



## Draft Fare Proposal for Public Comment

### Overview:

---

Urban local, commuter, and LINK Express bus routes will return to fare collection in January 2024. GMT will use a new fare management system, named Genfare Link, that will greatly improve payment options for both riders and organizations that support riders. The new options of this system will allow us to simultaneously adjust fare rates to match higher operating costs while also limiting the impact of fares on individual users. The draft fare plan below was developed with the following factors in mind:

- Limiting the financial impact of fares, especially frequent users reliant on public transit.
- Offering a simple and easily understandable fare structure.
- Increasing opportunities for organizations to support riders.
- Creating a system that has greater reliability and decreased maintenance requirements.
- Providing GMT with critical local match funding to help sustain operations.

### Changes in Fare Technology Drive Fare Adjustments

---

#### How will Genfare Link be different?

In addition to accepting cash payment for fares on buses, the Genfare Link system provides:

- The ability for riders to pay via debit/credit card/smartphone on the bus.
- The ability to cap costs for individual users.
- Improved options for organizations to pay for service, partially or in full.

#### The Role of Individual Rider Accounts for GMT's Fare System: Caps and Organizational Support

Individual rider accounts will allow GMT to establish cost caps for riders. These caps are critical for ensuring financially vulnerable riders can use public transit. GMT will have daily and monthly caps for each rider. Once the rider reaches the cap, additional rides are provided at no additional cost. Importantly, caps do not require an upfront payment.

Individual accounts will also allow organizations to directly manage the support they provide to riders. Participating organizations will have their own portal in the Genfare Link system that will allow them to add funds to specific riders. Organizations will have access only to the riders they support. This will vastly simplify the way employers, schools, and human service agencies administer programs to support riders.

### **Will it be Difficult to Create Rider Accounts?**

No. Most riders will create their own accounts. Both from our own experience on our buses and in collaborating with human service providers in the area, we know roughly 90% of our riders have a smartphone. These riders can install the Genfare App on their smartphone and create their own account in less than 5 minutes without GMT's assistance. When they enter a bus, they will wave their smartphone over the farebox to pay for their ride.

Riders without a smartphone will be able to create an account and receive a physical smart pass in about 5 minutes at our transit centers. The smart pass is the size and shape of a credit card. The rider will then wave the smart pass over the farebox when they enter the bus.

From November 2023 through January 2024, GMT will have pass creation events in the area that will provide a convenient way for riders to receive assistance in setting up an account, whether they use their smartphone or prefer a smart pass. As we do with the annual ride check, we will bring on temporary staffing to help us with these account creation events.

### **Will Riders be Required to Create an Account?**

No. Riders who do not wish to create an account can still pay by cash on the bus. They will not, however, benefit from fare caps or the ability to have their rides paid for by another organization.

## **Proposed Fares, Passes, and Caps**

---

### **\$2.00 Fare for Urban Local, Commuter, and LINK Express Routes**

GMT proposes a \$2.00 fare for urban local, commuter, and LINK Express routes. This is a 33% increase over the previous urban local fare (\$1.50), no change to the commuter fare (\$2.00), and a 50% reduction to LINK Express fare (\$4.00).

- Urban local routes have returned to their pre-pandemic levels.

- Commuter and LINK Express routes are still significantly below pre-pandemic ridership levels. Furthermore, there has been a shift in our perception of who uses these routes, with more riders using commuter and LINK Express for medical and human services related travel.

GMT will continue to provide a 50% discount fare for riders under 17, over 60, or with a disability. Discounted urban local, commuter, and LINK Express routes will be \$1.00.

### **Creation of Daily Pass**

GMT will offer a day pass for \$4.00. GMT had not previously offered day passes. A day pass will allow for unlimited rides for a single day. These passes will be for sale at the transit center, and to organizations that want to provide day passes to individuals they serve.

### **Elimination of Monthly and 10 Pass Rides**

GMT previously sold a monthly pass for \$40.00 and a 10 ride pass for \$15.00. Both of these products will not be necessary with an account-based system that offers caps and with the ability to pay on the bus with a credit/debit card.

### **Elimination of Transfers**

With the creation of a daily cap that is the equivalent of two rides, free transfers will be eliminated.

