



**Tuesday, October 14, 2025, 5:30 PM, 645 Pine St., Front Conference Room, OR
REMOTELY via ZOOM**

5:30 pm, 645 Pine St., Front Conference Room, OR Remotely via ZOOM:

Please click the link below to join the webinar:

<https://zoom.us/j/91614872377>

Or One tap mobile :

+19292056099,,91614872377# US (New York)

+13017158592,,91614872377# US (Washington DC)

Or Telephone: Dial(for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location): US:

+1 929 205 6099 US (New York)

+1 301 715 8592 US (Washington DC)

+1 305 224 1968 US

+1 309 205 3325 US

+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

+1 646 931 3860 US

+1 507 473 4847 US

+1 564 217 2000 US

+1 669 444 9171 US

+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)

+1 689 278 1000 US

+1 719 359 4580 US

+1 253 205 0468 US

+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)

+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)

+1 360 209 5623 US

+1 386 347 5053 US

Webinar ID: 916 1487 2377

1. Agenda

1.1. Motion to amend/adopt agenda

2. Consent Agenda

Subject	2.1. September Commission Meeting Minutes (attachment)
Meeting	October 14, 2025 - Parks and Recreation Commission Meeting - Tuesday, October 14, 2025, 5:30 PM, 645 Pine St., Front Conference Room, OR REMOTELY via ZOOM
Category	2. Consent Agenda
Department	Parks, Recreation, & Waterfront
Type	Action (Consent)
Recommended Action	Waive the reading, accept the communication and approve the request for special use permit
Subject	2.2. Leddy Bike Park Opening Event Special Use Permit (attachment)
Meeting	October 14, 2025 - Parks and Recreation Commission Meeting - Tuesday, October 14, 2025, 5:30 PM, 645 Pine St., Front Conference Room, OR REMOTELY via ZOOM
Category	2. Consent Agenda

Department	Parks, Recreation, & Waterfront
Type	Action (Consent)
Recommended Action	Waive the reading, accept the communication and approve the request for special use permit

3. Public Forum

Subject	3.1. Verbal Comments
Meeting	October 14, 2025 - Parks and Recreation Commission Meeting - Tuesday, October 14, 2025, 5:30 PM, 645 Pine St., Front Conference Room, OR REMOTELY via ZOOM
Category	3. Public Forum
Department	Council and Board
Type	Procedural

4. Deliberative Agenda

Subject	4.1. Open Space Plan (attachment)
Meeting	October 14, 2025 - Parks and Recreation Commission Meeting - Tuesday, October 14, 2025, 5:30 PM, 645 Pine St., Front Conference Room, OR REMOTELY via ZOOM
Category	4. Deliberative Agenda
Department	Parks, Recreation, & Waterfront
Type	Action

Subject	4.2. Ordinance Appendix D, Sections 2 & 5 (attachment)
Meeting	October 14, 2025 - Parks and Recreation Commission Meeting - Tuesday, October 14, 2025, 5:30 PM, 645 Pine St., Front Conference Room, OR REMOTELY via ZOOM
Category	4. Deliberative Agenda
Department	Parks, Recreation, & Waterfront
Type	Action

Subject	4.3. Staff Update/Director Search
Meeting	October 14, 2025 - Parks and Recreation Commission Meeting - Tuesday, October 14, 2025, 5:30 PM, 645 Pine St., Front Conference Room, OR REMOTELY via ZOOM
Category	4. Deliberative Agenda
Department	Parks, Recreation, & Waterfront
Type	Information

Subject	4.4. Bike Park Update
Meeting	October 14, 2025 - Parks and Recreation Commission Meeting - Tuesday, October 14, 2025, 5:30 PM, 645 Pine St., Front Conference Room, OR REMOTELY via ZOOM
Category	4. Deliberative Agenda

Department Parks, Recreation, & Waterfront

Type Information

Subject 4.5. Comprehensive Plan Update

Meeting October 14, 2025 - Parks and Recreation Commission Meeting - Tuesday, October 14, 2025, 5:30 PM, 645 Pine St., Front Conference Room, OR REMOTELY via ZOOM

Category 4. Deliberative Agenda

Department Parks, Recreation, & Waterfront

Type Information

5. Standing Items

Subject 5.1. Parks Foundation Update (verbal)

Meeting October 14, 2025 - Parks and Recreation Commission Meeting - Tuesday, October 14, 2025, 5:30 PM, 645 Pine St., Front Conference Room, OR REMOTELY via ZOOM

Category 5. Standing Items

Department Parks, Recreation, & Waterfront

Type Information

Recommended Action

6. Director's Report

7. Commissioner's Items & Volunteer Hours

8. Adjournment

Subject 8.1. Motion to adjourn

Meeting October 14, 2025 - Parks and Recreation Commission Meeting - Tuesday, October 14, 2025, 5:30 PM, 645 Pine St., Front Conference Room, OR REMOTELY via ZOOM

Category 8. Adjournment

Department Council and Board

Type Procedural

Recommended Action

Parks Commission Meeting Minutes

September 9th, 2025 at 5:30pm

645 Pine Street, front conference room & zoom

Commissioners in attendance: Nate Lantieri, Katie Mobley, Kirstin Boehm, Harley Johnson, Robert Etter, Halle Davis and Ryan Bergmann

Staff & presenters in attendance: Sophie Sauv , Scott Gustin, Meghan O'Daniel, Jill Dixon & Zoe Richards

Public in attendance: Phillip Pezeshki

1. Agenda

1.1 Motion to amend/adopt agenda

Lantieri opened the meeting by welcoming everyone. He asked if there was a motion to amend/adopt the agenda. Mobley made the motion. Boehm seconded. All were in favor, none were opposed.

