



CITY OF BURLINGTON, VERMONT
CITY COUNCIL TRANSPORTATION, ENERGY &
UTILITIES COMMITTEE

c/o Department of Public Works
645 Pine Street, Suite A
Post Office Box 849
Burlington, VT 05402-0849

802.863.9094 VOX
802.863.0466 FAX
802.863.0450 TTY
www.dpw.ci.burlington.vt.us

Councilor Kurt Wright, Chair *WARD 4*
Councilor Vince Brennan *WARD 3*
Councilor David Hartnett *WARD 4*

Inquiries:
Nicole Losch
802.865.5833 DIRECT
nlosch@ci.burlington.vt.us

Transportation, Energy and Utilities Committee of the City Council

Wednesday, August 10, 2011 at 5:00 PM

645 Pine Street, front conference room

–MINUTES–

DRAFT

Members present: Chair, Kurt Wright
David Hartnett
Vince Brennan

Others present: Charlene Wallace (Local Motion & Burlington Walk Bike Council), Nicole Losch (staff)

Chair Wright called the meeting to order at 5:14 pm. Wright and Brennan in attendance.

1. Agenda
Wright added BED Smart Grid Update as item 8.5. Brennan moved to accept. Wright second.
2. Public Forum
None
3. Minutes of 6/14/2011
Brennan moved to accept. Wright second.
4. FY12 Agency of Transportation Enhancement Program Candidate
Losch provided candidate details per memo supplied. Candidate 1: Bike Path Enhancement at Blanchard Beach. Candidate 2: Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements along North Winooski Avenue.
Questions arose regarding potential FEMA funding for bike path improvements. Acknowledge both projects are strong candidates and desired improvements.
Brennan noted North Winooski Avenue project would benefit more modes and is more of a safety risk as-is.
Wright tabled item until Councilor Hartnett arrived for vote.

5. Parking Changes on Main and South Union Streets
Councilor Hartnett arrived at 5:36
Losch provided project update per memo supplied.
Brennan noted Public Works Commission was concerned about loss of metered parking and potential hazards for safe drop off along Main Street. Also noted preliminary discussions between Champlain College and Edmunds Schools for shared parking opportunity off of Maple Street entrance to Edmunds.
Hartnett acknowledged difficult traffic flow near Edmunds during school pick up times.
Unanimous support for project.
6. FY12 Agency of Transportation Enhancement Program Candidate, continued
Brennan reiterated support for North Winooski Avenue project. Noted Community Health Center expansion will bring more pedestrians, bicyclists, and general traffic. Improvements along the corridor would be needed.
Hartnett acknowledged safety concerns for antiquated signal hardware at intersection of Archibald and North Winooski.
Wright asked how long projects have been considered for upgrades. Acknowledge is supportive of bike path improvements, but understands safety concerns associated with North Winooski Avenue project.
Losch noted North Winooski project has been considered since completion of 2002 North South Bicycle and Pedestrian Route Study, and was unsuccessful 2007 TE grant candidate. Bike path enhancement became an issue of concern following the spring 2011 flooding. No history of flooding in previous years, but sediment and erosion from flooding was substantial.
All Councilors acknowledged hope for FEMA funding for path improvements.
Supportive of North Winooski Avenue project for 2012 TE program.
7. City Wide Speed Limit Public Hearing and Process
Losch provided update per memo supplied.
Questions arose regarding number of streets affected, number of signs needing replacement, and proposals for main corridors leading into the city.
Councilors acknowledged general concept would filter speeds, where upon entering the city speeds are higher and get increasingly slower as travelers get closer to the city center. Unanimous support for residential streets at 25 mph and main corridors remaining 30 mph until further review.
8. Colchester Avenue Update
Losch provided update per memo supplied. Invited TEUC to late August meeting of Colchester Avenue Corridor Study Task Force and expressed need for Task Force to attend future meeting to present Corridor Study recommendations. Noted final report for Complete Street Demonstration is complete and available online; crash data will continue to be evaluated; need more time to collect "after" data.
Wright questioned process for approving Corridor Studies' recommended speed limits.

Losch stated TEUC could approve Corridor Studies in entirety, but could make recommendations to Public Works Commission regarding implementation of ordinance changes.

Brennan stated he travels corridor frequently and UVM employees like the change.

Wright acknowledged initial skepticism for successful conversion from 4 to 3 lanes, but feels corridor has been operating successfully.