### **\$4.00 Daily Cap and \$40.00 Monthly Cap**

The daily cap for full-price riders will be \$4.00. After a rider pays for two full-price rides at \$2.00, their remaining rides for the day will be free of charge. The cap for our discounted rate will be \$2.00.

The monthly cap for full-price riders will be \$40.00, the same price as the discontinued monthly pass. The cap for our discounted rate will be \$20.00.

Caps are not purchased separately. They will automatically apply when the rider reaches that threshold.

### **Elimination of Separate Monthly Passes for Commuter and LINK Express**

Previously, urban local, commuter, and LINK Express routes had separate fare prices. This led to different monthly pass costs, with the commuter monthly pass \$75 and the LINK Express monthly

pass \$150. The \$40 fare cap will apply to commuter and LINK Express service, significantly reducing the financial impact of these routes on regular uses.

### **ADA Service - \$4.00/Ride Without Caps**

With GMT's return to fare service, ADA transportation provided by SSTA to augment our urban local routes will also no longer be free. The Federal Transit Administration provides guidelines for ADA pricing, and GMT's practice consistent with those guidelines has been to charge twice the full-price fare for ADA transportation. ADA riders in Chittenden County will see their door-to-door transportation increase from \$3.00/ride to \$4.00/ride, and there will not be a daily or monthly cap.

### **Price Increase and Price Cap Combination**

The \$40 monthly cap will allow GMT to increase the urban local fare by 33% while also ensuring riders' monthly costs do not exceed the previous cost of a monthly pass.

Infrequent riders will see an increase in their costs, while our most frequent riders will have the same or lower cost than previously without having to pay the upfront cost of a monthly pass.

### **Future Consideration**

---

### **Payment Network**

The Genfare Link system will provide access to the nationwide payment network. This will allow riders to add funds to their smart pass using cash or credit/debit card at participating retailers, such as CVS, Walmart, etc. Setup for inclusion in this system takes 18-24 months to complete, which is why it is not being included when we restart service.

### **Expanded Discounts**

Further work will be done to highlight populations eligible to receive a discounted fare rate directly from GMT. To begin, our focus will be on assisting organizations that wish to support riders through the Genfare Link system. This will expand the options for riders to have a free or discounted ride while also ensuring that GMT meets its obligation to generate approximately 10% of its urban operating costs from fare revenue.



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

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

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

**Councilor Mark Barlow, Chair, North District**  
**Councilor Gene Bergman, Ward 2**  
**Councilor Hannah King, Ward 8**

**Inquiries:**  
**Madeline Suender**  
802.735.5324  
[msuender@burlingtonvt.gov](mailto:msuender@burlingtonvt.gov)

**Transportation, Energy and Utilities Committee of the City Council**  
**Tuesday August 22<sup>th</sup>, 2023 – 5PM**

Front Conference Room  
645 Pine Street, Burlington, VT 05401  
Masks Optional

Join via Zoom, <https://zoom.us/j/84603122855>

To call into the meeting, including to speak during public comment:

Phone number: 312-626-6799, Webinar ID: 846 0312 2855

If you prefer to attend in person, you may join us in the Front Conference Room.

**–DRAFT AGENDA–**

- 1. Agenda**
- 2. Minutes of [8.15.23](#)**
- 3. Public Forum**
  - Up to 30 Minutes
  - Written comments may be submitted and will be included with the meeting record.
- 4. City Authority to Regulate Airport Activity**
  - Nic Longo
  - Action
  - 30 Minutes
  - [Presentation](#)
- 5. GMT Fare Policy**
  - Clayton Clark
  - 30 Minutes
- 6. N Winooski Ave Update**
  - Chapin Spencer
  - Action
  - 5 Minutes
- 7. Director's Report**
- 8. Councilors' Update**
- 9. Next Meeting 9/26/23**
- 10. Adjourn**

JAMES LEAS

Remarks to the TEUC on June 27, 2023

The City of Burlington is the airport proprietor. Federal law and FAA Grant Assurances signed by the city enable municipal airport proprietors to establish non-discriminatory standards so long as they apply to all aircraft using their airport.

