



**Thursday, September 17, 2026, 4:30 PM, Bushor Conference Room 1st Floor, City Hall
OR REMOTELY via ZOOM**

When: Sep 17, 2026 04:30 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)
Topic: Ordinance Committee Meeting

Join from PC, Mac, iPad, or Android:
<https://zoom.us/j/99732088003>

Phone one-tap:
+19292056099,,99732088003# US (New York)
+13017158592,,99732088003# US (Washington DC)

Join via audio:
+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
+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)
+1 360 209 5623 US
+1 386 347 5053 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)

Webinar ID: 997 3208 8003

International numbers available: <https://zoom.us/u/alDs4bqr2>

1. Agenda

1.1. Motion to amend/adopt agenda

2. Adopt the Minutes

Subject	2.1. Adopt Draft Minutes from August 20, 2026
Meeting	September 17, 2026 - Ordinance Committee Meeting Agenda - Thursday, September 17, 2026, 4:30 PM, Bushor Conference Room 1st Floor, City Hall OR REMOTELY via ZOOM
Category	2. Adopt the Minutes
Department	City Attorney
Type	
Recommended Action	
Subject	2.2. Adopt Draft Minutes from July 14, 2026 and August 11, 2026 Collaborative with Planning Commission

Meeting	September 17, 2026 - Ordinance Committee Meeting Agenda - Thursday, September 17, 2026, 4:30 PM, Bushor Conference Room 1st Floor, City Hall OR REMOTELY via ZOOM
Category	2. Adopt the Minutes
Department	City Attorney
Type	
Recommended Action	

3. Public Forum

Subject	3.1. Verbal Comments
Meeting	September 17, 2026 - Ordinance Committee Meeting Agenda - Thursday, September 17, 2026, 4:30 PM, Bushor Conference Room 1st Floor, City Hall OR REMOTELY via ZOOM
Category	3. Public Forum
Department	Council and Board
Type	

4. E-Moto Discussion

Subject	4.1. E-Moto Discussion
Meeting	September 17, 2026 - Ordinance Committee Meeting Agenda - Thursday, September 17, 2026, 4:30 PM, Bushor Conference Room 1st Floor, City Hall OR REMOTELY via ZOOM
Category	4. E-Moto Discussion
Department	Council and Board
Type	

5. Other Committee Business

Subject	5.1. Other Committee Business
Meeting	September 17, 2026 - Ordinance Committee Meeting Agenda - Thursday, September 17, 2026, 4:30 PM, Bushor Conference Room 1st Floor, City Hall OR REMOTELY via ZOOM
Category	5. Other Committee Business
Department	City Attorney
Type	
Recommended Action	

6. Adjournment

Subject	6.1. Motion to adjourn
----------------	-------------------------------

Meeting	September 17, 2026 - Ordinance Committee Meeting Agenda - Thursday, September 17, 2026, 4:30 PM, Bushor Conference Room 1st Floor, City Hall OR REMOTELY via ZOOM
Category	6. Adjournment
Department	Council and Board
Type	
Recommended Action	

**Ordinance Committee
Thursday, August 20, 2026
Bushor Conference Room, City Hall
or Remote via Zoom. Burlington, Vermont
DRAFT MINUTES**

Members Present: Councilor Bergman (Chair), Councilor Barlow, Councilor Carpenter (on-line)

Staff Present: Kim Sturtevant (Assistant City Attorney), Laura Wheelock (City Engineer), Phil Lewis (Director of Parks and Recreation)

Public Present: Sharon Bushor, Richard Hillyard, Polly Vanderputten (public and school board member), Councilor Melo Grant

Meeting called to order at 4:34 PM.

1. Adopt the Agenda

1.1 Adopt the Agenda

Motion to Adopt Agenda.

Motion by Councilor Barlow, Seconded by Councilor Carpenter.

Final Resolution: Motion Passes

Yes: Unanimous

2. Adopt Draft Minutes

2.1 Adopt Draft Minutes from July 16, 2026

Motion to Adopt minutes.

Motion by Councilor Barlow, Seconded by Councilor Carpenter.

Final Resolution: Motion Passes

Yes: Unanimous

Councilor Bergman noted the minutes for the Joint Planning Commission and Ordinance Committee's IZ work would be adopted at the next meeting.