8.5 BED Smart Grid Update

BED representative did not arrive for update.

9. September Meeting & Agenda Items

Councilors opted to continue meeting as-needed rather than have regularly scheduled meetings. Would like regular written updates on projects from DPW, but don't want updates to become burdensome for staff. Will revisit at future meetings

Requested update on Sidewalk Strategic Plan, including plan for truncated dome replacement and schedule for Cross Parkway sidewalk. Also requested update on Battery Park crosswalk improvement request and updates from Airport on parking operations RFP.

Hartnett provided update on meeting at Staniford Rd and bike path crossing. Immediately before TEUC meeting met on site with Norm Baldwin of DPW and several residents. Suggests DPW test in-street "yield" signs at this intersection and use information to guide Bike Path Task Force recommendations for bike path crossings at streets. Noted yield behavior is shared responsibility, but while on site witnessed all cyclists from path run the path stop signs. Feels burden is on motor vehicles. Wright supportive of potential yield signs but wouldn't support stop signs along roadway. Wants to hear Task Force recommendations.

10. Adjourn

Wright adjourned meeting at 6:24.



Office of Planning
 645 Pine Street, Suite A
 Burlington, VT 05402
 802.863.9094 P
 802.863.0466 F
 802.863.0450 TTY

www.dpw.ci.burlington.vt.us

Steven Goodkind, P.E.
 Director of Public Works
 City Engineer

Memo

Date: September 9, 2011
To: Transportation, Energy and Utility Committee
From: Nicole Losch, Bicycle, Pedestrian & Environmental Planner
Subject: Sidewalk Strategic Plan – history and 5 year work plan

History

In 2008-2009, DPW developed a Sidewalk Strategic Plan (SSP). Prior to development of the Sidewalk Plan, funding was allocated evenly by Ward and improvements were compiled and scheduled in response to complaints.

To improve our sidewalk program, our goals were:

1. Identify an acceptable condition for our sidewalks
2. Lower the life cycle of our system by increasing the number of miles improved each year
3. Use the most efficient methods for installation
4. Coordinate projects with other right-of-way improvements to increase efficiency
5. Utilize alternative funding sources to construct new sidewalk
6. Move toward a more pro-active planning process
7. Increase the commitment to curb and greenbelt restoration
8. Meet American's with Disabilities Act (DAA) requirements, walkability goals, and current standards

To develop the SSP, we recruited volunteers and inventoried our entire 150-mile sidewalk network; this information became our Sidewalk Deficiency Index. Our sidewalk inventory gave all deficiencies equal priority* and included:

Possible hazards & deficiencies:

(only counts one per slab/5' section)

- Vertical displacement across >50% sidewalk or >2" in height
- Horizontal displacement greater than 2% slope
- Drainage problem
- Surface deterioration or material inconsistency
- Surface spalling or cracking
- Obstruction (hydrant, utility pole or cabinet, light pole, signal pole, parking meter, bike rack, tree, sign, structure)

ADA ramp requirements:

- Detectable warning
- Ramp slope < 8.33%
- Ramp > 4'x4'
- Ramp flares' slope < 10%
- Landing slope < 2%
- Landing > 4'x4'
- Ramp lip < ¼"

We also developed a system to identify priority pedestrian routes. Our Pedestrian Potential Index (PPI) assigns points to variables that affect pedestrian travel, such as the volume of traffic and the destinations along a route. The PPI values were discussed at several NPAs and through online surveys. The PPI includes:

Variable	Code	Description	Assigned Value
Type of Road	ART	Arterial	5
	COL	Collector	3
	LCL	Local	1
Major Pedestrian Generators	ASL	W/in 0.25 mi of retirement community, assisted living, or senior center	5
	CC	W/in 0.25 mi of library, community center, places of worship, etc	3
	WK	W/in 1 mile of employment center for > 200 employees	3
	SOC	W/in 0.25 mi of community medical & social services	1
School Zones	ES	W/in 0.25 mi of elementary school	5
	MHS	W/in 0.5 mi of middle or high school	3
	UNV	W/in 1 mi of college or university	3
Transit Routes	TRN	Roads that are transit routes	5
Commercial Areas	DD	W/in Designated Downtown	5
	NAC	W/in 0.25 mi of Neighborhood Activity Center	4
Paths, Trails, & Parks	PK	W/in 0.25 mi	3
No Sidewalks on Either Side	SIDE	City policy for at least one sidewalk on every street	5

The SSP prioritizes sidewalk improvements based on an equal weight of the Deficiency Index and Pedestrian Potential Index. The combined indexes give us a Sidewalk Condition Index, which allows us to identify and prioritize the sidewalks in the worst condition, in the most heavily traveled areas.

