

7. IMPLEMENTATION

As has already been discussed, this plan has been designed to operate as an integrated whole in which the component parts (i.e. land use and development, network, modal, and facilities plans) are specifically designed to support one another. Thus, ultimately it will necessarily draw on a wide array of implementation tools and techniques as well as the actions of a wide range of responsible parties.

7.1 TOOLS AND TECHNIQUES

A number of methods generally falling under the rubric of “tools and techniques” have been addressed for their relevance in implementing each aspect of the final plan. These methods include:

- Inclusion in the community comprehensive plan and planning process
- Inclusion in community zoning and/or subdivision regulation
- Designation on the community’s Official Map
- Funding through the TIP/STIP process
- Private/voluntary actions

7.1.1 Comprehensive Plans

Community Comprehensive Plans represent not only a vision for the future of the communities, but they serve as the basis for all local actions to revise land use, adjust local operating structures and implement a capital program. The Comprehensive Plan is the legal basis for creating zoning and subdivision regulations that may be needed to achieve the objectives of this study. All four communities have clearly indicated a strong interest in a growth center based development pattern. Colchester has identified each of its designated growth centers at Severance Corners and Exit 17 as well as continued development at Exit 16. Milton has clearly indicated its interest in developing a new Town Center in the Bombardier Road area and has already invested substantial community resources in bringing this about. Georgia has already identified its "southern tier"-the area of Georgia covered by this study in the vicinity of Exit 18-as its "growth center" In both Milton and Georgia, however, additional focus on "main street" style development along Route 7 (in part, made realistic by the rethinking of Route 7 from an arterial to a collector) has developed as a result of this study. Winooski has undertaken a major downtown redevelopment that appears headed for implementation. In each community, these significant developments will have important implications for the wider community relative to housing, and economic development and environmental conservation. As each community continues its comprehensive planning process, these development strategies should be integrated with them.

7.1.2 Zoning

Zoning is the legal mechanism to implement desired land use and development practices in the corridor, and to implement the vision in the Comprehensive Plan. Because it controls private development practices, it has a direct impact on the traffic generation in the corridor. Although a detailed and specific implementation of growth center zoning provisions for each community is beyond the scope of this study, there are a number of principles that will help to implement the desired strategy.

Corridor Transport Plan

Uses: The development of mixed use growth centers is often thought of in terms of mixing uses within the same building, usually with retail (or retail service) on the first floor with offices and residential above. Sometimes, this is extended to include industrial uses as well. In the mixing of uses and the development of growth centers, at least three principles will apply:

- Despite the outward attractiveness of mixing uses in the same building, this is often easier said than done. While permitting the mixing of uses in the same building may be desirable, few or no impediments should be erected to more uniform uses within the same building so long as uses are allowed/encouraged to mix in close proximity otherwise.
- Some uses mix better than others: retail/service tends to mix quite well with office (even in the same building), residential may mix with retail but often better near than in the same building, and industrial does not mix well (more because of building style/density and delivery needs than the old noxious fumes, etc.) at all. Don't forget institutional uses, especially churches and neighborhood schools.
- What happens at the edges of town center areas and nearby may be as important as what happens in them. Extensive development of highway commercial on the fringes of and nearby community center areas can parasitize them and diminish their vitality.

Density and Dimensions: Although it is often the uses and their mixing that get the most attention in discussion of mixed use growth centers, it is probably two other provisions: 1. density and dimensional controls, and 2. parking, that have at least as much a role in defining and fostering a growth center as use. Densities must be high enough to support true village style development, and setbacks must not be so great as to push buildings back from the street/pedestrian access nor to require large, unpleasant to walk gaps between buildings. Some principles to observe when designing zoning for village/town center style developments include:

- Commercial densities should be relatively high. Although this is not usually a big problem, heights should permit multi story development in most growth centers, at least two to four stories is appropriate.
- Setbacks for commercial buildings should be minimal, especially in front of and between building. Consider zero front and side setback requirements for commercial buildings.
- Residential densities should be consistent with village/town centers at least 4 to 6 units per acre. Consider specific forms that foster this, e.g. multifamily. Townhouse style multifamily that puts each unit on the street rather than "garden apartments" (including upper only story units) are preferable.
- In keeping with higher residential densities, conversion of large, older homes to apartments is acceptable, but must be carefully monitored and controlled to prevent loss of the architectural integrity and contribution of the older home and/or a negative neighborhood environment. In such conversions, the additional parking required should be restricted to back yards.

