MEMORANDUM

TO: PUBLIC WORKS COMMISSION
FM: CHAPIN SPENCER, DIRECTOR
DATE: JULY 14, 2016
RE: PUBLIC WORKS COMMISSION MEETING

Enclosed is the following information for the meeting on July 20, 2016 at 6:30 PM at 645 Pine St – Main Conference Room

1. Agenda
2. Consent Agenda
3. Driveway Encroachment Pilot Study Report
4. Pearl Street Parking Reconfiguration
5. 10 Year Capital Plan
6. Draft Minutes of 6-15-16

Non-Discrimination
The City of Burlington will not tolerate unlawful harassment or discrimination on the basis of political or religious affiliation, race, color, national origin, place of birth, ancestry, age, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, marital status, veteran status, disability, HIV positive status or genetic information. The City is also committed to providing proper access to services, facilities, and employment opportunities. For accessibility information or alternative formats, please contact Human Resources Department at 865-7145.
M E M O R A N D U M

To: Hannah Cormier, Clerks Office
From: Chapin Spencer, Director
Date: July 14, 2016
Re: Public Works Commission Agenda

Please find information below regarding the next Commission Meeting.

Date: July 20, 2016
Time: 6:30 – 9:00 p.m.
Place: 645 Pine St – Main Conference Room

A G E N D A

ITEM

1 Call to Order – Welcome – Chair Comments

2 Agenda

3 Election of Chair, Vice Chair, Clerk

4 10 Min Public Forum

5 5 Min Consent Agenda
   A Traffic Request Status Report
   B Flynn Avenue Parking Removal
   C Motorcycle Parking Removal on St. Paul St
   D 1 Hour Parking Removal on Pine St
   E King Street/South Champlain Street Truck Loading Decision
   F Cherry Street Parking

Non-Discrimination
The City of Burlington will not tolerate unlawful harassment or discrimination on the basis of political or religious affiliation, race, color, national origin, place of birth, ancestry, age, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, marital status, veteran status, disability, HIV positive status or genetic information. The City is also committed to providing proper access to services, facilities, and employment opportunities. For accessibility information or alternative formats, please contact Human Resources Department at 865-7145.
6  20 Min  Driveway Encroachment Pilot Study Report
   A  Communication, N. Losch
   B  Commissioner Discussion
   C  Public Comment
   D  Action Requested – None

7  20 Min  Pearl Street Parking Reconfiguration
   A  Communication, E. Gohringer & G. Gardner
   B  Commissioner Discussion
   C  Public Comment
   D  Action Requested – Decision

8  30 Min  10 Year Capital Plan- (Will be Mailed & Emailed on Friday 7/15/16)
   A  Communication, C. Spencer
   B  Commissioner Discussion
   C  Public Comment
   D  Action Requested – None

9  5 Min  Draft Minutes of 6-15-16

10 10 Min  Director’s Report

11 10 Min  Commissioner Communications

12  Adjournment & Next Meeting Date – September 21, 2016
MEMORANDUM

July 13, 2016

TO: Public Works Commission
FROM: Damian Roy, DPW Engineering Technician
CC: Norman Baldwin, City Engineer
     Dave Allerton, Public Works Engineer
RE: Traffic Request Status Report

New Requests since 6/7/16 = 8
Requests closed since 6/7/16 = 6

RFS BREAKDOWN BY TYPE*

  Accessible Space: 3
  Resident Only Parking: 14
  Crosswalks: 17
  Driveway Encroachments: 19
  Signage: 12
  Loading Zone: 5
  Area/Intersection Study: 4
  Parking Prohibition: 12
  Bus Stop:
  Geometric Issues: 3
  Parking Meters: 2
  Other:

  TOTAL: 91
MEMORANDUM

July 11, 2016

TO: Public Works Commission

FROM: Damian Roy, DPW Engineer Technician

CC: Norman Baldwin, City Engineer

RE: Flynn Avenue Parking Removal

Background:

The Department of Public Works (DPW) has been requested to evaluate the removal of parking along Flynn Avenue by resident Betty Mills and as recommended by the Bike Walk PlanBTV that is currently in the public review phase.

Ms. Mills states that Flynn Avenue is unsafe due to excessive vehicle speeds, parked vehicles narrowing the roadway, bikes competing for travel lanes, and high pedestrian activity creating challenging conditions for those living in the Southwind and Lake Forest communities; see the attached traffic request. These conditions are exacerbated during the hot summer months when parking on Flynn is fully utilized by beach-goers wishing to access Oakledge Park.

The Bike Walk PlanBTV recommends removing the parking on Flynn Avenue in favor of installing Advisory Bike Lanes; see the attached drawings. Reasons of this recommendation mirror concerns expressed by Ms. Mills including slowing traffic speeds, providing separate lanes to vehicles and bikes, aiding visibility to pedestrians, and eliminating parked vehicles pulling out of parking spaces.

Observations:

Flynn Avenue is a 30 foot wide collector roadway providing primary access for several businesses and numerous residents to the rest of the city as well as providing sole access for all vehicles to Oakledge Park. The roadway narrows to 18 feet at the Oak Beach Drive intersection as it approaches Oakledge Park. Unrestricted on-street parking is allowed on the north side of the street from 105 feet west of the Switchback Brewing parking lot entrance to the narrowing of the roadway resulting in 29 parking spaces. This section of Flynn Avenue has two 11 foot travel lanes, 8 foot wide parking, and a 5 foot wide sidewalk with no greenbelt. The narrow section of
Flynn Avenue is 18 feet wide with two 9 foot lanes, no parking, and a 5 foot wide sidewalk with no greenbelt.

The Department of Parks and Recreation has recently installed their new paystations within Oakledge Park providing hourly rates instead of daily rates. Their records show that most patrons spend an average of two hours at the park making a daily rate of $6-$8 unduly prohibitive. The goal of the new paystations is to make the park more accessible to the average patron by relieving them of paying a daily rate. The Department of Parks and Recreation has received substantial complaints regarding the parking on Flynn Avenue and how it affects access to Oakledge Park, see attached email from Parks Director Jesse Bridges.

The Advisory Bike Lanes proposed by Bike Walk PlanBTV are designed to provide two dedicated lanes for westbound and eastbound bicyclists while maintaining safe functional access for vehicles. With this design, drivers are to share the center lane from the Oakledge Park entrance to where Flynn Avenue intersects the railroad tracks. At the wide section of Flynn Avenue this center lane will be 20 feet wide while the center lane will be only 8 feet wide at the narrow section. During this narrow section, drivers would temporarily encroach onto the bike lanes as needed when two vehicles wish to pass each other. As business and residential access occurs within the wide section of Flynn Avenue with only Oakledge Park patrons continuing into the narrow section, the occasional encroachment into the bike lane is considered acceptable by Bike Walk PlanBTV and the city transportation planner.

Conclusions:

Flynn Avenue experiences high volumes of vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle traffic during the summer months when access to Oakledge Park is in high demand. Along with this high volume comes diminished safety as bicycles compete with vehicles within the roadways and bicycles compete with pedestrians on the sidewalk. On-street parking forces bicycles into the roadway or onto the sidewalk. The Advisory Bike Lanes would alleviate this conflict and provide safer access for businesses and residents along Flynn Avenue as well as Oakledge Park patrons as the cost of losing 29 unrestricted parking spaces.

Recommendations:

Staff recommends that the Commission:

- Remove on-street parking on the north side of Flynn Avenue in favor of installing Advisory Bike Lanes as proposed by Bike Walk PlanBTV.
ADVANCE CROSSING SIGNAL

Definition: The programming of a traffic signal to remain all-red for several seconds for vehicles traveling in all directions while pedestrian crossing signal gives people walking a head start. Increases compliance of turning cars to yield to crossing.

ADVISORY BICYCLE LANE

Definition: A bicycle lane that creates preferential space for bikes that cars can use as needed to make room for oncoming traffic. Advisory bicycle lanes are typically marked with a dashed (not solid) line, and they are often used in conjunction with centerline removal along low-speed, low-volume streets. Bollards can be placed on the dashed line at intervals to enforce motorist use of the center lane.

BICYCLE BOX

Definition: A section of pavement aimed at preventing bicycle/car collisions at intersections, particularly between drivers turning right and cyclists traveling through an intersection or turning left. To improve its visibility, a Bicycle Box is often colored and includes a standard white bicycle pavement marking.

Overlapping benefits: Increases distance between people walking across the street and idling motorists, and provides people bicycling with a head start across the intersection when the light turns.

BICYCLE CORRAL

Definition: An on-street bicycle parking facility that can accommodate up to 12 bicycles in the same area as a single car.

Overlapping benefits: When placed near street corners, a Corral increases visibility and creates an additional buffer for pedestrians,
CITY OF BURLINGTON
SERVICE REQUEST

Name and Address

Name: Betty Mills
Address:
Phone Number: betty.girlwalker@gmail.com

Request

Location: Flynn Ave & Oakbeach Dr
Request Description: Once again i write with lower Flynn Ave issues. Unlucky me I live down here. The parking situation from oakledge park users is out of hand...dangerous... I can not safely drive down to turn left on my street. Cars are backing out..pulling over...and some going 40 mi/hr down to park.... say nothing about the stupidity involved in the loss of revenue daily....i cringe riding my bike or walking dog. When i pull out of Oakbeach Dr turning right up Flynn there is not room for myself and a vehicle headed west....very dangerous....im thinking of starting a neighborhood petition.

Assign History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Assigned To</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/22/2014 2:18:54 PM</td>
<td>Damian Roy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/1/2014 12:56:36 PM</td>
<td>Colin Brett</td>
<td>Request Assigned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Staff Person</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05/03/2016</td>
<td>Chapin Spencer</td>
<td>Parks Dept is installing new parking meter kiosks in Oakledge June 2016 which will allow hourly parking in park instead of just a daily rate. This RFS is consistent with PlanBTV Walk/Bike which calls for advisory bike lanes on Flynn Ave. I suggest we advance this RFS to the Commission in June 2016 to coincide with the installation of the kiosks. (Entered on 5/3/2016 5:41:21 PM by Chapin Spencer)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Customer Service

Status: New
Request created by: Valerie Ducharme

Print Date: 7/11/2016 9:42:46 AM
Damian Roy

From: Jesse Bridges
Sent: Wednesday, July 06, 2016 3:16 PM
To: Damian Roy
Cc: Erin Moreau
Subject: RE: Paystations and Flynn

Damian,

Thanks for following up. I’ve copied in Erin who’s team oversees parking in case she’d like to elaborate.