Exercising this power to set a non-discriminatory fuel-efficiency standard is the lowest of low-hanging fruit consistent with the city's declaration of a climate emergency: it would ban all gas-guzzling aircraft from BTV, and it would cost the city nothing.

Most commercial passenger airliners get close to 100 passenger-miles per gallon. Some get 120. The F-35 only gets 0.5 passenger-miles per gallon! Most of the luxury private aircraft, the ones that exclusively serve a tiny fraction of the one percent, get between 10 and 45 passenger-miles per gallon.

Burlington can use its airport proprietor authority to establish a minimum passenger-miles per gallon standard or the equivalent in tons-of-cargo-miles per gallon. Setting it at 50 passenger-miles per gallon would cut out the gas-guzzling luxury privates and the climate-killing F-35.

The city also has the power to establish a non-discriminatory standard that requires all aircraft using BTV to meet the already-established FAA aircraft-noise standards. The FAA itself only has authority to require civilian aircraft to meet its noise standard. But the city's airport proprietor authority gives it a power and an obligation the FAA lacks.

Without intending to, the airport is currently applying the FAA noise standard in a grossly discriminatory manner: It allows the F-35 to use the airport for hundreds of training flights each month even though that aircraft wildly exceeds the FAA noise standard that limits the noise of all the civilian aircraft. That is discrimination.

One of the most important purposes of the FAA noise standard—to protect children from damage to their cognitive development—is defeated at BTV because of this blatant invidious discrimination.

The city, however, has the airport-proprietor power to abolish that gross discrimination by establishing a requirement that copies the FAA standard and applies it for all aircraft using BTV with no exclusions or exceptions, including the F-35. I have here a copy of the grant assurances that prove that city-proprietor power.

The Burlington City Government may be unique, or among a select few, in knowing about a severe harm to more than 1000 children and having the power to protect them

from the harm without any cost to the city, and still not using that power.

Under the leadership of this committee, Burlington can do much better. I urge the TEUC to submit draft ordinances to the city council that implement the airport proprietor power to set fuel efficiency and noise standards for the airport that would fix these problems to save planet and children now.

**FAA grant assurances**

[https://www.faa.gov/airports/aip/grant\\_assurances/media/airport-sponsor-assurances-aip.pdf](https://www.faa.gov/airports/aip/grant_assurances/media/airport-sponsor-assurances-aip.pdf)

22. Economic Nondiscrimination.

h. The sponsor may establish such reasonable, and not unjustly discriminatory, **conditions to be met by all users** of the airport as may be necessary **for the safe** and efficient operation of the airport.

i. **The sponsor may prohibit** or limit any given type, kind or class of aeronautical use of the airport if such action is necessary **for the safe** operation of the airport or necessary to serve the civil aviation needs of the public.

27. Use by Government Aircraft

It will make available all of the facilities of the airport developed with Federal financial assistance and all those usable for landing and takeoff of aircraft to the United States for use by Government aircraft **in common with other aircraft** at all times without charge. . .



**CITY OF BURLINGTON  
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS**

645 Pine St. Suite A  
Burlington, VT 05401  
802.865.7200 VOX  
802.863.0466 FAX  
802.863.0450 TTY

---

**Chapin Spencer**  
*DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS*

## **MEMORANDUM**

To: Transportation, Energy & Utilities Committee

From: Chapin Spencer, Director

CC: Norm Baldwin, P.E., City Engineer, Division Director – Technical Services  
Corey Mims, P.E., Senior Public Works Engineer  
Phillip Peterson, P.E., Public Works Engineer  
Jeffrey McKee, CEO, Community Health Centers  
Sam Arnold, COO, Community Health Centers  
Kim Anderson, Director of Development and Communications, Community Health Centers

Date: August 22, 2023

RE: North Winooski Avenue Project and Community Health Center Parking

### **Request:**

DPW requests the City Council consider a \$15,000 contribution from the FY'24 City Council Initiatives fund to support CHC's additional design work for the development of additional off-street parking.