2. Consent Agenda

2.1 Special Use Permit for Alex Manfull Fund and Gaskell Family on Burlington Greenway

Lantieri then asked if there was a motion to adopt the consent agenda. Boehm made the motion. Bergmann seconded. All were in favor, none were opposed.

3. Public Forum

3.1 Verbal Comments

Opened at 5:35pm. With no one in attendance, Lantieri closed public forum at 5:36pm.

Noting a member of the public was now present, Lantieri re-opened public forum at 5:59pm.

Philip Pezeshki was in attendance and noted that the removal of bittersweet in the meadow in Arms Forest is looking very good and asked if there was an update about signage that was planned for that area and if there were any design or usage plans for that space. He continued by asking if there were any plans to change the stop signage along the Bike Path to allow bicycles and pedestrians to have the right of way to cross the streets rather than having the stop signs on the bike path.

He also asked if there were any plans to resurface the stretch of bike path by the North Beach Campground.

Lantieri said he would look into the answers and follow-up with Pezeshki.

The public forum was closed again at 6:02pm.

4. Deliberative Agenda

4.1 Open Space Plan

Scott Gustin began by noting that tonight is for reviewing the draft and the plan is to come back again for adoption next month or December if more discussion needs to be had at the next meeting. He continued that they have been working on this for roughly a year with help from BPRW staff including Sophie Sauv , Dan Cahill and Juliet Shen,

Conservation Board representative Zoe Richards, and Sarah Morgan from City Planning. He shared that UVM spatial analysis labs did a comprehensive tree canopy analysis, which has been incorporated into this plan as well. Gustin continued that there are 4 primary themes in this plan: conserve, experience, connect and cultivate, as well as the Urban Forest Plan, the Legacy Fund and climate resiliency. He shared that the City team received the draft at the end of July and have met 6 or 7 times to go through it line by line and have made comments, some of which were: looking for a more robust integration of the spatial analysis lab's tree canopy work, emphasizing the need for sustained communications to keep this all in the forefront to keep connections robust and functional and fleshing out strategies and supportive local community food systems. He also shared that they are looking to put together a small write-up about the history of the conservation legacy fund and its central role in all of this. Gustin closed by asking the Commissioners to share any feedback they have by the end of the week so that they can incorporate it into a further revised plan. He then handed it over to Jill Dixon, who shared her screen with the power point presentation.

Dixon began by speaking to the history of open space planning in Burlington, which began in 2000. She continued that this iteration, like the others was built on a strong foundation of community engagement including pop-up events to conversations with students and community workshops, which have all reinforced the different ways that open space matters for the City. She shared that this plan takes a holistic approach to open space, including the role it plays for healthy ecologies, recreation, nature experiences, City identity and food systems. Dixon continued that the vision statement builds on past plans, what community members are saying today about the need and want for open space, climate change and our changing environment, with the underlying theme that Burlington is a nature-filled City, a strong legacy that they wanted to build upon while also using language that is accessible and gets at what people love about open space today and its value for the future. Dixon continued by reviewing the 4 main themes of the open space plan: conserve, connect, experience and cultivate as well as some overarching themes that emerged, including: climate resilience, equity, community, connectivity, identity and accessibility, which will be seen throughout the plan. She reviewed conserve first, which she shared focuses on big picture stewardship of existing protected lands across the City and how these spaces work together to support healthy ecosystem and a healthy Burlington. She continued that this area has 4 strategies and a number of actions and shared a map showing the core ecological areas, from large natural cores to areas identified as stewardship zones where residents that live close to open spaces can take action in their own backyards that can have positive influences. Next, Dixon reviewed connect, which focuses on how stewardship and nature-based development can work together to increase connectivity of ecosystems across Burlington. The strategies for this section focus on expanding nature-based climate solutions across the City and the ecosystem of stewardship including how all land stewards play a role. She continued that this area also includes thinking about how open space and new development can work together and not be an either/or. Dixon then shared a map and table that showed the amount of impervious service and how that matters for the future of open space, which is a starting point to figure out which

strategies are going to be the most effective and important to prioritize. Next she reviewed experience, which focuses on the role that open spaces play from a people perspective, with strategies that increase awareness about the existing open spaces across the City, expanding public access to nature-based experiences and breaking down barriers to open space so that everyone is able to enjoy their benefits. She then shared a map showing the different levels of access to nature experiences across the City, with the densest being in the New North End. She noted that this is where the Comprehensive Plan and the Parks and Rec Master Plan could continue to expand on how to enhance access and experience when it comes to parks, open space and recreation. Dixon then moved on to review the fourth goal, cultivate, which she shared was focused on local food systems with strategies of cultivating sustainable and resilient agricultural practices, expanding community gardens and thinking about how to support the cultivation of alternate food sources, such as foraging. Then Dixon shared a final map showing a connected ecosystems framework, which will act as a roadmap where both people and nature can thrive together over time. She continued that the goal is that this is a roadmap for the City and also partners and other groups to work together to achieve a healthy ecosystem across Burlington.

