



**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](http://www.burlingtonvt.gov)

**Councilor Maxwell Tracy, Chair** *WARD 2*  
**Councilor Jack Hanson,** *East District*  
**Councilor Franklin Paulino,** *North District*

**Inquiries:**  
**Phillip Peterson**  
802.865.5832  
ppeterson@burlingtonvt.gov

**Transportation, Energy and Utilities Committee of the City Council**  
**Tuesday, May 7, 2019 5:30 PM**

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

**–AGENDA–**

Meeting begins: 5:34

MT: introductions of staff for new councilors

**1. Agenda**

MT: Motion on the agenda

JH: moves to accept

FP: Seconds

Unanimous aye

**2. Minutes of 03/19/2019**

Unanimous aye to accept

**3. Public Forum**

MT: welcomes public comment now or during agenda items

Martha Lang: Colchester Ave resident

I support alternative means of transportation

Bike lanes on both sides of the street improve safety

Removing parking is acceptable but implications must be fully considered

Mansfield Ave to Winooski River needs to be accommodated

Use side streets, Fletcher, Latham, Case, etc. for alternative parking for Colchester Ave residents

Additional parking behind the building on Pearl Street was done after a similar situation

This shows a parking plan should be in place before the plan is implemented

Jason Stuffel – 316 Colchester Ave Resident

14 year resident, Old East End Neighborhood Coalition member

In favor of bike lanes

Neighborhood must be safe for everyone, all modes of transportation including bikes

On street parking can be removed and a solution can be found

Bikes need a dedicated place to be to be safe

Resident and businesses can be accommodated

Cameron Scott – No Waste Compost

See attached PowerPoint

MT: wants to continue the conversation and move No Waste Compost forward

MT: no further public comment, move forward with the agenda

#### 4. GMT NextGen Recommendations & College Street Shuttle

- a. Mark Sousa, Green Mountain Transit
  - b. 10-minute duration
  - c. Action: Informative, no action needed.
- NextGen recommendations – 18 month project to look at entire system and see efficiencies – Nelson Mygard was hired to do this
  - Board adopted these recommendations in 2018
  - GMT Burlington specific recommendations
    - o Changes in service times/frequency for various routes, this was done to holistically and realistically look at the overall system
    - o College St Shuttle changes specifically – made more convenient, still no fare required based on public correspondence, this fare was difficult because this route runs between various towns/cities that are not all in agreement with it being fare free

JH: what if South Burlington doesn't come up with a subsidy to keep it fare free

GMT: People get off once it crosses from South Burl to Burl and then get back on and pay

FP: Why switch from 15 mins to 30 minutes?

GMT: This was done to make the operation more feasible, it used to frequently be late.

GMT: College St shuttle is 30 minutes year round, no longer seasonal

JH: Why was this not switched to 15 minute routes during peak times?

GMT: This was done for logistics, taking into consideration airport as well

GMT: Fare free must be subsidized, SB would need \$72,000 more to have this be fare free

FP: Will this be an item on their agenda soon

GMT: Yes moving forward

JH: \$125000 for Burlington, will this change with these changes

GMT: Doesn't anticipate this will change

MT: Wow does So Burl feel about keeping this free

GMT: No communication yet, these routes start June 17<sup>th</sup>

MT: This decision is already made?

GMT: Yes and they have committed to keep it fare free

MT: Issues around fare but also concerned about turnaround time and convenience. Used for health care services. Will there be a tracking route, will this be flexible?

GMT: Committed to quarterly check-ins to see if everything is working and is open to making changes. Will report back to the board. All of Chittenden County is covered with this

MT: What is the board structure?

GMT 13 members, rural and urban communities – Burlington has two commissioners on the board to account for size and population

FP: What are your thoughts on the app to track buses?

GMT: State wide AVL – real time app to locate busses. Tell you where nearest busses are based on your location. Entire state will have the same app and locate any transit system. Can pick a destination. Mobile ticketing will be combined in the same app- this is not widely done elsewhere. This will be implemented soon after June 17<sup>th</sup>

FP: This will be helpful in his neighborhood.

