Fwd: Appeal of DPW Decision on Roundabout versus Signal at NorthAve/South Cambrian Way

Fri 6/19/2020 4:35 PM
From: TONY Redington
To: Solveig Overby

Good Day Solveig:

This message forwards a message appealing the decision rejecting a roundabout at South Cambrian Drive/North Avenue at Cambrian Rise development provides issues regarding the decision. Please note carefully the reference material from Clive Sawers who is the top expert on the planet who evaluated the traffic numbers from RSG and the dimensions available based on drawing provided by developer Eric Farrell. The traffic analysis is attached here. Here is the key section on mini roundabout being both feasible in terms of traffic capacity and right-of-way available:

"Director Spencer and City Engineer Baldwin on April 2, 2018 did meet with DPW staff, Developer Eric Farrell and his development team along with representatives of the Cambrian Watch grassroots involvement process undertaken by North Avenue resident Aj Rossman.

At that meeting April 2 it was confirmed again that based on the applicable traffic impact study by RSG, a mini-roundabout analysis had been performed by the top min-roundabout practitioner on the planet, Clive Sawers of Devon, U.K. (Sawers presented a workshop at Waterman during his first U.S. tour in 1999). Not only did Mr. Sawers in November 2017 submit the clear technical analysis confirming a roundabout feasible and able to fit the space available at the intersection, Sawers further determined feasibility even if the 25% of traffic allocated to North Cambrian Way were added to a South Cambrian Way roundabout to handle 100% of the Cambrian Rise traffic! (No such analysis was undertaken in the professionally executed RSG traffic study.) To be clear, the July 24 Memorandum [by City Engineer Baldwin] does not acknowledge the existence of Mr. Sawers engineering analysis showing a roundabout feasible both in terms of capacity to handle projected traffic but also fitting within the constraints of the available intersection right-of-way.

"Besides, at the April 2 meeting Cambrian Rise's consultant, Mark Smith of RSG, provided within a day or so to attendees a list of 15 separate issues—roundabout versus signal—which were raised. All present were invited to respond in a timeline of two weeks and at least one set of submissions within that time frame were submitted addressing in detail of the issues raised at the April 2 meeting.

"But the focus here must be on the July 24, 2018 Baldwin Memorandum. First, the memorandum does not address in any way or question the Sawers technical analysis. The Baldwin Memorandum arbitrarily changes the RSG and North Avenue Corridor study analyses to fit a new set of assumptions—in a word goal posts were changed. What those specific changes were—and where they are derived from--are not clearly spelled out, and no output including the performance of the roundabout versus the signal (a routine exercise) is provided based on the admittedly unspecified set of new factors."

I am attaching here the referenced documents from Mr. Sawers which were provided to DPW, RSG and City Engineer Baldwin

well before the April 2, 2018 meeting.

Thank you for your attention in this matter.

Yours truly,

Tony Redington

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: TONY Redington <tonyrvt99@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Sep 4, 2018 at 11:47 AM
Subject: Appeal of DPW Decision on Roundabout versus Signal at North Ave/South Cambrian Way
To:

Good Day Mayor Weinberger:

First, I would like to bring to your attention the first National Roundabout Week September 17-24 being sponsored by the U.S. Department of Transportation with many organizations in support--AAA, AARP, Geico, etc. It is my hope that perhaps this year for the first time a one day popup demo of this pedestrian (and all modes!) lifesaving infrastructure comes to Burlington! While we await the first roundabout in Burlington set or 2021-2022 completion at the Shelburne Street "rotary" know in the neighborhood as the "intersection of death" we also know that a busy intersection like Pine/Maple streets could be designed and built as a mini roundabout inexpensively and in about a one year time frame. While our five downtown Vermont roundabouts recoded a single pedestrian/bicycle injury in 52 recent operating years, Prospects/Colchester/Pearl was recording one ped/bike injury a year in that intersection study.

This message hereby appeals the apparent decision by Public Works Director Chapin Spencer accepting the recommendation of City Engineer Baldwin's contained in a July 24, 2018 memorandum (Memorandum) in effect rejecting a Vermont proven safe-for-all-modes roundabout for the North Avenue/South Cambrian Way gateway for obsolete and unsafe traffic signal technology. This message requests a fair and technically competent evaluation of both a roundabout and a signal which includes factors of capacity, delay, safety, and emissions--element of primary concern to the residents of the ONE. That decision is noteworthy as the first crash, a multi-vehicle crash at South Cambrian Way/North Avenue already has occurred with injuries resulting—in the prior intersection at the Burlington College entrance in a recent period an injury a year was recorded as reported in the RSG traffic study accepted by the Department. Note that while making a decision on transportation in the Burlington Transportation Plan safety is termed “critical” the word, too often the case in City transportation decisions, is noticeably absent in the July 25 Memorandum.

