

Advisory Committee Meeting

Riverside Avenue Scoping Study/ 195311163

Date/Time: September 22, 2016 /5:30 pm
Place: CCRPC
Attendees: See sign in sheet
Absentees: Absentees
Distribution: Project team

Meeting Summary

Purpose of meeting was to receive comments on the draft report chapter describing alternatives. Alternatives were discussed and more analysis requested. Follow-up meeting required.

Meeting Minutes

Proposed Process Going Forward

- Alternatives will be presented to the Ward 1 NPA and the Public Works Commission. Finally, the City Council will be asked to approve a recommended plan.

Short Term Plan

- Sharon Bushor:
 - Asked if any state funding is committed to the short term plan. (No. The City will be funding the short term changes.)
 - Limits of bike land on Colchester Avenue? The purpose of the lanes on this project is to demonstrate what can be done within the existing curbs and can be compatible with the City Bike/Ped plan. The limits of this project do not effect on street parking but the BTV Walk/Bike concept and conflicts with on-street parking must be resolved.)
 - Clarification of three lane bridge proposal. (Two lanes northbound and one lane southbound. Multi-use path added on west side.)
- Jason Van Drieche:
 - Manhole in sidewalk is slick when wet. Unsafe for bikes. Cover with textured material for safety.
 - Consider widening the sidewalk on the west side of the bridge by narrowing lanes to 10 feet. (Probably not possible since no shoulders available to as buffer from curb for 10 foot lanes.)
 - Add “cross bike” on Colchester Avenue south of intersection adjacent to the crosswalk. Paint green to better define bike route. (Extra wide crosswalk is proposed to

accommodate multiple modes.)

- Sharon:
 - Upgrading pedestrian crossings should be the highest priority and completed as soon as possible.
 - Left turn movements into Mill Street cause back-ups under existing conditions. Back-ups may worsen with three-lane bridge. Pros and cons of prohibiting left turns was discussed.
- Chase Mill:
 - Opposed to any turn restrictions at Colchester Avenue. Rear access to Patchen Road is not suitable for two-way traffic. It is often closed to prevent cut-through (entering) traffic. When open it is intended to serve exiting traffic.
 - Access drive on the south side of the Mill is narrow and proximate to apartments owned by Al Senecal. Apartment residents may not want increased traffic on this driveway.
- Jason van D:
 - Jason asked that the consultant team analyze operations at the Mill Street intersection assuming that the signal is removed and that access is restricted to right-turns only. (Removal of left turns would not allow the signal to be removed.)
- Sharon:
 - Would like to meet with other Mill Street residents and landowners prior to implementing any turn restrictions to/from Mill Street.
- Eleni Churchill:
 - Has Winooski been consulted regarding three-lane bridge proposal? (No. It may be possible to maintain four-lanes at north end of bridge.)
 - Separate study will be needed to address issues on the Winooski side of the bridge.
 - A pedestrian bridge study should begin in January. Sharon concerned that the two studies are not being conducted concurrently.
- CATMA:
 - How will pedestrians using the relocated bus stop cross Colchester Avenue? (Must use crosswalks at Barrett Street.)
- Nicole Losch:
 - Proposed crosswalk north of Mill Street may not be feasible. Space for pedestrian signal poles is limited. Wheelchair ramps would interrupt grades along the existing

shared-use path. Utility manholes may also conflict with ramps.

- Concerned that even if the crosswalk is viable in the short term it may not be viable in the long term when signals are removed from this location. Also concerned about possible public reaction should the crosswalk be built now but removed later as part of the long-term plan. (Better to never have the crosswalk than to have it then take it away?)
- Sharon:
 - Supports short term measures as the timing for long-term measures is uncertain.
- Richard Hillyard:
 - Was right turn lane considered for Barrett Street? (Yes. Concerns raised about need for roadway widening and impact to businesses with loss of on-street parking and loading zone.)
- Chase:
 - Add advance signal phase to aid southbound left turns into Mill Street.
- Jason Charest:
 - Consider moving crosswalk to south side of Mill Street if not feasible on north side. (Crossing would be much longer. Could create conflicts with through movements from Mill Street.)
- Jason V.:
 - Extend Colchester Avenue bike lanes further north (Barrett to Mill). Space appears to be available at least on east side.
- Nicole:
 - Make sure through traffic can still pass a stopped bus if bike lanes extended.
 - Not sure if sidewalks can be added to Mill Street without removing parking. (Space is available as shown on the plan except at the west end of the street where some parking would be removed.)
 - Durable pavements markings can only be used with new pavement. Unless overlays are proposed durable markings may need to be removed from the plan.
- Sharon:
 - What is transit ridership at this location? What are origins and destinations?