GMT: Pilot program was done in southern VT for a year and a half, confident this will increase ridership and be more efficient

Public Comment: Speculates route 11 is most traveled route with the most passengers. Truly urban route made for convenience and ease - no wait time. Why not have it run every 30 minutes for airport route, and keep higher frequency route for more used current route. He is happy with the plans but this area needs a frequent route and this may have been overlooked.

Public comment: on behalf of City Councilor Busher:

- Pleased that the voices of citizens speaking out about fare get heard and can be acted on and effective with changes

- Sharron, Chapin, and I met last week. Identified poor level of communication from GMT to city council and DPW regarding changes. Busher requests there be a written communications sent to the council as a whole for one of the May meetings that could describe changes, frequency, existing and proposed routes side by side, time frame for implementation, and definitive statement saying College St will stay free. Staff are overwhelmed and while Chapin is the appropriate member for the GMT board he has many other responsibilities. There can be alternates that can be appointed so when a commissioner cannot make it an alternate can sit in. This could help the problem and more effectively represent the city. Sharron wants that to be looked into. Communication to councilors, state the names of GMT Burlington reps and proposal for alternates be put in. This will help with issues of review to make sure all people's views are heard. Also can assess less ridership and decreased frequency - are we overpaying? This can also be looked into with alternates.

Chapin: Happy to work with GMT – in support of alternates, many other communities have these. Communication to city councilors was not optimal. GMT did outreach in advance to public forums. No directly to councilors, this omission was not nefarious. He will clearly look at ridership. This was a budget neutral proposal. More hours in Burlington for the same amount of money in Burlington. This adds new areas that will be serviced.

GMT: recognizes that outreach could have been improved. Started to put in place a media plan to inform councilors.

TEUC supports this idea that this information is laid out to entire council to give more people the information to move forward.

MT: Request for communication moving forward and a request to add alternatives to GMT council. Do we have a motion to move forward?

JH: I will move that these both occur.

FP: Second and a motion.

GMT: can send along proposed changes.

Public Comment: Busher is looking for written communication and a conversation about alternatives.

MT: this does not have to be a full deliberative item.

Public Comment: Could be discussed in the committee reports. Being on the consent agenda would be fine.

MT: this would be on one of the next two agendas.

MT: unanimous aye. Item closed

## 5. CSWD FY'20 Budget

- Sarah Reeves, CSWD
  - 10-minute duration
  - Action: Informative, no action needed.
- CSWD: last week budget was proposed to city council.
  - Clarify the landfill ban is July 1, 2020.
  - Opens table for questions.

JH: concerned with moving forward. Increasing trash is not good. Proposed budget keeps the fees constant for trash but increases for recycling and compost. What impact will that have? How will this reduce solid waste?

CSWD: We are just responding to increased trash. Trash amount ebbs and flows. Trash generation increased now because of favorable economic climate (not recession). CSWD educates public. In the community everyday talking about managing and reducing waste. Food scrapes management and reduction is important. Powerful methane gas is produced from food scraps. Looking at communication strategies to target more people and more regular communications on outlets that already exist, radio TV FPF etc. Phone calls have worked. Increasing fees – this is not controlled by Casella, this is a private company. \$27/ton of trash disposed is what is charged by the haulers. This fee is not hugely impacted. If the fee is raised too high people won't dispose of trash correctly to get rid of things cheaply. This is a straight fee for people who do all three (i.e. trash, recycle, and compost) and subsidizing people who are only using one (i.e. just recycle) which if done alone is currently free. This new fee is to change that and have everyone pay for the cost of their waste. Casella is \$125/ton for compost. \$60/ton is what CSWD charges. This is much below what the industry standard is. Largest food scrap processor in the state. CSWD spent 2 years trying to bring franchise public disposal to Chittenden County. Haulers did not agree this was the right thing to do. CSWD still agrees this is good and is happy Burl and So Burl are studying this.

JH: need for more revenue to cover the cost of recycling. Right now it is to be gained by increasing fees to those bringing strictly recycling to the facility

CSWD: This is not the only source of income for recycling. China essentially closed paper and cardboard imports for recycling which hugely effected CSWD. Heavy capital intensive year, replaced bailer, which gets products to market. We did not add money into capital reserve fund. This year will rebuild capital reserve. Mitigate losses on things such as paying to recycle paper, and have a stabile price.

