP14(12)	Bike/ped connectivity scoping	Front Of Book
JERICHO	STP BP14(17)	Bike/ped scoping	Front Of Book
JERICHO	STP BP14(2)	Improve school crossings	Front Of Book
JERICHO	STP SDWK( )	Browns Trace Rd. sidewalk	Front Of Book
MANCHESTER	STP BP13(18)	Sidewalk scoping	Front Of Book
MIDDLEBURY	STP BP14(8)	Pulp Mill Bridge sidewalk	Front Of Book
MILTON	STP BP14(18)	Sidewalk scoping	Front Of Book
PLAINFIELD	STP BP14(3)	Main St. pedestrian bridge	Front Of Book
PROCTOR	STP BP14(22)	Bike/ped path scoping	Front Of Book
RUTLAND CITY	STP BP14(11)	Dorr Dr. shared-use path	Front Of Book

Projects Added in FY2015

Project Name	Project Number	Description	Reporting Format
SHELBURNE	STP BP14(5)	Construct sidewalk along US7	Front Of Book
SOUTH BURLINGTON	STP BP14(6)	Construct sidewalk along VT116	Front Of Book
ST. JOHNSBURY	STP BP14(14)	Bike/ped safety scoping	Front Of Book
STATEWIDE		New awards - state funds only	Front Of Book
REGION	SWRT(2)	Resurface Rail/Trail	Front Of Book
SUNDERLAND	STP BP14(21)	Bike/ped safety scoping	Front Of Book
SWANTON-ST. JOHNSBURY	STP LVRT(3)	Rail trail - Phase IA	
WAITSFIELD	STP BP13(4)	Construct sidewalk along VT100	Front Of Book
WEST RUTLAND	STP BP14(20)	Multi-use path scoping	Front Of Book
WILISTON		Shared-use path along US2	Candidate
WILLISTON		Shared-use path along VT2A	Candidate
WILLISTON	STP SDWK(21)	Construct path along VT2A	Front Of Book
Transportation Alternatives			
BURKE	TAP TA14(11)	Scope bike.ped improvements	Front Of Book
FAIR HAVEN	TAP TA14(14)	Sidewalk scoping study	Under Statewide
HARTFORD	TAP TA14(13)	Bike/ped facility scoping	Front Of Book
KILLINGTON	TAP TA14(15)	Scope bike/ped improvements	Front Of Book
MONTPELIER	TAP TA14(7)	Construct sidewalk	Front Of Book
NORTH BENNINGTON	TAP TA14(9)	Repair train depot roof	Front Of Book
PUTNEY	TAP TA14(1)	Construct sidewalk	Under Statewide
READSBORO	TAP TA14(8)	Construct sidewalk	Front Of Book
RUTLAND CITY	TAP TA14(5)	Install flashing beacons	Under Statewide
SPRINGFIELD	TAP TA14(12)	Sidewalk improvement scoping	Other
SPRINGFIELD	TAP TA14(6)	Construct sidewalk along South	Front Of Book
ST. ALBANS CITY	TAP TA14(2)	Sidewalk, crosswalk, lighting	Front Of Book
WILLISTON	TAP TA14(3)	Construct sidewalk	Front Of Book
WILMINGTON	TAP TA14(10)	Scoping for bikelane/sidewalk	Front Of Book
Aviation			
BERLIN		Solar hazard beacon replacement	Front Of Book

