



Tuesday, January 13, 2026, 5:30 PM, 645 Pine St., Front Conference Room, or Remotely via Zoom

5:30pm, 645 Pine St., Front Conference Room, or Remotely via Zoom

Please click the link below to join the webinar: <https://zoom.us/j/99899730021>

Or One tap mobile: +13126266799

Webinar ID: 998 9973 0021

1. Agenda

1.1. Motion to amend/adopt agenda

2. Consent Agenda

Subject	2.1. Motion to amend/adopt consent agenda
Meeting	January 13, 2026 - Parks Commission Meeting - Tuesday, January 13, 2026, 5:30 PM, 645 Pine St., Front Conference Room, or Remotely via Zoom
Category	2. Consent Agenda
Department	Parks, Recreation, & Waterfront
Type	
Recommended Action	

3. Public Forum - Time Certain 6pm

Subject	3.1. Verbal Comments
Meeting	January 13, 2026 - Parks Commission Meeting - Tuesday, January 13, 2026, 5:30 PM, 645 Pine St., Front Conference Room, or Remotely via Zoom
Category	3. Public Forum - Time Certain 6pm
Department	Parks, Recreation, & Waterfront
Type	

4. Deliberative Agenda

Subject	4.1. Appendix D, Sections 5 & 7
Meeting	January 13, 2026 - Parks Commission Meeting - Tuesday, January 13, 2026, 5:30 PM, 645 Pine St., Front Conference Room, or Remotely via Zoom
Category	4. Deliberative Agenda
Department	Parks, Recreation, & Waterfront
Type	Discussion

Subject	4.2. Budget FY27 Process
----------------	---------------------------------

Meeting January 13, 2026 - Parks Commission Meeting - Tuesday, January 13, 2026, 5:30 PM, 645 Pine St., Front Conference Room, or Remotely via Zoom

Category 4. Deliberative Agenda

Department Parks, Recreation, & Waterfront

Type Information

Subject 4.3. Penny for Parks - Community Requests

Meeting January 13, 2026 - Parks Commission Meeting - Tuesday, January 13, 2026, 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. Comprehensive Plan Update

Meeting January 13, 2026 - Parks Commission Meeting - Tuesday, January 13, 2026, 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. Visioning: Parks & Recreation Commission 2026

Meeting January 13, 2026 - Parks Commission Meeting - Tuesday, January 13, 2026, 5:30 PM, 645 Pine St., Front Conference Room, or Remotely via Zoom

Category 4. Deliberative Agenda

Department Parks, Recreation, & Waterfront

Type Discussion

5. Standing Items

Subject 5.1. Parks Foundation Update

Meeting January 13, 2026 - Parks Commission Meeting - Tuesday, January 13, 2026, 5:30 PM, 645 Pine St., Front Conference Room, or Remotely via Zoom

Category 5. Standing Items

Department Parks, Recreation, & Waterfront

Type

Recommended Action

Subject 5.2. Director's Report

Meeting January 13, 2026 - Parks Commission Meeting - Tuesday, January 13, 2026, 5:30 PM, 645 Pine St., Front Conference Room, or Remotely via Zoom

Category 5. Standing Items
Department Parks, Recreation, & Waterfront
Type
Recommended Action

**Subject 5.3.
Commissioners Items and Volunteer Hours**

Meeting January 13, 2026 - Parks Commission Meeting - Tuesday, January 13, 2026, 5:30 PM, 645 Pine St., Front Conference Room, or Remotely via Zoom

Category 5. Standing Items
Department Parks, Recreation, & Waterfront
Type
Recommended Action

6. Adjournment

Subject 6.1. Motion to adjourn

Meeting January 13, 2026 - Parks Commission Meeting - Tuesday, January 13, 2026, 5:30 PM, 645 Pine St., Front Conference Room, or Remotely via Zoom

Category 6. Adjournment
Department Parks, Recreation, & Waterfront
Type
Recommended Action