3. Public Forum

Richard Hillyard of Ward 1 advocated for more education in every city and school regarding e-scooter and e-bike safety, emphasizing resources need to be multilingual, as from their perspective, many cyclists in general do not obey road rules.

Polly Vanderputten of Ward 2 commented that riding behavior for e-bikes and e-motos seems to be different from bicycles, so road rules need to be clarified, and the public and students need to

be educated on those rules. Vanderputten also noted that drivers need to be more educated on how to share the road with cyclists.

Sharon Bushor commented from a pedestrian perspective that traffic laws for bikes are confusing, and riding behavior is too inconsistent to know what to expect when sharing the road. Bushor stated education needs to target walkers, bikers, and vehicle drivers, that enforcement needs to be part of the strategy, and that the whole community needs to urgently band together on this issue. Bushor also added that other traffic rules should be reconsidered, such as the age limit for riding on sidewalks.

Public Forum closed at 4:52 PM.

4. Motorized Bicycle Ordinance Discussion

Councilor Barlow commented that while enforcement was important, education was key and the school will need to take an active role in that, including in educating parents, many of which are under the impression they are buying e-bikes for their children when they are in fact, buying e-motos, which do not fit the definition of an e-bike. Councilor Barlow also stressed the importance of BPD stepping in to deter behavior to the extent they can.

Councilor Carpenter stated she urged a constituent to report a recent encounter to the police, but that the constituent was reluctant to do so because they were not confident in the police response and wonders what BPD does with reports of e-moto incidents when they come in. Councilor Carpenter questioned if there are any changes that need to be made at the ordinance level and is looking to BPD and DPW to provide input on that. Councilor Carpenter also suggested that a committee or group be created through resolution to organize a citywide educational campaign.

Chair Bergman expressed that the Committee needs to look at the bike ordinance to add e-motos and also look at sidewalk rules. Chair Bergman added the role of e-moto sellers is worth considering and agrees with looking at enforcement and that the whole community needs to be engaged.

Director Lewis summarized BPRW's response to e-motos on the bike path and put up signs in various locations along bikepath. Some of those signs have gone missing. The department is creating permanent signs that specify no e-motos or motorcycles. The department also did some outreach with the school, and Director Lewis said the school had a substantial campaign at the end of the year and believes e-moto traffic on the bike path has gone down. Director Lewis also noted staff have collected data that shows e-motos account for 0.2% of bike path users. Director Lewis clarified that when an incident occurs, the department tries to document it and provide that information to law enforcement and urges community members to do the same through either SeeClickFix or BPD's non-emergency number.

Councilor Barlow commented on how e-motos should be defined so signs prohibiting them are clear to the public.

Councilor Carpenter asked Director Lewis how to take a community education campaign for e-motos to the next level. Director Lewis offered BPRW support in educating the public and said Local Motion has held community meetings to discuss e-motos. Director Lewis added the department has checked for alignment in the City's ordinances with state laws and would be willing to participate in a multi-stakeholder educational group or initiative.

Chair Bergman asked Director Lewis to state what resources BPRW has and if civil enforcement parks officials can be added and what money there is for enforcement and education efforts.

Sharon Bushor commented BPRW's signs could have pictures to address language barriers and stressed regulating e-motos is also a university and employer issue and that Local Motion is not a large enough platform to broadly educate the public and believes CATMA may have a role to play. Bushor suggested BPRW and BPD create a shared budget to put toward education and enforcement.

Councilor Grant commented that the issue seems to be enforcement and that the school personnel may have a role to play in intervening when underage students ride e-motos to school.

Councilor Carpenter agreed with Councilor Grant's comments and suggested the Committee ask the Mayor to appoint someone to be a coordinator of the initiatives discussed. Councilor Carpenter also noted the nuisance e-moto riding behavior is not isolated to the bike path but an issue on city streets.

Chair Bergman requested Polly Vanderputten relay the Committee's desire to develop an approach to this issue with the coordination with the school district to the School Board. Vanderputten confirmed they would be in touch with Chairperson Wool and Superintendent Flanagan and would also email the Committee further ideas and comments.