Paystations have been installed and will be going live shortly. They are the same as the ones we have in the Waterfront lot as well as the ones DPW has in the downtown.

We’ve been looking at an hourly charge for Oakledge due to customer feedback and length of stay. Most patrons visit the park for 2 hours so a $6-$8 daily charge feels prohibitive.

We’ve also received substantial complaints regarding the parking on Flynn, one way to make it easier to achieve the goal of bike lanes/remove the parking is to make it more accessible to access the park. We also offer season passes at a discount for residents, league members and students. All our parks are free to bike/walk and handicap placards can also park for free. We also offer discounted income sensitive season passes and accept senior citizen green mountain passport passes.  http://enjoyburlington.com/resources/pricing-fees/

Best,
Jesse

Jesse Bridges, MPA, CPRP
Director and Harbormaster
Burlington Parks, Recreation & Waterfront
645 Pine Street
Burlington, VT 05401
(802) 864-0123

@BTVparks

From: Damian Roy
Sent: Wednesday, July 06, 2016 12:56 PM
To: Jesse Bridges
Subject: Paystations and Flynn

Jesse,
Damian Roy

From: Julie Taylor <julie@appletreebay.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 07, 2016 12:22 PM
To: Damian Roy
Subject: RE: Southwind-by-the-lake re Flynn Ave parking removal

Damian,

I represent Lake Forest as well. I will pass along this information to both Associations Board Members.

Regards,

Julie Taylor
Property Manager
Appletree Bay Property Management
1205 North Avenue
P.O. Box 3009
Burlington, VT 05408-3009
802-863-6940 x108 - phone
802-865-7928 - fax
www.appletreebay.com

This message and any attachments is intended only for the personal and confidential use of the designated recipient(s) named above. If you are not the intended recipient of this message you are hereby notified that any review, dissemination, distribution or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. Any use not in accord with its purpose, any dissemination or disclosure, either whole or partial, is prohibited except with formal approval. This communication is for information purposes only and should not be regarded as an official statement of Appletree Bay Property Management. Email transmission cannot be guaranteed to be secure or error-free. Appletree Bay Property Management (and its subsidiaries) shall (will) not therefore be liable for the message if modified.

From: Damian Roy [mailto:droy@burlingtonvt.gov]
Sent: Thursday, July 07, 2016 12:18 PM
To: Julie Taylor
Cc: Nicole Losch
Subject: Southwind-by-the-lake re Flynn Ave parking removal

Hi Julie, I got your address from a resident of Southwind and wanted to send you this notification as the representative of this neighborhood:

The Burlington Department of Public Works (DPW) is seeking to install Advisory Bike Lanes as recommended by the Walk/Bike Plan3TV along the north and south sides of Flynn Avenue from the railroad to Oakledge Park. This will effectively remove parking (29 spaces) along the north side of Flynn Avenue relieving congestion and making travel along Flynn Avenue safer for vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians especially during the summer months. This will also improve safe access to Oakledge Park in concert with the paystation improvements being made within the park by the Parks and Recreation Department.

The action to remove parking is set to go before the Public Works Commission on Wednesday July 20th at 6:30pm in the front conference room at 645 Pine Street.
I’ve attached drawings illustrating the bike lanes and associated signage for your review. If you would like to provide any feedback on this as a representative of Southwind-on-the-Lake you may contact me and/or voice your position at the Public Works Commission meeting.

I also wanted to ask whether you managed Lake Forest as well? They may also be interested in the parking removal. If you do not represent Lake Forest, would you be able to share that contact information with me?

Thank you!
Damian

Damian Roy, Engineering Technician
Burlington Public Works Department
645 Pine St. Burlington VT 05401
Desk: 802.865.5832
Cell: 802.598.8356
Email: droy@burlingtonvt.gov
Web: www.burlingtonvt.gov/dpw
MEMORANDUM

July 5, 2016

TO: Public Works Commission

FROM: Damian Roy, DPW Engineer Technician

CC: Norman Baldwin, City Engineer

RE: Motorcycle Parking Removal on St. Paul

Background:

The Department of Public Works (DPW) has received a communication from the Accessibility Committee regarding the motorcycle parking area on St. Paul Street just north of the bump-out on the western side of City Hall Park between Main Street and College Street, see the attached drawing. The Committee is requesting DPW evaluate the motorcycle parking area to ensure that there is sufficient space for a side-deployed accessible ramp from the accessible space adjacent to it.

Observations:

This location is within the City’s downtown core where efforts are being made to make all accessible spaces compliant with the Proposed Accessibility Guideline for Pedestrian Facilities in the Public Right-of-Way (PROWAG). The 45 degree angled parking next to the bump-out creates an irregular space that is currently being utilized for motorcycle parking. The Committee states that when the area is occupied with motorcycles there is insufficient space for an Accessible Van’s side ramp to deploy.

The PROWAG states that five feet of clear space is required for a side-deploying accessible ramp, see attached. This requirement is compromised when motorcycles are parked in the space.

There is another motorcycle parking area located at the northeast corner of Main and St. Paul Street 170 feet south of the motorcycle parking requested for removal.
**Conclusions:**

Given that there is insufficient space for both an accessible ramp deployment and motorcycle parking, staff recommends removing the motorcycle parking.

**Recommendations:**

Staff recommends that the Commission:

- Remove the motorcycle parking area adjacent to the bump-out on St. Paul Street between Main Street and College Street so that the accessible space next northerly of the space is PROWAG compliant.
R309.2.1 Alterations. In alterations where the street or sidewalk adjacent to the parking spaces is not altered, an access aisle shall not be required provided the parking spaces are located at the end of the block face.

R309.2.2 Narrow Sidewalks. An access aisle is not required where the width of the adjacent sidewalk or the available right-of-way is less than or equal to 4.3 m (14.0 ft). When an access aisle is not provided, the parking spaces shall be located at the end of the block face.

Advisory R309.2.2 Narrow Sidewalks. Vehicle lifts or ramps can be deployed on a 2.4 m (8.0 ft) sidewalk if there are no obstructions.
Damian Roy

From: Ned Holt
Sent: Monday, June 27, 2016 3:49 PM
To: Damian Roy
Subject: RE: Motorcycle parking

Damion,

Nothing in the minutes but this is how it all unfolded, do with this what you may!

As the liaison sitting on the and the individual enforcing ADA rules in the City. The night of the 6-21-16 meeting, it was brought up by one of the members and to my attention that Motorcycle parking encroached on the loading/unloading area of the accessible parking across from American Flat Bread on Saint Paul Street. I told the committee that I would look into this issue and confirm. This being the case my findings disclosed the lack of marking of the aisle for the accessible parking and offers motorcycle parking to encroach onto the accessible space. Side by side parking can exist with the marking in place.

should you have any questions or if I can be of any further assistance please contact this office directly.

Respectfully,

An Equal Opportunity Employer

Ned H Holt, Senior Building Official
Burlington Public Works Inspection Services
645 Pine Street Suite A
Burlington, VT 05401

T- Direct 802-865-7559
T- DPW/ISD Customer Service 802-863-9094
F- 802-863-0466
E- NHolt@burlingtonvt.gov
Web: www.burlingtonvt.gov/dpw

Life is a roller coaster ride...eat a light lunch!
“We cannot direct the wind, but we can adjust our sails” unknown

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information contained in this e-mail and any attachments may be confidential, is intended only for the use of the recipient(s) named above and may be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail or any of its contents is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and delete the original message and all parts thereof from your computer system.
MEMORANDUM

July 13, 2016

TO: Public Works Commission

FROM: Damian Roy, DPW Engineer Technician

CC: Norman Baldwin, City Engineer
    Dave Allerton, Public Works Engineer

RE: 1-hour Parking Removal Request on Pine Street

Background:
The Department of Public Works (DPW) received a request from PJ McHenry and George Lambertson to install dedicated food truck vendor parking on the east side of Pine Street in front of their business ArtsRiot, see the attached email from Mr. McHenry. The request was made on behalf of the DolceVT food truck that had been parked off-street in front of ArtsRiot for three summer seasons. This off-street location was still encroaching on City Right-Of-Way (ROW) and necessitated an encumbrance permit to be issued to DolceVT, see attached. Mr. McHenry’s business then expanded by constructing an outdoor patio area facing Pine Street, this action effectively removed DolceVT from their permitted space. ArtsRiot made no other off-street considerations for DolceVT at that time.

The DolceVT food truck then began parking on Pine Street in front of ArtsRiot in a 1-hour parking space and would remain there throughout the day. Parking enforcement eventually noticed this practice and began issuing tickets to the food truck. DolceVT applied for an Obstruction Permit for a dedicated space within the City ROW and was denied, see attached. DolceVT then relocated across the street in front of the Maltex building outside the City ROW. This location has been profitable for DolceVT but owner Stefano Cicirello states that business would be improved if he was allowed to parking on the east side of Pine Street in front of ArtsRiot. He says this is likely due to the available seating in ArtsRiot’s outdoor patio area and because the prevalence of businesses on the east side of Pine Street attract more pedestrians and potential customers.

Staff spoke with Mr. Lambertson and Mr. Cicirello regarding ArtsRiot’s original request to install a dedicated vendor parking space on Pine Street. Staff explained that DPW does not support assigning exclusive use within City ROW to any single person or business and that the City street system’s primary function is to provide access, not enterprise. This was understood and accepted by both Mr. Lambertson and Mr. Cicirello.
Mr. Lambertson then modified ArtsRiot’s request to removing two 1-hour parking spaces on the east side of Pine Street in front of ArtsRiot to be designated as two unrestricted parking spaces. These two unrestricted parking spaces, if available, would allow the DolceVT food truck to legally park without time restrictions at a location beneficial to both businesses. Staff explained that the availability of these two spaces is not guaranteed with Mr. Lambertson and Mr. Cicirello accepting that possibility.

Staff asked Mr. Lambertson if any consideration was made towards accommodating the food truck on ArtsRiot’s property. Mr. Lambertson responded that ArtsRiot wishes to explore the off-site possibilities first before considering an on-site solution.

Observations:

Pedestrian generators are located along both the east and west side of Pine Street with the slight majority of generators located along the east side. The nearest crosswalks are located 370 feet to the north and 310 feet to the south at the intersections of Pine and Marble, and Pine and Howard respectively.