Dixon then opened it up to feedback and questions.

Lantieri felt that it was very comprehensive and noted that he needed more time to really dive into it.

Etter asked about the survey responses and if this took those into account.

Gustin responded yes, but that was not the main way they received feedback.

Dixon chimed in that about 50 people took the online survey in addition to pop-up events across the City where they asked the same questions as the survey, which addressed things like challenges of open space and visions for the future and received feedback in person. They then put all of that feedback together to see what was most important to people.

Gustin shared that they attended 24 pop-up events in addition to visiting various boards, commissions and councils throughout the City. He felt confident that they had people in the hundreds weigh in between those and the survey.

Lantieri asked about the timeline for this.

Gustin responded that the hope is to have an adoption by this body and the Conservation Board in October with an adoption by council hopefully in November. If more time is needed, things could get pushed back a month to December.

Etter stated that if hundreds of people participated, that is about 1% of Burlington.

Gustin shared that they also engaged with people on social media, the website and Front Porch Forum in addition to the in-person events and survey.

Dixon noted that in addition to the broad public outreach that there was a big effort to focus on engaging stakeholders that have direct either ownership of open space properties or some other connection to open space in Burlington. She continued that Gustin and his team did a great job getting attendance at the stakeholder sessions, so the plan reflects a lot of those collective ideas from a lot of different people.

Gustin shared that they would be back next month and reiterated that the Plan BTW open space website has a public comment feature and encouraged Commissioners to

check that out and/or e-mail him directly with any comments by Monday. Everything then will be sent out to the agency for a revised plan next month.

4.2 Chief Greylock

Sauvé shared that the sculpture came down this summer and now evaluating the base is in process to support a replacement piece. She continued that the work is being led by BCA and that communication with the Abenaki Council is happening through the REIB Office. She expects that at a future meeting there will be a bigger update and potentially a request for approval.

4.3 Director Search

Lantieri shared that last week there were originally 7 interviews scheduled, but only 5 were conducted after 2 candidates dropped out. He said he could not go into specifics but that there are some good candidates in the mix and that there were honest conversations about that at the end of all of the interviews. Based on the group's scoring, their recommendations were sent to the Mayor's office for appointment consideration. He shared that ahead of the interviews, he attended a manager's meeting to hear directly from staff.

Mobley asked who was on the committee.

Lantieri shared that there was someone from the Mayor's office, City Council, BPRW, BCA, BSD and himself.

Davis asked if there were any local candidates.

Lantieri said no.

Boehm asked what the timeline was.

Lantieri reflected that because there were fewer candidates in the first round of interviews than anticipated, he was not sure if that would change anything, but if not, the first round is done and the next round is with the Mayor who will make her selection. Then, it goes to City Council for approval. He shared that the hope is that there will be someone in the position soon.

4.4 Comprehensive Plan

Sauvé shared that BPRW is due for a review of the comprehensive plan since the last one was done in 2015. She continued that at the same time, the City's Plan BTV needs to be revised and there has been a request to have a transportation plan done for the whole City and potentially an economic development plan. She shared that all of the different City departments are collaborating to get a consultant team on board to work on all of these plans together, with each having their own sections. She continued that this will be called Plan BTV 2050. Sauvé shared that there has been an RFP issued for our piece and there is a pre-submission meeting this week with proposals from consultants due at the end of this month. From there, they will be ranked and chosen, but in the meantime internal teams are meeting regularly to keep the project moving forward because there are pieces that staff will start putting together. Sauvé continued that they are looking to put together a Project Advisory Committee (PAC), which would include a member of the Parks Commission, so she is hoping who might be interested in this can

be a conversation amongst Commissioners. She closed by sharing that because this is a massive undertaking, the more voices involved in the process would be appreciated and being at the table will be important.

Etter asked how long this process is going to take.

Sauvé answered that this part would need to be done by January 2027.

Lantieri asked if this had anything to do with an accreditation process he had heard about.

Sauvé answered no and that the CAPRA initiative had been put on hold due to the reduction in force in the spring.

Mobley shared that this seems like a great opportunity to collaborate and also a lot of work.

Boehm asked when the Department would like the Commission to have someone chosen to step into this role.

Sauvé answered by next month.

Mobley shared that she would be interested.

Lantieri closed this item by asking everyone to think on it.

4.5 Off-Leash Dog Policy

Lantieri shared that he wanted to start fresh with and use this new document as the building space to hopefully iron everything out as much as possible together. He continued that as he was working through the document, if the group decided to not go in the direction of having unfenced, off-leash areas, and it actually brought up the question of do we need a separate policy from Appendix D section 7 or can these function as the same thing.

Mobley asked if this was a Commission decision.

Lantieri answered that the Parks Department needs to have an off-leash dog policy, but that's it.

Mobley then asked for clarification that the Commission has influence over the mechanics of that.

Lantieri answered yes, but that the ordinance needs to be approved and passed by City Council.

Boehm clarified that section 7 of the ordinance does not exist right now, but in this addition to the ordinance there are places where an off-leash dog policy is referenced.

