



**CITY OF BURLINGTON**  
**DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS**

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](http://WWW.DPW.CI.BURLINGTON.VT.US)

**STEVEN GOODKIND, P.E.**  
 DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS  
 CITY ENGINEER

## MEMO

**Date:** February 4, 2011  
**From:** Nicole Losch, DPW  
**To:** TEUC  
**Re:** Colchester Avenue Corridor Study Update

On February 3, the second public meeting was held for the Colchester Avenue Corridor Study. Attendance was on par or slightly higher than the last public meeting, held in May 2010. After a brief introduction and review of draft vision and goals, the bulk of the meeting was devoted to plan review and discussion of design concepts for the western (Prospect Street to East Avenue) and eastern (East Avenue to Riverside Avenue) segments of Colchester Avenue.

There were several features common to all of the design concepts:

1. continuous bike lanes
2. optimized and coordinated traffic signals
3. pedestrian signals at each signalized intersection
4. additional pedestrian crossings in mid-block locations and at intersections
5. realign South Prospect Street by shifting the entire roadway west
6. realign Riverside Avenue/Barrett Street by removing the signalized intersection at Mill Street, closing Riverside Avenue at Barrett Street, and enhancing the one signalized intersection of Riverside Avenue/Barrett Street/Colchester Avenue

In addition, there were specific features that needed further review and feedback from the public:

1. Desired locations for bus stops? Shelters?
2. Desired location(s) for mid-block pedestrian crossing(s) to Trinity Campus?
  - a. Suggestions on design and control type (raised median? HAWK signal control?)

There were two options presented for the western segment.

1. 3 lane option, with changes from demonstration project that include:
  - a. Continuous bike lane
  - b. Widening roadway for wider travel/turn lanes and wider bike lanes

2. 4 lane option, wider roadway than previous 4-lane configuration
  - a. Two travel lanes in each direction
  - b. Left turn lanes at signalized intersections
  - c. Continuous bike lanes, green belt and sidewalks

There was one option presented for the eastern segment.

1. One travel lane each direction
2. Maintain on-street parking on both sides
3. Continuous bike lanes and sidewalks but not a continuous greenbelt

General discussion points within each group:

1. As the demonstration project has shown, there are longer vehicle queues and delays during peak periods with a 3-lane design.
2. A 4-lane design reduces congestions but has a larger footprint.
3. Where parking and bike lanes would exist on both sides of the eastern segment, there can be no greenbelt.

General questions posed to each group, and comments heard in each group's report back at the end of the meeting:

- Any comments or revisions on the vision or goals?  
*No comments, but supportive of the draft.*
- What is your general attitude toward overall street design options or specific features?
  1. 4-lane options has a highway feel, doesn't seem supportive of vision for attractive public space, and seems to have potential for congestion at each end where intersections only have 1 lane.
  2. Prefer 3-lane design. Would it still work in the future, as population increases?
  3. Like bike lanes, but discussed concerns about potential turn conflicts at intersections and concerns for "dooring" when next to parking.
  4. Would like exclusive pedestrian phase.
  5. Like intersection redesigns.
  6. If choice between parking, bikes, or greenspace, they prefer greenspace or bike lanes. Perhaps parking on only one side? Consider shared lane for bikes (instead of actual bike lane) only if there is adequate room for wide, shared lane.
  7. Bus shelters only needed at high volume stops. Existing corridor has too many bus stops.
  8. Underground utilities.
  9. Chase Street: "don't block the box" treatment, calm Chase Street (one way pair with Barrett Street, narrow entrance to Chase Street)

The written comments from each break out group are not yet available, but written comments were provided by 14 of the 39 attendees and are attached for your review.

In addition to comments for the corridor study, there were comments on related issues:

1. The meeting acknowledged the ongoing demonstration project, but details of the data collection and monitoring were not provided as time did not allow for that level of discussion; however, several people felt that more time should have been given to the demonstration project results, as they could have provided more guidance for feedback on the design options.
2. The corridor study does not include Pearl Street, which some residents expressed a need for evaluation.
3. Some people felt the demonstration project came about too quickly and will be decided too quickly, while others felt that it should have been implemented earlier and should be finalized already.