There are currently six 1-hour parking spaces and three 2-hour parking spaces located in front of the building where ArtsRiot, the South End Arts & Business Association (SEABA), and Speeder and Earl’s Coffee is located, see the attached drawing. Time restricted parking is most often utilized adjacent to businesses that benefit from vehicle turnover. To evaluate ArtsRiot’s request to reduce this time restricted parking by two spaces, staff contacted the businesses in the immediate area to measure how these businesses may be impacted by the request. The following is a summary of this effort:

- Speeder and Earl’s Coffee. Manager Matt White is supportive of the request.
- SEABA. Executive Director Adam Brooks is not supportive of this request stating that lost turnover would have a negative effect on his business.
- Great Harvest Bread. Staff spoke with an employee and left a message and card, no response received.
- Sterling Hardworks. Supports ArtsRiot’s request.
- Green State Gardener. Supports ArtsRiot’s request.
- The Lamp Shop. Employee states that their business suffers on Friday’s when ArtsRiot hosts their Friday Food Truck event due to loss of available parking for their patrons. She states that the time-restricted parking was recently hard fought for (approx. 3 years ago) and the Lamp Shop would not support reducing it.

- Supportive of the request: 3
- Not Supportive of the request: 2
- Inconclusive: 1

Conclusions:

Support for removing the time restricted parking on Pine Street is not unanimous. Both SEABA and The Lamp Shop have stated that their business would be negatively affected by the loss of vehicle turnover. Mr. Cicirello and Mr. Lambertson have both separately stated that the current arrangement of DolceVT’s location across the street, while not ideal, is functioning adequately. Staff is of the understanding that while the current situation is adequate, both
businesses would enjoy mutual benefit from the DolceVT truck being located in front of ArtsRiot.

It is of Staff's opinion that improving two businesses does not justify weakening two other businesses, especially when other off-street options are yet to be explored. ArtsRiot's request to remove 1-hour parking in favor of unrestricted parking for the expressed intent of enabling food truck vending is yet to be broadly established as proper use of City ROW and there are various policy questions that remain. Given that the current arrangement is described by ArtsRiot and DolceVT as adequate weighed against the negative effect expressed by SEABA and The Lamp Shop, staff recommends maintaining the current parking restrictions on Pine Street.

Recommendations:
Staff recommends that the Commission:

- Maintain the current time restricted parking on Pine Street.
April 20, 2016
Damian Roy
City of Burlington
Burlington, Vermont

Dear Mr. Ray,

As stated in my email, my name is PJ McHenry. Our restaurant at 400 Pine Street has recently acquired a vehicle for mobile vending. For the past three years our organization has operated over 20 Food Truck events per year with over a dozen Food Trucks at each one. We have successfully worked with the City developing safe, secure, unique, all ages experiences helping to build the character of Burlington and the identity of the South End Arts District. In addition we have supported the local business, Dolce VT, by coordinating a service area in the front of our business, where lunch service can be provided to nearby neighbors and south end employees. This has occurred for the past 3 summer seasons. As our business has grown, the specific location of the Food Truck (vending during lunch time) has moved. In recent weeks, as Dolce began vending on the east side of Pine Street for the 2016 summer season, it was brought to our attention by the City that Dolce’s vending permit was not in line with their on-street vending location.

As we started to inquire within the City what the options are for mobile vending ourselves we were directed to you to request a change in parking. Outside of our business there are two parking spaces, currently marked for 1 hour parking, located just to the south of the curb cut outside 400 Pine Street. We would like to officially request that these spaces assume a similar function to the vending spaces on University Place. Specifically, we would like to propose that the 1 hour parking sign remain in effect but additionally permit the two spaces for vendor parking for specific hours of the day (ideally 9am-5pm). This request is made by ArtsRiot and on the behalf of Dolce VT.

I have attached a photograph depicting the spaces in mention. I hope to hear from you soon to figure out what the next step is in this process. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely yours,

PJ McHenry
Hi Damian,

My name is PJ McHenry. I own and operate a business located at 400 Pine Street in Burlington, VT. Our restaurant and performing arts center, ArtsRiot, has been given your contact information in order to get the ball rolling on a parking change request. I am not familiar to this process but after a brief conversation with Ron Gore at Public Works was pointed in your direction. He recommended we write a detailed letter describing our request, submit it to you, and go from there.

So...here we are. Please see the attachments below. I've included a picture of the parking spaces being discussed and the aforementioned letter. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

--

PJ McHenry
ArtsRiot - 400 Pine St.
Burlington, VT 05401
802.578.3500

*** To contact ArtsRiot directly, call: 802.540.0406. OPEN Tues. to Sat. 4:30pm - 10pm
*** I can be hard to reach Monday's & Saturday's via email. Please call my cell to contact me directly.
OFFICE OF THE CLERK/ TREASURER
City of Burlington
City Hall, Room 20, 149 Church Street, Burlington, VT 05401
Voice (802) 865-7000
Fax (802) 865-7014
Deaf/Hard of Hearing 711

PLEAS ANSWER ALL APPLICABLE QUESTIONS

PEDDLER LICENSE APPLICATION

DATE 5-4-16
How long have you lived in VT 25 years, 6 months
Name (A) STEFANO J. OLIVEIRA Phone # 802-324-6220
Current Address 498 HEBERTON AVE ORCHESTER VT 05462 E-Mail DOLCEVERMONT@GMAIL.COM
Date of Birth 9-27-1989 Place of Birth STANFORD CONNECTICUT Sex M
Name (B) Phone #
Current Address E-Mail
Date of Birth Place of Birth Sex
How long have you lived in VT Business Name DOLCE VT
Have you ever been convicted of any misdemeanor, felony, or violation of any city or town ordinance or law? NO
If yes please explain
Do you have any criminal charges pending against you in any federal, state, local or military courts? No ✓ Yes
If yes, please list each crime, date of conviction and the city and state in which the court is located.

Have you ever had a peddler license with the City of Burlington (including the Church Street Marketplace)? YES
If yes, has this license ever been revoked for any reason? NO If revoked, please explain why and when
Name, address & phone # of current employer
DOLCE VT 478 WEDDELL AVE COOLESTER VT 05446  #807-324-672-0

Gross Receipts # 111055 Food Peddler's State License number (VT Dept. of Health) 15931

Peddler's with a vehicle endorsement - Vehicle Reg. # 4U2A4FFHHXXCF66 35L
Lic. Plate # J93A384 Types of goods being sold COUNTRY STREET FOOD

Description of Table, Cart, Stand or Vehicle
22 FT BOX TRUCK, BLACK, FOOD TRUCK

Proposed Location (see map for central district peddlers) TRAVELERS, PINE STREET

Spot # 1

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

Pictures  Insurance Date Deposit Refunded

Refunded to

**APPLICANT MUST PRESENT LICENSE TO RECEIVE REFUND**

License: Central [ ] General [ ] Vehicle [ ] Fee Paid 200.00 Deposit Paid — Duration

Background check SSC(Nat’l) VT DMV

Attorneys reply from background checks with problems

License Valid From To

To renew your peddler license you will need to re-submit the following each year:
Application
Background Check
Fee
Insurance Certificate
Agreement (for University Place Peddlers Only)

If the Clerk/Treasurer's Office does not receive all forms/fees required to re-new your license before June 1st, you will no longer be licensed to sell in the City of Burlington after that date and your spot may be re-assigned to another peddler.

If you are late submitting your paperwork/fees, you will not be licensed to sell any items until all the requirements are met. There will be a $30.00 fee charged, in addition to the license fees, for all applications submitted after June 1st (per License Committee-Meeting of 5/19/10)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To:</th>
<th>Stefano Cicirello</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DBA:</td>
<td>Dolce VT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>642 Bean Rd., Colchester, VT 05446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For:</td>
<td>Vehicle Peddler License</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE ISSUED</td>
<td>6/1/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPIRES</td>
<td>5/31/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPOSIT OF $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAID ON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This certifies that a license has been granted by the city council of the city of Burlington, Vermont.

Subject to the Charter and Ordinances of the City. This license must be presented to receive refund.

Att: ____________________________
Jean Poulin

From: Lori Olberg
Sent: Wednesday, April 06, 2016 1:55 PM
To: Jean Poulin
Cc: Ronald Gore
Subject: FW: food truck parking

Please review his current application and contact him, advise him to have his paperwork on his at all times, specifically his peddler license of course—thanks Jean—

From: Ronald Gore
Sent: Wednesday, April 06, 2016 1:48 PM
To: Lori Olberg
Subject: food truck parking

Hi Lori,
Received a call from Dolce VT food truck, parked on Pine St. He was given a WARNING from Parking Enforcement for parking in this spot greater than 1 hour. The existing parking spaces in this area have a 1 hour limit during certain times of the day. He did not show the parking person his agreement for the vendor license.

He would like some direction or some communication with Parking Enforcement with the agreement with the City of Burlington.

His cell number is 324-6220

Thanks
Ron
Hi Jean,

I am emailing about the parking complaint I received today. This will be my 3rd year in the same spot and the first complaint I have ever heard about. Setting up on Pine Street is a large part of my business and income. There has never been an issue before and would like to resolve this problem at the next town meeting, if possible.

Thank you,
Stefano Cicirello
DolceVT
802 324 6220
Hi Ron,

Please see e-mail below from Stefano Cicirello (Dolce Vermont). He has a license to operate his food truck in front of the Art’s Riot building. A couple years ago you check out the spot and determined it was partially on City property. The License Committee approved that spot. Now he is saying that Art’s Riot put a picnic table there so he moved out into the street and has been there for some time. I told him that he would need to have that spot approved by the license committee. Would you please check it out and e-mail me back on the exact location and your thoughts on whether or not this spot would work as a peddler spot for Stefano. Lori said the next License Committee meeting is 4/19/16. Please let me know by 4/13/16. Thank you

Jean Poulin
Customer Service Representative
Burlington Clerk/Treasurer’s Office
149 Church Street
Burlington, VT 05401
Phone #802-865-7030
Fax #802-865-7014

Hi Jean,

I am emailing about the parking complaint I received today. This will be my 3rd year in the same spot and the first complaint I have ever heard about. Setting up on Pine Street is a large part of my business and income. There has never been an issue before and would like to resolve this problem at the next town meeting, if possible.

Thank you,
Stefano Cicirello
DolceVT
802 324 6220
DENIED

CITY OF BURLINGTON • DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

OBSTRUCTION PERMIT APPLICATION

TO BE COMPLETED IN FULL BY ALL PERSONS SEEKING AN OBSTRUCTION PERMIT FOR CONSTRUCTION WITHIN THE CITY LIMITS PURSUANT TO CHAPTERS 27-29 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON BACK BEFORE COMPLETING)

Please Print or Type

OB SITE LOCATION: STREET NAME & NUMBER

400 PINE STREET

OFFICE USE ONLY

LAND ATTACHED

TRAFFIC CONTROL & FLAGGER INFO
WORK ZONE & SIGNAGE LOCATION
PEDESTRIAN DETOUR PLAN
LANE SHIFTS
ADA ACCESSIBILITY PLAN

DESCRIPTION OF OUR WORK

Obstruction of (1) one parking space on the East Side of Pine Street at 400 Pine Street in front of Art's Riot's place of business. Obstruction to be for use of a fixed truck in the described location.