Chair Bergman invited City Engineer Laura Wheelock to speak from the DPW perspective on the issue, who summarized the following:

- DPW currently has no ordinance changes in the works and that work done earlier in the year clarified city ordinances and brought them in alignment with state statutes, but noted the language at the state level is weak and suggested communities band together to change the language at that level.
- DPW expects an ordinance or policy change will need to occur but that a public community conversation needs to happen first, pointing out e-motos are a form of alternate transportation, of which increasing the use of is an initiative of the City's and would be in line with the BTV Mobility plan, which is being updated and why DPW has not proposed anything as of yet.
- Past changes were developed in collaboration with the Walk/Bike Council and Local Motion who have more recommendations and would be a starting point for community input.
- DPW fully supports stronger guidance and has already seen a difference from BPRW's signage and the campaign last spring.

- Implementing speed limits on the bike path could be effective because it would apply to all modes of transportation and address issues with unsafe speeds in congested areas.
- The Committee should consider if this is the right forum to take up this issue at this time and that there are challenges with enforcing ordinances against this behavior.

City Engineer Wheelock clarified for Councilor Barlow that DPW is open to looking at imposing a speed limit or changing the age limit for bike path use but has concerns for vulnerable riders. Councilor Barlow agreed the conversation needs to be broadened outside the Committee and wants to hear from the school district and BPD on the issue.

Richard Hillyard commented witnessing children as young as 7 or 8 riding to school on e-scooters with no helmets and emphasized helmet safety needs to be part of the education. Hillyard also said at least some of the kids source the e-motos online and trade within the community.

Sharon Bushor spoke to City Engineer Wheelock's point about who should take lead on this issue and said whoever does take lead needs to have a clear, cohesive approach in tackling it. Bushor also stated the Walk/Bike Council does not focus enough on the pedestrian compared to riders.

The Committee discussed next steps:

- Councilor Carpenter said the Committee should go to the Mayor to assign a coordinator for the City and how that should be handled, and the Committee can continue to be involved but not lead.
- Councilor Barlow supported Councilor Carpenter's idea to authorize Chair Bergman to speak to the Mayor.
- Chair Bergman noted there are many stakeholders and many parties information needs to be gathered from before change is made. Chair Bergman requested that each committee member write individual requests for information and collective requests and recommendations, based on this meeting's deliberations, to be considered at a future meeting, with the idea that the Committee get to a point of reaching a decision or motion on a proposal from the Committee.
- Chair Bergman requested the City Attorney's Office work provide input where needed and that the Committee needs to compile the ideas that have come out of 3 meetings on this topic.

Councilor Grant said this topic is relevant to public safety and that the Public Safety Committee should take it on.

5. Any Other Committee Business

The Committee said they would meet again on the September 17, but will generate and circulate their lists by September 2 to committee members, key departments, and the Mayor.

6. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn by Councilor Bergman, without objection.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:10 PM.

Burlington Planning Commission & City Council Ordinance Committee Collaborative Working Group on Inclusionary Zoning

Tuesday, July 14, 2026, 6:00 P.M.

Hybrid Meeting via Zoom and in City Hall's Bushor Conference Room

Draft Minutes

Planning Commissioners Present:

- ☒ Andy Montroll, Chair
- ☒ Erin Malone
- ☒ Michael Gaughan
- ☒ Julia Randall
- ☒ Alexander Friend
- ☒ Ryan Nick
- ☒ Erhard Mahnke

City Council Ordinance Committee Members Present:

- ☒ Councilor Gene Bergman, Chair
- ☒ Councilor Mark Barlow
- ☒ Councilor Sarah Carpenter

City Staff Present:

- ☒ Charles Dillard, Director, City Planning
- ☒ Kara Alnasrawi, Director, CEDO
- ☒ Kimberlee Sturtevant, Assistant City Attorney
- ☒ Scott Gustin, Zoning Division Manager, DPI
- ☒ Sarah Morgan, Principal Planner, City Planning
- ☒ Nancy Stetson, Senior Policy & Data Analyst, DFA
- ☒ Maggie Callaghan, Housing Program Manager, CEDO

Invited IZ Panelists: Eric Farrell, Bruce Baker, Michael Monte, Brenda Torpy

Public Attendance: Buddy Singh, Sharon Bushor, Evan Gould, Jak Tiano, Jane Knodell, Jordan Redell, Todd DeLuca

1. Agenda

Call to Order: 6:00pm

Changes to Agenda: None

2. Public Forum for items unrelated to ZA-27-01 Inclusionary Zoning

3. Director's Report

C. Dillard reported on the recent planBTV 2050 Scenario Planning workshop with 60 stakeholders and announced an upcoming community meeting on July 22nd at 6:30pm at the Miller Center to discuss Plan BTV New North End before the public hearing that will be held on July 28.