Next steps:

- 3<sup>rd</sup> and final public meeting anticipated for June 2011 – review draft plan
- Final plan anticipated in June/July 2011

*Note: the draft vision and goals and design option drawings will be available at the meeting on February 9.*





**Colchester Avenue Meeting #2 Evaluation RESULTS**  
**February 3, 2011, McClure Conference Room, FAHC**



14 Responses with 39 participants signing in.

ITEM 6a

**1. How did you hear about the Summit? (check all that apply)**

a) Email from Friend/Colleague	6
b) Email from Sponsors	8
c) Email from Other	1
d) Flyer	1
e) Postcard	2
f) Front Porch Forum	3

g) Burlington Free Press	
h) Seven Days	
j) Television	
k) Other (please describe)	5
BWBC/BBC, UVM Class, TAC member, Ward 1 NPA, word-of-mouth in neighborhood	

**2. Please rate the following aspects of the meeting:**

Aspect	Fantastic	Very Good	Good	OK	Poor	Terrible
Welcome & Presentation	2	7	6			
Quality of the breakout session	5	4	4	2		
Wrap-up	2	3	4	3		
Physical facilities for this event	4	9	1			
Amount of time allowed for input	4	4	5	1		
Overall value of this event to you	4	3	3	2		

**Comments:**

- Vegan snacks next time and no bottled water!
- Need more time for input. Maybe an on-going blog?
- Appreciate process. Helpful info and chance to give feedback without taking FOREVER.
- Vote bike
- Bike < Car
- Breakout sessions could have been longer. We had lots of good discussion.
- The break-out session was well timed. We need data on congestion before and after the pilot/demonstration. I still don't know if 3 lanes would be good – I'd like to see if it causes more back-up traffic during rush hour on East Avenue.
- Getting consensus on this issue may be impossible. I think the City is going to have to make a tough decision and go with it.
- Local residents enjoy the opportunity to contribute to the redesign.
- Thanks for the pizza!
- Please integrate the findings of the demo project next time and use this as a starting point for discussion.

**3. Anything else you'd like to share with us?**

- Why do projects take years and years to be done in Burlington?
- So far so good.
- Like the "mock-ups" of landscaping.
- Love look with buried utilities, less of a wasteland look.
- Love N. Prospect/Pearl fix and also Colchester/Bridge proposal.
- 3 lanes
- Straighten out Pearl/Prospect
- More bikes please
- 3 lanes
- Match intersections

*Colchester Avenue Meeting #2 Evaluation Results*  
*February 3, 2011, McClure Conference Room, FAHC*  
*Page 2 of 2*

- Less cars
- Please look at the data and how it affects idling time along East Avenue and the corridor itself. I have experienced very long wait times (up to 20 minutes) moving/sitting in traffic from the Sheraton Inn onto East Avenue and finally turning left onto Colchester Avenue. I don't recall sitting so long before the pilot project. Of course, I notice some cars turning left onto Colchester Ave. took it slowly because the man-hole was sticking up (part of the repaving effort), so maybe that is a confounding factor.
- If the congestion goes up on this corridor it will most likely push traffic to use a different corridor into the city (unintended consequences).
- BUT: There needs to be visible achievements. The only "deliverable" after the May meeting was the unilateral imposition of the 3-lane solution. Please don't encourage public input and then completely ignore it, and introduce something totally different.
- I've seen the 4-lane cities like Chicago and I prefer the European/NYC-style narrow street cities that promote walking and bicycling.
- I am very happy with the pilot program (demonstration project)!
- Complete streets concept is essential!
- 3 lanes good – 4 lanes not-so-good (longer pedestrian crosswalks/bottlenecking of pedestrians halfway across)
- Bike bridge across/attach to Winooski Bridge
- Remove one side of East section on-street parking to enhance green space and bike lanes
- Bury the utilities throughout the corridor
- \*Really would like to see some traffic slowing measures @ Colchester/Chase St. intersection (ie 90% turn/right hand turn and "don't block the box" @ intersection).