JH: Concerned 0\$ to 2\$ per visit to drop off strictly recycling is a huge jump. This could discourage recycling. Why was trash not increased this much (rather increased by cents)?

CSWD: Most people who bring recycling only have already made other arrangements for their trash. This is people who may have excess or overflow. Generally not a weekly occurrence. Multifamily apartments generally have commercial disposal. These are not the types of people who use this service. They have not heard this being a problem. People who use this are generally dealing w things such as excess recycling from a special event/party.

JH: Are there any additional resources put into waste reduction in this budget?

CSWD: This is always in the budget. They are happy to talk to people to talk about consumption, management, zero waste. Web resources available.

JH: Supportive of the work that CSWD is doing and has done. Trash is rising and he just wants to make sure this is being addressed.

CSWD: Finds personal connection has been doing well in this effort. Increased outreach department, hired full time person to do outreach with businesses and events and waste reduction there.

JH: Is there increased funding in this?

CSWD: More targeted approach. Not necessarily more funds. More efficient data driven approach with current funds.

MT: Appreciates CSWD coming, Dan Gusin has done great outreach. Still has concerns that JH was rising. There has been trouble with the communications with the board. The Burlington rep has since retired. Need to make sure communication is done before decisions are made. This has happened last year with drop off sites that councilors had questions about.

Chapin: has been communicating with Jen Green as the alternate. Rob Green (retired) is happy to stay in his roll until its end May 2020. This position is posted. DPW wants council to provide information about what they want moving forward.

No waste Compost: Appreciates CSWD

- Believes we need more fees on trash as CSWD is doing (i.e mattresses, ect)
- Ladfill in VT is reaching capacity
- If we are still generating trash then this will be a huge cost
- Education and outreach is fundamental
- More fees on trash
- Brattelborough is very successful

Public Comment: What are the components of trash? How can we start to eliminate things waste that is bad and go back to better alternatives? CEDO could be appropriate to look into this

CSWD: State completed extensive waste characterization study. CSWD is extrapolating to get specific Chittenden County data. CSWD does their own categorization. The goal is to implement new programs.

MT: closes item

#### **6. North Avenue Lighting Update**

- a. Munir Kastj, COO/Manager of Utility Services & Engineering, and Andy Elliston, Director of Engineering & Technical Services, BED
- b. 10-minute duration
- c. Action: Informative, no action needed.

BED: Ethan Allen Pkwy to Woodbury St. lights completely installed. This includes in front of shopping center. Sidewalk and roadway was considered. Illuminating Engineering Society lighting levels were met. 38 LED fixtures were installed. Additional fixtures will be installed with new crosswalks installed on North Ave. 3 new poles were installed. LED light fixtures meet the rating of backlight/uplight glare.

FP: Happy it was done

MT: Clarifies great majority of work is done, just crosswalk lighting needs to be installed.

#### **7. Colchester Avenue Bike Lanes and Paint Scheme**

- a. Nicole Losch, DPW presenting
- b. 10-minute duration
- c. Action: Informative, no action needed.

NL: Quick update on plans for improving bikeway on Colchester Ave. in coordination with repaving which was scheduled for last year. Initial implementation was a climbing lane. While paving was put off due to various factors, neighborhood interest was spiked and wanted DPW to do more. While looking into the feasibility, roadway geometry was investigated. High crash rates. Businesses were considered. Many neighbors and bikers want parking removed on both sides. Planned for June commission. Retain parking on one side between East Ave and the cemetery. Provide parking for store. Reconsidering plan for parking on the hill - remove parking to provide bike lanes on both directions on the hill. Is there off street/side street parking – this will be considered. This won't be implemented with paving – temporary paint can go in until plan is finalized.

JH: outreach has showed people want more to be done with the bike lanes. He has done much outreach since. Removing parking on the entire north side but retaining in that section. It does a good job of balancing needs and concerns. Would like to see protected bike lanes along the full stretch and continuing to Pearl St. This will require more removal and investment. This is a good first step. Happy with where we are at. Having bike lanes in both directions on the steep section is critical for safety.

FP: Kampus Kitchen needs parking, how many spots are being saved for them?