4. Annual Organization Meeting of the Planning Commission

Executive Committee: A. Montroll (Chair), A. Friend (Vice Chair), E. Malone (At-large)

Ordinance Committee: M. Gaughan, A. Friend, R. Nick

Long Range Planning Committee: J. Randall, E. Mahnke, E. Malone

5. Welcome & Introductions with Invited Panelists

6. Staff Presentation of proposed Amendment ZA-27-01 Inclusionary Zoning

The meeting focused on discussing seven inclusionary zoning amendment proposals as part of Burlington's broader housing strategy. Staff presented the proposals, including raising the project threshold from 5 to 17 units, eliminating tiering requirements, allowing offsite units anywhere, and reconfiguring payment-in-lieu calculations.

7. Discussion related to Proposed Amendment ZA-27-01 with IZ Experts

The meeting focused on discussing affordable housing policies and development thresholds in Burlington. Bushor recommended lowering the development threshold from 17 to a lower number like 13 units to encourage more smaller-scale housing developments, particularly for homeownership opportunities. The panelists agreed that removing tiering requirements and allowing off-site development options would help increase affordable housing production, with particular support for using payment-in-lieu funds to support both large-scale developments and smaller conversion projects like turning rental properties into homeownership units. The discussion highlighted the need to balance affordable housing requirements with market feasibility, especially for smaller developers entering the market, while ensuring adequate funding flows into the Housing Trust Fund to support various affordable housing initiatives.

8. Discussion related to ZA-27-01 Proposals 1 & 2 amongst Working Group

Proposal 1, IZ Threshold: The group discussed the inclusionary zoning (IZ) threshold for housing developments, with staff recommending 17 units while offering 13 as a midpoint option. The discussion focused on balancing the trade-offs between maintaining IZ requirements and encouraging overall housing production, with staff noting that increasing the threshold might result in fewer IZ units but could potentially be offset by other housing creation tools like development agreements and public-private partnerships. Ultimately, the group reached a compromise on raising the threshold to 13 units as a middle ground between the staff-recommended 17 units and the 10 units proposed by some panelists.

Proposal 2, IZ Tiering: The group discussed but did not reach a consensus on waterfront district tiering, with debate between maintaining 25% requirements versus reducing them to 20%, and whether to remove Cambrian Rise from waterfront district requirements. The Working Group conducted an informal vote, which resulted in Cambrian Rise being pulled out of the Waterfront District (6-2, E. Mahnke and E. Malone voted against) and reducing the waterfront requirement from 20% to 20% (5-3, G. Bergman, E. Mahnke, and E. Malone voted against).

9. Public Forum related to ZA-27-01

Sharon Bushor: IZ is an affordability tool, not the tool to help us get to 7,000 units but will help make sure that some of those will be affordable for low- and moderate-income people. Was a commitment that she understood the value system of Burlington. Its an equity an inclusion tool but will not help with neighborhood code with RL and RM because those have a maximum of 8 units per parcel. Supports going to 10, not 13. Its about the people, not the units. As far as the tiering system, looks to the experts and agrees with the 2 Tier. Because of equity, thinks the waterfront needs to be 25%. If it went to 20%, it would at least be something. Try not to disincentive with Payment in Lieu.

Evan Gould: Generally okay with compromise at 13 units. Because the Working Group was comparing Burlington's proposed policies to Portland, OR, wanted to point out that, per state statute in Oregon, they cannot do unsubsidized IZ. Every IZ unit in Portland requires a subsidy and is not paid for by the developer. Minneapolis is the same way, and most projects there are subsidized IZ. With the Waterfront tiering, his observation is that most of the development of large units in the Waterfront happened in old RL-W zones that no longer exist and there haven't been that many large projects in those districts, and wonders how much the very large tiering has affected that. Census block groups that have become "More Inclusionary" are not the ones located on the waterfront. How many actual IZ units were created in the old Waterfront districts?