Lantieri shared screen so that everyone could look at the document together and confirmed that currently the part that will go into the ordinance and the policy are separate but that the Commission could make the decision to combine them if they were interested in doing so. He continued by asking if anyone was against number 3: "there are no areas designated as unfenced off-leash dog areas within the City of Burlington's parks". No one was.

Davis asked if people get any information about the off-leash dog policy when they register their dogs with the City.

The general consensus was no but that it could be an opportunity to share information in addition to on-site signage and the website.

Lantieri also noted one other change he made, which was adding in an 18 month timeframe for BPRW to conduct an outreach campaign to educate the community if the ordinance or policy are modified.

After some discussion, everyone was comfortable with these changes.

Lantieri continued by going through the minor changes he made, including moving “human food” from the recommended rules to what is prohibited in off-leash dog areas.

Etter asked if there was a mechanism to track violations.

The general consensus was no, but Etter felt that if there was at least some sort of tracking system, even if it wasn’t through a formal system, that it would be helpful for enforcement.

Mobley asked if the Rangers had the authority to write tickets to people in parks. The group was not sure.

Etter also asked if the Director has authority to incur penalties or issue fines.

Sauvé answered that they can ban people from certain parks or BPRW operated spaces, but she was not sure about in this specific situation.

Boehm said that this is a big discussion point of this whole thing because if the Commission says off-leash dogs are not allowed in these places but there is no way for it to be enforced, what does that look like. She continued that this is what is happening now and there is a culture around having off-leash dogs in places and at times where no one is there to enforce it.

Etter also asked about removing the piece about restorative justice.

Mobley recalled talking about this one as a “may” vs. “shall” after conversations about repeated offenders and reflecting back on hearing from community members during this process. She reinforced Boehm’s point that off-leash dogs are already present in parks, so how can the Commission help engage people in conversations about it so that it is not just a penalty.

Etter expressed concerns about adding to people’s workloads by keeping in the part about restorative justice and what the process could actually do.

Davis circled back to the question about the BPRW Director’s ability to enforce with penalties.

Sauvé said that she asked a fellow BPRW colleague and he said that the Director can issue penalties and write tickets.

Lantieri suggested changing the language but leaving them in.

Johnson agreed.

Lantieri continued by addressing the “administration” section that really only has to do with commercial use in the dog parks, which he felt was strange.

Boehm felt it went hand in hand with certain areas in parks being considered off-leash areas, but wasn’t completely sure.

Lantieri noted that it was also touched on in the policy.

The group discussed the pros and cons of leaving this section in and ultimately decided that they would leave it as is.

Lantieri moved on to going through the policy, which he explained is reviewed and decided on by the Commission, so gives a little more flexibility for change as opposed to the Ordinance.

Davis felt given that information, that it might be better to keep the two documents separate.

Mobley shared that even once Appendix D is adopted, the policy is what people are going to pay more attention to so the Commission will have more work to do on it.

Lantieri suggested that moving the section on what the BPRW Director can do from the policy to Appendix D.

There was general agreement.

Lantieri then shared the background section, which he feels will be helpful to share with PACC.

Lantieri asked if anyone would like to make a motion.

Etter moved to approve the document with the amendments that were made. Mobley seconded.

All agreed, none opposed

4.6 Universal Access Design for Playgrounds Policy

Lantieri continued sharing screen

Etter shared that he had a number of concerns about this. He began by asking for more information about “equitable use” and if this means that every piece of playground equipment has to be usable by everyone, and if not, it should be pointed out that it does not mean that in the policy. He continued by sharing his concerns about the auditory piece in the policy.

Mobley summarized that when this was presented to them at the last meeting, one big takeaway was that this is already how the Department is approaching projects so this is just codifying what is being done.

Sauvé confirmed that that was correct and shared the context that because the Parks Foundation is raising funds specifically for accessible playgrounds, that if any of Sophie’s team were to not be there at some point that future staff would still be applying these principles. She continued that staff want that certainty too.

Etter continued that he has heard concerns about the accessible Oakledge playground not being as “fun” for older kids and he does not want to see that copied at every other playground.

Sauvé answered that this policy is not necessarily repeating Oakledge, but it is making sure that playgrounds have things that support access – for example accessible surfacing.

Etter responded that he recalled a large amount of the budget for these being the surfaces and what if only the areas around the accessible pieces of equipment had that type of surface underneath.

Sauvé replied that the point of the Universal Design Principle is for equitable use, so not segregating kids in certain areas but allowing them to be throughout the playground, so that would defeat the purpose. The goal is equitable access for all and it’s really more about differently able bodied children and adults being able to play together. She continued that they are aware that not every piece of equipment is going to please everybody and not every piece will be accessible to everybody, but as long as there is a variety for everyone then they are meeting the needs of playgrounds.

Mobley chimed in that there should be awareness to not conflate accessibility with challenge and that the goal of this is not to flatten out the experience for users, but instead have principles that guide how choices are made. She believes that universal design is the gold standard and of course they should be looking at spaces through the lens of access for all. She continued by recalling that it was shared at the last meeting that it is actually more cost effective in the long run to have these accessible surfaces as opposed to woodchips.