Projects Added in FY2015

Project Name	Project Number	Description	Reporting Format
CLARENDON		Multi-Purpose Vehicle	Front Of Book
CLARENDON	AV-FY15-018	Taxiways D & E	Front Of Book
CLARENDON		Hazard beacon tower replacement	Front Of Book
CLARENDON		Terminal area layout	Front Of Book
CLARENDON	GR0174	TSA Grant	
CLARENDON		TW E full parallel	Front Of Book
COVENTRY		4-bay hangar	Front Of Book
COVENTRY		Property acquisition - 4 parcels	Front Of Book
COVENTRY		Reconstruction TW "A"	Front Of Book
COVENTRY		design/construction	Front Of Book
COVENTRY		Terminal area de-ice	Front Of Book
COVENTRY	AV-FY14-012	SRE Building	Under Statewide
COVENTRY	AV-FY15-013	Runway Apron Expansion	Front Of Book
COVENTRY	AV-FY15-015	Runway & Apron Peripherals	Front Of Book
HIGHGATE	AV-FY15-020	Airport terminal building	Front Of Book
MIDDLEBURY		Construction 4-bay hangar	Front Of Book
MIDDLEBURY	AV-FY13-025	Avigation easements	Front Of Book
MORRISTOWN	AV-FY14-022	Runway reconstruction	Front Of Book
SPRINGFIELD		Master plan update	Front Of Book
SPRINGFIELD		Perimeter fencing complete	Front Of Book
SPRINGFIELD		RSA/Obstruction study removal	Front Of Book
SPRINGFIELD		West end corporate hangar site	Front Of Book
SPRINGFIELD		4-bay hangar	Front Of Book
STATEWIDE		Airport Perimeter Fencing	Front Of Book
STATEWIDE		MSGP underdrain eval & cleaning	Front Of Book
Rail			
BRADFORD		Improve BR513 on Bradford Sub.	Candidate
BRADFORD	STP 0202( )	Improve WACR-Bradford Sub/TH1	D & E
BURLINGTON		Construct new wye	Candidate
BURLINGTON	STP 2035( )	Improve VTR/College St. x-ing	Front Of Book
CHESTER		Improve BR125 on GMRC	D & E

Projects Added in FY2015

Project Name	Project Number	Description	Reporting Format
FAIRLEE	RRE4178A	Culvert/slope repair	
FERRISBURGH	STP 2035( )	Improve VTR/Plank Rd. x-ing	Front Of Book
FERRISBURGH	STP 2035( )	Improve VTR/Monkton Rd. x-ing	D & E
FERRISBURGH	STRB1502	Rehab BR252.3 on VTR	Front Of Book
LYNDON	STP 0113( )	Improve WACR-Bradford Sub./US5	D & E
MANCHESTER		Rehab. BR69 on VTR	Front Of Book
MANCHESTER		Rehab. BR74 on VTR	Front Of Book
MT. HOLLY	STRB1501	Rehab. BR140 on GMRC	Front Of Book
NORTH BENNINGTON	RR15CUL1	Improve drainage near Main St.	Under Statewide
PITTSFORD		Construct new siding	D & E
RUTLAND-BURLINGTON	VTRY(2)	Procure CWR & OTM	Front Of Book
RUTLAND-BURLINGTON	VTRY(3)	Replace ties, install CWR	Front Of Book
RUTLAND-BURLINGTON	VTRY(4)	CWR materials procurement	Front Of Book
RUTLAND-BURLINGTON	VTRY(5)	Install 2.62 miles of CWR	Front Of Book
STATEWIDE	STP 2030(11)	Section 130 data compilation	Under Statewide
VERGENNES		Train station	Front Of Book
WALLINGFORD		Rehab. BR91 on VTR	Front Of Book
WALLINGFORD	STP 2033( )	Improve VTR/TH7 x-ing	D & E
Transportation Buildings			
BERLIN		Central Garage Hazmat Remed.	Front Of Book
BLOOMFIELD		Construct 3-Bay Garage	Front Of Book
COLCHESTER		2-Bay mechanics' addition	Front Of Book
DUMMERSTON		Garage roof replacement	Front Of Book
EAST DORSET		Construct Bridge shop	Front Of Book
EAST DORSET		Salt depot rail siding	Front Of Book
EAST DORSET		Temporary bridge cold storage	Front Of Book
LYNDONVILLE		Construct mechanics' garage	Front Of Book
NEW HAVEN		Construct 5-Bay Garage	Front Of Book
RUTLAND CITY		Increase mechanics bays cleara	Front Of Book
SHARON		Construct salt depot	Front Of Book
SPRINGFIELD		Construct 6-Bay Garage	Front Of Book

Projects Added in FY2015

Project Name	Project Number	Description	Reporting Format
ST. ALBANS CITY		Construct 10-bay garage	Front Of Book
STATEWIDE		Pavement grindings storage	Front Of Book
STATEWIDE		Standby generators	Front Of Book
TRAINING CENTER		Standby generator	Front Of Book
Town Highway Bridges			
CHARLOTTE	BO 1445(36)	Rehab. BR28 on TH36	D & E
NORTHUMBERLAND-GUILDHALL	BO A003(750)	Rehab existing bridge	Under Statewide