



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

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

Inquiries:
Phillip Peterson
802.865.5832
ppeterson@burlingtonvt.gov

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

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

–AGENDA–

1. Agenda
2. Minutes of 05/16/2018
3. Public Forum
4. **CSWD 195-201 Flynn Ave Option Information**
 - a. Rob Green presenting
 - b. 20-minute duration
 - c. Action: Informative, no action needed.
5. **Residential Parking Program Ordinance Changes**
 - a. Phillip Peterson presenting
 - b. 10-minute duration
 - c. Action: Informative, no action needed.
6. **Winooski River Bridge Scoping Report and Alternative Selection**
 - a. Nicole Losch presenting
 - b. 20-minute duration
 - c. Action: Recommend approval to City Council
7. **Colchester / Riverside / Barrett Intersection Scoping**
 - a. Nicole Losch presenting
 - b. 20-minute duration
 - c. Action: Recommend approval to City Council
8. **Bank and Cherry Streets Public Improvements – 30 % plans**
 - a. Kirsten Merriman-Shapiro and Laura Wheelock

b. 15 minutes

c. Action: Informative, no action needed.

9. Scheduling Future Meetings

10. Councilors' Update

11. Adjourn



August 1, 2018

Memo

TO: Public Works Commission

FROM: Phillip Peterson, DPW Associate Engineer

CC: Robert Goulding, DPW Public Information Manager

RE: Resident Parking Management Plan (RPMP) Update

We understand concerns have been raised about potential changes to the administration of Burlington's residential permit parking (RPP) program. Maintaining the livability of Burlington's neighborhoods is critical and the RPP program remains an essential tool. Over a two-year period, in 2014 and 2015, DPW staff and other parties engaged the public in an extensive process to update the RPP, which has been in existence for 30 years. To our knowledge, this was the first time the RPP has been comprehensively evaluated. As with most programs, periodic re-evaluation is necessary to be timely and responsive.

The plan, which was approved by the DPW Commission in 2016, can be found here:

burlingtonvt.gov/sites/default/files/DPW/TransportationProjects/ResidentialParkingPlan_finaldraft_public_h.pdf.

A few important points to note about the development of the plan:

1. This plan was a collaborative effort. Many changes were made to the Plan in response to the public engagement process.
2. To address the immediate concerns, no changes to the program will be made until there are opportunities for public input, deliberation and approval from the Public Works Commission and consultations with the City Council's Transportation, Energy and Utilities Committee (TEUC).
3. As noted in the document approved by the DPW Commission, the plan aims to balance the needs of residents along with other needs within the public right of way.
4. There are 8 draft strategies in the Plan. These recommendations are the result of extensive engagement and working with a consultant who reviewed how 5 other similar communities managed residential parking

Multiple City departments are working together to draft possible, proposed revisions to City ordinance consistent with the Plan. Possible revisions would be:

1. Capping the number of permits per unit to limit the parking impact on RPP streets from any one property. Currently, a property can request an unlimited number of permits.
2. Instituting a permit fee, starting at \$10 per permit.
3. Providing one voucher per permit each year to void a ticket for times when residents or their guests get a ticket.



May 16, 2018

Memo

TO: Public Works Commission

FROM: Phillip Peterson, DPW Engineer Technician

CC: Nicole Losch PTP, Senior Transportation Planner

RE: Resident Parking Management Plan (RPMP) Update

In 2015 the RPMP was completed and a memo was presented on the implementation plan. Since that time, some implementation has been delayed due to staff turnover, competing work, and other City projects. The RPMP identifies strategies that should be implemented incrementally. This is a brief summary of the near-term implementation plan.