Parking: Parking may be one of the most important and least understood parameters of zoning and, most importantly, of community center zoning. Originally developed to assure against undue taxing of public resources by private development, these regulations have evolved to require excessive total parking, and to foster isolated buildings in a forbidding sea of parking lot. Some concepts that would vastly improve community center parking include:

- Inclusion of off site spaces in the calculation of parking availability including on-street spaces and spaces in public or other lots. Making use of a "shared parking" strategy in

Corridor Transport Plan

which parking supply is allocated between uses with different needs at different times of the day (e.g. sharing parking between commercial uses with high daytime needs and modest nighttime needs and residential with high night usage and lower daytime usage). Even more sophisticated sharing may take place between such uses as restaurants, movie/theaters, offices, and hotels.

- Parking should not be located in front of buildings in community center areas, especially commercial buildings. Nothing should be located between pedestrian access and the building/use except modest, attractive landscaping (recognizing that such uses as outdoor seating for eating establishments are, of course, integral to the use itself.).
- Parking should be minimized between buildings, especially where this would lead to long, barren gaps between buildings.
- Require high standards of parking area design. Open, barren lots striped for maximum parking density are not adequate. Good parking design will require shading against summer sun, proper layout with respect to the building(s) served and adequate pedestrian walkways at a minimum.

Signage Control: Signs in community center areas need to be thoughtfully regulated. Adequate signage is essential for information purposes, but excessive, garish signage can convey a deteriorated image harmful to overall vitality.

Site Plan: Site plan regulations are used to assure adequate and proper access to development on a site. Screening, lighting and other factors may also be reviewed. Access and circulation should apply to pedestrian, bicycle and transit as well as private autos. Access criteria should foster better “access management” or clearly defined curb cuts along roadways.

Conditional Use Review: The criteria of conditional use acceptance may be applied to all the issues of access addressed in this study including access management/driveway consolidation, the design and layout of parking areas and the potential for establishing connections between adjoining lots as well as pedestrian, bicycle and pedestrian access as a condition for approval.

7.1.3 Subdivision Regulation

While not as important as zoning in defining the nature of new development, subdivision regulations have an important effect on some aspects of development most notably on access. Subdivision regulations should be carefully reviewed to assure high standards of pedestrian and bicycle access as well as vehicular access. Roadway standards should be reviewed to assure that subdivision roads are not excessively wide and straight (often wider and straighter than the town roads that serve them) engendering higher speeds and costs than appropriate. Where a gridded street pattern is deemed desirable (e.g. in or near a mixed use growth center) this should be explicit.

7.1.4 The Official Map ¹

An official map is an ordinance in map form adopted by the selectboard that conclusively shows the location and width of proposed streets, public facilities, public areas and drainage rights-of-way. The official map grants the town the right of first refusal in acquiring land for rights-of-way, at market rate. An official map is a powerful tool that is little used by Vermont municipalities. It allows the town to show in plan where existing and proposed streets are intended. Mapping a proposed street in no way constitutes a taking or acceptance of streets by the municipality, or obligates the municipality for maintenance or opening the street. The official map does indicate the intentions of the town in laying out streets that can guide subdivision and site plans for developments.

This plan recommends actions that require street connections, relocated streets and new streets. By locating these features on an official map the town authoritatively states its intentions, so that the right-of-way can be acquired in the future.

7.1.5 Transportation Improvement Program/TIP

The recommendations of this plan are overwhelmingly based on actions that will involve capital construction that will require state and/or federal financing. These actions apply to new interchanges and interchange improvements, intersection improvements, and reconstructions and geometric configurations of Route 7 and the adjacent roadways. Each of these projects must be refined and included in the regions' (CCMPO and NWRPC) Transportation Improvement Program as projects for consideration for state funding through capital construction funds in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). It is a federal requirement that any project within the planning area of the Chittenden County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) must be included on that organization's TIP.

7.1.6 Private/Voluntary Actions

A variety of private or voluntary actions are suggested in the recommendations. These may include individual agreements to share driveway access, and to connect parking areas in the rear of buildings.

