



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 Jack Hanson, Chair, *East District*
Councilor Jane Stromberg, *Ward 8*
Councilor Mark Barlow, *North District*

Inquiries:
Madeline Suender
802.735.5324
msuender@burlingtonvt.gov

Transportation, Energy and Utilities Committee of the City Council
Monday, March 14, 2022 6:30PM

–DRAFT MINUTES–

Call to order 6:32PM by Chair Hanson

1. Agenda

Councilor Barlow moved to approve agenda. Seconded by Chair Hanson. All in favor passed unanimously.

2. Minutes of 2/24/22

Councilor Barlow moved to approve minutes. Seconded by Councilor Stromberg. All in favor passed unanimously.

3. Public Forum

Bragg via chat - I only see 4 people. Is this a one way blind communication?

Chair Hanson – Explains Zoom set up, panelists

No Comments.

Closes at 6:37

4. North Winooski Parking Management Plan and Corridor Study Implementation

- Chapin Spencer, Nicole Losch, Norm Baldwin
- Action

See attached memo.

Director Chapin Spencer – Here to get input on N Winooski. Overview of project.

Chair Hanson – Put together a draft resolution that will be discussed tonight to move forward and achieve a compromise to address what we've heard for past three years. 23 attendees so keep comments concise to give everyone chance to speak. Opens Public Comment 6:48PM.

Jane Knodell: The March 2020 Council resolution created committee which intentionally included people who live and work on N Winooski Ave. Committee concluded we do not yet have a plan that meets the needs of the community and we should keep working towards a solution. The work of the joint committee should be honored by the Council. The draft resolution before you recommits to the removal of parking in 2023 without solutions. Against resolution.

Graham Truk: Climate Crisis. Roll of the community government to look at long term climate goals not short term impacts. Gas is expensive. Bike infrastructure is needed. We need to take a lead here with safe bike infrastructure and low emission modes of transportation. Look past concentrated pain of some residents who may lose parking to the larger community as a whole who benefit. More affordable and vision Zero. Supportive of resolution.

Bragg – Disagree with the changes to North Winooski Ave. I have worked as an administrator for the Bike Ped Coalition. I have been biking here for over 20 years and "sharing the road" is the way to do this. Against resolution.

Liz Curry – We need bike infrastructure on N Winooski Ave. The resolution disregards the public engagement plan that governs DPW projects. The City is committed to climate crisis solutions but not a just transition. The City is missing the opportunity to mitigate the impacts on low income and minority populations. CATMA is not a trusted advisor in the neighborhood. Old Spokes home could play the role of a trusted advisor? We spent years doing community development in the neighborhood and gentrification possibility is disappointing. Bike infrastructure needs to happen in an environmentally just way. This will not help the users of the neighborhood in the short term. Against resolution.

Jonathon Weber – Ultimately think the phased approach is a good solution and honors public input. Supportive of resolution.

Jason Stuffle – There are already biking, walking, and driving/parking issues there. We have real issues that we are ignoring because of perceived issues that could result. The Colchester Ave parking removal had a similar process and people changed habits and adjusted with the parking removal. Paint changes for bike lanes can be undone. We should have more options than just vehicles. Supportive of resolution.

Eliana Fox – This resolution provides a good balance between parking management plan and corridor study. Supportive of resolution. Connor Smith echoes sentiment of support.

Liz Curry via chat - Colchester Ave. does not have the complexity that exists on No Winooski. Expecting low-income tenants and immigrant-owned business customers to "just adapt" is exactly the opposite of ensuring a just transition. People don't seem to understand or respect that concept. Colchester Ave. is a middle-income census tract. You can't compare to a low-income mixed use corridor that's like the ONE's downtown. This is not a binary conversation - it's not either or, it's "how," and "how fast"

Kirsten Shapiro – Need to find how we can have this transition work and not leave behind or have hard impacts on social services and small businesses in neighborhood. Appreciates the efforts to find ways to address some of these concerns but generally still concerned with intention to move forward and not have clear steps the address these. CATMA services don't seem like a good fit for small restaurants. What is solution or experience with CATMA and folks with English not as first language. What is happening on Bright Street? Thought that was identified and a place for displaced folks to park.

Nicole Losch – Bright Street traffic calming project will shift parking, not remove any. Potentially will gain a space.

Director Spencer – If Council decided to allocate funds to transportation management, it doesn't have to be CATMA. Could be done by application from business. Small businesses along this corridor may have different needs than typical CATMA businesses. We will work with them.

