

Winooski Avenue Transportation Study
Public comments received as part of alternatives development
March - June 2019

From: J. G. <aliencycle@live.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 27, 2019 10:35 PM
To: Bryan Davis <bdavis@ccrpcvt.org>
Subject: Re: no winooski ave

Please remember the Motorcyclists killed in New Hampshire when developing a city plan. At NONE of the meetings were motorcyclist safety addressed. Our people are just as important as bicyclists..and we are ALL required to carry insurance and obey laws that the police WILL enforce.

The infrastructure put in place last year to supposedly keep bike riders safer endangered motorcyclists!

gone are the days of treating motorcyclists as second class citizens. we are Vets, first responders and parents....

please remember this!

jeff

From: J. G. <aliencycle@live.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 6, 2019 9:29 PM
To: Bryan Davis <bdavis@ccrpcvt.org>
Subject: no winooski ave

Hi Mr Davis. I go to all the meetings I can and we have met,

.

i have lived on No. Winooski ave for 38 years, and prior to that this home was owned by my grandparents. I have 50+ years of experience on this State highway rte 's 2 and 7.

it is not just a street, it is a State highway. is the state involved in this planning?

My home at 132/134 shares a common driveway with 136. we have 5 apartments and 3 parking places off street. There is no room for more, so I must have my tenants park on the street.

If the city plans on removing parking, i would need permits for street parking reserved for my property as the city will be responsible for loss of income if i have to lower rents due to no parking.

feel free to "google-earth" this property. This was built in 1842...they weren't worried about cars or Bicyclist "stresses" back then.....

Also, the Burlington fire dept frequently uses this street to get to the old north end by going north on the one-way section..a very narrow 36ft wide section,. putting bike barriers will affect them.

one last issue, the posts and hedge-hog things put on the street to protect bicyclists ENDANGERS MOTORCYCLISTS!--ARE OUR LIVES LESS IMPORTANT THAN A BIKE RIDERS?..8.5 MILLION MOTORCYCLES ARE REGISTERED IN THE us..WE VOTE, WE COUNT, WE NEED PROTECTION TOO

THANKS

jEFF gILBERT
134 N. WINOOSKI AVE

From: Jason Van Driesche <jvandriesche@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 22, 2019 9:09 PM
To: Bryan Davis <bdavis@ccrcvt.org>
Cc: Allegra Williams <allegra@localmotion.org>; Erik Brown Brotz <erik@burlingtontelecom.net>; Chapin Spencer <cspencer@burlingtonvt.gov>
Subject: Winooski Ave designs

Bryan,

I just filled out the Winooski Ave survey. There wasn't anywhere to add my name, but I'm sure you'll be able to tell which one was mine. I voted for alternative #3 all up and down the corridor, with some modifications.

I'm writing to you because I'm concerned about how -- at least in the project materials -- there was no mention of the fact that there is a very large practical difference between those alternatives that involves widening the road and those that do not. You know as well as I do that widening Winooski Ave would be both extremely expensive and hugely contentious. As a result, it would take many years to implement such a design -- if it happened at all.

But most people don't know this. Many folks may have been drawn to the "have your cake and eat it too" option of widening the road so we get protected bike lanes and lots of parking to boot. It seems a bit deceptive to let people choose such an option, though, given that what they indicated they want would be unlikely to happen in the next decade (if ever).

As you review feedback, I urge you to find a final design that marries the intent of respondents with practicality of implementation. I'm guessing that lots of folks will want two-way protected bike lanes. They may not have said "do it within the existing width," but if you asked them, "Do you want this to happen in the next few years at a price we can afford?" I guarantee you that the answer would be a resounding "YES!"

My comments were all focused on how to make this marriage of safety and practicality possible. I hope they are helpful.

Best,
Jason

From: Eric Coker <teanaubound@yahoo.com>

Sent: Thursday, June 20, 2019 8:55 AM

To: Bryan Davis <bdavis@ccrpcvt.org>

Subject: Re: Winooski Avenue Transportation Study - thank you, and survey still live!

Hi Bryan,

I just took the survey, but wanted to reach out to give more details to my response.

I bike through Burlington a lot. It is my main form of transportation despite living in Shelburne because it is basically faster to do everything when you include time to park... and it is way more fun.

Parking needs to be slowly removed from the streets. It is ugly and makes the city feel like a place for cars, not people. It is a big change for some, which is why it needs to be done a little bit at a time. Start now! Create parklets, add bike share hubs, remove spaces near corners to improve visibility, etc... taking away a couple spots at a time now will make it easier when the big conversion is done.