Parks Commission Minutes

December 9th, 2025 at 5:30pm

645 Pine St., Front Conference Room & Zoom

Commissioners in Attendance: Lantieri, Bergmann, Johnson, Boehm & Etter

Staff in Attendance: Lewis, Moreau, Sauve, Kaeding, Peterson, McClenahan & O’Daniel

Public Present: none

1. Agenda

1.1 Motion to amend/adopt agenda

The meeting commenced at 5:34pm with Lantieri asking for a motion to amend/adopt the agenda. Boehm made a motion to adopt the agenda, Etter seconded. All were in favor, none were opposed.

2. Consent Agenda

2.1 November Minutes

Lantieri asked for a motion to adopt the November minutes. Boehm made a motion, Bergmann seconded. All were in favor, none opposed.

3. Harbor Commission

Boehm made a motion to recess the Parks Commission and start the Harbor Commission, Etter seconded. All were in favor, none opposed.

After the presentation by the Waterfront team, the Harbor Commission was adjourned and the Parks Commission was re-opened.

4. Public Forum (Time Certain, 6pm)

Public forum was opened at 6pm. With no one present for it, it was closed at 6:01pm.

5. Deliberative Agenda

5.1 Appendix D, Sections 5 & 7

Lantieri began by giving context that during the leadership transition there were some sections of Appendix D that did not go to McClenahan, the staff attorney for Parks, before going to City Council, so the goal of this is to get clarity on the best process moving forward.

McClenahan introduced herself and began by giving an overview and background on where this document has been and where it seems like these changes are headed. She continued that her understanding that the former Director had initiated changes to these sections and had brought them to this body for review and input, which then went to City Council in July, with a recommendation to pass the changes as presented. The City Council decided that more review and updating was potentially needed,

specifically in relation to parking at Perkins Pier, so they sent this to PACC (Parks, Arts & Culture Committee) for review. PACC then met in October and decided that they wanted more input from the Parks Commission, which is how things ended up here. She continued that the request from the City Council is still out there and valid and they are waiting for those changes to come back. She shared that her view on the Parks Commission's role is to look at the last lingering issues with these two sections and send final comments back to PACC and then they can decide from there if they want to make any changes or sent them back as is to the City Council. McClenahan continued that section 7, the dog section, is a different issue. She shared that her understanding is that began with a recommendation from the Dog Task Force and the off-leash dog policy landed with the Commission to work on and then pass to the PACC for their review and feedback to then pass on to City Council. McClenahan feels this approach would be fine and then PACC can decide if they want to send everything to City Council as one package or develop the dog section further in a committee before sending it back. She then said that ultimately the next step is getting consensus from this body on their recommendation.

Lantieri asked about the sequence of things and that if the Commission approves something that will become a part of Ordinance, who should it go to first.

Haley answered that she would be happy to review and provide feedback but that City Council has the final authority.

Boehm asked for clarification that the best path forward would be for the Commission to discuss and send draft changes to McClenahan for review and feedback that are then incorporated before voting and passing it on to PACC/City Council.

McClenahan said yes.

Lewis confirmed they would be following these steps moving forward.

Lantieri asked if all things need to go from the Commission to PACC before it goes to City Council.

Haley answered that everything ultimately needs to be approved by City Council, so before changes are made it would be helpful to figure out what the most efficient workflow will be, including what the preference for PACC and the City Council are. She continued that this body can make recommendations directly to the City Council, and then they can decide if they're going to approve it as is or if they want to send it to a committee to make changes. Or, it can be sent to PACC first. She shared that as long as all of the appropriate bodies have an informed chance to weigh in and the City Council formally adopts it that is what's needed from an efficiency standpoint. McClenahan confirmed, however, that in this particular instance PACC has requested that these documents go back to them first.

Sauve asked if the new software system for requesting legal advice etc. would be available for Commissioners.