Todd DeLuca: Has looked a lot at IZ as a policy, feels it's a failed policy in Burlington. Would like to see it repealed. Supports proposals on the table. Central problem is that it targets developers as the funders. Doesn't want less housing development in Burlington, but we've been placing heavy burdens on developers. In a 2017 evaluation showed that development rate dropped after IZ was adopted and that few IZ units have been created. In terms of getting low-income housing into the buildings, there are plenty of examples where that isn't the case. 2017 study also says that most IZ projects were not in high income neighborhoods and thinks that IZ integration has failed. Funded or subsidized affordable housing is more effective. Thinks that affordable housing trust fund using short term rental taxes is more effective.

10. Adopt Minutes & Accept Communications

Planning Commission Action: Adopt minutes, accept communications.

Motion by: J. Randall

Seconded by: A. Friend

Vote: Unanimous

11. Adjournment (9:30pm)

Motion by: R. Nick

Seconded by: E. Mahnke

Vote: Unanimous

Burlington Planning Commission & City Council Ordinance Committee Collaborative Working Group on Inclusionary Zoning

Tuesday, August 11, 2026, 6:00 P.M.

Hybrid Meeting via Zoom and in City Hall's Bushor Conference Room

Draft Minutes

Planning Commissioners Present:

- ☒ Andy Montroll, Chair
- ☒ Michael Gaughan
- ☐ Alexander Friend
- ☒ Erhard Mahnke
- ☒ Erin Malone
- ☐ Julia Randall
- ☒ Ryan Nick

City Council Ordinance Committee Members Present:

- ☒ Councilor Gene Bergman, Chair
- ☐ Councilor Mark Barlow
- ☒ Councilor Sarah Carpenter

City Staff Present:

- ☒ Charles Dillard, Director, City Planning
- ☒ Kara Alnasrawi, Director, CEDO
- ☐ Kimberlee Sturtevant, Assistant City Attorney
- ☒ Scott Gustin, Zoning Division Manager, DPI
- ☒ Sarah Morgan, Principal Planner, City Planning
- ☒ Nancy Stetson, Senior Policy & Data Analyst, DFA
- ☒ Maggie Callaghan, Housing Program Manager, CEDO

Invited IZ Panelists: Eric Farrell, Michael Monte, Brenda Torpy, John Davis, Samantha Dunn

Public Attendance: Sharon Bushor, Fawnya Wilson, Jane

1. Agenda

Call to Order: 6:00pm

Changes to Agenda: None

2. Public Forum for items unrelated to ZA-27-01 Inclusionary Zoning

3. Adopt Minutes & Accept Communications

Planning Commission Action: Adopt minutes, accept communications.

Motion by: E. Malone

Seconded by: R. Nick

Vote: Unanimous

4. Director's Report

C. Dillard reported shared that the regular Planning Commission meeting scheduled for September 8th will be rescheduled for September 15th. Staff is working to get a meeting specifically about PlanBTV 2050 set with other relevant boards and commissions.

5. Staff presentation on Mayor's Housing Strategy

City staff presented a comprehensive approach that includes updating inclusionary zoning standards, revitalizing the Housing Trust Fund, activating the neighborhood code, and strengthening the public sector's role in housing development through strategic use of public land

6. Review of IZ Collaborative Working Group Progress & Proposals 3, 4, and 5

The group reviewed progress on Inclusionary Zoning (IZ) proposals, confirming that Proposal 1 was compromised at 13 units and Proposal 2 moved toward a uniform approach with 15% affordable units at or below 65% AML. Staff indicated that they would use the next month and a half to work on full amendment language before the next meeting on September 22nd.

7. Discussion related to Proposed Amendment ZA-27-01 with IZ Experts

The panelists and working group members discussed thresholds for on-site vs. off-site affordable housing requirements and the role of nonprofit housing agencies have in ensuring compliance and affordability. Panelists discussed challenges with market-based housing development not naturally filtering down to affordable units, the importance of permanent affordability through portability of inclusionary units, and the need for stewardship to monitor and enforce affordability covenants. The conversation also addressed questions about unit size requirements and geographic exclusions for off-site affordability payments, with consideration given to whether scale or geography should determine where in-lieu-of-production and off-site options are allowed.

Samantha Dunn: Supported allowing off-site development of inclusionary units but raised concerns about potential resident displacement and suggested considering tiered payment-in-lieu amounts based on unit size.

Michael Monte: Highlighted the importance of using designated housing agencies rather than private developers for affordable housing construction, citing better compliance and long-term affordability guarantees.

Brenda Torpy: supported including affordable housing in all new development to maintain mixed-income neighborhoods, particularly in valuable areas like the waterfront and South End.