CONTRACTORS / HOMEOWNERS NAME

N/A

CONST. START DATE

5/1

END DATE

5/30

ADDRESS

400 PINE STREET

CITY/TOWN

BURLINGTON

STATE

VT

ZIP CODE

05401

CONTACT PERSON

P J McHenry

DAY PHONE

802-578-3560

RE SIGNATURE

Date

Title

4/10/16
CITY OF BURLINGTON • DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

OBSTRUCTION PERMIT
APPLICATION

TO BE COMPLETED IN FULL BY ALL PERSONS SEEKING AN OBSTRUCTION PERMIT FOR CONSTRUCTION WITHIN THE CITY LIMITS PURSUANT TO CHAPTERS 27-28 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON BACK BEFORE COMPLETING)

Please Print or Type

JOB SITE LOCATION: STREET NAME & NUMBER

Office Use Only

PLANS ATTACHED
TRAFFIC CONTROL & FLAGGER INFO
WORK ZONE & SIGNAGE LOCATION
PEDESTRIAN DETOUR PLAN
LANE SHIFTS
ADA ACCESSIBILITY PLAN

DESCRIPTION OF OUR WORK

FOOD TRUCK VENDING

INSURANCE INFORMATION

Insurance listing “The City of Burlington” as Certificate Holder attached. YES NO

All coverage is equal to or greater than one million ($1,000,000.00) dollars.

CONTRACTORS / HOMEOWNERS

NAME

STEFANO CICIRELLO

ADDRESS

478 GELEMAN AVE

CONTACT PERSON

STEFANO CICIRELLO

DAY PHONE

802-324-6220

SIGNATURE

CHEF/OWNER

Title

Date

4-70-16
MEMORANDUM

July 20, 2016

TO: Public Works Commission
FROM: Nicole Losch, Senior Transportation Planner
RE: King Street Deli Loading Zone Change

INTRODUCTION
In 2014, the King Street and Maple Street neighborhood initiated a request for traffic calming and neighborhood enhancements. Working with DuBois & King, we held two community meetings to understand the existing traffic patterns, neighborhood concerns, and to develop potential improvements. Following the second neighborhood meeting, we separated the traffic calming process to advance King Street ahead of Maple Street. King Street will be paved this summer and traffic calming improvements can be coordinated with that work. In addition, Maple Street has unique challenges with truck traffic and business activity, which warrants extra consideration for the design options on that street.

PUBLIC INPUT
At the neighborhood meetings, there was consensus from residents to avoid vertical elements of traffic calming and to improve the experience of walking along these neighborhood streets. As a result, our traffic calming concepts focused on corner curb extensions to slow traffic entering these streets, to make pedestrians more visible when trying to cross, and to provide opportunities for benches or seating, for public art or landscaping, or for raingardens to manage stormwater runoff.

To better understand the neighborhood’s receptiveness to these concepts, DPW staff and DuBois & King staff held one final meeting in a pop-up curb extension at the corner of South Champlain and King Street. Invitations were mailed to King Street addresses in advance, and the neighborhood was invited through Front Porch Forum and through lawn signs posted during the event.
The event was very successful, with some constructive feedback from both residents and businesses in the area. There was some skepticism that curb extensions will lower traffic speeds and there was some concern for large vehicles passing each other; there were requests for low-maintenance curb extensions (i.e. hardscape or raingardens but nothing that would become overgrown with weeds); and there were requests to relocate the King Street Deli loading zone to better accommodate the size of their delivery vehicles and also provide a curb extension in front of the Deli. The majority of visitors were supportive of the curb extension concepts.

**NEXT STEPS**

As a result of the neighborhood feedback at the pop-up event, the traffic calming concepts were revised to better accommodate the truck loading zone for the King Street Deli. The neighborhood is currently considering the traffic calming poll, which closes on July 22, and final changes to the concepts will be made quickly and in advance of paving work this summer.

Both the Deli owner and neighbors suggested an area for bike parking or small tables in front of the Deli, with truck loading on the South Champlain side of this intersection. There are design considerations for either location:

1. If the loading zone is on the King Street side, a hardscaped curb extension would still be possible as a mountable surface for delivery vehicles. However, the delivery vehicles frequently encroach into the driveway immediately west of the loading zone and this couldn’t be remedied with any traffic calming design changes.

2. If the loading zone is on the South Champlain side, South Champlain Street would become a “yield street” while the loading zone is occupied. South Champlain Street currently has parking on the east side and the roadway is only 30 feet wide. As on many residential streets, oncoming vehicles in this configuration would yield to one another around the parking and loading zone pinch point. However, South Champlain traffic volumes are low, traffic speeds are slow, visibility around corners would be improved with the curb extensions, and truck traffic is very minimal, leading DPW and DuBois & King staff to recommend this option.
RECOMMENDATION
DPW staff recommend the Public Works Commission:

1. Repeal Appendix C Section 12-1 (21), which currently reads:
   On the south side of King Street in the first space west of South Champlain Street.

2. Create “No Parking Except Vehicles Loading or Unloading.”
   On the west side of South Champlain Street beginning 10 feet south of the King Street crosswalk, for a distance of 30 feet.

Attachment:
King Street Traffic Calming Concept + Loading Zone location
Maple Street is also being considered for traffic calming through a separate neighborhood process.

Pine Street Intersection may have curb extensions as part of the Champlain Parkway design.
MEMORANDUM

July 13, 2016

TO: Public Works Commission
FROM: Damian Roy, DPW Engineer Technician
CC: Norman Baldwin, City Engineer
     Dave Allerton, Public Works Engineer
RE: Cherry Street Parking

Background:

The Department of Public Works (DPW) received notification from Chittenden County Transit Authority (CCTA) that the completion for the new Downtown Transit Center is estimated for September 2016. The new transit center is located on St. Paul Street and once completed will alleviate the south side of Cherry Street from current bus loading/unloading operations, see the attached transit center site map. Per direction from Director Spencer, staff is seeking to establish no time limit Smart Meter parking spaces along the south side of Cherry Street where the bus operations had been. Staff has identified 13 parking spaces available along this section of Cherry Street, see the attached drawing.

Observations:

This section of Cherry Street is located within the downtown core where smart meters are currently being utilized for on-street parking; see the attached meter parking map. Installing smart meters to replace bus parking represents a clear advantage to businesses and residents in the area and increases the total available parking to the public. Staff anticipates no negative feedback from the public or area businesses.

Conclusions:

Installing smart meters at this location will increase available parking and create metered parking uniformity within the downtown core.

Recommendations:

Staff recommends that the Commission:

- Approve the installation of thirteen no time limit Smart Metered parking spaces on the south side of Cherry Street.
DRIVEWAY ENCROACEMENT PILOT STUDY REPORT

Background

The Department of Public Works’ (DPW) Driveway Encroachment Pilot Study was active from April 15th 2016 through May 15th 2016 prohibiting parking within two feet of driveways on Henry Street, Weston Street, Loomis Street, Brookes Avenue, and North Williams Street affecting approximately 150 households. The purpose of this pilot study was to measure the positive and negative impacts to on-street parking, driveway ingress/egress, and to gauge residential support for this parking restriction.

During the study, Burlington Police Department (BPD) parking enforcement officers patrolled the area recording violations and issued citations when a complaint was received. After the study, staff distributed approximately 180 Driveway Encroachment Survey Questionnaires with accompanying cover letter. Residents could complete the questionnaire and return it via mail or could follow the link provided on the cover letter to fill out online. Residents were able to complete the questionnaire and return it to DPW on or before June 8th.

Observation Summary

There are currently 18 requests in queue from residents throughout the city to restrict parking around their driveways. These driveways are mainly located in densely populated mixed-unit residential streets where parking is at a premium and often when there is typically 30 to 40 feet of curb space between driveways. Most driver’s perceive 35 feet as more space than one vehicle requires and often try to squeeze two vehicles in that space to maximize available parking – leading to driveway encroachment.

Of the 180 surveys distributed, Staff received and reviewed 31 responses from residents. These survey responses and comments are included in the following pages of this document.

The following is a summation of the feedback staff received.

Positive feedback for implementing a Driveway Encroachment Parking Restriction:

- Improved vehicle safety and maneuverability into and out of driveways
- Improved sightlines between vehicles, pedestrians, and vehicles in the travel lane
- Improved quality of life and residential atmosphere

Negative feedback and/or criticism to implementing a Driveway Encroachment Parking Restriction:

- The 2 foot restriction being inadequate in sufficiently improving vehicle encroachment to driveways, suggestions include 3 feet and 5 feet as well as measuring from the curb cut rather than the straight line edge of the driveway.
- Loss of on-street parking as a result of reduced available curb line.
- Loss of on-street parking due to people parking overly cautiously around driveways
- A perceived prejudice towards renters and lower income residents in favor of home owners and higher income residents
- Resident response unanimously supported the idea of line striping around driveways and parking stalls. Residents both for and opposed of the proposed parking restrictions felt that line striping
the parking limit near driveways would improve awareness of the restriction, increase compliance and efficiency, and lead to more available spaces.

Driveway Encroachment Pilot Study Survey Results

Question #1: Overall, how severe would you describe the issue of vehicles parking too close to your driveway BEFORE the pilot?

- Severe: 5 (17%)
- Significant: 12 (40%)
- Somewhat of an issue: 5 (17%)
- Not Significant: 3 (10%)
- Not an issue: 5 (17%)

Question #2: Overall, how much improvement to this issue did you experience DURING the pilot?

- Greatly Improved: 10 (32%)
- Somewhat Improved: 7 (23%)
- Could not tell: 7 (23%)
- No Improvement: 7 (23%)
- Condition Worsened: 0 (0%)

Question #3: Do you feel that sight distances when exiting your driveway were improved?

- Greatly Improved: 10 (33%)
- Somewhat Improved: 7 (23%)
- Could not tell: 7 (23%)
- No Improvement: 6 (20%)
- Condition Worsened: 0 (0%)

Question #4: Was turning into and out of your driveway any easier?