¹ 24 V.S.A. § 04401 (b)(3) Official Map. Except as limited by this chapter, a municipality may adopt and amend an official map showing the location and widths of the existing and proposed rights-of-way of all streets or drainageways and the location of all existing and proposed parks, schools, and other public facilities. Except as set forth herein, no building or improvement may be constructed within the lines of any existing and proposed rights-of-way of all streets or drainageways, parks, schools, and other public facilities shown or laid out on such official map.

7.2 RESPONSIBILITIES

Implementation of the recommendations will require actions by all levels of government, as well as by cooperative agreements and private initiatives.

7.3 COSTS AND FINANCING

Consultants' Opinion of Probable Costs

A preliminary generalized cost analysis has been prepared as part of this plan. It should be emphasized that none of these specific improvements have been engineered, so the costs are based only on a comparison with similar projects. When fully engineered and implemented they may vary considerable from this initial estimate.

Methods:

The following methods and techniques were used in developing cost estimates for the projects and activities recommended in this study:

- Where specific cost estimates were available from previous studies these were adjusted to reflect today's dollars and used as-is.
- Costs have been adjusted to present dollars based on Consumer Price Index for all Urban consumers (CPI-U) for which good and consistent data are available from about 1913 to the present. (The present, for these purposes has been defined as the last month for which CPI-U data are available, i.e. Feb., 2001). For the purposes of transit operating costs, these data have been adjusted on the basis of a subcategory of CPI-U data, i.e. CPI for transportation services for northeast cities.
- Where specific cost estimates have not been available, Oman Analytics has developed a number of "unit costs" for entire classes of improvements (e.g. roundabout or signalized intersections). These unit costs have been developed from a variety of sources including, recent MPO scoping studies, AOT capital program projects, RS Means (tm) cost data, MPO LRTP data, and recent OA project estimates. No attempt has been made to specifically engineer these improvements at this time, due to 1. the very large number of improvements under consideration, 2. the choice not to select any final preferred alternative at this time, and 3. the need for scoping before the improvements are finalized and programmed. While these result in necessarily generalized estimates, a variety of variables have been considered in evaluating them. For example, for roundabouts, the size, number of circulating lanes, and urban vs rural typical have been considered, while for signalized intersections, the number of approaches, urban vs rural typical, and number of additional approach lanes have been considered.
- Right of way (row) costs have not been included in these estimates.
- Transit costs have been estimated primarily from the KFH analysis of operating costs.
- Capital costs have been supplemented by LRTP costs (adjusted to reflect current dollars).
- In a few instances, roundabouts have been considered as an option in an existing, usually large scale, project (e.g. as an optional intersection configuration at an interchange, or associated with the Creek/2A/Bay intersection constellation. Where these have been added to existing construction or reconstruction, only 50% of the total roundabout cost if developed independently was added to the project.

Corridor Transport Plan

- No attempt has been made to estimate the land use and development costs associated with the community center developments. Transportation costs associated with each of these centers have been estimated as part of the modal plan.

Finally it should be noted that although all costs have been inflated to year 2000 dollars, some of the estimates have been based on engineering estimate for projects studied a number of years ago and many are not likely to be built for a number of years yet. Further as already mentioned, this estimate does not include any right-of-way or property acquisition costs. Under these circumstances, it is entirely possible that the final, built costs of the full package of project will ultimately be twice the current estimates.

7.3.1 Network Plan

The transportation improvements associated with the broad network function have been estimated and summarized in the table below.

Intersection/Interchange	Urban/ Rural	Sig. Now	Addl. Lanes	Roundabout		Signal	Roundabout
				diameter	Lanes		
Exit 16 SB	U	S		200	2	5,000 (2)	1,447,018
Exit 16 NB	U	S		150	2	5,000 (2)	986,421
Exit 17 NB	R	U	1	150	2	297,620	969,700
Exit 17 SB	R	U	2	128	1	332,120	615,386
Chimney Corners	R	S		150	2	5,000	969,700
Exit 18 SB	R	U	2	150	2	332,120	969,700
Exit 18 NB	R	U	2	150	1	332,120	745,923
Skunk Hill relocation	R					106,883	106,883
Exit 15 NB	U	S	1	250	2		942,615 (3)
Exit 15 SB	U	S	(1)	400	2		1,596,203 (3)
Interchange						3,803,609	6,342,427
Exit 17 1/2 NB	R	x	(1)	150	2		367,550 (3)
Exit 17 1/2 SB	R	x	(1)	150	2		367,550 (3)
Interchange						4,961,862	5,696,962
Rt7/W. Milton Rd	R	U	4	150	1	376,453	615,386
W. Milton/Bartlet	R	U	2	150	1	307,453	615,386
Reconstruction W Milton						341,940	341,940
Winooski Downtown Circulation						tbd (4)	tbd (4)
Subtotal						11,207,181	20,422,833

