



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.burlingtonvt.gov

Councilor Maxwell Tracy, Chair *WARD 2*
Councilor Sharon Foley Bushor, *WARD 1*
Councilor David Hartnett, *North District*

Inquiries:
Phillip Peterson
802.865.5832
ppeterson@burlingtonvt.gov

Transportation, Energy and Utilities Committee of the City Council
Thursday, February 21, 2019 5:30 PM

Burlington Department of Public Works – Front Conference Room
645 Pine Street – Burlington, VT

–AGENDA–

1. Agenda

Motion on the agenda – unanimous aye. 5:30 pm.

2. Minutes of 01/08/2019

Motion on the minutes:

Councilor Bushor: Question regarding FY2020 CCRPC unified planning work projects topic

- Motion mentioned here not explicitly specified just stated as happening and moving forward
- This must be addressed and motion must be explicitly stated

3. Public Forum

Councilor states that questions are welcomed and open at all times but recommended during relevant items.

S Prospect Resident residing near Ruggles House comes forward to speak:

- East side of South prospect has houses with cul de sacs, resident center, etc. Many people walk here and infrastructure, location, demographic in neighborhood encourages walking.
- Redstone campus is down the street, cliff street has bumper to bumper parking, speculated as mainly UVM commuters
- UVM has Redstone buss that cycles bus route continuously
- Resident states she has been in hospital due to being hit by a bike
- UVM is proposing e-scooters and e-bikes and resident is worried for safety concerns that will come from this
 - o Riding on sidewalks is a hazard
- Resident things reevaluating bike/walk plan and getting bikes off sidewalks is necessary for safety here
 - o Currently bikes are allowed at any age to ride on sidewalks
 - o Proposed a change to the city rules to allow age restriction of riding on the sidewalks
- Resident states she was a member of the bike walk council

- She mentions when UVM got city to include recommendation to have the sidewalk in front of her home to be 8ft wide shared use path which she is not in favor of as this gives cyclist too much freedom
- Ultimately states she is in favor of E-Scooters and E-Bikes riding exclusively in the street.

Next Resident speaks: Dan

- Resident comes forward to ask about salt distribution and snow melt on sidewalks – was brought up by resident last year to city council where the City said there would be steps to use pet friendly salt mix
- Resident called Lee Perry to see when this mix would be used
 - Lee said later in the year it would be used
- What is progress and when will it be started?

Chapin Responds: Mix was used but major challenges arose – it requires a more frequent application that isn't feasible. The City is still testing it but has gone back to rock salt for the time being.

- Additional comment from resident: Bike path barriers are dangerous in the winter and make maneuvering dangerous
- Resident proposes taking them out in the winter and reinstalled in the summer

Next Resident: Samuel – south end

- Concerns of danger with e scooters
- Says slick conditions, reckless drivers, lighting areas, need to be considered not just overall idea of project
- Concerns of what is not being factored in – other users of the street need to be considered
- States scooters go 15 mph with no helmet program, no regulation program, no enforcement and that is unsafe
- If this will be implemented: need to implement rider education, community education, vender accountability
- Texas had fatality from e-scooters
- Seattle also has case studies on e-scooters
- Many case studies show safety concerns
- Collaboration between city and Gotcha (Vendor) needs to have more accountability, as in they pay higher premium
- Have more people involved who have more diverse safety backgrounds involved in planning
- Designated parking areas don't have requirement just 5\$ fine – this could cause clutter

Council opens comments back to public: no one comes forward

4. Recycling Cart Update

William Ward, Director Code Enforcement presenting, see handout

WW: Update on mayors request for goals

- Yearlong evaluation of recycling outreach for education
- Goal of 50% improvement on streets with poor track record
- Burlington staff took tour of Williston recycling facility to get baseline to see how Burlington is performing
- Some streets good some streets regularly bad in regards to recycling properly
- Completing evaluation phase of evaluation process currently – seeing regularly bad properties with trash frequently there
- Next step is daily inspections and outreach to address issues with tenants
- Weekly recycling may not be enough – could be better management at properties or facilities
- May show properties on various streets with commonality of property owners who may be negligent
- Enforcement is next step: ticketing 100\$ and second ticket increases if within specified time threshold
- People recycling improperly – trying to recycle the wrong things, mixing in trash with recycling
- People walking by put trash in with recycling containers left on the street
- Totes can be part of the solution along with enforcement and learning from people (property owners) who are doing a good job
- If we press 100s of people to get recycling totes the city must have them in stock

SB: Landlords must be clear of how they want their property kept and tenet selection. Properties are falling apart on the inside and often have trash on the outside – This reflects on property owner. Asks question regarding what the metrics of observation being used by the city are in regards to the handout provided.