- A lot easier: 11 (37%)
- Somewhat easier: 8 (27%)
- Could not tell: 5 (17%)
- Wasn’t any easier: 6 (20%)
- Condition worsened: 0 (0%)

Question #5: Do you feel that having line striping around driveways would improve the effectiveness of this parking restriction?

- Yes: 18 (60%)
- Maybe: 4 (13%)
- Neutral: 3 (10%)
CITY OF BURLINGTON
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
645 Pine Street
Post Office Box 849
Burlington, Vermont 05402-0849
802.863.9094 VOX
802.863.0466 FAX
802.863.0450 TTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probably not</th>
<th>1  3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4  13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question #6: Do you feel that the amount of available parking was negatively affected during the pilot?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes, greatly</th>
<th>6  19%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, somewhat</td>
<td>1  3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could not tell</td>
<td>12  39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not really</td>
<td>6  19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>6  19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question #7: If given the choice, would you like to have this parking restriction in effect in your area at all times?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>22  71%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9   29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question #8: Please feel free to write any questions, comments, concerns, or recommendations you might have for DPW Staff regarding the Driveway Encroachment Pilot Study.

The following responses were submitted via online survey:

1. I have a roommate who I share one off street parking spot with. When the off street spot is unavailable, we rely on street parking. Our options for street parking were considerably reduced during this time, forcing us to drive to other streets to park. However, my off-street parking/house is not on the side of the street where the parking occurs. Therefore, I am unable to say whether it was easier or not to move in and out of the driveway. It seemed like a significant improvement for those residents, though.

2. Parking became even more limited. It seems individuals frequently chose to park in the middle of two spaces in order to make sure that they were not encroaching on a driveway. Also, many individuals who parked even slightly back from a driveway made another space unavailable by doing so. We are renters on Brooke's Ave and do not have designated street spots or enough room in our driveway for all of our cars. Life became more annoying during the encroachment study, because of drastically more limited parking options, although we certainly feel for those who have their driveways encroached upon. I feel a potential way to remedy this would be to have clear designated parking spots. This would ensure that individuals both park far enough away from driveways but not too far as to make another spot unavailable.

3. Please do not do this. This neighborhood needs to be accommodating of renters and tenants so people can afford to live here. And I say this as a homeowner! I think this driveway rule is prejudicial. You can contact me at 802 . 734.6731 if you have any questions. My name is Margaret Tamulonis and I live on north Willard street.

4. Thank you!! My driveway is opposite the side of the road vehicles can park on...having the 2ft clearance by the driveway allows me to back out more safely, going straight out of my driveway and not risking hitting a car opposite of me. I greatly appreciate this!
5. Parking isn't that bad on upper Henry but it's nice to be able to park close during busy times so status quo seems fine. We live in the city!

6. This was not at all well advertised or explained, or at the very least it was entirely ignored on my street. I had to report at least two cars during the course of the study for parking way too close or hanging over into the line of entrance/egress from my driveway.

7. This tight parking at driveways is a constant problem on upper North Street, where renters and hospital employees vie for parking day and night. I had no idea there was a program to remedy the issue, and have seen no improvement as the mostly out-of-state young people who park so close to the driveway have no idea there's a program too. Painting lines or creating a fine for parking like this would be more effective.

8. Nothing is different here on north Winooski Ave...parking is still very bad and getting in and out of the driveway can be dangerous and difficult...had no idea you were even trying this out. Was it in all neighborhoods?

9. Before this pilot, we had cars parked very close to our driveway which made it impossible to safely back out of the driveway into the street. Also, Brookes Ave is such a narrow street that having the cars parked so close to the driveway makes turning onto the street from the driveway very cumbersome and challenging. I'm really hopeful that this change happens for us homeowners on the street.

10. My "yes" answer to question #7 is contingent upon the pavement markings. Without the markings, drivers are unsure what exactly is "2 feet", and overcompensated. When this occurred, the parking spaces in front of my home reduced from 3 to 2. Several other curbs have room for two cars, but during this pilot drivers were cautious and parked right in the middle, eliminating several opportunities to meet intended capacity. I also am concerned when I park my bumper hangs across the end of my own driveway due to lack of available parking, that I would get ticketed/towed. That is an existing concern regardless of Pilot, as I've been told by Parking Dept. that they do not verify whether the car is the property owners before they ticket/tow - so anyone could call on my car being in violation of this new rule if they wanted to. Thank you for considering my feedback.

11. Two feet is not enough of a buffer. I live in an area where most residents park on the street and there is no resident only parking situation. People, before and now park at the edge of a driveway apron and sometimes even block part of a driveway apron. It should be a 5 foot setback and it should be enforced.

12. Bigger issue is not having resident permit parking on North Williams. Cars of strangers constantly circling and jockeying, squeezing in, unloading at all times of day and night degrades neighborhood feel.

The following responses were hand-written and sent in by mail:

13. I'm at 54 Brookes. We have historically had extreme difficulty getting out of our driveway especially in the winter. We're on the north side and pulling out is near impossible when the tenants across the street do not pull in close to the curb. I have been told that "if a police cruiser can navigate the street then there is nothing that can be
done.” I have taken to parking in the street when it is snowy because I can’t access my very long and accommodating driveway. This is dangerous because I have MS and fall very easily. There is no handicap parking near my house on the street.

14. I wish that we had done this when my kids were little. We never could let them near the end of the driveway because of obstructed views – not that it wouldn’t still have been dangerous, but it would have been safer. We have had to drive up on the grass to access our driveway when it’s blocked, that’s not cool. Also, there are times we can’t get out and that’s a safety issue. We live with some elements that lend themselves to frequent emergencies. Also, I think most people are willing and understanding – they just don’t realize they’re blocking a driveway. So marking where to park (and not to park) is going to solve the problem, I think.

15. The minute the signs came down the encroaching began again. We’ve had two instances of blocking since the signs came down. Both cars were 2 feet over our driveway.

16. There is no parking on our side of Brookes Ave. The parking on the opposite side of Brookes already has “reduced parking” enforced to mitigate previous space issues (not enough egress for those of us with no driveway directly opposite).

17. Two feet is not enough – especially in the winter with snow banks. I am not sure how it will work in the winter at all with snow. How will someone see the lines? I still believe that residential parking for N. Williams would be the best solution, as Damian supported several years ago, but it was defeated at a meeting that N. Williams St. residents were not informed of.

18. Post permanent ordinance and add parking distance to curb. Adding a parking distance from curb would improve site distance up and down street! Limiting SUVs and trucks would help site distance also (within 20’ of a curb cut). I have a Toyota Prius that cannot see over SUVs and trucks when backing out of my driveway. Also, make permanent ordinance, add signage for residential parking, sign posts.

19. Why are you spending tax payer money on such studies?

20. Parking on the lower end of Loomis St. (between Weston and Willard) was severely impacted. Curbs where 2 cars should fit had only 1 car parked – generally because people were overly cautious (left 4’ of space rather than 2’). 95% of the time I am able to park my car directly outside of my house, whereas during the survey period this was reduced to 50% - I often had to park at the top of the block (near Prospect & Mansfield) where my car is both out of eyesight and earshot (it’s been broken into before). In my opinion, too many street parking permits are provided to students – why should every student who is squished into a 6-bedroom house receive a permit? There are not enough spaces on the street as it is to match the permits.

21. Isn’t the 2 foot restriction already part of city code? Lower Henry seems to have more issues than upper Henry but we’ve experienced more encroachment the past 6 months – usually depends on how many vehicle that renter have / amount of on-street parking.
Quantifying the Affirmative versus the Negative.

Each question except questions #7 and #8 on the survey was designed to have five multiple choice answers, two answers in the affirmative, one neutral, and two in the negative. In order to derive a clear consensus from these questions, a point system can be applied to quantify overall public opinion of the Driveway Encroachment Pilot Study by assigning a number of points to each answer:

For Example, answering “Severe” to question #1 yields a +2 to the affirmative, “Significant” +1 to the affirmative, “Somewhat of an issue” 0 or neutral, “Not Significant” -1, “Not an issue” -2. These point values are then multiplied by the number of responses for that choice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #1: Overall, how severe would you describe the issue of vehicles parking too close to your driveway BEFORE the pilot?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat of an issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not an issue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this example we can derive 22 points in the affirmative for Driveway Encroachment and 13 points in the negative for Driveway Encroachment. Applying this system to the survey questions will yield the following:

- Question #1: 22 points in the affirmative
  13 points in the negative
- Question #2: 27 points in the affirmative
  7 points in the negative
- Question #3: 27 points in the affirmative
  6 points in the negative
- Question #4: 30 points in the affirmative
  6 points in the negative
- Question #5: 40 points in the affirmative
  9 points in the negative
- Question #6: 18 points in the affirmative
  13 points in the negative

(note: affirmative/negative answers to question #6 are reversed purposely)

The summation of these numbers show:

164 points in favor of applying the Driveway Encroachment Parking Restriction
54 points not in favor of applying Driveway Encroachment Parking Restriction

Based on this point system, DPW estimates that public opinion is 3 to 1 in favor of applying a Driveway Encroachment Parking Prohibition. This result is mirrored by Question #7 showing 71% in favor, 29% opposing – nearly a 3 to 1 ratio.
Conclusions

Based on resident’s feedback, the two foot parking restriction is a clear improvement for safe access into driveways and onto the street system when on-street parking is on the same side of the street. The restriction alleviates the challenge of having a driveway encroached or blocked resulting in severe inconvenience and diminished quality of life. Conversely for properties without off-street parking options, this restriction represents a direct reduction in available spaces. These residents also expressed a diminished quality of life as they are less likely to find parking close to their homes. These conflicting needs are the main source of disparity between these two groups.

All Burlington residents should have reasonable access to their homes and the street system. A blocked driveway or a driveway that is encroached such that it is impossible or unsafe to navigate is unacceptable. Staff would seek to both restrict parking away from driveways while minimizing the subsequent loss of parking. This may best be achieved through the practice of painting parking brackets around driveways on problematic streets. Several residents have commented that the total amount of available parking spaces were reduced when drivers parked too far away from driveways, exceeding the two foot restriction and further reducing the available number of parking spaces. Visually defining the parking restriction by painting brackets would provide drivers a visual reference that would promote more efficient parking and minimize the potential loss of parking.

To achieve this, Staff proposes to:

- Implement a city-wide ordinance restricting parking adjacent to all driveways and curb cuts by two feet as measured by the straight line edge of the driveway.