In addition to the infrastructure assessment, the SSP development process provided information that led to our allocation of the concrete program budget to address indirect and direct sidewalk deficiencies. As a result, 10% of the budget is devoted to curb and greenbelt replacement/restoration (to help alleviate drainage, erosion, or splashing problems), 10% of the budget is devoted to sidewalk "patches" of small projects to address complaints or significant safety hazards, and 80% of the budget is devoted to long run sidewalk repair.

Sidewalk Program Annual Work Plan

Initial Implementation

Fiscal year 2010 was the first implementation of our Sidewalk Plan. We developed a 5 year work plan that anticipated replacement of 0.91 miles of sidewalk in different sections of three streets in FY10, 0.86 miles on five streets in FY2011, 0.86 miles on seven streets in FY12, 0.92 miles on five streets in

FY13, and 0.88 miles on 8 streets in FY14. Our Sidewalk Condition Index (SCI) for the sections to be replaced ranged from 82 (worst condition) to 77 (better condition). The average SCI at the beginning of the program was 55.47; after the 5 year improvements, the SCI average was expected to be 49.64.

Sidewalk System Inventory Results - 2009	
City streets	88.6 miles
City sidewalks	150.2 miles
Missing sidewalks	27 miles
Sidewalk needed to meet Transportation Plan policy to have sidewalk on one side of every street and both sides of Complete Streets	4.5 miles

Next Steps

Our Sidewalk Plan is still addressing sidewalks with an SCI of 77. Each year, we inspect the highest-ranked sidewalks to ensure they are the “worst of the worst” in the most frequently traveled areas. We have learned several things since implementing this plan in FY2010, and we have planned revisions to ensure more meaningful SCI rankings, and ultimately develop a better Sidewalk Strategic Plan.

On the positive side, we have learned that we are much more efficient with this plan’s focus and priority to replace long sections (as mentioned above, 80% of the program is devoted to long runs). We had estimated completion of 0.86 miles in FY10 but were able to repair 2.29 miles instead.

The area in need of most improvement is our Deficiency Index. We have given equal priority to all sidewalk deficiencies described on Page 1. As we developed our Sidewalk Plan, we felt that a sidewalk with a spalled surface was no better than a sidewalk with a 2” heaved corner – it needed to be replaced in either situation, for cost-effectiveness, efficiency, and safety. However, as we have inspected the “worst of the worst” in the most frequently traveled areas – as ranked by our Sidewalk Condition Index – we have seen that many of those are not, in fact, the worst. We have had to re-prioritize sidewalks on our list in every year’s work plan.

Therefore, we are planning a new sidewalk inventory for 2012. We are considering utilizing technology to assist our inventory. We will also be rewriting our Deficiency index and assigning values as we did for the Pedestrian Potential Index.

We are continuing to patch sidewalks in the worst condition, as reported through complaints from the public. In addition, we have focused a substantial amount of the program budget to Pearl Street between Winooski Avenue and Saint Paul Street, which was our one downtown sidewalk that clearly did not meet ADA requirements or general walkability initiatives; obstructions from signal poles and utility poles encroached in the sidewalk and reduced the width to less than 4’ in some sections.

Pending completion of the Pearl Street sidewalk project, we will reassess the program budget and develop a work plan for the remainder of FY2012. Our improvement list currently includes:

1. Mansfield Ave, East, from McAuley to Colchester
2. Main St, South, from St. Paul to Church
3. Maple St, North, from South Willard to Harrington

4. St. Paul St, West, from Kilburn to Marble
5. St. Paul St, East, from Spruce to Adams
6. Pearl St, North, from George to Elmwood
7. St Paul St, East, from Howard to South Union
8. Pine St, East, from Maple to Kilburn
9. South Union St, West, from College to Main
10. Main St, North, from Church to South Winooski



CITY OF BURLINGTON, VERMONT
CITY COUNCIL TRANSPORTATION, ENERGY &
UTILITIES COMMITTEE

c/o Department of Public Works
645 Pine Street, Suite A
Post Office Box 849
Burlington, VT 05402-0849