### **Background:**

The new North Winooski Avenue lane configuration, with the addition of bike lanes, was installed between North Union Street and Riverside Avenue last week. DPW sent out an email on 8-17-23 to stakeholders along the corridor asking whether there were any early concerns with the installation that needed to be monitored or fixed. We will update you at the upcoming meeting on what we heard. The new lane reconfiguration was a recommendation that came out of the Winooski Avenue Corridor Study. More information on the study can be found here: <https://www.ccrpcvt.org/our-work/transportation/current-projects/corridors-circulation/winooski-avenue-corridor-study/>

As City Councilors may recall, there has been a concerted effort to minimize the impact from removing 40 parking spaces on the east side of North Winooski Avenue by implementing many strategies including:

- Installing more time-limited parking on the west side of the street to encourage turnover and reducing the fine for time-limited violations from \$75 to \$20 per violation
- Securing off-street spaces for public use
- Providing \$15,000 in City grants to adjacent businesses and non-profits to enhance their transportation demand management (TDM) efforts

- Connecting adjacent businesses to resources from the Department of Business & Workforce Development
- Allowing a one-month grace period to issue warning tickets for time-limited violations to assist in the parking transition
- Working with the Community Health Center (CHC) to explore more off-street parking options for their employees

Regarding this last item, DPW and CHC staff have been working through conceptual off-street parking options that utilize portions of adjacent properties. Given the steep slopes around the CHC building, geotechnical considerations are key to determining the viability of developing additional off-street parking adjacent to their operation. CHC paid for initial design work that indicated additional parking could be added to the back of their facility, but the stabilization costs made the overall project too expensive (over \$1M for approximately two dozen spaces). Since then, DPW and CHC staff have been discussing whether smaller and lower-cost options that reduce impact on the steep slopes may be viable.

DPW shared some conceptual drawings that CHC thought were worth pursuing. To determine whether these lower-cost options are technically viable, additional geotechnical work must be completed. CHC is requesting the City consider a cost share contribution towards this work. I am proposing that the City Council consider a \$15,000 contribution from the FY'24 City Council Initiatives fund to support CHC's additional design work. CHC would cover the balance of costs for the additional design work.

The City and CHC have looked at grant and Congressionally Directed Spending sources, but to date have not found promising leads. Both parties will of course continue to look for future funding opportunities. Given that the financial expense of constructing such a private facility would be borne largely by CHC, DPW staff is supportive of helping with this upcoming supplemental design work to determine the overall feasibility.

We are coming to the TEUC to get your feedback on this proposal before going to the Board of Finance and City Council in September. Don't hesitate to reach out with any questions or comments prior to the meeting.

### **Proposed Motion:**

The Transportation, Energy & Utilities Committee recommend the City Council approve a \$15,000 financial contribution to the Community Health Center from the FY'24 City Council Initiatives Fund to conduct additional geotechnical study for off-street parking adjacent to their facility.

# CITY OF BURLINGTON'S AUTHORITY TO RESTRICT AERONAUTICAL ACTIVITIES

Nicholas Clabbers  
Kaplan Kirsch & Rockwell LLP

Presentation to the City Council Transportation, Energy, and Utilities Committee  
August 22, 2023



---

# About Kaplan Kirsch & Rockwell

- National law firm with a focus on representation of airports
- Do not represent aircraft owners, airlines, pilots, or aeronautical service providers
- Counseled many clients on potential aeronautical access restrictions

# Questions Raised at BTV

- What is the City's legal authority to...
  - Prohibit or restrict aircraft operations at the Airport?
  - Require that only aircraft meeting a certain fuel efficiency or noise standard\* may operate at the Airport?
  - Limit military operations?
  - Prohibit the sale and/or use of leaded aviation fuel at the Airport?



# Top Line Answer

- City has essentially no authority to adopt or enforce such restrictions\*
- Attempts to adopt and/or enforce restrictions likely would result in:
  - FAA enforcement actions
  - Informal or formal complaints from Airport users or industry groups
  - Loss of eligibility for federal grant funds if the noncompliance is not corrected

\* Noise restrictions subject to slightly different standard, but still very difficult to adopt or enforce

# Sources of City's Legal Restrictions

- Grant Assurances
- Federal Preemption
- Airline Deregulation Act
- Airport Noise and Capacity Act



# Grant Assurances

- Obligations established by federal statute as a condition of receiving FAA grant funds
- The City must:
  - make the Airport “available as an airport for public use on **reasonable terms and without unjust discrimination** to all types, kinds and classes of aeronautical activities.”
  - avoid granting an “exclusive right” to use the Airport.
  - permit “government aircraft” to utilize all facilities at the Airport.

