



**CITY OF BURLINGTON, VERMONT**  
**CITY COUNCIL TRANSPORTATION, ENERGY &**  
**UTILITIES COMMITTEE**

c/o Department of Public Works  
645 Pine Street, Suite A  
Post Office Box 849  
Burlington, VT 05402-0849

802.863.9094 VOX  
802.863.0466 FAX  
802.863.0450 TTY  
[www.burlingtonvt.gov](http://www.burlingtonvt.gov)

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

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

**Transportation, Energy and Utilities Committee of the City Council**  
**Wednesday, August 1, 2018 5:30 PM**

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

**–MINUTES–**

Members Present: Councilor Max Tracy, TEUC Chairperson; Councilor Sharon Bushor, TEUC Member Councilor; David Hartnett, TEUC Member Councilor; Karen Paul, City Councilor

City Staff Present: Patrick Mulligan, DPW; Phillip Peterson, DPW; Laura Wheelock, DPW; Max Gildemeister, DPW; Nicole Losch, DPW; Robert Green, DPW; Connor Lyons, DPW; Robert Goulding, Public Information; Kirsten Shapiro, CEDO

Residents Present: See Attendance Sheet

**1. Agenda**

- a. Councilor Tracy called the meeting to order at 5:34 pm.

**2. Minutes of 05/16/2018**

- a. Councilor Bushor moved for a motion to accept the minutes. All in favor.

**3. Public Forum**

- a. John Bisson is concerned about the removal of resident parking on his street. He entertains people from the VSO on Summit Ridge, and they often get expensive tickets.
- b. Sally Richard, also from Summit Ridge, would like to know what is covered under the scope of 'parking' in the existing real estate tax, and why there would need to be an additional charge to park on their road.
- c. Another citizen from Summit Ridge expresses that he thinks it's unfair that they have to pay to park on their roads.

- d. Mr. Simpson, another citizen from Summit Ridge, believes that it's inequitable that they have to pay when other residents don't. Furthermore, he thinks that license plate reading technology is disruptive. Finally, he thinks that downtown commercial interests are growing and that the RPMP is a great way to preserve their parking and protect their streets from becoming 'parking garages.'
- e. May Chow, a citizen from Robinson Parkway raises the point that children play on the street, and that residents pay taxes and are thus invested in the neighborhood. She believes that the City is catering too much to outsiders and not focusing on its citizens. Again the point is raised that residents pay taxes and that a fee is unfair. She believes that guest parking passes also unfairly restrict the ability of residents to have social functions. Agreements from the other citizens who have made comments about the RPMP.
- f. Laura Wheelock: The Great Streets Initiative is a culmination of many years of planning and project development to reinvest in our core downtown streets, continue beautifying our streetscape, and install more sustainable infrastructure. The process began with the public vote in March of 2015 to use the City's downtown TIF district to make new investments in the downtown's public infrastructure and to ensure that Burlington has a downtown that is a vibrant, walkable and sustainable urban center. Work will include reconstruction of St Paul from Main to Maple, including the intersections with King and Maple and extend slightly along each side street. The project will work to underground overhead utilities through construction of a new duct bank under the western sidewalk, install new tree infrastructure, sidewalks, tree belts, pervious pavers, storm water gardens, drainage, curbs and repaving the surface of the road. We will have full time on-site inspection of the work and representation for the City that residents and businesses will be able to reach out to regarding immediate construction concerns. Approval for the contract will go before City Council on August 13th. Pending approvals, mobilization and work will begin as early as the week of August 20th. We expect to close St. Paul between Main and Maple to all through traffic through the end of heavy construction this season - likely around mid-November. Local traffic will be allowed. Work will continue through winter, but with more specialized work and likely less impacts, and will pick back up again in spring with all work likely concluding by Memorial Day. Work is scheduled for daytime 7am-6pm M-F and 7am-12pm Saturdays. We will be holding a neighborhood meeting for businesses and residents on the 8<sup>th</sup>, one meeting in the morning and one in the evening. Outreach for that meeting is happening currently and by the end of this week.