Notes

- (1) New construction, no existing lane
- (2) Controller modifications only
- (3) Roundabout add to basic interchange/intersection project
- (4) Winooski Downtown circulation not estimated here

Corridor Transport Plan

7.3.2 Modal Plan

Modal plan improvements cover a wide range of possibilities. In community center areas, all transportation improvements have been assigned to this plan component because of the close mutually supportive relationship between the mixed-use centers and pedestrian and transit modes.

Transit costs have been largely developed from the KFH analysis already discussed supplemented with LRTP and other sources. Mostly, these costs relate to operating costs rather than capital, although, where clear capital needs have been identified (e.g. the two additional buses required to service the Winooski - Georgia transit extension) they have been added to the cost estimate.

In addition to the service extension(s) specifically identified in this corridor, it is anticipated (indeed, to be successful, it is required) that the frequency and coverage of transit service to the corridor from the core area and other satellite centers are also improved per the KFH recommendations. However, the costs of this service has not been included, since, although it is important, service in support of this corridor (vs. Route 15 and general circulation) is impossible to allocate apart from the broader service improvements.

One key requirement for implementing any significant expansion of transit service is the development of some alternative financing mechanism for transit, both here and throughout the transit service area. Reliance on the local property tax to support this style of transport has proven to be prohibitive for communities to bear. A number of alternatives have been proposed including financing via both the gas tax and the sales tax.

Additional costs have been estimated for both park and ride lots and sidewalks and multi-use paths not located specifically within community centers under this provision as well.

Corridor Transport Plan

Improvement	Capital	Operating (annual)
Commuter Bus; Winooski - Georgia	663,400	177,097
Transit Feeder Service; Milton village	contract	49,860
Exit 16/Water Tower Hill "Jitney" Service	contract	49,860
Transit Subtotal	663,400	177,097
Town Center and Pedestrian		
Georgia main street growth center	1,125,000	
Milton new town center	1,500,000	
Checkerberry (boulevard)	4,500,000	
Bike/Pedestrian Path; Milton Village to new town center	400,000	
Exit 17 growth center	500,000	
Severance Corners boulevard & sidewalk	1,400,000	
Bike Lanes; Severance & Kellogg	2,100,000	
Exit 16 sidewalk system		
Main Street and pedestrian subtotal	11,525,000	
Park & Ride		
Milton Village (100 spaces estimated)	168,069	
Exit 16 (150 sp)	252,103	
Blakely/Severance Corners (137 sp)	253,560	
Chimney Corners (30 spaces estimated)	50,421	
Georgia (30 spaces estimated)	50,421	
Park & Ride Subtotal	774,573	
Modal Total	12,962,973	177,097

Corridor Transport Plan

7.3.3 Supportive System Improvements

The additional improvements designed either to support the broader plan(s) or to address specific/existing capacity or safety deficiencies have been estimated here. These have been estimated using the same methods used for the larger network improvements, including presenting at least two alternative improvements and the use of adapted unit costs.

Intersection	Urban/ Rural	Signal Now	Addl Lanes	Roundabout		Signal	Roundabout
				diameter	lanes		
Main/Spring	U	S	2	100	1	382,490	458,701
Lafountain	U	U	2	100	1	430,790	458,701
Tigan	U	S	1	100	1	347,990	458,701
MtnView/WTHill	U	S		150	2	5,000	986,421
Hercules	U	S		150	2	5,000	986,421
US7/Rathe	U	U	1	150	1	396,290	762,644
SeveranceCor	U	S	4	150	2	499,790	986,421
East/MillPd	U	S		100	2	256,976	458,701
Creek/7	R	U	2	128	1	426,098	971,484
US7/Bay	R	U	4	128	1		
2A/Bay	R	U		128	1		
US7/2A	R	U	3	128	1		
Bombardier	U	U	3	150	2	533,255	986,421
Middle/RR	U	U	1	150	1	339,928	507,500
Rebecca Lander	U	U	3	150	1	311,327	762,644
MainStMilton	U	U	3	150	1	533,255	762,644
MainSt/RR	U	U		100	1	429,755	458,701
Main/North/East	U	U		128	1	517,730	615,386
LakeRd	R	U	3	128	1	380,745 *	615,386
BallardRd	U	U	3	150	1	341,953	762,644
104A	U	U	2	150	1	307,453	762,644
Subtotal						6,445,825	12,762,165
TOTAL						17,653,006	33,184,998