## Grant Assurances, cont.

- Restrictions on aeronautical activities *may* be “reasonable and not unjustly discriminatory” **if**:
  - they are justified for aeronautical safety reasons *and*
  - approved by the FAA
- Prohibitions on certain type of aircraft are **rarely acceptable**; only if the aircraft cannot be safely accommodated
- Restrictions on aeronautical activities for reasons other than aeronautical safety would violate the Grant Assurances

# Federal Preemption Generally

- FAA has exclusive jurisdiction over many aspects of aviation, aircraft in flight, airspace, and aircraft fuel efficiency
- Local attempts to directly or indirectly regulate these areas may infringe on FAA's jurisdiction and therefore would be invalid\*
- FAA defends its authority in these cases – Santa Clara County (CA)



# Other Federal Statutory Impediments

- Airline Deregulation Act
  - **Expressly preempts** any local law or regulation that relates to the prices, routes, or services of an air carrier, with limited exceptions
  - Airlines generally very litigious regarding any local regulation that is arguably preempted by the ADA
- Airport Noise and Capacity Act (ANCA)
  - Procedural requirements for adoption of any airport access restriction (e.g., FAA review/approval), with rigorous showing required for approval
  - Since enactment of ANCA in 1990, no airport has successfully adopted restrictions on any modern aircraft

# Likely Consequences

- FAA enforcement actions or investigations
- Formal or informal complaints from:
  - Airport users
  - Airlines
  - Industry groups
- Adverse findings could result in:
  - FAA or court injunction against enforcement of any restriction
  - Withholding of federal grant funds
  - Loss of eligibility for federal grant funds
  - Civil penalties



# Questions?

ATTORNEY ADVERTISEMENT. The contents of this document, current at the date of publication, are for reference purposes only and do not constitute legal advice.  
© 2022 Kaplan Kirsch & Rockwell LLP



Email 8/22/23:

ATTN: TUEC councilors and Madeline Suender

Please accept this email into the public record for tonight's meeting.

As any decision maker will attest, there are any number of justifications, including expert opinions such as the one you're being presented with today, that will ostensibly prove to you why you must maintain the status quo; that will help you justify, in this case for example, NOT doing what you must do to salvage a habitable planet, or to explain why it's acceptable to NOT stand up for residents in neighborhoods surrounding the airport who are suffering daily from the onslaught of F35 noise. Today, I'd like to share the voices of some of my tenants whose lives are affected by the F35s.

One tenant shared this:

The F35s are extremely loud! I think it's hard for people who don't live right here to understand.

I have the opportunity to work from home or have needed too due to childcare issues or illness but can't because the jets are simply way too loud and disruptive. During Covid when I was forced to work from home there were times that clients in crisis would hang up on me because they couldn't hear me or me them for such an extended period of time that they didn't know what was going on.

My partner is in the early years with his own commercial cleaning business and he works at night. He suffers from insomnia and when he gets woken up it can be very difficult to fall back asleep. When the jets take off in the morning it is only about half way through his sleep time. They are so loud that they are impossible to sleep through... there are so many of the jets! Lack of adequate sleep is very harmful, especially to him because he has a brain injury and requires a healthy sleep routine to function more than the average person. The jets make that very difficult.

There is no such thing as sleeping in when the jets take off! We all want to sleep in sometimes! I've had headaches, the flu, etc and the jets only make things worse! I have been so upset when I had sick kiddos that were up half the night and were finally getting some sleep when the jets take off!

If you are outside when they take off it is very uncomfortable, and simply too much. It is so loud it is difficult to handle. We have to go inside the second we hear them. When my kids were younger, they would get really scared and run inside covering their ears.

Another tenant shared this:

I am lucky that i don't at home but I have also experienced working from home and or when the girls are sick and I don't have a baby sitter. The F35s are loud, almost painful piercing sounds and it is not just one jet, at least 6-7 fly, one after the other, and honestly I have been scared that the house would crash on us when the jets fly by. There are cracks on the house that could be from those jets. Luckily they have never flown by at night but if they did, that would be terrifying, imagine being woken up by that sound.