Haley answered that currently only staff can access this tool, but that this may change in the future.

Lewis confirmed that he has been trained on the new system and encouraged Commissioners to use him as a resource for communicating with the City attorneys.

Lantieri shifted the conversation to reviewing sections 5 and 7 specifically. McClenahan noted 2 minor changes she suggested to section 2 first: adding “or designee” in case the Marina Manager was not available or this was ever delegated to someone else in the future and that she changed some grammatical pieces to another spot but the content or intent did not change. She continued by reviewing section 5 changes, beginning by asking what time this body wanted Leddy Park to close. Moreau confirmed that both bodies wanted 9:30pm, after clearing up some confusion. Haley continued that she recommended language about paying to park overnight at Perkins Pier be removed because of redundancy.

The group agreed.

Lantieri asked if numbers 1, 2 and 3 are restrictions and if they’re not outlined in that area, then it’s allowed.

McClenahan answered yes, unless there are other City ordinance or rule that apply.

Moreau chimed in except for number 3, which states that motor vehicles are excluded from Waterfront Park unless approved.

There was a discussion about whether Calahan should be included in this section or not, with the consensus being to check in with Roach before making any decisions.

McClenahan then continued with section 3, noting that she didn’t have any feedback on that.

The group then discussed section C, which included deciphering what this section means and workshopping the language about the authority to close a park or a portion of a park. There were feelings that this section was too broad as was and lacking clarity on who had more authority than the other, the Chief of Police or the BPRW Director.

McClellan explained that they have equal power in this specific scenario, but that the Chief of Police has jurisdiction to do this anywhere in the City for safety or hazardous reasons.

Lantieri asked if it would be okay to remove that title then because of that.

McClenahan answered that that would be a policy decision, and other parties would need to weigh in.

McClenahan had a question about banning alcohol in parks and whether or not this body had put this in.

Moreau answered that there was a question this summer if they could suspend alcohol being allowed for a short window to cool things down and help with safety and they were told no, which is why they asked if it could be included in the Ordinance.

McClenahan explained that open containers are prohibited in the City, with some exceptions, which are listed in the Ordinance. She continued that her take on this is that if there is going to be an exception to this rule, it should be in the section of the Ordinance about alcohol in general and this body could make a recommendation to the City Council in conjunction with the Appendix change.

Lantieri asked for McClenahan’s opinion on section 7.

McClenahan shared that technically section 7 has expired but it is still used informally and that based on the minutes from PACC, that they are looking for what would this body recommend changing about those rules, if they were in effect. She continued that

rules that are more stagnant and don't change are better for the appendix and having a Department policy for some of the more granular rules that might need flexibility for change, such as locations and time of year, is her biggest takeaway from this section. She then shared that she felt the designation of permanent off-leash dog areas would make more sense in the appendix, while things like the public education period, maps, hours etc., would be better in the policy.

Commissioners reviewed how they had left things during the last discussion of policy vs. appendix and that it felt like they had landed on almost the inverse of this.

Boehm noted that they had talked about not making any changes to the existing leashed areas and asked what a policy would look like if this were the case. She noted that the group had worked on a current document.

McClenahan said she would be happy to review that.

5.2 Chapter 20, Section 12 (E-bikes on the Greenway)

Lantieri opened by sharing that it seems to read that e-bikes are not allowed on the Greenway and asked McClenahan for her read.

McClenahan shared that certain areas, like the Greenway, are for bicycle and pedestrian travel and "other similar uses" and then it goes on to clarify that motorized vehicles of any kind are prohibited. She continued that a caveat could be the term "bicycle", which the ordinance does define as well as "motor assisted bicycle", which she found interesting. She continued that in terms of bicycle and pedestrian travel, that as long as an e-bike isn't hitting that 30 mph threshold that there is an argument that it could fall under "other similar uses", but the no motorized vehicles piece could also lend to the argument that they are not allowed, regardless of how fast they're going. She noted that this was the analysis, but asked the rhetorical question of where this would leave things practically.