Sauvé confirmed that even though woodchips are less expensive to install, there is a large annual cost to replace them, which in addition to maintenance adds up over time. Etter asked about the maintenance costs of the semi-permeable surfaces.

Sauvé said minimal and it is done by the contractor and they try to time it when they are already doing an installation at another site. This is much less maintenance compared to weekly staff maintenance of the woodchips.

Etter asked for confirmation that universal design does not mean that every piece of equipment needs to be used by everyone.

Sauvé replied that it is a challenging discussion, but the equipment that is available is not going to be accessible to everyone, but, by putting these principles in the requests for proposals, they are telling the vendors to start thinking more out of the box.

Etter hopes that playground designs moving forward will have more “traditional” things as opposed to Oakledge, where he feels everybody can use everything.

Sauvé responded that based on feedback from community members, this is not true.

That families have shared that children who use mobility devices cannot use every component despite best efforts to not have that be the case.

Etter shared that he hopes that creating spaces for older kids to develop independence and confidence is retained through this process, with things like platforms and other climbable structures.

Sauvé responded that with something like a platform, if a ramp can be added to it then the ability for all to join in that space has been achieved. She continued that doing things like that, however, is not always possible depending on the space requirements, which is why considering different types of equipment is so important. She shared that what exists in catalogs now compared to 30 years ago is so different and that this is a huge asset to creating accessible spaces.

Mobley noted that “tolerance for error” is in the policy, so one of the principles of this is that there should be the ability to try something and fail safely while still being challenged.

Johnson suggested that it might be helpful to see the catalogs for examples of universal design in action. He continued that it does not seem like this policy is prescriptive, but because the Parks are already putting this into practice, that this would be a helpful piece to help staff when working with vendors and to help codify that in terms of securing grants that rely on universal design as a part of that. He closed by sharing that this seems like a crucial part of what staff are already doing.

Etter circled back on his question about things like platforms and nets, things that people climb on so are not everyone can necessarily do, are still being incorporated into future playground designs, sharing that he thinks those things are important pieces.

Sauvé replied that she stands by that everyone should be able to at least join in if they want to. She continued by speaking to the Oakledge playground design, which includes components like the rocks that go up to the slide vs the ramp that goes up to the slide – even though they don't look like traditional play equipment, it is still challenging to go up those, so using the landscape to enhance the equipment and space is a way to think outside of the box and still be as in alignment with universal design as possible. Etter asked if they could hold off on any action on this to review more material and discuss it more at a future meeting.

Lantieri noted that it is an action item for this meeting.

Sauvé shared that they are meeting with the subcommittee on playgrounds for the Accessibility Committee later this week, which she noted is a warned public meeting, where options will be presented so that these decisions are made with community feedback, not in isolation, so that we can best serve the community. She continued that they would be providing a summary of that meeting next Monday at the full Accessibility Committee meeting.

Etter moved that they wait on any action until a later meeting.

No one seconded, the motion failed.

Davis noted that seeing design options feels like more detail than they need to make a decision on this policy.

Johnson agreed, saying that this is meant to be a set of high level principles that staff are going to be working with in order to design parks, and while he is curious to learn more about the designs, he shared that he was comfortable with voting on this item today.

Lantieri made a suggestion to change that the Parks Commission would be the group to review this policy every 5 years. He also noted that this policy, if passed, would go into effect today. There was general agreement.

Mobely made a motion to approve this policy with the amendment. Boehm seconded. All but 1 were in favor. The motion passed.

4.7 BPRW Commission Memo: Update to PACC

Boehm began by giving an overview about how this came to be, based on the last meeting and last Director's report. She continued that the Commissioners were talking about how they could at least try to elevate those concerns and share them more directly with City Council. She shared that this was the Commission's effort to do their part in making sure that there was an awareness of the challenges that the staffing changes have caused and recognize the exceptional work of the BPRW team in the busiest part of the year for the department, as well as offer some ideas for how to potentially repair relationships with the department and staff and bring awareness to what happened to the incoming Director.

Lantieri continued by reviewing the recommendations in the memo with the group, noting that this is a little outside of what the Commission has done in the past 5 years but that this is a different moment for the Commission and the Department in general. He continued that this is their opportunity to run it up the flagpole and share the seriousness of this situation.

Boehm chimed in that an action on this would be agreement that the content of this memo resonates and that it should be sent to PACC for review, with the hope that they would invite the Commission to be on an upcoming agenda.

Mobley reflected that they did an excellent job capturing what staff have shared and agreed that there is a disconnect with what happened and people's understanding of BPRW's services to the community. She feels that the Commission has a responsibility to lift staff's voices.

Etter noted that an approach might be to share understanding that budget cuts happen sometimes, but that there also needs to be an understanding that not everything can continue as it has in regards to tasks and services.

Mobley wanted to highlight that another goal of this document was to give the incoming Director insight into what has happened to help them navigate the next 6 plus months ahead.

Davis asked for clarity about the example of work being done in public buildings.

Lantieri responded that yes in the last few years, things were consolidated so that all public buildings fall under Parks now.

Mobley noted that she was shocked when she found this out and knows that it's not widely known or understood.

Lanteri asked if Sauvé felt like this would put staff in a bad spot in any way moving forward.

Sauvé did not think so.

Lantieri asked if there was any misattribution of feelings in the memo.