NL: all spots that exist there will remain and add time restricted spaces. They said they wouldn't need more than 4 spaces. The vast majority of the parking in that area is Resident Permit Parking only.

FP: what is the possibility of the off street parking capacity?

NL: we are looking for direct feedback from neighbors to see necessity for this and where they see opportunities.

FP: is there parking available?

NL: only aware of Centennial Field which could have capacity to accommodate some parking during some times. Currently working with the field and UVM who may have ownership. Parking counts showed low parking utilization. Most days all parking could be accommodated on one side. Unsure of parking on hill. Still need to do parking counts here.

JH: Centennial field could be a good option to consider, especially moving forward and making this project extend further. Downhill section of Colchester Ave. Would these bike lanes be wide or have a buffer?

NL: if there is no on street parking then there is potential for wide bike lanes and/or buffer. Plans haven't been drawn up. Currently there are only minimum requirements being met.

Public comment - Jason: thinks there is enough parking on side streets to accommodate this. Mill St parking lot also could be looked into. Need to find out the people who are in need of parking and accommodating them. Uses the sidewalk in this section because there is nowhere to go on the street. Between drivers and parked cars.

Public Comment - Martha Lang: Spoke during public forum. Reiterates points brought up previously. Supports bike lanes. Tenants that depend on driving on Colchester Ave must be considered. Used to have parking on both sides of the street. Need to accommodate biking and parking.

Jason: Have shared use of side streets to accommodate this parking offset.

Martha: Tenants don't having parking, homeowners have parking.

Busher: wants a pilot program. Where do residents, guests, and service vehicles park? What will Kampus Kitchen see as problems? Wants a safer bike lane. This could also be a pilot for resident permit parking which is problematic.

Jason: what is the number of resident permit passes/guest passes that were actually given out?

MT: NL can you follow up with Busher and share responses to the commission and commission members

Public Comment: Stop using public land for private parking. Are car share capabilities being considered for long term planning?

NL: for specific projects cars here isn't brought into too much consideration but its value is recognized greatly by the city.

#### **8. 2019 Construction Season Overview**

- a. Rob Goulding, DPW
- b. 10-minute duration
- c. Action: Informative, no action needed.

Chapin: please let us know if further efforts can be taken to present this to the commission.

MT: put this on the consent agenda

See Presentation.

Questions:

MT: Hyde St and Walnut St both have significant damage and should be assessed. Walnut adjacent to Dewey Park Triangle. Has been asked about for a long time. Between Archibald and Spring. Great to continue investment into sidewalks. When will

assessment of sidewalks be redone so planning can be done well with most updated information. Excited about five corners. Feedback on ONE greenway – people think it's ugly. When will this be constructed? Keeping safety data on these is important to make it permanent.

RG: we will look into the segments brought up and see how they can be mitigated. Will look into sidewalk metrics.

Chapin: looking to do another round of assessment. SCF is still useful. Sidewalk cutting will continue – allows for ADA surface to be obtained much more cheaply.

FP: Supports having the best pothole fixing. Pothole crew could be used in the winter. In favor of increasing financial budget to improve this asset mitigation.

JH: agrees it is worth dedicating more resources to work on sidewalks and streets. Different landscape that requires more resources. Worthwhile investment.

Chapin: not a resource issue, it's a weather. Can't get a durable repair during the winter.

Lee: temporary fix in the winter until asphalt can be used. Plows also pull out pothole fixes. Rain and snow cycles are difficult.

Chapin: throwing more money at potholes does not fix problems during the off season. Expanded paving program for various years is the solution. What will happen after Mayor's 5 year plan, will funding drop off?

FP: a lot of support for this.

JH: supports more money during the on season.

MT: include this on consent agenda.

#### **9. Shared Mobility Update**

- a. Rob Goulding, DPW and Nicole Losch, DPW presenting
- b. 10-minute duration
- c. Action requested.

See presentation.

Bob Dale from Gotcha Group attending.

Questions:

FP: Skeptical about scooters. In favor of geo-fencing. Scooters could be better for downtown areas and getting up and down the hill (UVM). More comfortable w that than spread throughout the city. Asks to clarify this means 105 regular bikes will be replaced by 200 E bikes. NNE hubs will be expanded.