802.863.9094 VOX
802.863.0466 FAX
802.863.0450 TTY
www.dpw.ci.burlington.vt.us

Councilor Kurt Wright, Chair *WARD 4*
Councilor Vince Brennan *WARD 3*
Councilor David Hartnett *WARD 4*

Inquiries:
Nicole Losch
802.865.5833 DIRECT
nlosch@ci.burlington.vt.us

Transportation, Energy and Utilities Committee of the City Council

Thursday, September 15, 2011 at 5:00 PM

645 Pine Street, front conference room

–AGENDA–

1. Agenda
 - a. DISCUSSION
 - b. ACTION
2. Public Forum
3. Minutes of 8/10/2011
 - a. DISCUSSION
 - b. ACTION
4. Burlington Downtown Transit Center – Aaron Frank, CCTA
 - a. DISCUSSION
5. Colchester Avenue Corridor Study – Colchester Avenue Task Force
 - a. DISCUSSION (draft report available online: www.colchesteravenue.org)
6. Waterfront North – Kirsten Merriman Shapiro, CEDO
 - a. DISCUSSION
7. TIGER3 Grant – Kirsten Merriman Shapiro, CEDO
 - a. DISCUSSION
8. BED Smart Grid – Barbara Grimes, Burlington Electric
 - a. DISCUSSION
9. Sidewalk Strategic Plan and 5 year workplan – Nicole Losch, DPW
 - a. DISCUSSION
10. Staniford Road / Bike Path – Nicole Losch, DPW
 - a. DISCUSSION

11. Battery Street/Sherman Street Crosswalks – Nicole Losch, DPW
 - a. DISCUSSION
12. 25 mph Citywide Speed Limit Public Hearing – Nicole Losch, DPW
 - a. DISCUSSION
13. Adjourn



Office of Planning
645 Pine Street, Suite A
Burlington, VT 05402
802.863.9094 P
802.863.0466 F
802.863.0450 TTY
www.dpw.ci.burlington.vt.us

Memo

Steven Goodkind, P.E.
Director of Public Works
City Engineer

Date: September 9, 2011
To: Transportation, Energy and Utility Committee
From: Nicole Losch, Bicycle, Pedestrian & Environmental Planner
Subject: Battery Street / Sherman Street Crosswalks

In July 2011, the city received a petition from residents near Battery Park outlining concerns for the crosswalks connected to Battery Park: two crosswalks adjacent to the Police Department and one crosswalk across Battery Street at Monroe Street. Residents noted that these crosswalks suffer from poor visibility, lack of signage, and general lack of awareness of the crosswalks due to the many distractions in that area – views of the lake, activity in the park, awkward street alignment and traffic lights. Residents requested DPW's evaluation of these crosswalks and to consider enhanced signage or other improvements for these crossings.

DPW has also been approached by the Department of Parks & Recreation, who is a willing partner in this discussion. They understand the complex and confusing issues of the crosswalks leading into Battery Park, and want to do what they can to help pedestrians access their park.

DPW plans to begin the evaluation in fall 2011 and have recommendations over winter 2011. Our evaluation for the area surrounding Battery Park will include analysis of traffic data (speed and volume), site assessments for visibility/geometry of the crosswalks, and may also include crash history and pedestrian counts. Due to projects already planned for summer/fall 2011, we have not been able to schedule this review earlier than fall 2011.

In the meantime, residents have been speaking with our Traffic Division regarding the potential installation of in-street "yield to pedestrian" signs. Those can be obtained without an engineering study and require a caretaker sign a contract with DPW.



Office of Planning
645 Pine Street, Suite A
Burlington, VT 05402
802.863.9094 P
802.863.0466 F
802.863.0450 TTY
www.dpw.ci.burlington.vt.us

Memo

Steven Goodkind, P.E.
Director of Public Works
City Engineer

Date: September 9, 2011
To: Transportation, Energy and Utility Committee
From: Nicole Losch, Bicycle, Pedestrian & Environmental Planner
Subject: Bike Path Crossing at Staniford Road
Cc: Norm Baldwin, DPW

In August 2011, DPW met with residents and other city staff at the intersection of Staniford Road and the bike path. The city has been asked to implement safety improvements to this crossing. Although recommendations for improvements would be provided in the Bike Path Task Force report – anticipated in October 2011 – changes at this intersection were requested more immediately.

DPW is currently reviewing state and federal standards for treatments associated with a shared use path. Recommendations, including signage, will be developed as part of a comprehensive package for potential improvements to this intersection.