- i. Councilor Bushor: This 'presentation' is inadequate and I would like a more detailed presentation to the City Council.
  - ii. Wheelock: There is not intended to be a more detailed presentation.
  - iii. Bushor: When you say that you're building it for a ten-year storm, are you talking about a historical ten-year storm or a more current storm adjusted for the effects of climate change?
  - iv. Wheelock: I don't know.
  - v. Bushor: If things have changed dramatically, I think that this is really important to understand, and know what we're talking about here.
- g. Barbara Headrick has a suggestion with regard to corner lot City ordinances. Generally, houses only have two or three cars, which isn't a problem when parking on the street. However, multi-unit homes are more complicated because they have more cars. She believes that there should be two separate rules for these situations.

#### **4. CSWD 195-201 Flynn Ave Option Information**

- a. Rob Green presenting
- b. 20-minute duration
- c. Action: Informative, no action needed.
- d. Discussion:
  - i. Rob Green: We are in the third year and believe that we may want to extend that timespan for another couple years. We don't think that we've seen the full impact of what could happen on Flynn Ave. We believe it could get more business than the Pine St. location. We've paid CSWD to keep the plant for three years, and we'd like to see what TEUC thinks of purchasing the Flynn Ave plant outright.
  - ii. Councilor Hartnett: What would happen if we didn't decide to go through with it?
  - iii. Green: We would have to make another purchase, and forfeit what we've already paid. CSWD is going through some growing pains and is figuring out their drop-off centers as well.
  - iv. Councilors agree that it would make sense to hold off.

#### **5. Residential Parking Program Ordinance Changes**

- a. Phillip Peterson presenting
- b. 10-minute duration

- c. Action: Informative, no action needed.
- d. Discussion:
  - i. Phillip Peterson: Reads his memo, an email from John King, and responds to thoughts residents had brought up. There are no plans to install meters on Summit Ridge, there are no plans to sell parking spaces to commuters or college students, nor are there any plans to open up any of the RPP streets to public parking of any kind. The ordinance revisions being brought forward at this time are primarily administrative. DPW Staff could not reach consensus with the City Attorney's office or the Police Department. Consequently, staff need to develop a more clear definition on what a corner lot is in the context of RPP; additionally, staff will develop a SOP for parking enforcement in regards to corner lots.
  - ii. Rob Goulding: Capping the number of permits should occur at a reasonable rate. The police have had problems because the ordinance allows an unlimited amount of permits to be issued to any house. The intent was to reopen this conversation and provide an opportunity to members of the public to comment.
  - iii. Councilor Bushor: As a Councilor from the ward where this started, the whole thing came about to provide relief to houses without driveways or driveways where only one car could fit. In order to provide this relief, this Plan was rolled out with a process: one had to come forward and show that the number of people who lived on the street didn't exceed the amount of parking on the street, with an equation to see if resident parking was a viable solution. Residential parking was a quality-of-life ordinance to relieve the stress from some institutions near residential neighborhoods. I don't feel that my ward is aware of what's being discussed here, and they should. There were comments made tonight that I heard several years ago, and I think people here are the same people who are concerned about their neighborhoods. I think people do much better if they're not surprised, and they need to know what's going on. This information should be brought out to them so that they can know what's going on here. Thank you.
  - iv. Councilor Hartnett: I feel that there shouldn't be 100% residential parking on any street in Burlington, because we all pay taxes, and these are all public streets. Why shouldn't I be able to park on Summit St and go to a UVM game? The New North End doesn't have residential parking. I'm not in favor of selling commuter passes or putting meters up, and I think that some spaces of all streets should be open to the public, that no City street should be 100% residential parking. This started out in Ward 1, and it's crazy the amount of streets that are resident-only parking. Even in the downtown area, it's almost impossible to park your car and walk to Church St. There's a conversation to be

had in the City to do it, but I think it's unrealistic to have certain streets as 100% resident only parking. Again, I'm sympathetic to the people with two cars and no driveway, and don't think that we should sell parking or anything like that.