Chair Hanson – Resolution tries to lay out context of the process. Meant to be compromise to take into consideration what we heard from the two bodies the Council created to advise how we should proceed – Project Advisory Committee 14 member stakeholder committee, and

separate Parking Management Committee with additional stakeholders.

The original resolution was to move forward with bike lanes in 2021. There was an amendment that brought forward a Parking Management Plan (PMP). I issued an amendment to that Amendment to move forward after the PMP but the committee then rejected the proposal. This resolution moves forward a phased approach, less parking removed and good bike connectivity. Takes steps to mitigate negative effects such as direct money to effected businesses allowing them to make changes in advance of this. They can choose how they would use this. It also directs administration to insure fair free transit. This is currently happening through the end of the summer from the state. DPW staff is directed to continue working to find transportation solutions for impacted stakeholders. Meant to be actions that can be taken over the next 18 months and lesser scale implementation. Still advises project to move forward in 1.5 years but scaled back. Worked with Director Spencer on this resolution. Meant to be in alignment with what DPW has stated.

Councilor Jane Stromberg - Supportive of this. See it as a major compromise. Funding questions about pilot.

Chair Hanson – Not intending to do a pilot with this resolution.

Director Spencer – We have embarked on large multi-year pilots but some investments in doing these are significant and with paving coming in 2023 here this would be rushed and have many obstacles. Trying to install a pilot and remove it pilot and then install final design with paving was too much of an effort vs moving forward with paving with a solid plan.

Norm Baldwin – This one year would provide us with an opportunity to spend more time finding a solution with the community vs putting effort into a pilot.

Councilor Stromberg – I see this resolution as a compromise that works towards just transition. This is an important goal and we should center projects on this.

Councilor Barlow – Appreciates work that has been done to lessen impacts and address concerns. Appreciates another year to be able to sort this out. Finding additional parking to replace lost parking is the key to this. Important to remember parking is heavily used. The City is removing parking that has been available for many years so I think the City is responsible to mitigate the impacts. The City loop route – would the proposal be to use the city loop in current configuration or a modified version?

Director Spencer – Would need to be looked into by GMT, turning radius, timing, direction considered. We could look into this with GMT.

Councilor Barlow – Would depend on Stakeholder input if this is needed. Compromise to remove less parking, if we do this and get connectivity into Burlington, would that be the end of it or do you anticipate that we would revisit this and do more southerly blocks as well?

Chair Hanson – This resolution doesn't lay out a direction for that so unsure of what might happen. This resolution isn't attempting to influence future plans.

Director Spencer – We saw it as a sort of pilot to see how this works and if it works well and safely then that could inform whether or not we went ahead with anything more. We are trying to

move forward considering all input from study and stakeholders.

Norm Baldwin – A part of this solution needs to be with business owners regarding parking minimums and private parking. Effort to remove Parking Minimums to make housing affordable but it challenges removing on street parking. Problem just gets worse as we move forward with these projects.

Chair Hanson – Travel Demand Model study passed in September and will create a system for the City to ensure there are robust transportation solutions.
Recommend we move the full resolution for the City Council to adopt.

Councilor Stromberg – Seconds.

Chair Hanson – PMP shows if we did full project and full parking removal, not all lost parking would not be mitigated, though ~80% would be. If we are cutting parking removal in half, there is enough capacity to absorb. Parking will shift onto side streets and off street parking. Reduce the number of people driving to some extent though limited. What we are moving forward is well below getting into the territory of not having a plan to absorb parking loss.

Councilor Barlow – Would like to see the project done in a way that does not adversely affect some of the stakeholders. We have seen serious concerns. With another year to make it happen it will give the chance to find solutions. Would like to see an Amendment to insert a dependency to allow for lost street parking to be mitigated and address stakeholder concerns we have heard. Don't support this tonight. Need a commitment to replacing some of parking loss in a final resolution that goes to Council.

Councilor Barlow – No.

Councilor Stromberg and Chair Hanson – Aye.

Move to full Council for consideration, two to one.

4. Director's Report

Defer.

5. Councilors' Update

Defer.

6. Next Meeting 3/22/22

One more meeting with this committee before reconfiguration.

7. Adjourn

Councilor Barlow motion to adjourn. Councilor Stromberg seconds. All in favor. Meeting ends 7:43PM.