* Realign only, no signal

7.3.4 Cost Summary

Costs for all corridor improvements proposed are summarized in below by major plan component:

Component Plan	Low Cost	High Cost	Operating Cost (annual)
Network Plan	11,207,181	20,422,833	
Modal Plan	12,962,973	12,962,973	177,097
Support Plan	6,445,825	12,762,165	
TOTAL CORRIDOR	30,615,979	46,147,971	177,097

7.4 Funding Mechanisms

7.4.1 Transportation Improvement Program/Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (TIP/STIP)

The TIP/STIP is the budget for most transportation programs that require capital expenditures. The TIP covers the Burlington metropolitan area and would cover all projects in Chittenden County. The STIP covers projects in Georgia and is developed from recommendations for projects submitted by NWRPC. Recommendations are categorized and assessed based on statewide submissions, and a recommended list of projects is formulated for submission to the legislature for funding.

7.4.2 State-wide Transportation Grants

In addition to the TIP/STIP, several statewide programs can be applied to transportation projects:

- **Enhancement Grants:** Enhancement grants are available to fund improvements which are related to the transportation system, but not specifically the transportation infrastructure. Such grants can be applied to sidewalk improvements, curbs, or the restoration of historic transportation structures. These funds are extremely competitive, but towns that have received funds before are not discriminated against in future years.
- **Urban Forestry Grants:** These funds, which are available through the Division of Forest, Parks, and Recreation, pay for the planning and planting of trees in towns and villages. Such funds may be tapped for some of the visual and landscape improvements envisioned for community center areas, etc.
- **Downtown Program:** The Vermont downtown program provides funding for certain transportation-related projects in designated downtown areas. Also in these areas, certain access requirements and design standards for roadways may be waived.

7.4.3 Municipal Capital Budget

The city/town budgets are the second source of funds, which is applicable to projects for which the regional impact is minimal. Pedestrian and bike projects, roadway striping and minor capital projects can be funded in this way. The towns can use their bonding authority through the statewide bond bank.

7.4.4 Transportation Improvement District (TID)

A transportation improvement district (TID) or special assessment district is a specific area of town where a special tax is levied on property owners who will benefit from specific transportation improvements. The funds generated by this special assessment are put into a special account to be used to make improvements on that segment of roadway (paving, sewer, water, sidewalks, street trees or special street furniture). A certain percentage of the property owners must petition the town to set up the district and to foster improvements that are specifically for their benefit. A parameter of special assessment districts is that property owners must not pay more than they receive in special benefits. Assessments may vary according to the benefit received and may be counterbalanced by other contributions of property owners, such as dedication of additional right-of-way.

There are few specifically transportation-oriented improvement districts in Vermont. Exit 16 in Colchester is one. However, there are numerous examples of special assessment districts. The Church Street Marketplace and Downtown Rutland are noted examples, but many towns and villages in the state have water and sewer districts that carry a similar function.

7.4.5 Impact Fees

The imposition of “impact fees” on new development is increasingly a way that communities finance the cost of growth on capital facilities and services. Impact fees are specifically permitted in Vermont through Chapter 131 of title 24 VSA. The law requires the adoption of a capital budget, and a local impact fee ordinance, which stipulates the specific formula used in calculating the fee. Impact fees cannot be used to raise money for the maintenance of the existing transportation system or to overcome existing deficiencies in the system. They can only be used to overcome funding deficits caused by the deterioration of the system due to increased growth, for example when the cost of necessary improvements exceed the projected capital budget for that facility.