- v. Councilor Tracy: In my ward (the Old North End), there is no residential parking, but we still understand the pressures from student-heavy neighborhoods. When you try to make changes to parking, there's always backlash from landlords who assume it's their right to have parking spaces on the street. To me, I feel like it's not fair for them to push that cost off to the City. This resource is enjoyed by some, but not others, so there is an equity issue here. User fees are something we use to create equity, and my ward isn't using this benefit, and it doesn't feel fair for them to pay for something that they don't enjoy. The Old North End should be included, because as downtown develops, more streets are going to feel more pressure, even more from the Catholic Diocese's sale of property. The New North End neighborhoods are also stakeholders and are facing pressures from high school events, etc.
- vi. Bushor: I hear you, I feel that each area of the City has its own individual stresses. Ward 1 has the medical center, and there would be no parking available if things were opened up. I feel like I need to do the best job I can do to protect my neighborhood, but I recognize that there are other stresses, and I don't know about the New North End. A lot of people from my ward move to yours to get away from the problems with parking in the ward. Like Councilor Hartnett is suggesting, I think we need to continue the conversation from 2015. We're evolving as a city, and if we want to move on these hot topics, they have to be clear. As an elected official, parking is something I hear about a lot. Get out what you're recommending, but then continue the conversation. These two things are important going forward.
- vii. Hartnett: I don't know if there's an area in Ward 1 where we couldn't have resident only parking because of the medical center and UVM. Perhaps we could not have resident only parking in the summer when students are gone. There are a lot of ways to do this, and it's going to be tough. If it comes to removing resident only parking, it's going to be hard.
- viii. Goulding: It might make sense for us to respond to Councilor Bushor. We're not making any proposals to taking parking away. We want to cap the number of permits allowed to each unit. We also want to institute a nominal fee starting at \$10 per permit to cover the administrative costs BPD goes through. Our hope for this meeting was to open this up before taking this to the Public Works Commission. Thirdly, we want to provide

vouchers, one per permit knowing that things happen. These are the main changes that we're looking to make.

- ix. Bushor: The fee structure was brought up, and I feel like there is a cost, but there were some previously that were concerned that they couldn't afford it. I want to know if there's a way that that can be addressed. Maybe someone could rule on it and it could be waived. If this is \$10 per year, I'd like to have someone check back from previous meetings and see if people felt better after this dollar amount was decided upon.
- x. Goulding: We will do that.
- xi. Hartnett: I think it would be important to have someone from BPD here. I understand we pay taxes, but it also costs money to put these programs together. I'm reluctant to say that \$10 is the right amount, and we need to show that to the residents. They'd rather have it be \$15 with an explanation that \$10 without.
- xii. Paul: This came to a head in Ward 6, because someone wanted to renew their permit, and was given inaccurate information saying that starting in October they will have to pay for it. Judging from the comments tonight, I hope that that conveys to you that there is misinformation, people don't know what is planned, so they don't know. When they hear one thing, it becomes a snowball effect. The case studies in the plan suggest from \$10 to a few hundred, and people need to be explained what's going on. People will assume that their parking is being attacked, and people are very concerned about this. I would encourage you to have much more interaction with the people who are more affected by it. I mentioned that it should go out to all of the Front Porch Forum. Thank you.

e. Public discussion:

- i. What's the impact on BPD? What is the difference on these streets that justifies these costs?
  - 1. Peterson: I don't have a clear understanding of the Police Departments costs, however I would assume that the cost is for permits and parking enforcement time and effort.
- ii. What are the cities that this is compared to?
  - 1. Ithaca, Boulder, others.
- iii. [Peterson and Goulding] said that the changes wouldn't be big, but in the plan it says that there is a plan for removing residential parking. The nose of the camel is in the tent, and this will become an assault on residential parking. Since we have downtown areas, why isn't there a huge impact fee for downtown developers? This is why the City comes to us and asks us to pay more taxes. Sinex, Cambrian Rise are putting in

hundreds of new units which will draw more cars and there aren't enough impact fees for them. I think there should be an impact fee included in this plan for developers.

- iv. Is it possible for any street in the City to apply for resident parking if they meet the 80% threshold? Are there any plans in the works to create satellite parking lots to alleviate the problem at its source?
- v. [Cross-discussion]
  - 1. Mulligan: It should be noted that UVM supports the City on July 3<sup>rd</sup>, we utilize their lots for large-scale events that benefit the City. I will investigate the use of satellite parking lots. We need to have the capacity and busing to handle that load. We need to have enough buses, seats, enough headway to get people to their workplaces.