This is truly a beautiful place to have a home, a family, the nature around us makes it all better to call home. I hope that they get rebased.

A third tenant shared this:

The F35 noise doesn't bother me so much because I believe it protects our freedom. Our country is challenged with its values which is the freedom. When I look around the world what's going on I always pray for God to continue to protect America. Only here we have freedom and free speech so many places you can't speak about this on TV and go home sleep peaceful. You may not see your family again. At work we really enjoy seeing them taking off we run outside to see them taking off. Only when we have an important phone call you can't hear anything but it last only 10 minutes. My kids are terrified by the noise they run inside the house or hold me by fear but they are still little..I don't want anybody to take away my freedom so USA , USA .... Thank you for considering my opinions.

These voices represent just a few of the people who suffer daily because no public official in this state has the decency to:

#1 say people like my tenants matter and that their suffering is unacceptable

#2 seek ways to right the wrong

#3 persist until the harm is stopped

I invite you to move toward what urgently must be done to protect residents and a habitable planet. Please do not allow today's presentation to be your excuse for maintaining the status quo.

Thank you,  
Ashley Adams  
Burlington



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

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

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

**Councilor Mark Barlow, Chair, North District**  
**Councilor Gene Bergman, Ward 2**  
**Councilor Hannah King, Ward 8**

**Inquiries:**  
**Madeline Suender**  
802.735.5324  
[msuender@burlingtonvt.gov](mailto:msuender@burlingtonvt.gov)

**Transportation, Energy and Utilities Committee of the City Council**  
**Tuesday August 22<sup>th</sup>, 2023 – 5PM**

Front Conference Room  
645 Pine Street, Burlington, VT 05401  
Masks Optional

**Chair Barlow starts meeting at 5:01PM. Councilor King not present.**

**–DRAFT MINUTES–**

**1. Agenda**

Councilor Bergman moves to approve the agenda as drafted understanding that more time can be given to Nort Winooski item as needed. Chair Barlow seconds. All in favor, passes unanimously.

**2. Minutes of [8.15.23](#)**

Councilor Bergman moves to approve the minutes. Seonded by Chair Barlow. All in favor, passes unanimously.

**3. Public Forum**

- Up to 30 Minutes
- Written comments may be submitted and will be included with the meeting record.

Jonathan Scott - Recommend that TEUC consider banning F35s and Private Aircrafts. Aviation is a significant driver of emissions.

Ashley Adams – Not supportive of F35s. Voices comments from three tenants. See [public comment](#).

Close public forum at 5:10 PM.

**4. City Authority to Restrict Airport Activity**

- Nic Longo
- Action
- 30 Minutes
- [Presentation](#)

Dave Carman, Deputy Director of Aviation Operations

Nick Clabbers – Outside Counsil for Airport and City

Kyle Clauss– Assistant City Attorney

Nick Clabbers – shares [presentation](#).

Councilor Gene Bergman – Santa Clara County (CA) clarifying question to NC.

NC – Goes over FAA and Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association investigations. Understanding is that ordinance is adopted but not enforced.

GB – Are you aware of any regulations at FAA regarding climate change?

NC – Unsure but believe there are ongoing efforts as result of congressional statute.

GB – Are you aware of any other airports looking at fuel efficiency standards with FAA?

NC – No.

GB – Would like to understand how to solve noise issue with FAA regulations or otherwise.

NC – Generally require full noise study under Part 150. Can put together more info on this.

Nic Longo – We are and have been part of this program for decades. We are updating noise map throughout next 12 months to be published. We are having public meetings to discuss Part 150 process.

NL – Working to get sustainable aviation fuel to Burlington as soon as possible. On a list to receive that. Also discussing no leaded fuel.

GB – Airforce needs to be held accountable as City is doing what we can to address the noise issue. Interested in talking to other airports about how we can move noise and sustainability goals through FAA.

Chair Mark Barlow – Are there any cases you can point to where FAA has ruled in favor with a complainant regarding restricting noise?