While this proposed ordinance would be in effect throughout the city, painting brackets would only occur on streets that meet certain characteristics and at locations where residents have expressed encroachment to be a significant issue. Staff has identified the two primary characteristics that lead to driveway encroachment and affect a resident’s ability to safely access their driveway or the roadway to be:

- A high rate of parking occupancy during peak times, at or above 90%
- The street travel width 18 feet or less
- A documented history of multiple violations at a specific location

Note: This list can be expanded on if it is deemed to not adequately encompass enough streets experiencing chronic driveway encroachment.

Recommendation

Staff recommends the Commission adopt the following amendment to the Burlington Code of Ordinances Appendix C, §7 and to Chapter 20-55 General Prohibitions:

7 No-parking areas.

(a) No person shall park any vehicle at any time in the following locations:

(1) – (538) As Written.

(b) No person shall park any vehicle at any time in front of another person’s driveway and within two feet of another person’s driveway as measured from the straight-lined edge of the driveway.
20-55 General Prohibitions.

(a) No operator or driver of any vehicle shall stop, stand or park the same in any of the following places, except when necessary to avoid conflict with other traffic or in compliance with the direction of a police officer or official traffic sign or except momentarily to pick up or discharge a passenger:

(1)-(3) As Written.

(4) In front of another person’s driveway and within two feet of another person’s driveway as measured from the straight-lined edge of the driveway.
At the July 20, 2016 meeting of the Public Works Commission we will present our recommendation to reconfigure parking for the preferred concept for Downtown Pearl Street. These recommendations are the culmination of various outreach efforts to local businesses and residents to obtain feedback on plans from the 2015 Pearl Street Scoping Study.

INTRODUCTION
Downtown Pearl Street has been considered in several prior planning studies: PlanBTV Downtown and Waterfront, the Waterfront North Access Study, and Burlington Transportation Plan. These plans emphasize the importance of Pearl Street from a variety of perspectives:

- Providing pedestrian connectivity between the downtown and waterfront and between the Old North End and the downtown
- Creating the potential for a continuous east / west bike route through the city
- As a transit street, needing to carefully accommodate transit vehicles, pedestrians, and bicyclists

In 2013, the Pearl Street streetscape was improved between the blocks of St. Paul Street and Winooski Avenue. In order for Pearl Street to better serve the community, the City explored opportunities to also reconfigure Pearl Street as a complete street between Battery Street and St. Paul Street. The Pearl Street Planning study, completed by Stantec and presented to the Public Works Committee in June 2015, recommended plans to implement streetscape improvements on Pearl Street. This study focused on low-cost improvements for installation within the existing curblines – small but transformative improvements – between St. Paul Street and Battery Street.
COMPONENTS OF THE FINAL CONCEPT

- Add bike lanes to Pearl Street, while maintaining much of the existing on-street parking supply.
- Since an underground utility vault on the south side of Pearl Street west of North Champlain Street prevents street tree planting, utilize planter boxes or civic art to visually narrow the street and bring street-level texture for pedestrians.
- Pedestrians crossing Pearl Street at North Champlain Street can be more visible by shortening the crosswalk with paint, bollards, and planters, which can also beautify the street.
- Pedestrians crossing at George Street can be more visible with a painted curb extension. Bollards and planters could not be utilized on the south side of the crosswalk so that CCTA can access parking in the spaces immediately east.
- Only one inbound turn lane is needed from northbound Battery Street onto Pearl Street. The easternmost turn lane on Battery Street can be reclaimed for another use, and the southeast and northeast corners can be shortened with paint, bollards, and planters to reduce the pedestrian crossing times.
- The greenbelt on the south side of Pearl Street between Pine Street and George Street should be removed and replaced with a wider sidewalk / pavers.
- Add planters, seating, and civic art as often as opportunities allow to visually spruce up the corridor.

PUBLIC OUTREACH AND NEXT STEPS

Implementation of these improvements is projected to occur after the downtown Transit Center is complete, after fall 2016. To advance these plans, the Department of Public Works conducted additional public outreach in the affected corridor in order to gain constructive feedback from both residents and businesses on the various aspects of the proposed plan.

Flyers were mailed to both residents and businesses, inviting them to join us for a one-day pop-up event on July 8th, at which they could provide feedback to “Help us build a recommendation for the Public Works Commission meeting on July 20th.” A follow up visit was conducted, prior to the pop-up, at each business along Pearl Street between Battery Street and George Street. DPW officials spoke with business owners and managers directly in order to get a general sense of how opposed or in favor of these changes they would be, as well as note their specific concerns, ideas, and other propositions.
Our July 8th pop-up consisted of a curb extension example set up on the northwest corner of George Street and Pearl Street, as well as a temporary bike lane installed along the north side of Pearl Street between George Street and Pine Street. To give the attending public both a life-sized example of the potential changes, as well as a full scale picture of the plans, designs and conceptual renderings similar to those provided in this memo were available to view, and DPW staff were on scene to answer questions, and encourage written feedback.

SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK

Of the seven businesses we spoke to prior to the pop-up, five were either in favor of the project, or did not express a strong positive or negative opinion. Common concerns of business owners in the area involved losing parking for staff (especially delivery drivers for Leonardo's Pizza during their peak winter hours) and seeing an increase in homeless people due to the seating improvements. Common positive feedback involved the possibility of an increase in pedestrian and bike traffic in the area, as well as the presence of a bike/board lane.

Other common desires independent of this project’s plans were to see an increase in garbage and recycling receptacles, as well as the addition of handicapped parking along this section of Pearl Street. There was also concern expressed with the current condition of the curb line on the south side of Pearl Street between Pine Street and what will be the new transit center.

Not all visitors at the pop-up event were interested in leaving comments, but of the 16 left by individuals at the pop-up, 10 were positive, and expressed a wide variety of reasons for their support. Three comments were either neutral or suggested concepts not being considered for this project, and the remaining three were negative and critiqued either the reclaimed right turn lane on Battery Street, the addition of bike lanes to Pearl Street, or a general lack of parking.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Given the relatively low volume of negative feedback collected through our public outreach and our ability to address some of those concerns, we recommend to continue with the project as outlined in the Pearl Street Planning Study, with the addition of three aspects not specified in the initial project plan:

- Additional on street handicap parking to accommodate the high level of handicapped and elderly residents in the area,
- Add garbage and recycling receptacles along Pearl Street between Battery Street and George Street,
- A directional parking sign installed along the north side of Pearl Street across from Pine Street in order to better advertise the underutilized off-street parking lot between Bove’s (68 Pearl Street) and Pearl Street Laundromat (76 Pearl Street).
We recommend the Public Works Commission amend the parking regulations to be effective after completion of the Downtown Transit Center:

1. Create one handicap parking space on the north side of Pearl Street, immediately west of North Champlain, and one handicap parking space on the north side of Pearl Street, immediately west of George Street; and
2. Prohibit parking on the south side of Pearl Street between Pine Street and Battery Street; and
3. Amend Appendix C Section 17 (e)(28)
   “Designation of Parking Meter Zones: Three (3) hour zones. The following streets or portions of streets are hereby designated as three (3) hour parking: Pearl Street from St. Paul Street to Battery Street Champlain Street.”
4. Amend Appendix C Section 7 (343)
   “On the north side of Pearl Street beginning 10 feet from the easterly crosswalk on Pearl Street at North Champlain and continuing , for a distance of 75 feet across from 39 Pearl Street, except for police vehicles between 8am – 5pm.”

Attachments:
Pearl Street Plans & Parking Recommendations
Flyer mailed to Pearl Street addresses
Posters on display at the July 8th pop-up meeting
Low Cost, Quick Build Plan for Pearl Street

- Curb Extension
- Bike Lane
- Public Parking
- Reclaimed Hardscape
- Bike Lane Buffer
- Bus Parking
- Potential Seasonal Planters
- Public Seating
- Hybrid Beacon Signal
- Police Parking
- Handicapped Parking
**Pearl Street Neighborhood Residents & Businesses**

**Date & Time:**
July 8th, 2pm

**Location:** Pearl St, between Pine St & George St
(Rain Date: July 14th)

---

**A one-day demonstration on Pearl St!**

Come discuss how Pearl St can best accommodate all modes of transportation! *Improved pedestrian safety and amenities? Bike lanes? More greenery and benches?*

We will also discuss how parking can be adjusted to accommodate bike lanes without losing spaces.

We want to hear your feedback! Help us build a recommendation for the Public Works Commission meeting on July 20.

**Light refreshments available.**

---

**Can’t attend or have questions?**
Contact Nicole Losch, 802-865-5833, nlosch@burlingtonvt.gov

---

*BURLINGTON, VT PUBLIC WORKS*

**Contact Information:**
DPW Office of Engineering / 645 Pine Street, Suite A / Burlington, VT 05402
802.863.9094 P / 802.863.0466 F / 802.863.0450 TTY
www.burlingtonvt.gov/dpw
Concept: Reclaim Right Turn Lane on Battery St?
Convert the eastern-most right turn lane into a lively public space for people to relax, meet up with friends, and promote a more active environment with views of the waterfront.

Curb Extensions:
- Continuation of the existing curb
- Improved safety conditions for pedestrians by making them more visible
  - Shorten crosswalk distances
  - Slow down traffic
Burlington Department of Public Works Commission Meeting
Draft Minutes, 15 June 2016
645 Pine Street

Commissioners Present: Robert Alberry; Tiki Archambeau (Vice Chair) (via phone); Jim Barr; Chris Gillman; Solveig Overby (via phone); Jeff Padgett (Chair); Tom Simon (arrives at 7:37pm).

Commissioners Absent: None.

Item 1 – Call to Order – Welcome – Chair Comments
Chair Padgett calls meeting to order at 6:32pm and makes opening comments.

Item 2 – Agenda
Commissioner Alberry makes motion to remove Agenda Item 12 and is seconded by Commissioner Barr.

Action taken: motion approved;
  Commissioner Alberry: Aye
  Vice Chair Archambeau: Aye
  Commissioner Barr: Aye
  Commissioner Gillman: Aye
  Commissioner Overby: Aye
  Chair Padgett: Aye
  Commissioner Simon: not present

Item 3 – Public Forum

Item 4 – Consent Agenda
A. Traffic Request Status Report
B. Fire Hydrant Ordinance Amendment
C. Accessible Space Relocation on Cedar St
D. New Accessible Space on Lyman Ave
E. Champlain College Loading Zone on Maple Street
F. Champlain College Accessible Space on Maple Street
Commissioner Alberry makes motion to approve Consent Agenda and is seconded by Commissioner Barr.