#### **6. Bank and Cherry Streets Public Improvements – 30 % plans**

- a. Laura Wheelock presenting
- b. 20-minute duration
- c. Action: Informative, no action needed.
- d. Discussion:
  - i. Laura Wheelock: This is exclusive for Bank and Cherry Streets [\[https://www.burlingtonvt.gov/CEDO/BTV-Mall-Redevelopment-Process/Bank-Cherry-Streets\]](https://www.burlingtonvt.gov/CEDO/BTV-Mall-Redevelopment-Process/Bank-Cherry-Streets), we did update some of the curb extensions and bump outs.
  - ii. Councilor Bushor: Bike parking and bulletin boards, are 30% plans included in this set?
  - iii. Wheelock: The bulletin board number did not change, which is 2 per block.
  - iv. Bushor: No real problems with this so far?
  - v. Wheelock: No, so far no major identifiers that would trigger a substantial change. The volatile nature of two large properties on Cherry St may have an impact, but we can readjust those scope limits and if Macy's goes in, they can pay for their curb. We are hyperaware that we don't want to construct something only to see it torn out and redone.
  - vi. Bushor: The presentation is at 30% and 75% - do you do any other checks during the process?
  - vii. Wheelock: The agreement we currently have with Stantec are 30% submittal, 75% submittal, and 100% submittal. The mall's design team also has a 75% and 100% deliverable schedule.

#### **7. Scheduling Future Meetings**

- a. When a meeting is needed, it shall be on the first Wednesday of each month. However, next month the meeting shall be on Tuesday, September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2018 at 5:30 in the DPW front conference room.

## 8. Councilors' Update

- a. Councilor Hartnett: When does St. Paul St construction start?
- b. Laura Wheelock: The contractor hopes to start on the 20<sup>th</sup> of this month.
- c. Hartnett: That area of the city has had a lot of street closures, and it's starting to have an impact. It's a concern of mine.
- d. Wheelock: We originally wanted to start this project in April, and take a more leisurely approach, and this isn't ideal but we're also allowing sign boards and local business signs for people to stay informed.
- e. Hartnett: Utility shutoff concerns due to lack of business, is there some kind of collaboration that we could do? These businesses are feeling the pinch and we should try and support them wherever we can.
- f. Wheelock: We'll look into that.
- g. Councilor Tracy: I would request: the DPW approved some bike pedestrian changes, including removing some parking on Pearl St. Where are we at with the bike this work? And also some of the sidewalk work my ward was told would be done, on Greene St in particular, this work didn't get done when we were told it would. It's a bit confusing because we were told Greene St was on last year's list, so it was supposed to be done earlier in the year.
- h. Nicole Losch: We are still on track to get everything in the work plan completed this year. The contractor estimates it will take four weeks, and Pearl St is near the end of their plan. By the end of this month, though, it should be done.
- i. Wheelock: It is on our own crews' work plans to coordinate and prioritize sidewalks. Greene St is on their list, honestly I am not sure how they prioritize their work.
- j. Tracy: Will all the greenway plantings in the Old North End have plantings, or not?
- k. Losch: They will.
- l. Hartnett: We're hearing a lot of conversation about wastewater bonding. What are the department's thoughts, decision-making process, timeline goals on that?
- m. Robert Goulding: I know that Megan and Chapin will be bringing more info forward as soon as possible. The goal is to bring the system back to full operating capacity very soon. I'll get you an update on that by the next TEUC. It looks like November-March right now.
- n. Councilor Bushor: Again, I think that it's important to clarify the classification of ten-year storms.
- o. Goulding: We use the NRCC out of Ithaca, and we're not sure if that's been updated.



- p. Hartnett: On Main St, these traffic calming structures are causing delivery vehicles to park in the middle of the street. These also back traffic up quite a bit. The wastewater and sewage problem is snowballing out of control, and it's becoming a big PR problem. I would recommend that you get on the NPA's agendas and talk strictly about wastewater. There needs to be a story being told, and we need to do a better PR job with this thing.
- q. Tracy: In addition to the NPAs, we should do a Contois thing where we share the whole story with people.
- r. Goulding: There has been tremendous progress over the last 25 years, but the older infrastructure is starting to limit us. I agree that we need to make a better and more consistent message.

**9. Adjourn**

- a. Councilor Tracy moves to adjourn.
  - i. Meeting adjourned at 7:22.