Sauvé did not.

Lantieri asked if this was outside of the role of the Commission.

Sauvé answered that it is hard to know what the role of the Commission really is because there has been such a disconnect for the past 5 years or so. She feels that this is supportive of how many are feeling and hopes that this will help begin conversations about why certain services are not happening now 5 months after the reductions in force.

Lantieri asked if anyone would like to make an action on this item.

Mobley made a motion to approve this memo and send it on to PACC.

Johnson seconded.

All were in favor. None were opposed.

4.8 E-bikes on the Greenway

Lantieri opened by sharing the current ordinance and that City Council asked the Commission review this. He noted that this was created in 1995, way before e-bikes were created, but that technically all motorized vehicles of every kind and description, except when staff or contractors are performing maintenance, are prohibited.

Mobley shared that they would need education about e-bikes etc. so that they can make an informed decision.

There was a discussion about the nuance of e-bikes and agreement that more education would be needed on this topic.

Johnson noted that the State defines electric bikes as bicycles and they are allowed where bicycles are allowed.

Lantieri said that this is an introduction to a future action.

5. Standing Items

5.1 Parks Foundation Update

Lantieri shared that they have not met since the last Commission meeting so he did not have an update. He noted that the next meeting is at the beginning of October.

6. Director's Report

Sauvé shared that they are looking forward to hearing more about the interview process and timeline.

7. Commissioner's Items & Volunteer Hours

Lantieri, 20 hours between meeting with staff, the Director interviews and prepping memos for this meeting

Boehm, 5 hours prepping memos for this meeting

Bergman, 2 hours coaching for the BPRW soccer program

Johnson did not have any hours to report this month

Mobley, 1 hour at the Kieslich VSJO memorial event

Davis did not have any hours to report this month

Etter did not have any hours to report this month

8. Adjournment

8.1 Motion to adjourn

Etter made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Bergman seconded. All were in favor, none opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 8:08pm.



MEMO

Date: October 14th, 2025
To: BPRW Commission
From: Max Madalinski, Parks Project Coordinator
RE: Leddy Park Special Use Permit for October 25th, 2025

Request for a Special Use Permit at Leddy Park to hold a community event and for a waiver to allow amplified sound.

The Burlington Bike Park Coalition (BBPC) in partnership with BPRW would like to host an event in the southeast corner of the Leddy Park parking lot to celebrate the completion of the first phase of the Burlington Bike Park. There would be a short press event and official opening/ribbon cutting (coordinated by BPRW), followed by games/skills competitions, vendors tabling in the parking lot (food and gear), and fundraising by BBPC for maintenance and future phases of the Bike Park. The event would take place from 10 AM - 2 PM on October 25th, 2025.

They are expecting 5-8 vendors to attend. Vendors will have demo bikes and gear for sale. There will also be 2-3 food trucks (included in vendor total). One DJ will be attending and will be housed under a 10x10 tent adjacent to the site.

An in-person raffle will be held featuring donated items from local bike shops. Funds raised as part of the event will be used for maintenance and/or construction of future phases of the Burlington Bike Park.

They estimate approximately 200 individuals to attend, spread between the vendor area and bike park facility.

Contacts for the event are Sean Melinn and Jeremy Oclatis.

It is on a day with no conflicting events.

Staff Recommendations:
Allow for Special Use Permit

Burlington Conservation Board

311 North Avenue
Burlington, VT 05408
<http://www.burlingtonvt.gov/dpi>
Telephone: (802) 865-7188

*Rebecca Roman, Chair
Ryan Crehan, Vice Chair
Zoe Richards
Don Meals
Ryan Crehan
Ethan Ely
Dale Azaria
Kelly Farrell
Evan Horne*



TO: Parks Commission
FROM: Scott Gustin
DATE: October 14, 2025
RE: Open Space Plan

The 2025 Open Space Plan is included in the Parks Commission's October 14, 2025 meeting packet for final review and, hopefully, recommendation for adoption.

This plan is the result of more than a year of collaborative work including assessments, outreach, visioning, and writing. Most recently, a comprehensive draft plan was circulated for review and comment to the Conservation Board, Parks Commission, and the Planning Commission. The draft plan was also made available online for review and comment during the month of August and into September, 2025. The effort to rewrite the city's Open Space Plan has been a collaborative effort between the core city team, UVM's Spatial Analysis Lab, and Agency Landscape & Planning.

Following action by the Conservation Board, Parks Commission, and the Planning Commission, the Open Space Plan will move on to the City Council in November and, ultimately, adoption in December 2025.

CITY OF BURLINGTON

ORDINANCE _____

Sponsor: Parks, Arts & Culture

Committee (PACC)

Public Hearing Dates: _____

First reading: _____

Referred to: _____

Rules suspended and placed in all

In the Year Two Thousand Twenty-Five

An Ordinance in Relation to

stages of passage:

An Amendment to Appendix D, Sections 1 and 4, Updating Parks Rules and Regulations

It is hereby Ordained by the City Council of the City of Burlington as follows:

1 That Appendix D, Rules and Regulations of the Burlington Parks and Recreation Department, of the Code of
2 Ordinances of the City of Burlington hereby is amended by amending Section 2 and Section 5, thereof to
3 read as follows:

4 | 2 Perkins Pier Marina, Waterfront Park and Community Boathouse.