Action taken: motion approved.
  Commissioner Alberry: Aye
  Vice Chair Archambeau: Aye
  Commissioner Barr: Aye
  Commissioner Gillman: Aye
  Commissioner Overby: Aye
  Chair Padgett: Aye
  Commissioner Simon: not present

Item 5 – Sidewalk Program
A) Staff Communication by Public Works Engineer Laura Wheelock and Engineering Intern Ben Tietze who speak on the city’s sidewalk program, presenting an via Power Point presentation.
B) Commission Questions
Chair Padgett, Vice Chair Archambeau, and Commissioners Barr, Gillman, and Overby ask questions on Item 5 with Engineer Wheelock answering.
C) Public Comment
Sharon Bushor, Ward 1, speaks on Agenda Item 5 and engages in a discussion with Engineer Wheelock.

D) Commissioner Discussion
Vice Chair Archambeau and Commissioner Overby engage in a discussion over Item 5 with DPW Director Chapin Spencer, Engineer Wheelock, and Intern Tietze.

**Item 6 – 2016 Vermont Bicycle & Pedestrian Program Public Hearing**
A) Staff Oral Communication by Engineer Wheelock who speaks on the need to present this program at a public hearing due to program-related grant requirements.
B) Commission Questions
C) Public Comment
D) Commissioner Discussion
Chair Padgett engages in discussion over Item 6 with Director Spencer and Engineer Wheelock.

**Item 7 – 1-7 Johnson St – Appeal**

**City Engineer and Assistant Director for Technical Services Norm Baldwin introduces the city’s packet of appeal documents concerning the 1-7 Johnson St appeal, a photocopy of Electrical Permit 11-140410, a photocopy of selected city codes, and a copy of Vermont Electrical Safety Rules 2011 for the record, along with background information**

A) Oral Presentation by Appellant Richard Rooney who respond to the city’s case.
B) Communication by Engineer Baldwin and Electrical Inspector Tim Hennessey who present the city’s case concerning the appeal of the 1-7 Johnson St inspection findings.
C) Commissioner Discussion
Chair Padgett, Vice Chair Archambeau, and Commissioners Alberry, Gillman, and Simon engage in a discussion on the appeal with Senior Assistant City Attorney Gene Bergman, Engineer Baldwin, Inspector Hennessey, and Mr. Rooney responding.
D) Action requested – Vote
No action taken in open session.

**Item 8 – Approval of FY’17 DPW Workplan**
A) Staff Oral Communication by Director Spencer who speaks on FY’17 DPW Workplan, presenting the budget requests to the commission.
B) Commission Questions
Commissioner Overby asks questions on Item 8 with Director Spencer answering.
C) Public Comment
D) Commissioner Discussion
Chair Padgett and Commissioner Barr engage in discussion over Item 8.

**Item 9 – Draft Minutes of 5-18-16**
Commissioner Alberry makes motion to accept draft minutes of 5-18-16 and is seconded by Commissioner Barr.
Commissioner Overby offers a friendly amendment to alter the Commissioner Communications section based on notes in an email she plans to submit – Commissioners Alberry and Barr agree to the friendly amendment.
Action take: motion approved;
Commissioner Alberry: Aye
Vice Chair Archambeau: Aye
Commissioner Barr: Aye
Commissioner Gillman: Aye
Commissioner Overby: Aye
Chair Padgett: Aye
Commissioner Simon: Aye

Item 10 – Director’s Report
Director Spencer reports on the budget going before City Council on June 27, the department drawing less on the city’s General Fund between FY’16 & FY’17, Assistant Director for Right-of-Way Rob Green joining the CSWD board, construction updates being available on the department’s homepage, the North Ave Pilot Project getting underway the week of 19 June, a special sale on recycling toters going on at DPW due to a CSWD grant, a public meeting scheduled for 21 June concerning a request for Residential Parking on South Prospect St, and comments on Commissioner Simon stepping down, the reappointment of Commissioner Alberry, and Commissioner-elect Justin Sears joining in July.

Item 11 – Commissioner Communications
Commissioner Overby asks about traffic violation revenues and about any commissioners having any interest in attending the 21 June Residential Parking request meeting with Director Spencer responding; Vice Chair Archambeau thanks Commissioner Simon for his service; Commissioner Barr thanks Commissioner Simon for his service; Commissioner Alberry asks a question about the parking kiosks downtown, with Director Spencer responding, and thanks Commissioner Simon for his service; Commissioner Simon thanks staff and his fellow commissioners for their service and comments on being excited to see what happens out on North Ave with the pilot project; Chair Padgett thanks Commissioner Simon for his service, comments on the July meeting being an organizational meeting, whether or not there should be a meeting in August, and about wanting to talk with City Attorney Bergman about the possibility of an executive session for organizational purposes.

Item 13 – Adjournment & Next Meeting Date – July 20, 2016
Motion to adjourn made by Commissioner Barr and seconded by Vice Chair Archambeau. Action taken: motion approved;
Commissioner Alberry: Aye
Vice Chair Archambeau: Aye
Commissioner Barr: Aye
Commissioner Gillman: Aye
Commissioner Overby: Aye
Chair Padgett: Aye
Commissioner Simon: Aye

Meeting adjourned at 8:46.
DRAFT 10 YEAR CITY-WIDE CAPITAL PLAN
The City’s municipal assets are valued at approximately $500M. DPW’s mission states our responsibility clearly “to steward the Burlington’s infrastructure”. Staff presented a draft 10 Year Capital Plan to the Commission in April 2015. Since then we’ve been working diligently to refine the financial projections and work on a funding plan to address the needs of the City’s assets. The current draft of the 10 Year Capital Plan will be sent to Commissioners under a separate cover on Friday, July 15. The goal for the July meeting is to provide an orientation to the plan and get the Commission’s initial feedback. We will be looking for the Commission’s recommendation on funding the plan in September. Please feel free to contact me with any questions in advance of the meeting.

FY’17 BUDGET
The City Council approved the FY’17 budget at their late June 2016 meeting. The budget can be viewed here: [https://www.burlingtonvt.gov/CT/Fiscal-Year-2017-Budget](https://www.burlingtonvt.gov/CT/Fiscal-Year-2017-Budget).

- General Fund: DPW’s reliance on the General Fund was reduced by $500K – or approximately 20% compared to FY’16. While reducing GF impact, the budget does increase staffing in our engineering group to expand our capacity to deliver more capital projects.
- Water: The Council passed a 2.5% increase in average water/wastewater/stormwater rates for FY’17. This will enable a modest increase in our capital reinvestment for our water, wastewater and stormwater utilities.
- Traffic: Before approving the budget, a few Councilors expressed concerns about the 10pm enforcement on weekdays and the concept of Sunday enforcement. Councilor Bushor advanced, and got accepted, an amendment to the budget resolution that stated the Council’s concern with evening and Sunday enforcement. Staff worked hard to educate the Council about the Downtown parking plan’s recommendations about demand-based enforcement and a financially sustainable system that is able to make critical repairs to our aging garages. There is also talk among some Councilors about taking back authority for setting parking rates from the DPW Commission. These Councilors express a view that elected, not appointed representatives, should be making decisions on parking rates and policy.

WATER LINE RELINING
As reported previously, we have contracted with a company to rehabilitate water lines using a trenchless re-lining technology. We’re the first municipality in the state to use this technique though it has been used extensively across North America for many years. Our contractor will
be relining water mains on Pitkin, Isham, lower King and then Industrial Ave. The total project timeframe is around 2 months. The door hanger notices are attached for your review.

DIVERSITY & EQUITY INITIATIVE
The City Council passed a resolution in 2012 calling for a Diversity & Equity Strategic Plan and they reviewed the plan in 2014. The Councilors have identified the need for members of Commission to understand the three goals of the Plan and action steps for implementation, and have recently passed a resolution calling for:

- The Chairperson of each Commission, or their designee, to annually attend a diversity and equity training to be organized by Human Resources, and
- Upon completion of the training, the Chairperson or their designee, provide an in-depth report to their Commission members, and
- The Chairperson of each Commission notify the City Council that all Board / Commission members have received the annual report on the diversity and equity training.

Let me know if the Commission needs any support from staff in fulfilling this requirement.

NORTH AVENUE PILOT
The installation of the pilot is complete and we have been receiving feedback, making adjustments, and collecting the initial round of traffic data. We’ve set up a project webpage (https://www.burlingtonvt.gov/dpw/north-avenue-pilot-project) and have produced a number of materials (attached) to explain the pilot project. We have hosted public meetings, attended NPA meetings, written articles in the North Avenue News, and posted to Front Porch Forum. We will be bringing a more thorough update to the Commission in the fall once we’ve had a chance to collect traffic data with school in session and to complete the resident / user survey.

DOWNTOWN TRANSIT CENTER & INTERSTATE CARRIERS
We are working with CCTA to get the interstate transit carriers to serve the Downtown Transit Center when it opens in late August / early September. The Downtown Transit Center provides more amenities for customers including a heated waiting area, bathrooms, and connections to local transit routes – much more than the current in-town stop at UVM. The carriers we are working with are Megabus, Greyhound and Vermont Translines.

PROJECT UPDATES
- The construction season is underway. Construction updates are posted on DPW’s website at: https://www.burlingtonvt.gov/DPW/CONSTRUCTION-UPDATES.
- Repair to the Manhattan Drive slope failure has made great progress and is nearing completion. The slope failure on the adjacent Route 127 bike path will be repaired in the next few weeks.
- The public information meeting for the Shelburne Street Roundabout project was held on June 29 at DPW. About 12 stakeholders attended. The project is scheduled for construction starting in 2019.
- We hosted a public meeting for the South Prospect Street residential permit parking request on June 21, 6:30pm at 645 Pine Street. This item was removed from the Commission’s May agenda at the request of residents who sought additional public process. We are preparing to bring a revised recommendation to the Commission at the September meeting.

Don’t hesitate to follow up with me to get further updates on these or any other topics.
IMPORTANT NOTICE
Sanexen Water Inc. will be proceeding with the rehabilitation of the water mains in your area within the next forty-eight (48) hours.

REHABILITATION OF THE WATER MAINS WILL TAKE PLACE
FROM ______ TO ______

In order to maintain the water supply to your home, a temporary surface water network made of plastic pipes and/or flexible hoses will be installed. It will be operational for the duration of the rehabilitation work. We ask you to please take care when walking and driving near the temporary water network, and to limit your water consumption to essential use only.

Sanexen Water Inc. will be completing water main rehabilitation work in your area within the next few days. Please follow these instructions to reconnect your water supply.