E. Farrell indicated that \$80,000 as a PIL fee seems right, but doesn't know the exact right number.

As it related to city-owned land, Michael asked about using City owned land as an off-site option for affordable housing development. Eric noted that idea could work similarly to providing money for property purchase, with the City leveraging its infrastructure.

John Davis: Provided historical context by referencing a 1986 city report that included 25 recommendations for affordable housing, emphasizing the importance of integrating inclusionary zoning with condo conversion and Housing Trust Fund ordinance. Emphasized 3 goals of 1990 IZ ordinance: inclusivity, longevity, and stewardship.

Proposal 3: Allow Off-Site Anywhere

Working group members discussed whether affordable housing units should be required to be built on-site versus off-site, with some expressing concerns about restricting off-site development while others favored ensuring on-site development for larger projects. The discussion also covered the potential use of CHIP funding for infrastructure and the importance of including both rental and homeownership options in affordable housing developments. The group agreed that off-site should be allowed anywhere, but at some point, there should be a tie to project size that requires the units to be in the neighborhood.

Michael Monte requested to reserve a discussion point around dedicated nonprofit housing developers and the designated housing agency being the developer of choice. Ties to the stewardship point made by John. CHT is frequently asked to take over affordable housing from private developers.

Erhard Mahnke: Would like to see added "or by one of the City's dedicated housing nonprofits in partnership". Would like to add golf course in as somewhere that couldn't do off-site and then define a larger development. There seemed to be general interest in 100-units being considered a "large" development.

Sarah Carpenter: We might need to do some review of the City's dedicated nonprofits.

Michael Gaughan: Wanted to flag the acquisition of units as tricky. Doesn't agree with Erhard's proposal about designated non-profits.

Andy Montroll: Agrees that the addition of the dedicated nonprofit partnership becomes an artificial barrier.

In response to Michael and Andy's comments about the designated housing agencies, Erhard asked why we had them embedded in our ordinance to begin with. Brought John and Michael Monte's points about stewardship up, and noted that some for-profit developers maintain their IZ units just fine, but others don't. Went on to emphasize that the city has struggles with code enforcement, and wants to make sure that IZ units are maintained in the best way.

Gene followed up on Erhard's point saying that the point on designated housing agencies needs more work from staff. Hears that designation is an important aspect of it, but for-profits (like Jonathan Rose Company) has a large portfolio across the country and they do good work.

Erin Malone noted that the City may instead want to consider strengthening the monitoring side of IZ as it relates to the stewardship question.

Sarah Carpenter agreed with Erin and suggested further discussion about ways to bring the state housing agencies into the conversation.

Proposal 4: Allow Payment-In-Lieu Anywhere

Michael Gaughan: Expressed that he doesn't feel the need to call out specific parcels where Off-site and PIL wouldn't be allowed. Agrees that 100 units or more should be required to build IZ, not allow off-site or PIL.

Sarah Carpenter: Supports allowing PIL anywhere (except waterfront and South End). Agrees that there should be the "large project" threshold instead of based on parcel. Maybe unit number should be guiding principle instead of an area.

Gene Bergman: Related to the threshold of "Large" projects, doesn't think that 100 units could cover a property as large as the golf course.

Michael Monte suggested that 100 to be considered as "large" might be too high, and asked that we consider a smaller number.

Proposal 5: Reconfigure Payment-In-Lieu Calculation

C Dillard: Clarification on this proposal in response to questions from Andy Montroll – it is to remove the fee amount from the ordinance but include the formula for annually recalibrating. The Council wouldn't have to do work every year to figure out what the formula would be, since that will already be in the CDO. The baseline is being set at \$80,000 for FY27, and then in FY28, council would need to vote on update this new number. Staff will come back next time with example formulas.

Gene Bergman: Makes the most sense to set the formula in the ordinance and have it be administrative, and have it be implemented. People forget that they have to do things, and this will likely happen at the time the budget has to be done. Have a baseline, come to an ordinance that is fair, and in the ordinance say that on an annual basis it is adjusted effective July 1st/new fiscal year.

Michael Gaughan: Really liked Samantha's idea on calculating based on NOI (net operating income). Has also worked with using replacement value or some portion of replacement value.