Summary:

The Department of Public Works (DPW) staff is working with the City Attorney's Office and the Burlington Police Department on developing ordinance language to bring to the Commission for approval. The ordinance language changes are based on recommendations from the RPMP. Staff are anticipating presenting these recommendations within the next three months. Some of the key revisions Staff are developing for Resident Parking Permit (RPP) streets deal with the following:

1. What the cost structure will be for eligible residents to purchase a RPP.
2. Clarify eligibility for residential permits within existing RPP streets, specifically for corner lots.
3. Define the number of permits RPP eligible residents may apply for.
4. Specify the number of contractor permits a resident may request on an RPP street, and how long those contractor permits are valid for.
5. Define acceptable documents to prove residency on a RPP designated street, section of streets or abutting corner parcel.

There are RPP related traffic requests in queue, including requests which are specific to RPP and corner lot eligibility, a request on existing time restrictions for RPP on a designated RPP street, and a request from a Burlington Resident to increase public parking opportunities on existing RPP streets. Staff will look to evaluate these traffic requests once the Commission approves the ordinance language for RPMP recommendations and changes.



MEMORANDUM

To: City Council Transportation, Energy & Utilities Committee

From: Rob Green; Assistant Director DPW Right of Way

Date: August 1, 2018

Re: Chittenden Solid Waste District (CSWD) Flynn Ave property

Background

In September 2016, the City of Burlington and CSWD entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) regarding property owned by CSWD at 195 and 201 Flynn Avenue. The MOU has now entered its last year, and DPW believes we need to extend this MOU because more time is needed to see what traffic impact the new City Market and the Southern Connector construction will bring to the South End of Burlington before we agree to a new DOC on Flynn Avenue.

City Councilors Mason and Shannon are in support of negotiating with CSWD to extend the MOU. It would add two additional installments of \$16,666 per year.

Request

With the support of the TEUC, DPW will negotiate an extension the Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Burlington and the Chittenden Solid Waste District and bring forward for City Council approval.

**MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN CHITTENDEN SOLID WASTE DISTRICT
AND THE CITY OF BURLINGTON**

This Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") is made effective as of the ____ day of _____, 2016, between the Chittenden Solid Waste District ("District") and the City of Burlington ("Burlington") (the District and Burlington are also referred to as the "Parties," and each, a "Party").

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

WHEREAS the District owns properties in the City of Burlington located at 195 Flynn, being a parcel with 0.91 acres and a three unit, 7200 SF commercial building, and at 201 Flynn Avenue, being a parcel with 2.87 undeveloped acres (collectively referred to as the "Premises");

WHEREAS the District purchased the Premises in December 2001 for the purpose of having a property on which a Drop-Off Center (DOC) could be constructed and operated for the collection of recyclable materials, special waste, universal waste, and refuse in Burlington in order to serve the residents and business in Burlington and other District member communities;

WHEREAS, it has been the District's policy as adopted by the District's Board of Commissioners, to locate and operate DOCs in member communities at suitable sites that are provided by the host member community, which sites are leased to the District for the use as a DOC for an annual rent of \$1 per year;

WHEREAS, under such arrangement, the District operates DOCs in Essex, South Burlington, Richmond, Milton and Hinesburg;

WHEREAS, the District has recommitted to three of these host member communities to provide DOC services for an additional 20 year term, and the District anticipates that the remaining host member communities will also want to recommit to an additional 20 year term when its current contract term expires;

WHEREAS, the District currently operates a limited service DOC on 0.68 acres in the City of Burlington at 339 Pine Street, under a short term lease with Burlington;

WHEREAS, it is the desire of Burlington to provide the District with a DOC location in the City of Burlington;

WHEREAS, the Parties have reached an understanding for Burlington to provide the District with a DOC location, under the current lease terms, through June 30, 2019.

WHEREAS, Burlington believes it is necessary for it to engage in some due diligence and public exploration before entering into a lease-purchase arrangement for the Premises, but the District is prepared to move forward with marketing the Premises now;

WHEREAS, the Parties have reached an understanding that the District will forego immediate marketing and give Burlington a three-year option to enter into the lease-purchase arrangement for the Premises, with the District developing and operating a DOC on a portion of the Premises in order to serve the residents and businesses of Burlington as well as other District member communities.