5 (A) Safety and Courtesy:

6 (1) Motorists shall not operate any motor vehicle within the land area of Perkins Pier or Waterfront
7 Park at a speed in excess of five (5) miles per hour.

8 (2) Motorists shall park automobiles and boat trailers only in areas designated for that purpose and
9 shall ensure that said vehicles and/or trailers do not block or impede pedestrian and bicycle access
10 along designated pedestrian and bicycle paths. Persons wishing to use launching facilities may do so
11 only after purchase of an appropriate ~~daily vehicle entrance ticket~~ permit or season's vehicle and
12 trailer vehicle entrance pass.

13 (B) Season and Transient Docking Permits:

14 (1) No ~~seasonal boater person~~ shall tie up overnight to any slip or bulkhead without first having
15 acquired a ~~contract transient permit~~ signed by the ~~Marina Manager~~ Dock Master or having paid a
16 transient fee.

17 (2) ~~Transient~~ Vessels within the ~~approved~~ docking or mooring areas are presumed to be overnight if
18 they remain after 7:00 p.m. E.D.T. ~~All Transient Boaters are required to check in with the Dockmaster~~
19 upon arrival and acquire an overnight permit and pay an overnight fee.

20 (23) ~~Vessel~~ Owner must provide adequate line and feneders and maintain them in proper
21 condition and arrangement. In the interest of safety, the ~~Dockm~~Master may require that dock lines
22 and feneders be changed or altered. ~~In~~ an emergency situation threatening damage to the owner's

An Ordinance in Relation to An Amendment to Appendix D sections 1 and 4, Rules and Regulations of City Park

23 vessel, another vessel or property of the City of Burlington. The Dockmaster may cause appropriate
24 lines and fenders to be attached to the owner's vessel and do other necessary work and the cost of
25 so doing shall be charged to the vessel owner.

26 (34) The City of Burlington can will provide docking assistance and will maintain reasonable
27 surveillance during regular hours but will not be held responsible for the security and/or safe-keeping
28 of vessels moored or docked at the facility.

29 (45) This seasonal dock or mooring agreement is not transferable and the City reserves the right to
30 use accommodations reserved by this agreement during temporary vacancies by owner. Owner shall
31 give the City advance notice of commencement and duration of such vacancies of 48 hours. There is
32 no permissible subletting of the slip or mooring by vessel owner at any time or length. The vessel in
33 the assigned slip must be registered in the vessel owner's name and align with the same name on the
34 permit/contract.

35 (56) After May 1st no refunds will be given to persons choosing not to use a designated slip or
36 mooring after having previously made payment to reserve said slip or mooring for the season. The
37 only exception would be if the Department is able to refill the space at full value by May 15th of the
38 same year.

39 (67) In no case may flame, heating elements, inflammable liquids, explosive gases or other
40 hazardous materials or equipment be used on the vessel while it remains at the City's facilities, but
41 the use of contained approved galley stoves, lamps, motors and other equipment shall be allowed in
42 safe accordance with manufacturer guidelines.

43 (78) Owner expressly undertakes and agrees to hold the City harmless with respect to damage or
44 loss to or of the vessel or its outfit, except such damage as may be conclusively attributed to the City's
45 own negligence, and this undertaking is provided to induce the City to enter into this agreement.

46 (89) Season's docking permit rates shall be set annually by the Harbor Commission, subject to final
47 approval of the City Council. Persons acquiring a larger or smaller boat during the permit period shall
48 have their fee altered and prorated on the basis of the amount of the season left. Boats shall not tie
49 up prior to May 15th or later than October 15th without written permission from the Harbor Master
50 or Deputy Harbor Master. Season's slips remaining open after July 1 may, after due notice by the
51 Harbor Commission, be reclaimed and reallocated by the Harbor Master or Deputy Harbor Master
52 Commission.

53 (910) Permit holders failing to remove vessel from assigned slip by October 15 are subject to a late
54 fee and/or towing fee set annually by the Harbor Commission.

--	--	--

Commented [HM1]: Does 'in safe' refer to a place on the vessel or is this a typo/extra language?

Commented [CW2R1]: @Hayley McClenahan - we had "safe" in there but I agree with striking it

An Ordinance in Relation to An Amendment to Appendix D sections 1 and 4, Rules and Regulations of City Park

55 (11) All permit holders, both seasonal and transient and their guests, are expected to conduct
56 themselves in a respectful manner. Belligerent behavior, harassment of guests or staff or conduct
57 disruptive to the operations of the marina will not be tolerated and are reasons for immediate
58 removal. The Harbormaster or Deputy Harbormaster have the ability to revoke any permit, either
59 temporary or permanent, if behavior is found to be disruptive.

60 (12) All boaters staying at our docks or moorings are required to provide Vessel insurance in such
61 coverage types and amounts as recommended by the City's professional insurance consultant.

62 (130) Additionally, rules set annually by the Parks and Recreation Commission and Harbor
63 Commission are in effect and enforceable by ordinance.

64 5 Park closings.

65 (A) Motor vehicles are prohibited at all times within the confines of City Hall Park, Champlain Street Park,
66 Lakeside Park, Pomeroy Park, Roosevelt Park, Smalley Park and Battery Park.