Traditionally, impact fees have been applied to facilities where the impact of a development can be clearly defined, such as the impact of a housing development on water or sewer mains, parks or on municipal services such as fire or police. The difficulty in applying impact fees to transportation functions is that a transportation facility is capital system characterized by non-exclusive use and by joint consumption by the public in general. Thus the “rational nexus”, or the clear, direct and substantial relationship between a particular development and the transportation needs which it generates, must be clearly defined, particularly for commercial and industrial developments.

The formula for applying the impact fee must take into account the dispersion of trips throughout the network and the potential for “linked” trips that are only partially influenced by the proposed development. Typically, a formula begins with calculating the number of trips created by the development using standard trip generation rates, such as those issued by the Institute of Traffic Engineers. These trips are assigned to routes throughout the network using a model similar to the Chittenden County Travel Demand Model used in this study. Sometimes an off-network reduction factor and a benefit equalization factor is used to account for extraneous situations which would distort the actual impacts on the minimal path from the development to or from specific sites. Impact fees are then assessed based on the cost of the specific improvements within the network needed to serve the development.

Fees are collected before issuing a building permit and deposited in a special account to be expended on the specific improvements. State law requires the town to expend the fee on the capital project for which it was intended within six years of the time it was levied. This presents a major drawback to the imposition of fees, since, possibly, insufficient development would occur to pay the entire costs of the improvement within this time frame. The town would be forced to pay the balance within a specified time period or forfeit the fee.

7.4.6 Private Development

Many of the actions recommended will be funded by private initiatives or transportation mitigation required through Act 250 review procedures.

7.5 Timing and Priorities

The suggested timing of the actions described in this plan is indicated in the implementation table that follows. In general, priorities have been assigned in accordance with the following hierarchy:

1. Existing safety and capacity deficiencies
2. Critical network improvements
3. Other supportive or general improvements

Finally, a chart detailing implementation strategies and techniques, responsibilities and priorities has been developed to assist in implementing this plan.

Corridor Transport Plan

Implementation Chart																							
Tools and Techniques						Responsibility						Financing						Timing (Priority)					
Comprehensive Plan						State Gov't						State TIP						Short-Term					
Zoning	Subdivision	Official Map	TIP/STIP	Private/Voluntary Actions		MPO/RPC	Local Gov't	Cooperative (Local/State)	Public/Private Partnerships	Private	Muni Capital Budget	Transit Operating Funds*	TID	Impact Fees	Private Development	(1-5) yrs.	Mid-Term	(5-10) yrs.	Long-Term	(10-20) yrs.			
Actions																							
Community Center Development Plan																							
Georgia "main street" town center	*	*	?	?	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*								
Milton new town center	*	*	?	?	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*								
Colchester Exit 17	*	*	?	?	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*								
Colchester Severance Corners	*	*	?	?	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*								
Colchester Exit 16	*	*	?	?	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*								
Winooski Downtown Redevelopment	*	*	?	?	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*								
Network Improvement Plan																							
Exit 16 N/S				*		*	*				*												
Exit 17 N/S, Chimney Corners				*		*	*	*			*		*	*									
Exit 18 N/S, Skunk Hill relocation				*	*	*	*	*			*												
Exit 15 Full interchange				*	*	*	*	*			*												
Exit 17 ½, W Milton Rd @ Rt 7 & Bartlett				*	*	*	*	*			*			*									
Winooski Downtown Circulation				*	*	*	*	*	*		*	*	*	*									
Modal Plan																							
Commuter Bus: Winooski - Georgia				*		*	*	*			*		*										
Transit Feeder Service; Milton village				?	?	*	*	*	*	*	?	?	*	?	?								
Exit 16/Water Tower Hill "Jitney" Service				?	?	*	*	*	*	*	?	?	*	?	?								
Georgia main street growth center	*	*	?	?	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*		?	?	*							
Milton new town center	*	*	?	?	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*		?	?	*							
Checkerberry (boulevard)	*	*	?	?	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*		?	?	*							
Bike/Ped Path; Milton Village to new Town Core	*		?	?	*	?	*	*	*		?	?	*	*		?	?						
			*		Part of implementation																		
	KEY		?		Possibly part of implementation																		
					Time period of implementation																		

