



City Council - Transportation, Energy and Utilities Committee

Tuesday, January 23, 2024, 4:00 PM,

Join in Person: Front Conference Room, 645 Pine St. Burlington, VT 05401

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

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

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

1. Agenda

1.1. Motion to amend/adopt agenda.

2. Adopt Minutes

2.1. Minutes of 1/9/2024

3. Public Forum

4. Deliberative Agenda

4.1. Main Street Great Streets Construction Update

4.2. GMT FY25 Assessment and Fare Resumption

4.3. Solar Ordinance and Rooftop Regulations

5. Director's Report

6. Councilor Items

7. Next Meeting

7.1. Next Meeting - 2/27/2024

8. Adjournment



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

Inquiries:
Madeline Suender
802.735.5324
msuender@burlingtonvt.gov

Transportation, Energy and Utilities Committee of the City Council
Tuesday January 9th, 2024 – 5:00PM

Burlington Electric Department - Spark Space
585 Pine Street, Burlington, VT 05401

–DRAFT MINUTES–

Chair Barlow calls meeting to order at 5:10PM

1. Agenda

Councilor King moves to approve the agenda. Councilor Bergman seconds. All in favor, passes unanimously.

2. Minutes of 1.9.23

Councilor King moves to approve the minutes. Councilor Bergman seconds. All in favor, passes unanimously.

3. Public Forum

Kim Horning Marcy – 350 Vermont, Creation Care Task Force. Support both proposed changes tonight.

Luce Hillman – UVM Executive Director of Facilities Management. Does not support passing proposals tonight. Would like time to evaluate. Thinks the ordinance as it stands is best.

Dave Kelty – UVMMC. Supportive of stopping dependence on fossil fuels. Want to insure there is a path forward to do this that is constructive and feasible. Concerned with updated proposal. Supports original proposal.

Kelly Devine – Reviews [memo](#) provided in packet. Important to understand what businesses would be impacted with the size change proposed. Concerned with the changes proposed as is.

Chris Gish – Supports the resolution proposed today.

Natalie Broan – BSD Phycologist – Supports proposals going to voters.

Dylan Gambadise – VGS. Extensive public process for the original proposal. Not supportive of the proposals today.

Nick Persampiere – Supports the resolution calling for a ballet question.

Jason Van Driesche – Supports the resolution calling for a ballet question.

Ashley Adams - Supportive of the resolutions proposed tonight.

Greg Hancock - Supportive of the resolutions proposed tonight.

Jack Hanson – Ordinance passed does not decarbonize all buildings. Supportive of the resolutions proposed tonight.

Liz Curry – CommonLand Solutions, LLC – Systems of people implementing this policy are not in place to achieve these climate goals. Public is uninformed to weigh in on this policy. The public needs to be aware of implementation feasibility. Think ordinance proposed is premature based on the science available. This ordinance as drafted is not conducive to getting public input.

Catherine Bock – Supportive of the resolutions proposed tonight.

Laura Simon – Supportive of the resolutions proposed tonight.

Sandy Henneberger - (Written in comment) I agree with the statements that favor holding a vote. This transition is complex, but we need to move more quickly. And we need to hear from every vote

Closes at 6:00PM

4. Carbon Impact Fee Ordinance

Councilor Gene Bergman – Both proposals submit are based on all input thus far while trying to move this forward as soon as possible.

Councilor Bergman moves to introduce the 1-9-24 Revised TMD 24 carbon fee ballot item resolution.
Second by Councilor King

GB – Goes through resolution. What would go on the ballot is not an ordinance, it would be an authorization for ceilings. This proposal closed a loophole from original item.

Councilor Hannah King – Will be supporting resolution.

Chair Mark Barlow – Has concerns with passing this so soon after the ordinance passed. Would like to see and review how new construction and buildings over 50k sqft perform with current ordinance and review before we iterate and make changes. Support decarbonization but need to provide predictability and stability to those impacted.