Please complete the steps in the following order:
1. Ensure that all water supply valves inside your home are shut off (sink, dishwasher, washing machine, toilet, etc.);
2. Turn on the garden tap (located outside);
3. Slowly open your home’s main valve (often located in the basement, facing the street) completely and let the water run outside for 2 minutes. This tap was shut off during the water main rehabilitation work;
4. After 2 minutes, turn off the garden tap;
5. Next, turn on the bathtub cold water faucet and let it run for 5 minutes;
6. After having let the water run in the bathtub, turn on all the taps in your home to discharge any air;
7. Lastly, turn off all taps, leaving the main valve open.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Should you require any assistance, a 24-hour service is available by calling the following number: 1-866-943-1708

Sanexen
Sanexen Water Inc. has been contracted to execute
THE STRUCTURAL TRENCHLESS REHABILITATION OF YOUR WATER MAIN

AQUA-PIPE® has been used to rehabilitate water mains in several North American municipalities for over 10 years. Compared to the traditional method, this technology eliminates leaks and restores the structural capacity of the water main without having to excavate streets.

AQUA-PIPE® uses a polyester liner (similar to that of a fire hose), which is coated with resin and inserted into the existing water main.

The liner is inflated to take the shape of the water main and then cured, using hot water, to harden the liner to make it a “new composite pipe”.

One of the advantages of this technology is that only a few access pits need to be dug in order to install the lining system. It is therefore not necessary to excavate the entire street, resulting in fewer interruptions to street traffic, maintaining continuous access to residents’ driveways and reducing the inconveniences associated with traditional excavation methods, such as dust, to a minimum.

In addition, the AQUA-PIPE® technology permits significant savings compared to traditional replacement methods.

AQUA-PIPE® is 100% compatible with drinking water. It is tested and audited regularly by the world renowned testing organization NSF International. AQUA-PIPE® prevents rust buildup, thus eliminating taste, color and odor from drinking water.

OVER THE NEXT FEW WEEKS, THE WORK WILL BE COMPLETED IN THE FOLLOWING STEPS:

• Installation of a temporary drinking water system;
• Excavation of access pits to complete work on the existing water main;
• Preparation of the soil;
• Installation of the AQUA-PIPE® liner;
• Opening of residential service connections;
• Disconnection of the rehabilitated water main;
• Reconstruction of the water main, as well as backfilling and paving of access pits;
• Site restoration (paving, sidewalks, etc.).

During the course of the work, you may observe moments of inactivity. Do not worry! Our team could be awaiting confirmation from the laboratory, in the fabrication stage, or working on other streets in your municipality.

Sanexen is proud to contribute to the improvement of the drinking water network and to have the opportunity to showcase its expertise across North America.

For more information, please visit www.aqua-phere.com
What does the pilot project involve?
The North Avenue Pilot Project involves measures to make North Avenue safer for pedestrians and bicyclists including signal improvements, temporary restriping and intersection changes between Washington Street and Plattsburg Avenue. The following changes will be made:

- The 4-lane segments of North Avenue will be reconfigured to 3 lanes,
- The intersections at Shore Road, Ethan Allen Shopping Center, Ethan Allen Parkway, and the VT 127 will be made more pedestrian-friendly,
- The signal at the intersection with VT 127 will be adjusted to increase safety by closing the high-speed northbound ramp and the free-flow westbound right-turn movement,
- Bike lanes will be added and existing bike lanes will be improved,
- Drain grates will be repaired or replaced with bike-friendly grates,
- Parking on North Avenue between Institute Road and VT 127 ramps and between Shore Road and Plattsburg Avenue will be swapped with the bike lanes.

A map of the changes can be viewed here

What is the project schedule?
The pilot measures will be installed in mid-June 2016, and an initial decision as to whether to remove or retain some or all of the measures prior to winter will be made by mid-October¹. For more a more detailed schedule, please see the project timeline.

How much will the project cost?
The pilot installation will cost approximately $155,000. DPW’s annual street and sidewalk capital budget is $2.4 million.

What has been the planning process for North Avenue?
In 2011, the City Council adopted a Transportation Plan that envisioned North Avenue as a Complete Street, designed to accommodate safe access for all users, including pedestrians, bicyclists, transit vehicles and riders, and motorists.

In 2013-14, the Department of Public Works and the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission conducted a North Avenue Corridor Study. The Corridor Study was approved by the City Council and makes recommendations regarding short, medium and long-term projects on North Avenue.

Why is the city conducting this pilot?
The city hopes that the pilot measures will decrease the number of and severity of crashes, calm traffic, reduce speeding and make North Avenue safer for cars, pedestrians and bicyclists, while still providing efficient traffic flow.

Additionally, the pilot will determine whether the middle section of North Avenue should ultimately be designed with three or four lanes. This determination is critical as it will direct the design of future improvements called for in the corridor study including signalization, transit stops, crosswalks, and bike facilities.

¹If the changes result in longer than expected traffic queues or significantly higher crash rates, they will be removed sooner.
How long does it currently take to drive the 4-lane section of North Ave?

A vehicle traveling at the speed limit (30 mph) that received all green lights would take 1 minute and 36 seconds to travel the 0.8 mile 4-lane section.

Travel time data collected during the morning and evening commute hours in June and November 2015 found that, on average, it takes about two minutes to drive northbound, and slightly over two minutes to drive southbound.

I live in the New North End, and commute to work. Will my driving time increase?

One of the project’s goals is to calm traffic and reduce speeds while still providing efficient travel times, so if you are one of the 86% of drivers who currently speed on North Ave between Ethan Allen Parkway and VT 127, your driving time is likely to increase slightly.

One of the purposes of the pilot is to determine what effect these changes have on driving times. DPW will closely monitor travel times and will, as needed and as possible, make modifications to optimize roadway and intersection efficiency. If pilot components result in unacceptable increases in driving times, it will be removed.

1 High crash locations are locations that have 5 or more crashes in a 5-year period and have an Actual/Critical ratio of 1.0 or higher.
2 This crash rate does not include crashes on side streets and in the shopping center.
3 For more information on crash rates, please see pages 30-31 of the corridor study.
4 Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
**Project FAQ  Sheet 3**

---

### Is this really a pilot? Once the changes are made, isn’t it a “done deal”?

This is a pilot. All the modifications that will be made are reversible, and DPW is committed to removing modifications that are problematic.

### How will decisions about the project be made?

The City Council directed the Department of Public Works to:

- Collect data throughout the course of the pilot,
- Conduct a public input survey,
- Keep the project area City Councilors apprised of pilot developments, and
- Make recommendations to the City Council 4 months into the pilot regarding the removal or continuation of the pilot components.

The October 2014 City Council resolution regarding the North Avenue Corridor plan states that, "If public input from the New North End does not support its continuation, the City will restore the 4-3 lane pilot area to its current configuration."

### Will raw data be shared?

Yes. Some residents have sought to have the raw data so that they can ensure DPW and the CCRPC is properly compiling and interpreting the data. The raw data files are linked on the [project website](#).

---

### How can I get more information?

For more information, please visit the DPW website:


Or contact **Nicole Losch**:  
645 Pine Street Suite A, Burlington VT 05401  
Phone: (802) 863-9094 x3  
Email: northavepilot@burlingtonvt.gov

---

### How can I provide input regarding my opinion?

You have a number of ways to provide your input:

- Attend the June 7 public forum
- Comment by e-mail (northavepilot@burlingtonvt.gov)
- Comment by phone: (802)-863-9094 x3
- Attend the mid-September public forum
- Participate in the September public input survey (Surveys will be available in print, online and via phone)
- Attend the October 17 City Council meeting

---

**Plattsburgh Ave – Shore Rd.**

**Shore Rd. – VT 127 ramps**
**About the Project**

The North Avenue Pilot Project involves temporary restriping and intersection changes along North Avenue between Washington Street and Plattsburgh Avenue. The pilot measures will be assessed to see if they have the desired effect of calming traffic and making North Avenue safer for cars, pedestrians and bicyclists, while still providing efficient traffic flow. The pilot measures will be installed in mid-June 2016, and a decision as to whether to remove or retain some or all of the measures over winter will be made by mid-October.

For more information about this pilot project, please contact:

**Nicole Losch**, Senior Planner  
645 Pine Street Suite A, Burlington VT 05401  
(802) 863-9094 x3  
northavepilot@burlingtonvt.gov

Or visit the Burlington DPW website: www.burlingtonvt.gov/DPW

**Opportunities for Public Input**

- June 7 Public Forum
- Comments by e-mail, phone or snail mail throughout the project
- Sept Public Forum
- Public Input Survey using print, online, and phone Mid to Late Sept
- October 17 City Council Meeting
Resolution Relating to DIVERSITY, EQUITY AND INCLUSION COMMITTEE

CITY OF BURLINGTON

In the year Two Thousand Sixteen .........................................................................................

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Burlington, as follows:

That WHEREAS, on July 16, 2012 the Burlington City Council unanimously adopted a resolution to create a
Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Committee to facilitate the development of a Diversity and Equity Strategic
Plan; and

WHEREAS, the City Council received the City of Burlington Diversity and Equity Strategic Plan (Plan)
on June 23, 2014; and

WHEREAS, the Plan contains 33 findings, 31 recommendations, and 49 action steps to address three
goals: eliminate race-based disparities across all City departments, promote inclusion and engagement of all
community members, and eliminate race-based disparities in the greater Burlington community; and

WHEREAS, in 2015 City Councilors received training on the practical applications of diversity,
inclusion, and equity related to race and ethnicity in the delivery of City services; and

WHEREAS, city employees receive diversity and equity training; and

WHEREAS, in addition to City Councilors and city employees, members of Burlington’s
Boards/Commissions play a role in city government by providing citizen input and oversight to city
departments; and

WHEREAS, City Councilors have identified a need for members of Boards/Commissions to understand
the three goals of the Plan and action steps for implementation;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Chairperson of each of the City’s Boards/
Commissions, or their designee, annually attend a diversity and equity training to be organized by the
Department of Human Resources; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that upon completing diversity and equity training, the Chairperson, or
their designee, provide an in-depth report to their Board/Commission members, including distributing handouts
in print or electronically to all of their Board/Commission members; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that by December 31 of each year, the Chairperson of each
Board/Commission notify the City Council that all Board/Commission members have received a report on
diversity and equity from the Chairperson, or their designee, on the components and elements of the diversity
and equity training.
DISTRIBUTION:
I hereby certify that this resolution has been sent to the following department(s) on
HR
Staff person for each Board/Commission

RESOLUTION RELATING TO

Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Committee

Adopted by the City Council
July 11, 2016

Clerk

Approved

Mayor

Lori Olberg
Licensing, Voting and Records Coordinator
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