WW clarifies metrics of observations.

SB: People want to recycle, often have too much recycling for a bin, capacity is often an issue, convenience of having it out with no fine, recycling comes during the day when people are home.

WW: Clean and sanitary code of ordinances is loosely used to make the case that people can't leave bins out.
He suggests recommendation to possibly set time frame to clarify when recycling can be put out and taken in
"Sunset day before to sunset day after" possibly

SB: She doesn't want to collect money or give people more rigidity. Appreciative of solutions but wants to find ways to fix problems without monetary fines.

Bill: He finds difference between property owner problems vs tenant problems in regards to recycling.

DH: Will totes be available for all duplexes/complexes after sept 1, 2018 who are required to obtain them?

Chapin: It was budgeted into FY19

DH: Will lack of supplies be addressed so this resolution can be justly amended?

Ward 1,2,3 seem to be problem

Should this statement of EVERY duplex be restricted to be more feasible?

WW: The City can accelerate outreach when inventory is there, slow enforcement to worst offenders when supplies of containers are low

DH: Bigger totes are favorable

Chapin: covers offer better quality, safety standpoint – truck arms lift rather than employees

SB: Information of proper recycling showing what items can be recycled rather than items that can - "DO NOT Recycle.." information on totes can be better than "DO recycle..."

MT: This hasn't lived up to what ordinance states.

Largely ineffectual from public perspective

Fully supports budget item because this demand must be responded as it is a basic quality of life

Quarterly report of how many totes go out should be provided

Storage of units can be addressed if needed – must get these out sooner rather than later

Majority of people on his street are using bins – inadequate

City wide need to get totes out to people

Direct contact to land lords must happen

Bill: incentivizing landlords is great but when UVM paid for an entire street to have covered totes (Isham St) they were not held responsible and accountable if they are not used. Giving them for free doesn't facilitate ownership and accountability. Landlords must train people every year on recycling

DH: could rewards be part of this solution – get a 5 if trash is not a problem? Younger generation wants to recycle but inadequate job done by landlords to allow them to do so properly

SB: Move-out-day swap on green belt goes throughout the entire summer which shouldn't be the case

This is positive but has downside that seems to have translated to recycling

If you regulate property owners, things left in green belt should also deduct points

WW: The city never encourages things in the greenbelt

Unrelated to Item:

S Prospect Resident: No notice in front porch forum about the E scooters

Chapin: Rob will verify

S Prospect Resident: NPA agenda hasn't had info on this

5. Public Engagement Plan Review

Rob Goulding, DPW presenting, see handout

RG: Presented information on this plan last night to the commission

State Input from last year made plan more robust

Presented final version to DPW in Oct. 2017 and City council in Dec 2017

SB: Asks for clarification on what RFS stands for

RG: Request for Service – internal tool that was used prior to SCF

Unrelated to item - Chapin clarifies E-scooter was posted on FPF

S Prospect Resident: NPA could be helpful as a metric

Presentation goes into the City's approach for SCF, public outreach, social media usage, website updates, construction portal, and how to reach everyone – equity

SB: What happened in May to generate a spike in followers?

RG: Marketing, clean sweep, outreach for construction season, etc

SB : interested in a recap in writing to go to full council of input from residents

Under-inform – notification regarding maintenance, asking people to move their cars

24 hrs inadequate

72 hrs could be better

Right amount of time needs to be found

Sometimes surprised as a counselor that meeting have happened

Sometimes need to look very hard to find meetings but this should be easier

Small scale neighborhood initiatives are best to put things on their doorstep

City calendar doesn't list TEUC

Chapin: conversations on joint a calendar are happening – this possibly becomes overwhelming with too many events, possibilities of these agendas being able to be filtered are being discussed.

MT: suggestion he received from resident – list server email for TEUC committee as well so people who are interested in regularly following the work can get an email directly to inbox.

DH: DPW should be split up to better address problems. Most complaints he received from citizens in New North End (NNE) are public works.