**Nicole Losch**

**From:** Bill Keogh [bkeoghsr@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 06, 2011 12:09 PM  
**To:** Paul, Karen; Wright, Kurt; Vince Brennan-CC; Bob Penniman-Jericho; Steve Goodkind; Erin Demers; Nicole Losch; Eleni Churchill; Michele Boomhower; Sharon Bushor  
**Subject:** As stated below....  
**Memo to:** City Council Transportation, Energy & Utilities Committee (TEUC)  
 Chair Karen Paul; members Kurt Wright, Vince Brennan  
**Subject:** Public Hearing on Colchester Ave. Demonstration Project, Feb. 3, 2011, FAHC

PRESENT: Staffs of CCMPO (Eleni Churchill, Peter Keating et al); City DPW (Steve Goodkind, Nicole Losch, Erin Demers et al); consultants RSG Assoc (Joe Segale); Colchester Ave. Task Force Chair Bob Penniman; Bruce Bourgeois and two others (Burlington Fire Dept.); Jared Wood (Public Works Commission); City Councilor Sharon Bushor; Fletcher Allen staff.  
 Counted were 25 taxpayers and almost as many non-taxpayers (staff, etc.)

After introductions, consultant Joe Segale outline the Colchester Ave. Demonstration project, which includes many potential changes, all the way from the Winooski Bridge to the intersection of Pearl and Prospect Sts. (Some of this the TEUC has not yet seen.) He described the "Complete Streets" concept and how it would apply to the Colchester Ave. project, in that it would address all forms of transportation, pedestrians, automobiles and bikers. Also, consideration of green space along the corridor.

He said that everyone should be working together on this and that there would have to be trade-offs along the way. There will be a follow-up public meeting to this one.

The attendees were split into four groups for corridor comments. (I drifted among each of the groups to get a pulse of what was transpiring.)

**Group #1 (?)**- Liked the 3-lanes over the 4-lanes; expressed concern for bicyclist safety; like the green space; wanted more crosswalks; need pedestrian crossing signals

**Group #2** (Erin Demers)- Similar concerns, especially about biking; liked Prospect-Pearl green space and wanted more; 3-lanes would slow speeders; possible Mansfield Ave. one-way North and Prospect one-way South; 3-lanes preferred and questioned 4-lane possibility; need ways for bikers to cross Winooski Bridge; questioned the need for residential parking along the way.

**Group #3** (Nicole Losch)- Agreed with the ideas of the first two groups. No support for 4-lanes; a lot of conversation on bike lanes; remove residential parking for bicyclists and increase green space; want undergrounding of utilities.

**Group #4** (Joe Segale)- Prospect St intersection, do *more*; no answer on 4- or 3-lanes, which remains an open question and needs more evaluation; seek a balance of parking, road usage and green space; pedestrian crossings need to be addressed.

*Observations: I have not seen this full report by consultant RSG, which apparently has been shown to the Colchester Ave. Task Force. Certainly not the TEUC. The City Council has been by-passed on this. {...and to think DPW was ready to implement a major part of this project last fall, after only four weeks of gathering data...} Bob Penniman and Joe Segale have agreed to make a presentation to the TEUC soon....It was clear that bike enthusiasts were active in the discussion and appeared to be at least half of the taxpayers present. I gathered this from the*

comments in each group as I roamed. {...the Martha Langs and Dick Boves were not present...}...A taxpayer (from Nash Place?) chimed in at the end remarking that congestion is an issue. If City development is to take place downtown and on the waterfront, that means additional traffic will use Colchester Ave. He wondered if the Colchester Ave. proposal was to "push people out of their cars." He reiterated that trade-offs need to be made...Bob Penniman and Joe Segale offered to make a presentation to the TEUC.