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the foregoing and for other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which are hereby acknowledged, the Parties agree as follows:

OPTION TERMS. The parties agree to the following option:

1. For a period of three (3) years from the date of signing of this Memorandum of Understanding, or until this Option is terminated as outlined below, the District agrees to forego any marketing, offering, or other activity to sell or convey the Premises and to grant to Burlington an option to enter into a lease-purchase arrangement upon the general terms outlined below.
2. For that option, Burlington will pay the District the non-refundable sum of \$50,000, ("the Option Payment") payable one-third at the signing of this MOU, one-third on July 1, 2017, and one-third on July 1, 2018.
3. Burlington's failure to pay an installment of the Option Payment within ten (10) days of receipt of written notice of non-payment from the District shall be an event of default.
4. This Option may be terminated by the District upon thirty (30) days written notice to Burlington for a default by Burlington of any obligation under this Memorandum of Understanding.
5. This Option may be terminated by Burlington for any reason, including non-appropriation of funds, upon thirty (30) days written notice to the District.
6. Option Payments are not refundable. If the Option is terminated, or if the term of three (3) years expires without the parties' entering into a lease-purchase arrangement, the Option shall end, and any amount of the Option Payment paid to date is not refundable. If a lease-purchase arrangement is agreed upon, the Option Payment shall be credited to the installments of lease payments due under the Lease-Purchase Agreement.
7. Burlington may exercise this Option by delivering, during the Option term, written notice to the District, and the parties agree to finalize a lease-purchase agreement consistent with the general terms outlined below. If a mutually agreeable lease-purchase agreement is not entered into by June 30, 2019, this Option will terminate.
8. The District is allowed to continue leasing a portion of the Premises on a short-term basis under current leases and renewals thereof. Any future lease entered into by the District shall be subject to this Memorandum of Understanding and Burlington's rights to the Premises in the event Burlington exercises the Option.
9. Both Parties understand the importance of the public process to inform the community of all aspects of the development of a DOC at the Premises, and that this public process will take many months. The Parties agree that they will begin a public process as soon as the Memorandum of Understanding is executed, and that if, as a result of the public process, the contemplated uses of the Premises are no longer viable, either party may terminate this Agreement. If this Agreement is terminated under this clause during the Option period, the

District will keep all payments made to date, but Burlington will be relieved of any obligation to make any further payments.

LEASE-PURCHASE. The parties intend to negotiate in good faith and with reasonable diligence a mutually agreeable lease-purchase of the Premises and sub-leasing of a portion of the Premises as outlined in this Memorandum of Understanding. The general terms of such transaction are as follows:

1. The District will lease the Premises to Burlington under a Lease-Purchase Agreement. The Lease-Purchase Agreement would provide for the District to lease the Premises to Burlington so that Burlington, at the end of the term and upon full payment, would own the Premises in fee simple with no remaining obligation to the District (except to the extent of any rights and obligations under the sub-lease to the District as described herein).
2. Annual lease payments would be subject to appropriation by the City Council of Burlington. The lease payments would not constitute a debt of the City of Burlington.
3. The term of the Lease Purchase Agreement will be for 20 years, and the total base rent shall be \$ 500,000.00. There will be no annual increases or additional fees charged by the District. Burlington would be responsible for its own costs as well as water/sewer charges, property taxes, insurance premiums and similar charges for the Premises. Payments of rent would be made in annual installments of \$25,000.00 each per year for 20 years. Burlington will receive a credit of the amount of the Option Payment made to the District to the last annual lease payments due under the Lease Purchase Agreement. At the end of the term, and after payment of the full 20 years of rental payments, Burlington would have the right to purchase the Premises for \$1. In the event of a default by Burlington, or if Burlington does not make an annual appropriation of lease payments, the Lease Purchase Agreement would terminate, and ownership of the Premises would revert to the District. Burlington would not receive any credit or return of lease payments. If the Lease Purchase Agreement is terminated by the District prior to the end of the 20-year term for any other reason permitted by the Lease Purchase Agreement, all lease payments will be returned to Burlington, and the ownership of the Premises will revert to the District.
4. The Lease-Purchase Agreement would be triple net, with Burlington responsible for any and all real estate taxes, real property insurance premiums, and costs of ownership of the Premises, as well as for its own use of a portion of the Premises.
5. As part of the transaction, Burlington will sub-lease a certain portion of the Premises consisting of the approximately 2.87 acre parcel designated as 201 Flynn Avenue ("201 Flynn") back to the District for a rent of \$1/year for an initial