NNE is mainly seniors. They don't get the twitter and other notifications – phone calls are best. DPW must address issues at hand with this ageing population.

Additionally construction sites not well lit, parking ban signs left on too long.

Unrelated to item – Resident: Who manages Nixle?

Chapin: Public works sends out gov delivery system for parking bans.

Resident: Parking bans must be more routinely reported, for past years as well.

RG/Chapin: This is being addressed. Staff is aware of problems.

Unrelated to item - S Prospect Resident: DPW staff is always nice.

6. Parklet Pilot Introduction

- a. Nicole Losch, DPW and Will Clavelle, CEDO presenting, see attached

DH: Aware of the pilot done last year. Thinks taking away parking spaces downtown is not favorable. Not in favor of this idea.

We need to have a better balance with transportation with biking and walking and driving, this will cripple that relationship.

Spending money on this rather than improving infrastructure is not the right way to go. If this is to happen it should totally extend the street like Church Street rather than intermixing people's spaces with vehicular travel. Take traffic off streets like St Paul and lower Church with same model as Church St Market Place.

SB:

- Shares some concerns, happy it is pilot with limited spaces
- City councilors should be involved if there is residential/business collaboration
- Councilors should be aware and able to give input
- Sees loss of parking as an issue, but if surrounding neighbors are fine she is fine with this.
- Insure the people who live in the neighborhood are aware and able to give insight on what this means for them, not just business owners
- Is optimistic lessons will be learned from this pilot
- Asks about cost range
 - o NL: Cost range stated in presentation 5-40K is the cost estimate from parklet construction and design in other communities. Ultimately just the cost of design to be paid by person implementing parklet.
- Drivers levels differ, parking near parklets may be a problem
- Concerns of Co habitation of parking and people using parklet, noise level etc
- Multi beneficial to many businesses in the same proximity must happen
 - o NL: This is being considered and businesses in proximity will be consulted
 - o WC: Assures survey will be taken after pilot program and will be given out to people who have the parklet and people who use it

MT:

- In support of parklets, better use of the space than what is currently being done
- Concerns with public access to the parklets

- "Pay to play" must be avoided especially with subsidy, staff time etc. that is being put in
- Signs can facilitate this being an open space
- Must be public and accessible to outweigh burden of taking away space

Public comment: Thinks Parklet improves streets

Public comment: Spent time with pilot previously and had good experiences. Future plans for city may involve more streets like Church st which he is in favor of. Asks about design requirements from those applying.

NL: If business apply they don't have to submit full designs.

Resident: How much will design factor into application?

WC: It is being weighed, to get a feel for what level of construction and vision of what it will be

WC: this could be a solution to losing space with city hall park

PP: Winooski had pilot parklet that can be referenced although location information may not be applicable.

7. Intervale Road Scoping

Phillip Peterson, DPW and Peter Keating, CCRPC presenting, See attachment

SB: feels she wasn't informed adequately

- Intervale Center should be responsible for maintaining gravel portion
- In favor of the gravel portion not being paved, staying gravel for natural feel
- Sizeable amount of money between alternatives (5-600,000 difference) how is safety addressed
- Parcel of land on left commercial parcel was sold as storage units (before but close to railroad tracks) how will this be considered/ is this still going through
- PK: Addresses questions from SB between alternatives
 - Public meeting showed alternative 3 was the winner, better lighting, and wider path
- House railroad station and regular house – those properties will not be impacted as widening of road will happen on the other side Nicole confirms

NL: Curb separation with alternative three to address steepness of road, and lighting was also seen as important (only in paved area lighting). This was supported at public meetings

- In Support
 - Refers to Intervale as "secret garden"

DH: asks to clarify makeup of public meeting

Intervale representative: Explains it was diverse: divers, community gardeners, farmers, BED, DPW, CCRPC, etc

Public comment: potholes here are bad on that road.

Chapin: management here is difficult, long-term needs to discuss who will maintain this

MT: Shared use path with income is of concern, how was this factored in?

NL: supplement shared use path with shared lane markings on roadway especially in downhill direction to get people with higher speed to use this rather than shared use path. BED was concerned with drivers of large trucks that use this. Trucks had no way of not encroaching into bike lanes when those designs were made

Resident: Should speed limit be dropped?