Chapin: Working with Gotcha to determine where hubs are - both racks and virtual. This will need to be finalized.

FP: 200 bikes doesn't seem to be able to be spread to more hubs

JH: build out the bike fleet further and get more hubs and e bikes. Awesome opportunity to make huge gains in transportation alternatives that are accessible to more people and more types of trips. Could facilitate more people commuting to work as he recently started doing with his personal e bike. Free, accessible, affordable, doesn't need a huge up front purchase – this is good. E scooter ridership surpassing e bikes is interesting. More widely used nationally that he was aware. Seems to be opportunities. Safety and geo-fencing is huge and helpful with regulating.

MT: concerned. Would like to see a copy of a contract. Make sure all public concerns are addressed. Desire to review the contract comes from concerns with accuracy of geo-fencing. Test geo-fences prior to full roll out. Provisions for protection of ADA violations – San Diego is currently being sued for this. Legal challenges being raised for people's ability to access.

Wanting to see a plan for how to develop an ordinance or a regulatory framework before this is moved forward. If there is not a

framework for where they go, how they go and where they are stored this will cause a broader traffic/safety concern. If someone is injured or killed this could cause huge problems had these steps not been taken. 100% e-Bikes is a concern. This feels like a back slide on sustainability by forcing people to ride e bikes even if they want regular bikes. Tradeoffs – are these sustainability things being made correctly, reducing trips or just for pleasure. Equity – how do we maintain equity and access? Seems like only wealthy college kids will use this. How will low income person have access to this? If this is in a neighborhood context. Not income sensitive, pay to play, gentrification. Attracts people to neighborhoods where they have these. Emphasis that mayor needs a 90 day lead time before this starts. August launch if we approve this now. 10,000 college kids will be using this. The window for this to go through may have passed.

FP: Scooters, very cheap to use.

RG: subsidy built into the contract to have vendor have discounts for various reasons: no mobile phones, low income, etc. We have a draft of the contract that we are happy to share now.

JH: What is the pricing?

Bob: E Scooter: 1\$ to unlock, 15 cents per min.  
E Bike 2\$ to unlock 10 cents per min  
15% off membership for people who qualify with low income  
Membership is monthly, gets allotted time

FP: e scooter usage vs bike usage?

Bob: varies, twice as many trips on e scooter when they are introduced at the same time as e bikes in a similar manner

FP: City only has one shot to do this. Has received articles stating logistics/quality of the e scooters. Public perception is big.

Bob: Gotcha has 10' wheel vs 6' wheel. Other companies put month life span on scooters. We have years of lifespan.

NL: wattage is good, has been tested that they can go up hills.

Chapin: Related to e scooter piece – should we state in the contract that the TEUC would need to authorize the initiation of a E Scooter option?

Bob: full conversion to E bikes vs balance of E bikes and regular bikes - It has been proven that in any market that this has been tried, the ridership of non e bikes goes to next to nothing.

MT: Open to e bike piece but wants to check geo-fencing. Brought up by councilors and public. Talk about equity. Clarify that Gotcha is able to do e bike separate from e scooter

NL: Core elements of contract can be signed to manufacture e bikes while logistics can be finalized.

FP: is a soft launch possible.

NL: this is up to a 1 year pilot. This can be less

Bob: only outside of winter months for e scooters. E bikes year long

FP: public input after soft roll out would be helpful

Public Comment: Should strike "to further initiate e scooter when conditions allow." Even after state approves, city must address all safety concerns that have been brought up. A previous committee asked that prior to e scooters there will be community outreach. Wants a small number of e scooters in terms of pilot program. Safety of pedestrians needs to stop being ignored in these discussions. E bikes and E scooters shouldn't be tied together. "As legal conditions allow" is open to interpretation and too vague for councilors to accept.

Samuel: Public: Concerns about e scooters and e bikes. What would be measured by pilot project and who would assess if it works. SCF? How can this equitably be expressed? Concerns with ADA. Public private partnership opens city to more risk. City is then held responsible. Current bikes are not good to ride. No cost to the city but still isn't great. What is the vendor accountable or liable for? Would like to see the contract. Substance abuse on scooters and bikes is a concern. Are we subsidizing people having fun vs safety? Appreciates how this has moved since it started.