Moreau asked if this was specific to the Greenway or if this would include our parks and trails too.

McClenahan noted that the legal description of the land is just the Greenway.

Lantieri asked when this was last updated.

Haley answered 1995 with some changes made in 2021.

5.3 Comprehensive Plan Update

Sauve shared that a consultant was selected and they are in scope and fee negotiations now. She noted that the sections outlined in the BPRW section did not reflect the amount of budget that they had for the effort and the scope did not reflect what is needed Department-wide, which has created a lot of back and forth in an effort to determine the best way forward, both in the distribution of funding as well as supporting the assessment that will be done by staff. She continued that the hope is to go to City Council in January for the contract approvals, but that there is a lot of work to do between now and then. Currently, Sauve has been meeting with BPRW managers to make sure they are familiar with the current plan and to help evaluate what the Department has done in terms of strategic initiatives that were outlined in it, as well as

needs going forward for the next 10 – 25 years. She noted that the BPRW is eager to hear about the process and be included in it.

Lantieri confirmed that how it is scoped currently, it hasn't captured what is needed for the Department.

Sauve answered yes, especially Waterfront, Recreation and newer pieces to the Department like Central Facilities, Marketing and Communication and the Park Ranger program, the goal and need being to build on it not just review it.

Lantieri noted the impact that the 2015 comprehensive plan has had in terms of it being the roadmap for the past 10 years, so it's an important process and document.

Sauve continued that this is especially important as everything else is changing, like adding housing and the impacts that has on Parks etc., there need to be plans that speak to each other across Departments for staff to use as guides, as well as grant funding, especially since this process includes input and vetting by the public.

Lewis shared that they're working on trying to right-size the scope of the work so that we don't get to the end of the project and realize it doesn't meet the needs of the Department.

5.4 Waterfront Calendar of Events 2026

Moreau shared a digital version of the events list noting that it is not public information yet because contracts have not been signed. She continued that these have all applied and been approved by the Advisory Committee and that the calendar is almost full except for June. Moreau noted that there are Act 250 parameters limiting it to 3 booked weekends a month at Waterfront Park. Moreau continued by giving kudos to KJ Doyle for stepping in this past season year and taking this on in addition to her internal events. Moreau continued by noting that Doyle also got an event to come back after being somewhere else last year and has added others, all of which have positive impacts on Burlington as a whole. She closed by sharing that this will be shared publically once the events are under contract!

5.5 Visioning: Parks & Recreation Commission 2026

Noting that there were only 3 Commissioners left at this point, Lantieri decided to bump this item to the next meeting.

Before doing so though, Lantieri did share some items he had in mind: vendors in parks, clarify the permitting process, reviewing open meeting law, creating a volunteer structure to more actively engage, reviewing the code of conduct, having a retreat and building a stronger relationship with the Conservation Commission.

6. Standing Items

6.1 Parks Foundation Update

Lantieri shared that they will be meeting later this week and they are working on launching their campaign.

6.2 Director's Report

Lewis shared that he is currently onboarding and the staff have been amazing and getting him up to speed as quickly as possible. He continued by sharing his gratitude for everyone who has reached out so far and that he's excited to be here.

6.3 Commissioners Items & Volunteer Hours

Boehm shared that she went to the Inglesby Brook volunteer day at Champlain Elementary, which was led by a member of the Conservation Team, and said that it was a great experience. She continued that the PTO member who worked with Parks staff to create this opportunity had wonderful things to say about the Department.

Johnson did not have any hours to report.

Lantieri shared that he finished the class he was taking and submitted his final paper that was an organizational assessment of the Department, which he will be sharing out. He had 1 hour to report.

7. Adjournment

Boehm made a motion to adjourn the meeting, Johnson seconded. All were in favor, none were opposed.