NL: we are restricted in doing this but we are designing the road to have a narrower road

Intervale partner: increased users are seen, appreciative of city support, trucks and pedestrian combination is prevalent here which causes problems. Support and willingness to work with city is fully there from interval. One conflict is the dump site at the end of the road, large trucks help potholes develop faster – anyway this can be addressed would be great. Traffic slowing occurs from potholes which is an upside. Slow traffic should be considered

Chapin: Darin Springiner sent email- appreciates effort to make intervale more user friendly

Councilors: Motion to approve draft resolution, unanimous aye

Resolution will be presented at the March 11 City Council meeting.

8. Bike Share/Scooter Share

Nicole Losch, DPW and Chapin Spencer, DPW presenting

Presentation is skipped to be time sensitive:

Chapin: after bike share last year city received proposals for next chapter of what bike share will be.

- Gotcha – vendor through CATMA for bike share is currently negotiating a contract with no city sponsorship dollars
- Councilor input is valuable
- 200 e-bikes and 200 e-scooters shared between Burlington, South Burlington, and Winooski and UVM and Champlain College
- The proposed 1\$ per scooter rented per day would generate roughly 300,00/yr
 - o Last year the city contributed 42,000 this year they could pay us

DH: When will this be implemented?

Chapin: Considering - Multijurisdictional proposal involving, Burlington, South Burlington, and Winooski. Will make sure city has all regulatory tools in place before implementation. The City would cosign with what CATMA and Gotcha on this plan. No action tonight but interested in how council will be involved

SB: What feedback has been given? She hasn't heard good things. Can this input be presented to those making the decisions?

NL: community forum shows general support for viable transportation option while on the roads

Path access was a concern and not good for sidewalks

Working with parks and rec and others to navigate this issue

Happy to package all comments and provide summary at a future meeting or post them online

General support in the road network

SB: anything motorized shouldn't be on the sidewalk, what is the appropriate age on sidewalks – how can elderly be addressed in this as well, not just children using the sidewalks. Criteria must be set for vehicles that are motorized

NL 18+ can rent through Gotcha insurance policy

DH: Doesn't get the sense DPW understands community outcry will occur – this will be controversial issue. To roll this out in May is ambitious. People are under impression this is still conceptual

MT:

- Issues will come along with this. Uber had issues and we as a city played catch up. Shouldn't rush to get this done. Should develop ordinances well before and look to other cities who did this will.
- Consider this use of public space – best spaces where taken up by bike share that was pay only. More public space will be priced and who will be using these? – not accessible to all people and seems to have a very targeted rich audience
- Start small – 200 at once is an influx. Bike share was small and that was smart. We should take it slow and learn and develop ordinances beyond that

Chapin:

- Gotcha did provide low income subsidy
- 105 speed bikes – last year
- 80% of feedback received from Nancy was in favor of bikes with limits i.e. speed limits

SB : how fast can e-bikes go ?

Chapin: propulsion stops at 20 mph. E-bikes can be limited i.e. propulsion stopped/monitored by GPS location

S Prospect Resident: bike shops commented that local shops lost revenue to bike rentals from bike share last year – we should be supporting local businesses. Bikes should be reducing car usage, plan hubs around this – UVM has a hub but no cars so this reduction doesn't happen.

MT: Metrics to understand if this is really reducing car usage or just for recreation should be taken

Chapin: Gotcha will have open sharing of data collected

SB: ask for clarification on number of e-bikes and scooters.

Chapin: 200 e-bikes and scooters.

SB: Hearing caution from public – not sure she is educated enough to know what to do with e-scooters. Wants to make informed choices – this means she will need more information, feedback, locations, what can be done to address speed, safety issues, helmet requirements, liability of city, risk of renter.

MT: Will require follow up on item.

Chapin: development of roll out plan will happen

States he sees there is concern and need to process both with more concern about e-scooters from councilors

Can a phase implementation be addressed? – This will be discussed

9. Councilors' Update

SB: The council will end at the end of March and committees will then be reassigned. Desires outstanding requests be addressed.

In the minutes from the last meeting there where action items and requests for information:

1. For the cost of ped activated lights and Cost of instillation and number that had already been done.
2. How many ped improvement requests are there in queue?
3. Funding of capital projects – how much money had gone for bike, ped, and vehicular improvements

SB requests the city provide this info at next meeting to pass onto new committee

10. Adjourn

Councilor Motion to adjourn – unanimous aye. 8:15 pm