- term of 20 years. The District will be responsible for all costs related to its use of 201 Flynn, other than real estate taxes and real property insurance premiums.
6. If Burlington purchases the Premises at the conclusion of the Lease-Purchase Agreement, it will provide the District with an additional 20 year sub-lease extension at the expiration of the initial 20 year term, to be exercised at the option of the District, with the same terms as the first 20 year Lease-Purchase Agreement. Terms may be negotiated at the time of purchase, provided both parties agree to the changes.
 7. Upon signing the Lease-Purchase Agreement and 201 Flynn sub-lease, the District will develop the 201 Flynn parcel for solid waste management purposes, which may include a DOC, a regional leaf and yard waste collection facility, and a sales outlet for Green Mountain Compost. The development of such parcel would be subject to the District's complying with all zoning and other code requirements and obtaining all necessary state and local permits. If for any reason, the District cannot develop a DOC on 201 Flynn, including if it finds the terms and conditions of any permit unduly burdensome, then the Lease-Purchase Agreement would terminate and ownership of the Premises would revert to the District. If termination occurs because the District is unable to develop 201 Flynn for a DOC, then the District would refund to Burlington all rent payments made under the Lease-Purchase Agreement (but not any payments made for the Option). If the District begins operating a DOC, but then ceases those operations before the full term of the Lease-Purchase Agreement, the Lease-Purchase Agreement and the 201 Flynn sub-lease will continue, unless the parties mutually agree to termination.
 8. The District shall operate any solid waste facility in compliance with all federal, state and local rules and regulations. All costs, expenses, responsibilities, and liabilities of operating a DOC by the District on the Premises shall be the responsibility of the District. Pursuant to the Sub-lease Agreement, both parties will indemnify each other for their respective use of the Premises during and after cessation of that use.
 9. The development of the 201 Flynn parcel and all of the District's structures, improvements, equipment, fixtures, and other personal property of every kind in or upon the 201 Flynn parcel, and all costs, responsibilities, and liabilities associated with them, shall remain the property of the District for as long as the parcel is leased from Burlington, and any responsibilities or liabilities arising from the District's use of the 201 Flynn parcel, particularly those related to hazardous waste or its removal, will remain the responsibility of the District in the future.
 10. The remainder of the Premises not sub-leased to the District may be used by Burlington for any lawful purpose, and any structures, improvements, equipment,

fixtures, and other personal property of every kind on the Premises other than the 201 Flynn parcel, shall remain the property of Burlington, and any responsibilities or liabilities arising from Burlington's use of the Premises (excluding the 201 Flynn parcel), particularly those related to hazardous waste or its removal, will remain the responsibility of Burlington upon and after execution of any Lease-Purchase Agreement.

11. If the Lease-Purchase Agreement is terminated, Burlington may elect to remove any of such property from the Premises before vacating.
12. Both Parties agree to negotiate in good faith a Lease-Purchase Agreement and the Sub-lease for the 201 Flynn parcel (the "Agreements") as set forth above. The Parties will endeavor to complete and execute a Lease Purchase Agreement and Sub Lease Agreement before June 30, 2019. If the Agreements are not executed by June 30, 2019, this Memorandum of Understanding offer will be withdrawn by the District. No payment (other than the Option Payment outlined above) will be due from the City until the final Agreements are executed.
13. This Memorandum of Understanding shall be executed before September 28, 2016, or the offer will be withdrawn by the District.
14. Both Parties understand that the District will pursue a district-wide comprehensive plan to be approved by the District Board by July 31, 2017, and if the plan does not include a DOC on the Premises, both parties agree that the District shall have the option to terminate this Memorandum of Understanding. If the MOU is terminated by the District because a Burlington DOC is not included for recommendation as part of the district-wide comprehensive plan, then the District agrees to return the Option payments made by the City.