Darron Springer – Have the same concerns that were expressed at council. Current policy is influenced by Burlington Net Zero Road Map. This will put us at odds with state policy. Proposal will not help with efforts for compliance options. Building size is concerning for carbon fees for small scale businesses. Have not been given the opportunity to engage with stakeholders on this. BED does not agree this is the right approach for this climate goal.

GB – This proposal doesn't change the ordinance it allows us to review and address problems with approved voter authorization.

MB – Think when we ask for authority from voters it should be when we intend to use the authority. Think doing this now has created uncertainty and doubt with some major stakeholders such as UVM and UVMMC. Don't see current ordinance as a finished product but need to be mindful of the effects of the policy we are making.

HK – We don't have time to wait on this.

All those in favor of the motion to move the 1-9-24 Revised TMD 24 carbon fee ballot item resolution.
Councilor Bergman and King in favor, Char Barlow against. Passes 2-1

6:29PM

GB moves to bring in 1-9-24 AMENDED RESOLUTION IMPLEMENTATION OF A CARBON POLLUTION IMPACT FEE item and changes name to alter name as shown. Seconded by Councilor King

GB– introduced ordinance revisions.

HK – Support for both items tonight. This is a first step to open up more conversation at a council level which is important. Youngest councilor representing youngest constituents who have voiced major concern for climate crisis and moving this to support those concerns heard.

MB – Not sure a carbon impact fee is the right way to achieve goals with these building sizes. Open to continuing conversations for this subset of buildings but not supportive of assuming it is a carbon impact fee. Proposed revised language to resolution (6:40PM)

MB – Is the date in the last resolved clause for May 2024 meeting achievable? What public process could be done in that amount of time? This seems like an aggressive timeline

Darron Springer – 7 months of process previously. BED capacity will be challenged in this time. Though this process is laid out that the TEUC is doing this rather than BED as was done previously.

GB – Would be open to extending timeline if good work is being done.

Councilor Bergman and King in favor. Chair Barlow opposes. Passes 2-1

GB – Would like to go on the Jan 16th City Council meeting.

Item ends 5:54PM

5. Councilor Items

None.

Item ends 5:55PM

6. Next Meeting 1/23/23

Meeting at 645 Pine St at 4PM

7. Adjourn

Meeting adjourns 6:51 PM



Report on Fare Equity to Transportation, Energy, and Utilities Commission

Decision to Return to Fares

- State Transportation Bill extended zero fare operations through December 2024 and established a requirement for GMT to earn 10% of urban revenue through fares and/or payment in lieu of fares.
- In consideration of the \$3M operating deficit projected for FY27, the GMT Board of Commissioners prioritizes service preservation over continuation of fare free service.

New Fare System Vastly More Economically Equitable

- Only 17% of rides on previous fare system were paid by the most cost-effective method, a monthly pass that required an upfront cost of \$40/\$50.
 - Workday riders without a monthly pass would pay \$66/month on average for full price (\$33/month for discounted price)
- Nearly all riders will have opportunity for GMT's best pricing without any upfront costs.
 - Workday riders will pay no more than \$50 or \$25/month.
 - Workday riders will pay the same price under new system as a rider paying up front for a monthly pass in 2005.
 - Riders will not risk paying up front for service they do not use.
 - Riders will not risk losing physical pass and losing unused value.
- The cost of traveling in and out of Chittenden County has been greatly reduced.

Deterioration of Public Safety Impacts Service and Employment Equity

- Perception of service safety is the primary barrier to expanding ridership, and this perception more severely impacts physically vulnerable riders and members of traditionally oppressed communities.
- GMT receives more requests to return to fare service from riders than to extend fare free. Nearly all requests cite safety perceptions as the reason.
- Public restrooms at Downtown Transit Center are consistently used by riders and non-riders as a safe place to self-medicate, leading to ongoing conflict and medical events.
- BIPOC riders and employees face physical and emotional violence as a part of their public transit experience in Burlington, Vermont.
- Safety concerns have led to staff departures, especially for female employees.
- Having 1 or 2 fare free routes could concentrate usage by problematic riders to those routes, impacting other riders' ability to safely use the service.