While the decision roundabouts versus signal may very well belong within

the jurisdiction of Director Spencer who serves at your pleasure, and clearly a well founded recommendation from a professional engineer allows Director Spencer full discretion on what decision to make—roundabout versus signal. But such is not the case here as the Memorandum contains disjointed analysis and discards the normal evaluation of studies-based safety, service, and capacity is totally at odds with professional and competent material to aid and allow Director Spencer to make an informed decision.

Please be aware that one must first and foremost give all praise and thanks to developer Eric Farrell whose good faith effort to undertake “best practices” in all phases of the development of Cambrian Rise cannot be overstated. His ongoing support of cooperative endeavors with Aj Rossman and others to measure water quality, traffic and wildlife corridor data utilizing totally new sensor techniques matches places Cambrian Rise in a leadership position where increasingly we need to not only develop needed expansion of urban lands but to do so in a way that minimizes all types of environmental impacts both today and tomorrow.

Director Spencer and City Engineer Baldwin on April 2, 2018 did meet with DPW staff, Developer Eric Farrell and his development team along with representatives of the Cambrian Watch grassroots involvement process undertaken by North Avenue resident Aj Rossman.

At that meeting April 2 it was confirmed again that based on the applicable traffic impact study by RSG, a mini-roundabout analysis had been performed by the top min-roundabout practitioner on the planet, Clive Sawers of Devon, U.K. (Sawers presented a workshop at Waterman during his first U.S. tour in 1999). Not only did Mr. Sawers in November 2017 submit the clear technical analysis confirming a roundabout feasible and able to fit the space available at the intersection, Sawers further determined feasibility even if the 25% of traffic allocated to North Cambrian Way were added to a South Cambrian Way roundabout to handle 100% of the Cambrian Rise traffic! (No such analysis was undertaken in the professionally executed RSG traffic study.) To be clear, the July 24 Memorandum does not acknowledge the existence of Mr. Sawers engineering analysis showing a roundabout feasible both in terms of capacity to handle projected traffic but also fitting within the constraints of the available intersection right-of-way.

Besides, at the April 2 meeting Cambrian Rise's consultant, Mark Smith of RSG, provided within a day or so to attendees a list of 15 separate issues—roundabout versus signal—which were raised. All present were invited to respond in a timeline of two weeks and at least one set of submissions within that time frame were submitted addressing in detail of the issues raised at the April 2 meeting.

But the focus here must be on the July 24, 2018 Baldwin Memorandum. First, the memorandum does not address in any way or question the Sawers technical analysis. The Baldwin Memorandum arbitrarily changes the RSG and North Avenue Corridor study analyses to fit a new set of assumptions—in a word goal posts were changed. What those specific changes were—and where they are derived from--are not clearly spelled out, and no output including the performance of the roundabout versus the signal (a routine exercise) is provided based on the admittedly unspecified set of new factors.

One cannot but conclude the work of Mr. Baldwin in this case is both unprofessional and disingenuous. This makes any approval—or disapproval—of the Memorandum recommendation wholly without material foundation. City decision makers certainly are free to make erroneous decisions, but on health and safety questions it is only reasonable to make such decisions where professional and technical input occurs which meets professional standards. When that professional work is falsified, incomplete, or unprofessional the process becomes clearly corrupted. Already there is a

heightened level of distrust at all levels of government between citizens and elected representatives—and the decision making process itself. In this case the Memorandum only adds to the level of distrust. Ironically, Eric Farrell and the City itself becomes a victim as property values of the new development become depressed from inefficient and unsafe public roadway investments. (Note roundabouts are proven safety treatments reducing serious and fatal injuries by about 90% and reducing delay for all users with pedestrian delay of only about five seconds.)

Much of the problem outlined here would have been avoided if the City subdivision regulations for new development were aligned with Vermont Agency of Transportation guidelines for new development (draft guidelines dating from at least 2005) which call for provision for roundabouts. Such a suggestion has been made to the Planning Department years ago. Most modern cities today are re-examining development guidelines to include retaining space for roundabout installation at busy intersections. As the U.S. has fallen from 1st to 17th in international safety performance, one factor at play has been the slow adoption of roundabout technology and discarding traffic signals (as advocated by AARP, Geico and AAA). Much of the “resistance” to adoption of roundabouts has been shown to rest squarely centered in the staff and political leadership of state, region, and local transportation planning and implementing agencies. The U.S. collapse of highway safety equates to 20,000 excess highway deaths and a current rapid increase in walk and bicyclist fatalities.