NOTICES. All notices, requests, and statements shall be in writing and shall be sent to the recipients and addresses set out below, as the same may be modified by the parties from time to time:

CSWD: Brian Wright, Facilities Manager
Chittenden Solid Waste District
1021 Redmond Road
Williston, Vermont 05495-7729
Phone: 802-872-8100
bwright@cswd.net

Burlington: Chapin Spencer, Director
Burlington Public Works Department.
PO Box 849
Burlington, Vermont 05401
Phone: 802-863-9094
cspencer@burlingtonvt.gov

MISCELLANEOUS.

1. The Parties reserve the right to re-visit or supplement this MOU if, during the course of negotiations, there is any change that materially affects the Premises or the expected use of the 201 Flynn parcel as a DOC and of the remainder of the Premises for City uses.
2. This MOU is not intended to, and does not create, any rights, remedies, or benefits of any character whatsoever, including any intended third-party beneficiaries, in favor of any persons, corporations, associations, or entities other than the Parties. The obligations herein assumed are solely for the use and benefit of the Parties, their successors in interest, and, where permitted, their assigns.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the Parties hereto have caused their representatives to execute and deliver this MOU as of the date hereinabove set forth.

Dated at Williston, Vermont this _____ day of _____, 2016.

Chittenden Solid Waste District

By: _____

Title: _____

Dated at Burlington, Vermont this _____ day of _____, 2016.

City of Burlington

By: _____

Title: _____

Flynn Ave

See a description for your map.



Legend

Champlain Elementary School

Flynn Ave

Flynn Avenue Self Storage

Howardcenter

Lake Champlain Shoreline Cruises

Pine Street at

339 Pine St DOC

Write a description for your map.



Transportation, Energy and Utilities Committee of the City Council

Tuesday, August 01, 2018 5:30 PM

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

SIGN-IN SHEET

NAME	EMAIL
Sally Weichert - 6 Summit Bldg	sallyweichert@gmail.com
John Biss on	JBisson@vtrm.EDU
PATRICK MALIN	SOPROMATA@aol.com
Charley Simpson	charley.simpson@plattburghil.ele
Laura Wheelock	LMWheelock@burlingtonvt.gov
May Chow	maygee1@aol.com
Barbara Headrick	barbara.headrick@gmail.com

Please note that this sign-in sheet and any information provided on it will be maintained as a public record and may be subject to disclosure under the Vermont Public Records Act.

Subject: RE: TEUC Meeting

Burlington Police Department supports the review of the resident parking program and the proposed changes that have been recommended. This program has not been reviewed since it was implemented years ago and needs to be updated to meet the needs of parking on streets from both residents who live on the street and visitors who park on the street for various reasons.

John J King
Parking Manager
Parking Enforcement
One North Avenue
Burlington, Vermont
(802) 540-2185
jking@bpdvt.org



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

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

Inquiries:
Phillip Peterson
802.865.5832
ppeterson@burlingtonvt.gov

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

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

–MINUTES–

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

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

Residents Present: See Attendance Sheet

1. Agenda

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

2. Minutes of 05/16/2018

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

3. Public Forum

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

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

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

4. CSWD 195-201 Flynn Ave Option Information

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

5. Residential Parking Program Ordinance Changes

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

c. Action: Informative, no action needed.

d. Discussion:

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

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

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

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

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

e. Public discussion:

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

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

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

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

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

7. Scheduling Future Meetings

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

8. Councilors' Update

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

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

9. Adjourn

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