Erhard Mahnke: Asked about what formula was used to come to \$80,000, and supports establishing some sort of annual recalibration. Emphasized the need to consider inflation index that is regionalized and takes into account construction and other related costs. Brought up the desire to require PIL for projects that are not subject to IZ.

Michael Monte: Highlighted that payment of the payment in lieu needs to be done in a way that's affordable. Upfront payment of PIL could have caused damage and difficulty for prior developers and projects. Suggested coming up with a way for allowing that payment to occur over a short period of time. Would still allow trust fund to grow, but the developer could borrow less money up front. Some working group members agreed to this suggestion of a timed PIL.

Eric Farrell proposed using HUD's income data for objective standards

8. Public Forum related to ZA-27-01

Sharon Bushor: Raised concerns about allowing off-site units, specifically around neighborhood diversity. Suggested that larger projects be considered 50 – 75 units as a threshold of mandating On-site and not allowing PIL.

9. Commissioner Items

Michael Gaughan brought up the need to review bike lane design standards following the recent cycling incident on Pine Street.

10. Adjournment (8:57pm)

CITY COUNCIL ORDINANCE COMMITTEE
E-Motos Discussion Summaries
(June 5 & 18, July 16, and August 20)

Summary

Education Outreach

- City provided school district with flyers prior to June 5, 2026 mtg.
- Parks department posted signage along Greenway, some were taken down, more permanent ones are being posted.
- Parks did outreach to the school, school did a campaign before end of school year. Data showed e-moto traffic on the Burlington Greenway had gone down, 0.2% of Greenway users.

Community Partners

- Local Motion having discussions on issue.

Enforcement

- Any city official authorized to write tickets can ticket for bicycle ordinance violations.
- Motor vehicle tickets need to be from law enforcement officer.
- When incident occurs, Parks tries to document it and provide information to law enforcement and urges community members to do the same through either SeeClick Fix or BPD's non-emergency number.
- Issue on both Greenway and city streets.
- Can be difficult to enforce.

Ideas/Suggestions

Education

- BPD and Parks post more signs educating people on the issue—signs need to be clear and define what e-motos are and that they are prohibited.
- If practicable, non-sworn officers should engage in more educational outreach.
- More outreach and education in the City and the schools regarding e-bike, e-scooter, e-moto safety needed; resources need to be multilingual; see many cyclists in general do not obey road rules.
- Riding behavior for e-bikes and e-motos seems to be different from bicycles, so road rules need to be clarified, and the public and students need to be educated on those rules.
- More education for motorists on how to share road with cyclists.

- Education targeted to walkers, bikers, and vehicle drivers as traffic laws for bikers are confusing for pedestrians and bikers are inconsistent.
- Establish committee through resolution to organize citywide educational campaign.
- Use pictures to help with language barrier on signs.

Community Partners

- Reach out to Chair of School Board and Superintendent with request to collaborate on approach to issues.
- Need more engagement from school district, including educating parents as to the difference between the e-bikes and e-motos.
- Establish a working group of City departments and the school district.
- City should engage with other municipalities, particularly South Burlington, and see how they have handled this issue and whether it has worked.
- Reach out to Vermont DMV about e-motos and/or ask for them to help address the unregistered, unlicensed e-moto issue.
- Generally, need more community engagement.
- Engage Walk/Bike Council, Local Motion, and CATMA.
- Request Mayor to appoint someone to be coordinator of initiatives discussed.

Enforcement

- More enforcement—question how? Police, school...
- Need more enforcement for deterrence.
- Question of resources for enforcement? BPRW? BPD? Share a budget for enforcement and Education?
- Intervention at school when underage students ride e-motos to school?

Potential Ordinance/Legal Changes

- Need to change law for non-law enforcement official to issue tickets for e-motos?
- Speed limit or advisory speed limit on greenway? (Greenway is a park and therefore motor vehicles generally not allowed.)
- Update to Chapter 6-1 to update definitions and add a strict power cap at 28 MPH?
- Updating and establishing relevant penalties for the different violations?
- Change age for e-bikes on sidewalks from 16 to 12 or 10 or no e-bikes on sidewalks?
- Add e-motos to bike ordinance?
- Look at sidewalk rules.
- Consider role of e-moto sellers.

- Work with other communities to request changes to strengthen state law.

Other Considerations

- E-motos as a form of alternate transportation.
- Should the Public Safety Committee take the issue up?
- Vulnerable riders.