**Bill Keogh**

Cc" Councilor Bushor, Bob Penniman, Steve Goodkind, Michele Boomhower,Nicole Losch; Erin Demers, Eleni Churchill

**Colchester Avenue Corridor Plan**

**Suggestions from May 27, 2010 Public Meeting for Short-Term Implementation**

Item 6c

Location	Issue	Remarks	Possible Short-Term Project	Possible Time Frame
<b>Roadway Condition</b>				
Corridor	Conditions are very poor and there are a lot of deep/serious pot holes	Final Top Course to be installed Spring 2011	Address as part of the resurfacing project	Final Course Spring 2011
Corridor	Drainage is very poor, and some drains are too low, motorists need to swerve to avoid them		Address as part of the resurfacing project	Final Course Spring 2011
FAHC intersection	Pooling at FAHC driveway		Address as part of the resurfacing project	Final Course Spring 2011
Riverside Ave intersection	The surface at Riverside is very, very poor	Completed	Address as part of the resurfacing project	Completed
<b>Striping and Signs</b>				
Corridor	Cross-walks should have signs.		Install pedestrian crossing.	1 year
Corridor	Lane designations become unclear as striping fades. Specific locations identified by meeting participants include East Avenue and Prospect Street, but this issue occurs throughout the corridor. Also a concern that poorly marked lanes increase last minute lane changes.	Could be installed for current lane configuration or for Complete Street configuration.	Install Advanced Intersection Lane Control Signs <a href="http://mutcd.fhwa.dot.gov/html/2003r1r2/part2/fig2b-04_longdesc.htm">http://mutcd.fhwa.dot.gov/html/2003r1r2/part2/fig2b-04_longdesc.htm</a>	Final Course Spring 2011
Prospect Street intersection	Vehicle paths are unclear at the Pearl and Prospect Street intersection	If the intersection is part of the paving project, could be implemented as part of this project. Need striping plan	Install dotted lines to delineate turning paths through the intersection. <a href="http://mutcd.fhwa.dot.gov/PavMkgs/Tutorial/dotted_lines.htm">http://mutcd.fhwa.dot.gov/PavMkgs/Tutorial/dotted_lines.htm</a>	Final Course Spring 2011
<b>Traffic Signals and Intersections</b>				
University Place intersection	Bad/unsafe lefts to/from University Place	Long-term option: close University Place to through traffic and limit to shuttles and service vehicles	In short-term, limit access to right-in / right-out.	2-3 years
Corridor	Numerous issues were raised regarding traffic signal timings. East Ave the light is too short and people run it, lack of protected left turns, need for coordination, desire for exclusive pedestrian phases, etc.	City DPW has been monitoring and adjusting traffic signal timings in conjunction with the demonstration project.	Develop traffic signal optimization plan for (a) existing equipment and (b) optimized with new equipment (pedestrian equipment, signal heads that allow protected left turns, automated no-right-turn on red message signs, etc)	On-going

**Colchester Avenue Corridor Plan**

**Suggestions from May 27, 2010 Public Meeting for Short-Term Implementation**

Location	Issue	Remarks	Possible Short-Term Project	Possible Time Frame
Mary Fletcher Drive intersection	Prohibit Right-turns-on-red on the Mary Fletcher Drive approach to Colchester Ave		Could be implemented with a sign.	1 year
Mary Fletcher Drive intersection	FAHC entrance only has 1 crosswalk on Colchester Ave. The crosswalk across Mary Fletcher Dr isn't signalized		Install pedestrian equipment for Mary Fletcher Drive cross-walk integrated with no-right-turn on red variable message sign.	2-3 years
Riverside Avenue intersection	The traffic signal at Riverside should be considered for actuation or it should be fixed if actuation is present.	Requires new equipment. In long-term, intersection will be reconstructed with all new equipment	Upgrade traffic signal equipment.	2-3 years
Barrett Street Intersection	At Barrett there is no cross-walk or (pedestrian) signals now.		Cross-walks were repainted as part of resurfacing project in fall 2010. Long-term reconstruction of intersection should include colored and textured pedestrian crossings as well as pedestrian signals.	Enhanced – Long Term
East Avenue intersection	"No-Right-Turn on Red" is ignored by vehicles turning right from Colchester Ave to East Ave	Drivers ignore the no right-turn on red signal.	Increase enforcement. Consider exclusive phase in long term	On going
<b>Sidewalks, Bicycle Facilities and Streetscape</b>				
University Road	The cross-walk at University Road to Centennial Field is faded.	It is used heavily during baseball games as a connection between parking at Trinity and Centennial Field	Address as part of the resurfacing project	Final Course Spring 2011
Trinity	Pedestrian crossing between Trinity and main campus		Identify best mid-block location and recommend barricade (similar to the granite bollards and steel rails along Main Street) to guide pedestrians. Install an appropriate pedestrian crossing system (e.g., HAWK) at the mid-block cross-walk.	2 – 3 years
Corridor	No Benches aside from those at the bus stops		Identify locations and install benches	2-3 years