In conclusion, it is my request that you instruct the Department of Public Works undertake a clear and professional analysis of the roundabout versus the traffic signal at South Cambrian Way/North Avenue consistent with the RSG, Sawers and other applicable analyses--following an agreement of those involved with the projected traffic volumes—an analysis similar to the same analyses properly conducted by the Department in 2006 on four Champlain Parkway intersection using FSEIS traffic analysis in accordance with normal practice at that time.

In doing a fair and open process analysis this will lift a cloud of suspicion now in place in our neighborhood over the integrity of this decision making process as well as the decision itself. More important the rate of injuries to our ONE/Cambrian Rise residents is at stake as well as the unaddressed issues easily assessed: (1) delay for users by mode and (2) generation of pollutants including climate change emissions.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Yours truly,

Tony Redington

Walk Safety Advocate

20 North Winooski Ave Apt 2

Burlington, VT 05401

cc Chapin Spencer, Director, Department of Public Works

Aj Rossman

Jim Holway

Jane Knodell, Burlington City Council

Brian Pine, Burlington City Council

Eric Farrell, Cambrian Rise

Ward 2 and Ward 3 Neighborhood Planning Assembly Steering Committee

--

*Stop and Re-design a Safe Champlain Parkway! - *Sign Petition:
*https://petitions.moveon.org/sign/governor-scott-federal
<https://petitions.moveon.org/sign/governor-scott-federal> - *Donate:
*https://fundly.com/stop-re-design-champlain-parkway#gallery/2
<https://www.google.com/url?q=https%3A%2F%2Ffundly.com%2Fstop-re-design-champlain-parkway%23gallery%2F2&sa=D&sntz=1&
usg=AFQjCNFbNr_xWxagaoYC6-GIK7ueOIcsNg>*

Websites:*SafeStreetsBurlington.com *
*https://www.facebook.com/SSBPineStreetNOW/
<https://www.facebook.com/SSBPineStreetNOW/>*

TonyRVT.blogspot.com @TonyRVT60

--

*Stop and Re-design a Safe Champlain Parkway! - *Sign Petition:
https://www.ipetitions.com/petition/re-design-champlain-parkway-for-safety-climate
Websites:*SafeStreetsBurlington.com *
*https://www.facebook.com/SSBPineStreetNOW/
<https://www.facebook.com/SSBPineStreetNOW/>*

Table 1. Simple capacity assessment at North Avenue/South Drive

Assessment of a mini-roundabout NO transfer to South Drive

1. AM peak 2022

Am Peak 8.15-9.15 From \ To	NA (s)	NA (n)	Devt (s)	Totals
NA (s)	0	382	97	479
NA (n)	783	0	27	810
Devt (s)	138	37	0	175
Demand (total)				
NA (s)	479			
NA (n)		810		
Devt (s)			175	
Capacity				
NA (s)	1163			
NA (n)		1103		
Devt (s)			417	
RFC %				
NA (s)	41%			
NA (n)		73%		
Devt (s)			42%	

1. PM Peak 2022

Am Peak 8.15-9.15 From \ To	NA (s)	NA (n)	Devt (s)	Totals
NA (s)	0	685	158	843
NA (n)	662	0	50	712
Devt (s)	128	37	0	165
Demand (total)				
NA (s)	843			
NA (n)		712		
Devt (s)			165	
Capacity				
NA (s)	1163			
NA (n)		1042		
Devt (s)			538	
RFC %				
NA (s)	72%			
NA (n)		68%		
Devt (s)			31%	

1. AM peak 2027

Am Peak 8.15-9.15 From \ To	NA (s)	NA (n)	Devt (s)	Totals
NA (s)	0	390	97	487
NA (n)	801	0	27	828
Devt (s)	138	37	0	175
Demand (total)				
NA (s)	487			
NA (n)		828		
Devt (s)			175	
Capacity				
NA (s)	1163			
NA (n)		1103		
Devt (s)			399	
RFC %				
NA (s)	42%			
NA (n)		75%		
Devt (s)			44%	

1. PM Peak 2027

Am Peak 8.15-9.15 From \ To	NA (s)	NA (n)	Devt (s)	Totals
NA (s)	0	700	158	858
NA (n)	677	0	50	727
Devt (s)	128	37	0	165
Demand (total)				
NA (s)	858			
NA (n)		727		
Devt (s)			165	
Capacity				
NA (s)	1163			
NA (n)		1042		
Devt (s)			523	
RFC %				
NA (s)	74%			
NA (n)		70%		
Devt (s)			32%	

Notes:

1. The capacity is based on single file operation on all entries.
2. Actual layout might include 2 lanes from the south.
3. No account is taken of how "peaky" the demand is.
4. Differences rather than percentages between Demand & Capacity may sometimes be more relevant.
5. Current side-road proportions are a significant proportion of the total. (> 10%)