JH: Wants to approve e bikes move forward but referring to e scooter process w no commitment from TEUC to pass

Public comment: If city council adopts the language as it is, DPW will have full reign. This seems rushed and TEUC should see contract and what's in it before handing it off to administration.

Discussion about hesitations with specific language and upcoming meetings between councilors.

Chapin: happy to share contract and let committee review and give individual feedback. We want to expedite this process and move this forward. No cost to the city.

MT: giving public ROW and there is a cost to this

Chapin: this is currently done with current bike program done at a huge cost

JH: there are indirect costs but also indirect benefits

MT: privatization of public space - must be careful about doing this

JH: Economically, this is expanding access more so than the status quo does. If you have money it is already easy to get around. This opens options for cheap, non-bus/walking transportation. Sees improvement to access for those w no means.

MT: no cost for bikes with low to no cost bike recycle programs already in place.

JH: not available to everyone. People in not great shape can't use bikes as easily. Requires maintenance of bikes

Bob: no maintenance with e bikes

JH: different than a cheap bike. Opens up different options. No maintenance. No physical effort.

MT: willing to move on it, just needs to be recognized that concerns are valid. Doesn't want to move at this time.

JH: happy to take longer look at the contract.

Chapin: look at the 20<sup>th</sup> for decision. Should we send contract individually or schedule meeting with councilors? Or otherwise?

MT: Needs more time. Layout process for how this would be adopted into ordinance. Legal issues

NL: Burlington specific conditions can be flushed out with the contract itself.

Chapin: Are you looking for this for e bikes and e scooters?

MT: E bikes are better, not as new. Move forward w/ e bikes but more carefully move forward with e scooters.

FP: move forward w the bikes on the 20<sup>th</sup>?

MT: need more time for e scooters

Chapin: if contract explicitly says e scooters won't be launched w out TEUC review is that acceptable? Vendor may find issues with that.

MT: Challenging to get this passed by the council. If the first launch is incorrect the whole thing will be set back much further. A number of issues don't have complete or full answers which is a problem. E scooters are the concern.

JH: E scooters wouldn't launch w out our approval with this

FP: This is the second point presented by DPW. They wouldn't be rolled out if we didn't like it

JH: Add TEUC has the ability to reject to this condition

FP: or the council has the ability to reject. They will deal with this as well as the TEUC in terms of public comments.

JH: doesn't agree the council should have a say in e bikes but agrees they should have say w e scooters. E bikes are already being sold widely.

FP: thinks this won't be as big of an impact as we think. They have been being sold for 2 years.

JH: Agree. Great technology.

RG: Expresses concerns that direct approval is problematic

Chapin: have the TEUC recommend the council authorize the contract once the TEUC is comfortable.

Public Comment: internal contradiction w in the bullets presented

Chapin: DPW is happy to share the contract and bring councilor on board.

FP: does this have to be amended before me vote on it?

Discussion on exact language of the proposal.

MT: Not comfortable will moving forward. Will vote no. Need to work on both as a committee. Need to see the contractor. Prefers we don't move this today.

Councilor Paul: It has been a long meeting w a packed agenda. Encourages as someone who will be voting on it, based on the history and the person who was a driving force behind BTV bike walk plan, it does matter as a committee that you move forward together and that you all vote yes on this. With more time I think this can happen. Max has been supportive since day one if there was unanimous support I think this would mean a lot. Encourage to meet again and vote again in a week and a half from now to vote on the same page.

MT: agrees a meeting before June 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting will be beneficial to address all councilors concerns. Hold off on motions and identify a time to bring this forward when there is the contract reviewed.

JH: open to target the 20<sup>th</sup>?

MT: concerns with time frame

JH: trying to target the 20<sup>th</sup>

Chapin: we can send out possible dates, happy to accommodate.

MT: coordinate offline in advance of the 20<sup>th</sup> otherwise push to the 3<sup>rd</sup>

#### **10. TEUC Committee Goals**

MT: move to discuss this at a later meeting

#### **11. Adjourn**

JH: motion to adjourn

All in favor

~9:15PM