I am of course in favor of a protected bike line, but I would like to point to Dorset street in South Burlington as the exact way of NOT doing it. I bike all the time on that section of "path" and am used to the crossing traffic and am careful about going slow and checking for people going in and out of all the driveways.... because I know that about half the time the drivers are completely oblivious about the fact there could be a biker in the bike lane. So if you combine a not so careful biker with the oblivious driver in this scenario, it's deadly.

I hope you have thought about how to handle this (sorry I missed the meeting! I really wanted to be there). My suggestion is that the bike lane be elevated so that it acts like a giant speed bump for crossing traffic. This needs to be done for traffic going both ways and include the street intersections, not just the driveways. This works on Dorset street. Cars that turn into a business from the road slow way down because they have to go up. But at street intersections and for cars leaving businesses they do not.

One other thing : Some of the alternatives showed a "protected" bike lane using parked cars. Again, crossing traffic is a huge concern with this concept. This actually works great in Montreal... it is very safe. They do 2 things : One, the bike lane goes against the parked cars so you are in a door zone, but it is the passenger side, and you are looking right at your potential assailant. The other, more important point, is that there are no driveways where they use this layout.

Thanks for your time and consideration. Good luck! I know you are likely getting all sorts of opinions and that this can be a tough job. But it is really important. Projects like this are going to make Burlington a world class city.

Regards,
Eric Coker

From: Ben Traverse <bentraverse@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 3, 2019 10:19 PM
To: Bryan Davis <bdavis@ccrpcvt.org>
Subject: Re: Reminder: Winooski Avenue Transportation Study Open House, June 4

Bryan - this study has gone through an awesome process and should serve as a model for public input in the future. Thanks for continuing to keep us so well-informed.

Ben

From: Marjorie Stinchcombe <MStinchcombe@vtlegalaid.org>
Sent: Monday, June 3, 2019 3:34 PM
To: Bryan Davis <bdavis@ccrpcvt.org>
Subject: Transportation study

Hello-

I am not able to attend the meeting tonight—but I wanted to voice my concern about any plans that would eliminate on-street parking in front of 264 (Vermont Legal Aid) and 274 (Legal Services Vermont) North Winooski. From the map, it looks like Alternative 2 eliminates the parking on both sides of the street—and several options remove the parking on at least one side of the street. Our clients rely on those spaces when they are coming to meet with their lawyer and losing those spaces would make the office less accessible. Our employee lots are often full—and most clients do not bike to appointments.

Thank you!

Marjorie Stinchcombe
Marjorie Stinchcombe, Staff Attorney
Office of the Health Care Advocate
Vermont Legal Aid
264 North Winooski Ave.
Burlington, VT 05401
mstinchcombe@vtlegalaid.org
vtlawhelp.org/health

From: Greg Hostetler <hostetler.greg@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 31, 2019 12:26 AM
To: Bryan Davis <bdavis@ccrpcvt.org>
Subject: Reminder: Winooski Avenue Transportation Study Open House, June 4

Hello Bryan,

Thank you for the reminder. I am out of town and unfortunately cannot make it to the meeting. I had the chance to review the alternatives a couple of weeks ago. I am in favor of alternatives 2, 2a, and 2c. I live on N Winooski Ave between North and Pearl Streets. I am in favor of eliminating parking on one side of our street, but I would rather not lose any trees. I would love to have protected bike lanes the entire length of Winooski Ave.

Best regards,
Greg Hostetler

From: Alissa Faber <alissafaber@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 29, 2019 12:59 PM
To: Bryan Davis <bdavis@ccrpcvt.org>
Subject: Re: Winooski Avenue Transportation Study -- Public Open House, June 4

Bryan,
Sadly I will be missing this meeting do to another meeting that was scheduled first.

I was talking with some of my neighbors about Winooski Ave about the different parking options listed on the alternatives. Someone brought up the idea of seasonal bike lanes on North Winooski Ave between Union/Decatur and Riverside Ave. The idea was that the parking lane could be there during the winter when less people bike and parking is harder to find and in the warmer, biking months, the parking lane could be painted for a bike lane and parking would not be allowed. Residents would know that from x date to x date the lane is used for parking or biking. I'm not sure if that falls within the walk/bike plan for the city but I was intrigued by the idea and thought I would pass it along.

Thanks
Alissa

From: Phil Hammerslough <phil.hammerslough@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 28, 2019 11:38 AM
To: Bryan Davis <bdavis@ccrpcvt.org>
Subject: Re: Winooski Avenue Transportation Study -- Public Open House, June 4

Hi Brian, Here's a way to feed many birds with two scone: Keep N. Winooski one way , keep the bike path plan, narrow the street and add MORE SIDEWALK on the east side. This will make the businesses happier because they can expand their outdoor space in summer, give more space to pedestrians, (were it counts most), maybe even provide space for bike parking to increase business.