Should/could a shelter be provided? (GMT can look up most recent ridership data.)

Long Term Plans

- Stantec:
 - Alternative 1 has been modified to include a crosswalk on Colchester Avenue north of Barrett.
- Wayne:
 - Has a three-lane bridge with an alternating flow center lane been considered? (No. Flows are fairly balanced during both peaks. Not much advantage to reversing the lanes. Lane widths may also be too narrow for this operation.)
- Jason V:
 - Tighten southbound right-turn radius at Barrett Street to slow traffic and allow safer bike/ped crossings. Add truck apron if needed.
 - Widen proposed multi-use path between bridge and Barrett. Keep consistent, wide width. (Pinch point is at southern end of bridge and may be made worse by proposed pedestrian crossing at this location.)
- Wayne:
 - How do Alts 1 and 2 differ from a safety perspective?
 - Net present value of crashes calculations are suspect since reliable crash modification factors specific to multilane roundabouts are not available. (Calculations admittedly are not precise but indicate relative performance of each alternative.)
 - Can pedestrian safety be measured by other criteria? Length of pedestrian crossings? Number of signal controlled crossings? Conflicting traffic volumes in crosswalks? (Will consider.)
- Richard:
 - Roundabout does not need to be round. Does an elongated roundabout work better here?

Evaluation Matrix

- Jason V:
 - Duration of construction should be indicated. Construction will disrupt traffic flow and

hurt local businesses.

- Nicole:
 - Intersection complexity should be mentioned. Alternative 1 is more complex than Alternative 2.
 - Scoring relative to operations should be reconsidered. What level of service, volume-to-capacity or delay thresholds are being used as criteria?
 - Scoring for bikes should be the same for all if the multi-use path on the bridge is common to all alternatives.
- CMP:
 - Add category for gateway/aesthetics.
- Biker (sitting next to Sharon):
 - Prefers Alternative 3. Should have positive impacts on safety by slowing traffic coming down the hill.
- CATMA:
 - Concerned that Alternative 3 results in two closely spaced traffic circles, one in Burlington and one in Winooski.
- Sharon:
 - Can we incrementally implement Alternative 1 or 2 as funding becomes available? Which proposals included in the long term plans could be done early in advance of the others? (Eleni indicated that funding for the long term plan is at least seven years away. 80/20 state/local split expected unless categorized as a safety improvement in which call all state funding would be used.)
 - Wayne supports phased implementation with monitoring of performance after individual elements are put in place.
- Nicole:
 - Are costs for short term improvements deducted from estimates for long term improvements? (No. Reconstruction of the short term improvements would take place when the long term plans are built.)

Next Steps

- Suggestions made included: straw poll among current alternatives; choose between a signal

alternative or a roundabout; and, circulate an itemized list of possible improvements to committee members and let them vote on them individually.

1. Review short term proposals with DPW to confirm feasibility. Certain proposals may be deleted or deferred to the long term plans.
 2. Examine Alternatives 1 and 2 to determine if any proposed actions could be incorporated into the short term plan.
 3. Refine the long term alternatives based on comments received and update/expand the evaluation matrix.
 4. Expand report narrative to better describe the pros and cons of each alternative.
- Committee members were asked to forward any written comments on the draft alternatives report chapter in one week.

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 pm

The foregoing is considered to be a true and accurate record of all items discussed. If any discrepancies or inconsistencies are noted, please contact the writer immediately.

Stantec Consulting Services Inc.



Rick Bryant
Senior Project Manager
Phone: (802) 497-6327
Fax: (802) 864-0165
Rick.Bryant@stantec.com

c:\documents and settings\rick\desktop\2014-05-20_corey.docx