Corridor Transport Plan

Implementation Chart - continued																											
Actions	Tools and Techniques						Responsibility						Financing				Timing (Priority)										
	Comprehensive Plan	Zoning	Subdivision	Official Map	TIP/STIP	Private/Voluntary Actions	State Gov't	MPO/RPC	Local Gov't	Cooperative (Local/State)	Public/Private Partnership	Private	State TIP	Muni Capital Budget	Transit Operating Funds*	TID	Impact Fees	Private Development	Short-Term	(1-5) yrs.	Mid-Term	(5-10) yrs.	Long-Term	(10-20) yrs.			
Modal Plan - continued																											
Bike/Ped Path; Milton Village to new Town Core	*		?	?	*	?	*	*	*		?	?	*	*		?	?										
Exit 17 growth center	*	*	?	?	*	*	*	*	*		*	*	*	*		?	?	*									
Severance Corners boulevard & sidewalk		*	*		*	*	*	*	*		*	*	*	*		?	?										
Bike Lanes; Severance & Kellogg					*		*	*	*				*	*		?	?										
Exit 17 growth center	*	*	?	?	*	*	*	*	*		*	*	*	*		?	?	*									
Severance Corners boulevard & sidewalk		*	*		*	*	*	*	*		*	*	*	*		?	?										
Bike Lanes; Severance & Kellogg					*		*	*	*				*	*		?	?										
Exit 16 (150 sp)					*	?	*	*	*		?		*	?		?	?	?									
Blakely/Severance Cor (137 sp)					*	?	*	*	*		?		*	?		?	?	?									
Chimney Corners (30 sp est)					*		*	*					*														
Georgia (30 sp est)					*		*	*					*														
Project Support																											
Main/Spring					*		*	*	*				*	*													
Lafountain					*		*	*	*				*	*													
Tigan					*		*	*	*				*	*													
MountainView/Water Tower Hill					*		*	*					*			*	*										
Hercules					*		*	*					*			*	*										
US7/Rathe					*		*	*					*			*	*										
Severance Corners					*		*	*	*				*	*		*	*										
East/Mill Pond					*		*	*	*				*	*													
					*		Part of implementation																				
					KEY	?	Possibly part of implementation																				

Corridor Transport Plan

Implementation Chart																								
Tools and Techniques										Responsibility					Financing					Timing (Priority)				
Comprehensive Plan										State Gov't					State TIP					Short-Term				
Zoning	Subdivision	Official Map	TIP/STIP	Private/Voluntary Actions	MPO/RPC	Local Gov't	Cooperative (Local/State)	Public/Private Partnerships	Private	Muni Capital Budget	Transit Operating Funds*	TID	Impact Fees	Private Development	(1-5) yrs.	Mid-Term	(5-10) yrs.	Long-Term	(10-20) yrs.					
Actions																								
Community Center Development Plan																								
Georgia "main street" town center	*	*	?	?	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*					
Milton new town center	*	*	?	?	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*					
Colchester Exit 17	*	*	?	?	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*					
Colchester Severance Corners	*	*	?	?	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*					
Colchester Exit 16	*	*	?	?	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*					
Winooski Downtown Redevelopment	*	*	?	?	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*					
Network Improvement Plan																								
Exit 16 N/S				*	*	*				*														
Exit 17 N/S, Chimney Corners				*	*	*	*			*		*	*											
Exit 18 N/S, Skunk Hill relocation			*	*	*	*	*			*														
Exit 15 Full interchange			*	*	*	*	*			*														
Exit 17 ½, W Milton Rd @ Rt 7 & Bartlett			*	*	*	*	*			*			*											
Winooski Downtown Circulation			*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*					
Modal Plan																								
Commuter Bus: Winooski - Georgia				*	*	*	*			*	*	*												
Transit Feeder Service; Milton village				?	?	*	*	*	*	*	*	?	?	*	?	?								
Exit 16/Water Tower Hill "Jitney" Service				?	?	*	*	*	*	*	*	?	?	*	?	?								
Georgia main street growth center	*	*	?	?	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	?	?	*							
Milton new town center	*	*	?	?	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	?	?	*							
Checkerberry (boulevard)	*	*	?	?	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	?	?	*							
Bike/Ped Path; Milton Village to new Town Core	*		?	?	*	?	*	*	*		?	?	*	*	?	?								
			*		Part of implementation																			
	KEY		?		Possibly part of implementation																			
					Time period of implementation																			

Corridor Transport Plan