NC – There are some examples of explicit noise restrictions that FAA has approved. Most recent case in East Hampton NY, airport tried to adopt noise restrictions that were largely invalidated.

GB – Would like to see cases where noise restrictions were upheld.

James Leas – City needs to adopt a noise ordinance that is identical to FAA aircraft noise standard for all airport users. FAA doesn't apply to military planes.

NC – GHG emissions and passenger miles per gallon would likely fall under same type of non-permissible regulations as it would exclude certain airplanes and that is what FAA does not allow. They only allow safety related to airport operations to allow restrictions. Noise standard that matches FAA standard for civilians would likely run into issues because it is done to exclude military aircrafts. Compounding issue that requires airport to make facilities available to government aircrafts. Not sure if this would be preempted by DOD or other government arm. City has a lease with VT NAG to be considered.

GB moves to accept all material and forward this to City Council for its consideration leaving the question of whether there should be a deliberative item to the council president. All in favor. Passes unanimously. Item closes 6:03PM.

## **5. GMT Fare Policy**

- Clayton Clark
- 30 Minutes

Clayton Clark walks through [draft fare plan](#). Though fare free was ideal, this is an improvement over past fare program.

Councilor Gene Bergman – Are you collecting demographic data?

CC – Will have data on where people get on the bus but not off the bus. We will be able to see how these people are paying. We do hope by 2024 to get automatic counters for when people get on and off.

GB – CATMA, have you discussed with City regarding permitting for new developments who are required to have TDM?

CC – Will look too coordinate.

GB – Outreach to current riders?

CC – We will have additional temp staff November – January to do outreach throughout region. Folks posted at Downtown Transit Center. Also working to get videos on how to use system and translated. Signs inside all buses and at transit centers. We also have a staff member on the buses.

GB – Will College St shuttle still be free?

Chapin Spencer – Still working on the route. Still waiting on prices from GMT.

Chair Mark Barlow – Will transfers be covered? School students?

CC – No but we will have daily caps. No changes for school students.

MB – Parkmobile has some people adverse to it. Older users. Demographic of bus riders, will some folks be adverse to using this system?

CC – Would recommend they get the smart pass. Tied to credit card or debit card.

MB – Will this be in effect regardless of any action the legislature will take?

CC – They required we submit fare plan in December. The plan will likely be ready in February.

CC – Still working on sustainable funding approach.

CS – Board generally positively receives the approach and so does public. A lot of improvements from last fare plan. Expect board to approve this in the next month or two.

Item closes 6:37PM

## **6. N Winooski Ave Update**

- Chapin Spencer
- Action
- 5 Minutes

Chapin Spencer points to [memo](#).

GB – Email - Doland's Auto received ticket for delivers. Lack of parking for customers. Think we need to have a loading zone here. Thought there was no enforcing until September. Loading Zone on other side of the street is too far away.

CS – Helpful to get feedback. Truck was parked in the bike lane. Nowhere in the city permits parking in the travel lane whether that be bike or vehicle. We can look back to see where the loading zone was requested. We received limits to enforce for time limited parking only which doesn't apply here.

GB – Ask that you weigh in on the appeal to wave the fine. And reach out to the Doland's to figure out a solution. Loading zone is too short and only in morning and always full according to Doland's.

MB – See this delivery truck parking in bike lane as common practice. We should do something to address this. Agree we need to be more forgiving during the transition period.

CS – City working with CHC and councilors to try to find ways to help CHC get parking for employees. CHC working on design for parking off street. We are looking to provide funds for this design. No funds for construction thus far. Will likely be hard to find public grant funds for construction.

GB moves the proposed motion as stated in memo. MB seconds. Who will be authoring the councilor initiated fund request?

CS – Staff create draft and forward to committee TEUC members to review.

All in favor. Passes unanimously.

Item closes 6:53

**7. Director's Report**

None.

**8. Councilors' Update**

GB – Would like update on Bird Bikes. Parked in sidewalk. Conversation about TDM may be appropriate along with other list provided.

MB – similar question about bird bikes. What is use of these?

**9. Next Meeting 9/26/23**

**10. Adjourn**

**6:56 Mark Barlow Adjourns**