**Colchester Avenue Corridor Plan**

**Suggestions from May 27, 2010 Public Meeting for Short-Term Implementation**

Location	Issue	Remarks	Possible Short-Term Project	Possible Time Frame
Corridor	Parts of the sidewalks are missing	DPW prepared a strategic sidewalk plan that will produce a five-year sidewalk replacement schedule	Publish the replacement schedule.	On Going
Corridor	Too few pedestrian crossings, crossings should be illuminated. Only one cross-walk between Trinity and Riverside	A sidewalk will be built along the south side of Colchester Ave to close the missing gap by the cemetery; and will reduce need for pedestrian crossings along this segment.	Review lighting at existing cross-walks and install new fixtures where necessary.	2-3 years
Kampus Kitchen	Put back the green space that used to be in front of Kampus Kitchen and do something to contain the parking		Develop plan and work with business owner to make sure sufficient customer parking and access for vendor trucks is provided.	2 - 3 years
Corridor	Build more shelters for inclement weather	Need to identify other locations. Maybe at Riverside.	Identify locations for new stops and construct.	2 - 3 years
Multi-Use Path	Signs on the multi-use path between East Ave and University Place are confusing		Replace signs. Work with UVM transportation office.	1 year
Multi-Use Path	Connect multi-use path to East Ave		Prepare design and construct.	2 - 3 years
Multi-Use Path	Improve the connection of the multi-use path where it ends at University Place with the path on the UVM Green		Prepare design and construct.	2 - 3 years
<b>Operations and Maintenance</b>				
Corridor	Forestry program to routinely complete maintenance on the trees, which would allow for adequate sight lines		Work with Parks & Recreation to identify locations for annual tree pruning.	Annual

**Colchester Avenue Corridor Plan**  
**Suggestions from May 27, 2010 Public Meeting for Short-Term Implementation**

Location	Issue	Remarks	Possible Short-Term Project	Possible Time Frame
Corridor	Ambulance should use Beaumont	The City of So. Burlington's ambulance uses East Ave to Colchester Ave to reach Emergency. CATMA and FAHC have made the City of South Burlington aware of this issue.	Continue efforts with the City of South Burlington.	On-going
Corridor	Bus stops need to be shoveled throughout the winter, there is a lot of snow in the way (esp. by Kathy's Flowers) if concrete pads were used in the bus stops could they be plowed?	Seems like a great opportunity for college students to provide community service – maybe the "UVM Shovel Brigade".	Work with UVM to establish volunteer group.	1 year
Corridor	Sight lines are blocked by shrubs no specific locations given)		Conduct annual brush trimming.	Annual
Corridor	Cars parked in driveways are spilling out onto the sidewalks	Enforcement issue.	Ticket vehicles as necessary.	On-Going
<b>For Evaluation</b>				
Corridor	High speeds. This was raised as an issue frequently at the meeting		Conduct traffic engineering study to evaluate 30 mph posted speed and recommend 25 mph posted speed as appropriate.	1 year
Corridor	Sight lines are blocked by parked car locations.	Potential locations are between East Ave and Nash Place.	Review intersections, determine if parking blocks sight lines, relocate "no-parking here to corner" signs if necessary	1 year
East Avenue intersection	Not enough stacking space for right turn from East Avenue onto Colchester Avenue	Desire to keep parking space makes extending the turn lane difficult	Extend right turn lane as far as possible. Minimum desired length is 60 feet to accommodate queues in right lane.	2-3 years

**RESOLUTION RELATING TO**  
*Amendment and re-adoption of the 2006*  
*Burlington Municipal Development Plan.*

**Sponsor:**  
*TEU Committee (Councilors Paul, Keogh,*  
*Brennan and Wright)*

**CITY OF BURLINGTON**

In the year Two Thousand and Eleven.  
Resolved by the City Council of the City of Burlington, as follows:

That,

WHEREAS, Title 24 of Chapter 117, Vermont Statutes Annotated grants enabling authority for Vermont municipalities to undertake a comprehensive planning program and prepare, maintain and implement a plan within its jurisdiction; and,

WHEREAS, such authority requires that a municipality have a municipal development plan in place in order to develop and amend subdivision and zoning bylaws and assess impact fees; and,

WHEREAS, the City of Burlington has actively pursued the proper planning and regulation of land use and development within the city since 1925; and,

WHEREAS, pursuant to such authority a municipal development plan must be adopted or readopted at least every five years; and,

WHEREAS, the City of Burlington has completed the development of the *Burlington Transportation Plan* which is the result of a multi-year collaborative inter-departmental effort involving City staff from DPW, CEDO and Planning; a 17-member steering committee; a nationally-renowned consulting team; and the review and consideration of the Public Works Commission, the Planning Commission, and the Council's Transportation, Energy and Utilities Committee; and,

WHEREAS, the *Burlington Transportation Plan* is intended to become the new transportation element for the City's municipal development plan pursuant to the requirements of 24 V.S.A. §4382, §4384 and §4387, and met the requirements of 24 V.S.A. §4384 and §4385 regarding the process for adoption; and,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Burlington City Council hereby amends and re-adopts the *Burlington Municipal Development Plan* with the adoption and incorporation of the *Burlington Transportation Plan* as recommended by the Burlington Planning Commission and amended by the Council's Transportation, Energy and Utilities Committee subject to technical corrections, formatting, graphics and other minor non-substantive editing that change neither the concept, meaning or extent of the Plan as presented.



To: City Council Transportation, Energy & Utilities Committee  
 From: Gene Bergman, Sr. Asst. City Attorney & David White, Director Planning & Zoning Department  
 RE: Revised TEUC amendment to the *Burlington Transportation Plan* (Planning Commission  
 Date: October 20, 2010

Based on the discussion at your 10/27/10 meeting, we have drafted the following substitute amendment to the Transportation Plan of the Burlington Municipal Development Plan for your consideration.

### 3) Moving Forward

The City has made significant progress toward the transportation goals in the 2001 *Municipal Development Plan*. This *Transportation Plan* builds on this success.

Moving forward on the *Transportation Plan* requires:

- Steering toward that course (*Transportation Services*);
- Monitoring what is going on (*Progress Indicators*); and
- Charting a course (*Five Year Plan*).

#### Transportation Services

The development of the street design guidelines and adoption of the “Great Streets” philosophy calls out for a “different” way of doing things. City staff and their governing officers must be committed to employing this new philosophy to implements segments of the plan. Commitment to the “Great Streets” philosophy will ensure a transparent process and an empowered decision making body.

Changes need to occur in the way the City delivers these programs and services. The changes are basic:

- treat the streets holistically as proscribed in the Great Streets philosophy,
- develop annual work plans dedicated to meeting the goals of this plan,
- establish mechanisms for the review of these plans,
- develop a project prioritization methodology and
- develop methods to communicate these activities to the public.

The Department of Public Works (DPW) will identify staff whose responsibility will be the preparation of work plans and the development of monitoring systems and communications methods designed to meet the goals set by the plan. Staff will continue to work with the city wide technical advisory committee and may create ad hoc advisory groups to carry out its responsibilities. This committee, an ad hoc working group known as the Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), is comprised of staff from DPW, the Planning and Zoning Department (PZ), the Community and Economic Development Office (CEDO), the Parks and Recreation Department (P&R), and Burlington City Arts (BCA). DPW will oversee the work of the TAC.

As a means of reviewing plans and communicating with the public prior to the implementation of major street redesign projects, DPW shall submit these projects' plans to and consult with the City Council's Transportation, Energy and Utilities Committee (TEUC).

The Public Works Commission (PWC), in its role of regulator of the operation of vehicular and pedestrian traffic on the streets and sidewalks, will continue its traditional oversight of the maintenance and development of infrastructure, parking and traffic systems. In this role, plans for major street redesign projects will be approved by the PWC after DPW has consulted with and received input from the TEUC.