67 (B) Motor vehicles are permitted to be driven and/or parked within the confines of Waterfront Park, Leddy
68 Park, South Calahan Park, Oakledge Park, Schmanska Park, Ethan Allen Park, North Beach Park and Perkins
69 Pier, provided that:

70 (1) Motor vehicles shall be excluded from the confines of Leddy Park between 9:30+1:00 p.m. and
71 6:00 a.m., except that motor vehicles may be driven and/or parked within the confines of Leddy Park
72 during such time for the purpose of attending scheduled skating events at Gordon H. Paquette
73 Municipal Arena. Motor vehicles shall be excluded from Perkins Pier between the hours of 11:00 p.m.
74 and 6:00 a.m., except that motor vehicles may be driven and/or parked within the confines of Perkins
75 Pier if the person driving and/or parking such vehicles displays on his or her dash-board a late
76 parking permit obtained from the attendant upon admission to the Pier pays the appropriate parking
77 fee associated with such parking activity.

Commented [HM3]: This section seems to state that no parking is allowed in Perkins Pier overnight, unless it is paid for. Isn't that also the case during the day? I'm just not sure what exception this section is trying to carve out for Perkins Pier at night. If we just strike the whole section, won't the default of paying parking at Perkins Pier just control?

78 (2) Motor vehicles shall be excluded from the confines of Schmanska Park, Ethan Allen Park,
79 Waterfront Park and Oakledge Park between the hours of 9:30 p.m. and 6:00 a.m.

Commented [EM4]: Account for Waterfront Park

80 (3) Motor vehicles shall be excluded from the confines of North Beach Campground Park, unless
81 access and parking within the campsite area are allowed by reservation permit, between May 15 and
82 October 14. Saturday at 6:00 a.m. on the last weekend in April and the end of Labor Day in the
83 following manner:

84 (a4) Motor vehicles shall be excluded from the "beaenrch parking lot" between May 15 and
85 October 15 from dusk to dawn. as follows:

Table with 3 empty columns and 1 row.

An Ordinance in Relation to An Amendment to Appendix D sections 1 and 4, Rules and Regulations of City Park

86 1. ~~Between 9:30 p.m. and 9:00 a.m. or~~

87 2. ~~Within twenty (20) minutes after the time that the lifeguard in charge shall announce~~
88 ~~that the beach is closed.~~

89 (45) ~~Between midnight on Labor Day and 6:00 a.m. on the last Saturday of April October 15 and May~~
90 ~~14 motor vehicles shall be excluded from the confines of North Beach Park, including the~~
91 ~~campground and the beach. between the hours of 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.~~

92 (56) Motor vehicles shall not be parked within the confines of any city park except in those areas
93 properly designated and marked parking areas. Motor vehicles shall not be parked within the
94 confines of a city park except by those using the park for recreational purposes.

95 (C) The ~~Director of Parks, Recreation & Waterfront~~ superintendent of parks or ~~tour commander of t~~Chief
96 ~~of the police department or their designee~~ shall have ~~the authority to close any park to vehicles and/or~~
97 ~~person~~ on a temporary basis for the following reasons:

Commented [EM5]: Add in portion of a park?

98 (1) Maintenance and/or construction.

99 (2) For public protection from conditions caused by weather or climate.

100 (3) When there is reason to believe that the closing of such park is necessary for the maintenance of
101 order, safety and decency in such park and in those areas surrounding such park.

Commented [NC6]: is it possible to add an ordinance that would make the speed limit at north beach enforceable by Burlington Police Department?

Commented [NC7]: Would we be able to a line here that would allow us to ban alcohol at any beach or any park on a temp basis if behavior is out of hand such as large amounts of underage drinking, large amounts of drinking and driving, or or violent behavior?

102
103
104 (D) The ~~Director of Parks, Recreation & Waterfront~~ superintendent of parks may, as authorized by the
105 ~~Parks Commission board of parks and recreation commissioners~~, allow vehicles in prohibited areas for
106 special events occurring in such areas. ~~Additionally, the foregoing restrictions on motor vehicles shall not~~
107 ~~apply to city vehicles or personal vehicles while being used for official City business.~~

108 (E) There shall be stop signs placed at the following locations within the city parks:

109 (1) At the Flynn Avenue exit from Oakledge Park.

110 (2) At the North Avenue exit from Leddy Park.

111 (3) ~~At the North Beach entrance.~~



Page 5

An Ordinance in Relation to An Amendment to Appendix D sections 1 and 4, Rules and Regulations of City Park

112 ~~(4) At the entrance to Perkins Pier.~~

113 (E) No person shall park a motor vehicle in any parking space on Perkins Pier which is marked for boat
114 trailers.

115 (FG) *Closing hours for City Hall Park.* City Hall Park shall be closed for public use from 12:00 midnight until
116 6:00 a.m. on a daily basis. This park closing shall not ~~a~~effect pedestrian crossings through the park.

117

118

119

120 * Material stricken out deleted.

121 ** Material underlined added.

122

123 em/hm/Ordinances 2025/ An Amendment to Appendix D, Sections 2 and 5 Rules and Regulations of the Burlington Parks and Recreation

124 Department

125 July 14, 2025

--	--	--