Assessment of a mini-roundabout left turns transferred to South Drive

1. AM peak 2022

Am Peak 8.15-9.15 From \ To	NA (s)	NA (n)	Devt (s)
NA (s) added			32
NA (n) added			
Devt (s) added		10	
NA (s)	0	382	97
NA (n)	783	0	27
Devt (s)	138	37	0
Demand (total)			
NA (s)	479		
NA (n)		810	
Devt (s)			185
Capacity			
NA (s)	1153		
NA (n)		1071	
Devt (s)			417
RFC %			
NA (s)	42%		
NA (n)		76%	
Devt (s)			44%

1. PM Peak 2022

Am Peak 8.15-9.15 From \ To	NA (s)	NA (n)	Devt (s)
NA (s) added			45
NA (n) added			
Devt (s) added		9	
NA (s)	0	685	158
NA (n)	662	0	50
Devt (s)	128	37	0
Demand (total)			
NA (s)	843		
NA (n)		712	
Devt (s)			174
Capacity			
NA (s)	1154		
NA (n)		997	
Devt (s)			538
RFC %			
NA (s)	73%		
NA (n)		71%	
Devt (s)			32%

1. AM peak 2027

Am Peak 8.15-9.15 From \ To	NA (s)	NA (n)	Devt (s)
NA (s) added			32
NA (n) added			
Devt (s) added		10	
NA (s)	0	390	97
NA (n)	801	0	27
Devt (s)	138	37	0
Demand (total)			
NA (s)	487		
NA (n)		828	
Devt (s)			185
Capacity			
NA (s)	1153		
NA (n)		1071	
Devt (s)			399
RFC %			
NA (s)	42%		
NA (n)		77%	
Devt (s)			46%

1. PM Peak 2027

Am Peak 8.15-9.15 From \ To	NA (s)	NA (n)	Devt (s)
NA (s) added			45
NA (n) added			
Devt (s) added		9	
NA (s)	0	700	158
NA (n)	677	0	50
Devt (s)	128	37	0
Demand (total)			
NA (s)	858		
NA (n)		727	
Devt (s)			174
Capacity			
NA (s)	1154		
NA (n)		997	
Devt (s)			523
RFC %			
NA (s)	74%		
NA (n)		73%	
Devt (s)			33%

Assessment of a mini-roundabout ALL turns transferred to South Drive

1. AM peak 2022

Am Peak 8.15-9.15 From \ To	NA (s)	NA (n)	Devt (s)
NA (s) added			32
NA (n) added			8
Devt (s) added	42	10	
NA (s)	0	382	97
NA (n)	783	0	27
Devt (s)	138	37	0
Demand (total)			
NA (s)	479		
NA (n)		776	
Devt (s)			227
Capacity			
NA (s)	1153		
NA (n)		1071	
Devt (s)			459
RFC %			
NA (s)	42%		
NA (n)		72%	
Devt (s)			49%

1. PM Peak 2022

Am Peak 8.15-9.15 From \ To	NA (s)	NA (n)	Devt (s)
NA (s) added			45
NA (n) added			11
Devt (s) added	39	9	
NA (s)	0	685	158
NA (n)	662	0	50
Devt (s)	128	37	0
Demand (total)			
NA (s)	843		
NA (n)		684	
Devt (s)			213
Capacity			
NA (s)	1154		
NA (n)		997	
Devt (s)			577
RFC %			
NA (s)	73%		
NA (n)		69%	
Devt (s)			37%

1. AM peak 2027

Am Peak 8.15-9.15 From \ To	NA (s)	NA (n)	Devt (s)
NA (s) added			32
NA (n) added			8
Devt (s) added	42	10	
NA (s)	0	390	97
NA (n)	801	0	27
Devt (s)	138	37	0
Demand (total)			
NA (s)	487		
NA (n)		794	
Devt (s)			227
Capacity			
NA (s)	1153		
NA (n)		1071	
Devt (s)			441
RFC %			
NA (s)	42%		
NA (n)		74%	
Devt (s)			51%

1. PM Peak 2027

Am Peak 8.15-9.15 From \ To	NA (s)	NA (n)	Devt (s)
NA (s) added			45
NA (n) added			11
Devt (s) added	39	9	
NA (s)	0	700	158
NA (n)	677	0	50
Devt (s)	128	37	0
Demand (total)			
NA (s)	858		
NA (n)		699	
Devt (s)			213
Capacity			
NA (s)	1154		
NA (n)		997	
Devt (s)			562
RFC %			
NA (s)	74%		
NA (n)		70%	
Devt (s)			38%