~~while~~ The City Council Transportation, Energy and Utilities Committee (TEUC) will monitor the transportation indicators described below. This will set a course that will result in progress.

The Mayor and City Council may appoint advisory committees to oversee any phase of specific projects as they see fit.

New and innovative motorized personal transportation devices, such as segways and electric scooters will likely continue to gain interest as an alternative mode of transportation in Burlington. The City will need to evaluate the possible impacts the use of these devices may have on both vehicles on the street and pedestrians on the sidewalk, and any infrastructure needs they may require.

**Deleted:** vehicles

**Deleted:** continue to be a primary

**Deleted:** to

**Deleted:** work

**Deleted:** accommodate

**Deleted:** need for parking and additional services of those using motorized personal transportation devices

**Deleted:** . In looking forward to our communities changing transportation needs, consideration should be taken to

**Deleted:** the

**Deleted:** of new forms of motorized personal transportation devices



Our 3 top suggestions for Transportation Plan

- 1) Parking – page 5. The language in support of adding parking is nebulous. Here is our suggested language change. Highlights on changed sections – also moved last sentence up.

It is the policy and priority of the City to better utilize the existing parking inventories by **implementing improved parking management strategies, and to add additional inventory in strategic locations and as new development presents opportunities.** [moved next sentence up] Parking in the downtown core is currently inadequate and action will be taken to address this issue. Parking management strategies aimed at increasing the utilization of existing facilities are set out in this Plan, and include improved wayfinding enabling motorists to more readily find available spaces in under-utilized facilities, along with more market- oriented approaches to the pricing of parking designed to free-up more on-street spaces.

Current language “It is the policy and priority of the City to better utilize the existing parking inventory by improving parking management strategies, and to add additional inventory in strategic locations as necessary. Parking management strategies aimed at increasing the utilization of existing facilities are set out in this Plan, and include improved wayfinding enabling motorists to more readily find available spaces in under-utilized facilities, along with more market- oriented approaches to the pricing of parking designed to free-up more on-street spaces. However, parking in the downtown core is currently inadequate and action should be taken to address this issue.”

- 2) Reference 2009 CCMPO/CATMA/BBA Study on creating a Downtown TMA in the TDM section

Proposed Change: Transportation Demand Management (TDM)

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) aims at reducing car travel and congestion. Work trips are especially important because they repeat on a regular basis, so changing even a single daily commute makes a big difference over time.

The Campus Area Transportation Management Association (CATMA) has been highly effective in reducing travel and parking demand for the City’s major educational and health care institutions. A Downtown Transportation Management Association (TMA) is under discussion as a means to expand this success to the downtown area. **The 2008 Downtown Employee Transportation Survey Report provides data on employee transportation use and the possibility of creating a Downtown TMA.**

Current language: Transportation Demand Management (TDM)

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) aims at reducing car travel and congestion. Work trips are especially important because they repeat on a regular basis, so changing even a single daily commute makes a big difference over time.

The Campus Area Transportation Management Association (CATMA) has been highly effective in reducing travel and parking demand for the City’s major educational and health care institutions. A Downtown Transportation Management Association (TMA) is under discussion as a means to expand this success to the downtown area.

- 3) Including language in policy initiatives to address parking needs for all types of motorized personal transportation devices. This will position the plan well as standards and modes for personal transportation change. We are already moving toward more use of scooters, electric cars, hybrid cars, alternative fuel vehicles. Our city needs to be ready to accommodate these

mode of personal transportation. More businesses are looking into the possibility of adding electric charging stations to their parking areas as reported in the January 18<sup>th</sup> article by USA Today [Retail outlets adding electric car charging stations](#). Burlington's Transportation Plan should include language that would encourage the community to support such initiatives.

Under page 15 Downtown Parking Supply add:

- **New and innovative motorized personal transportation devices, such as electric vehicles will continue to be a primary mode of transportation into Burlington. The City will work to accommodate the need for parking and additional services of those using motorized personal transportation devices. In looking forward to our communities changing transportation needs, consideration should be taken to the infrastructure needs of new forms of motorized personal transportation devices.**