If parking stays on the east side of the street between Brant & Pearl they create a barrier for pedestrians on the sidewalk. Alternatively, the cars could be parked further out and give protection to the bike lane & the sidewalk.

Best,
Phil

From: TONY Redington <tonyrvt99@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 27, 2019 11:39 AM
Cc: Burlington Walk/Bike Council <burlingtonwalkbike@googlegroups.com>
Subject: Sidewalk Cycle Track Discussion

Good Day Winooski Corridor Group:

Some thoughts after the Walk Bike Council discussion with DPW engineer Nicole Losch last Thursday. We have made a great deal of progress in a vision for our "Greatest Street in BTV." There seems to be growing consensus to provide cycle track (protected bicycles lanes) along the corridor. There is the recognition that the loss of some parking is both necessary though not necessarily wholly agreed on at this point. There seems to be no positive response to the idea of a two-way bikeway along this corridor and no examples given of where this works well--the North Champlain two-way takes advantage of a bike lane in place and an extra vehicle lane than needed besides (what a luxury of available right-of-way!).

Now the question of sidewalk level versus vehicle lane level cycle track. Few of us have observed much less biked on sidewalk level cycle track--though anyone of us can today (well tomorrow when GMT operates!) trip to Dorset Street to travel the only sidewalk level cycle track in VT! Nicole Losch and other engineers have expressed concern about sidewalk level cycle track and need for longer sightlines and driveway conflicts from vehicles exiting adjacent residences and establishments. The conflicts with driveways is not new and many bike/vehicle crashes today occur at driveway/bike lane interfaces (the "J-hook" crash) and I have observed first hand two within a block of where I live on Pearl Street and N. Winooski.

The lesson from observing cycle track and mixed bike pedestrian traffic on the major streets of Osaka, Kyoto and Osaka recently is the walk and bike modes co-exist, mingle easily and flawlessly at intersections and across crosswalks, and bicyclists operate at "neighborhood" speeds of 3-8 mph and at no time interfere with pedestrian travel or vice versa. If anything the cyclist is in better position, more observable position, at sidewalk level on cycle track than at same level on vehicle space with vehicles entering and exiting driveways. Any of us--I did it today and anyone can do it any time--travel at a sensible speed along sidewalks here where the primary danger is vehicles at existing driveways--and am super cautious, ready to stop, where sight distance to the building side is reduced to about 0 feet. Since in such cases installation of cycle track will be towards the roadway, away from such conflicts, the cyclist safety is enhanced from both the building side and the roadway side.

Perhaps too much of our cycling culture vision comes from seeing lots West European designs, particularly the exception to the rule, the cycle dominance over all modes in eternally flat Amsterdam and environs. Tokyo, Kyoto and Osaka cycle track sidewalk level are flat too but so are cycle speeds human and unhurried speeds (even the little league about 10-year old baseballer with his bat vertical in his backpack focused on a Saturday morning trip).

In sum our design efforts on the dense mixed-use neighborhood ONE/S. Winooski from Pearl to Main moves ahead. There needs to be more dialogue over the nature and function of the cycle track--does it serve primarily the needs of the high speed male commuter mostly seen today or the wide range of new cyclists who will arise naturally from a neighborhood friendly bicycle network featuring all-modes safe roundabouts and appropriate cycle track designs? Better we design our streets for the use of both the eight and eighty year olds to be sure to be democratic and safe for all modes!! Let's make our Winooski the "Greatest (and safest) BTV Street."

Attached photo is a dad on E-bike taking child likely to daycare early morning in Kyoto. "Barnes dance" all way stop signal--Japan just getting into roundabouts--about 10% of Japan bicycles used by adults are E-bikes.

Tony Redington

From: Lauren-Glenn Davitian <davitian@cctv.org>

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2019 10:12 PM

To: Bryan Davis <bdavis@ccrpcvt.org>

Subject: Winooski Avenue Transportation Study Public Input

Thanks for this. Please direct this to the person who is capturing input. I will come to the Open House.

I am not so sure if I am reading the maps right but it is really important that we have two sides of parking from Riverside to North Street. The business development in our area has dramatically increased traffic to the neighborhood and parking capacity needs have doubled in our half block area alone. Plus we have no green belt to spare. The pedestrian scape is vital to preserve. It can't be more narrow. There would be no more sidewalk in front of our building (as an example). Plus there is already sufficient room for biking on both sides in this section (Riverside to North). Thank you. Lauren-Glenn Davitian
802.777.7542

From: Liam Griffin <liamgriffin@me.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2019 2:39 PM
To: Bryan Davis <bdavis@ccrpcvt.org>
Subject: Re: thanks

Hey, nice work last night at North District NPA...

I thought things went fairly well, no real curve balls.

One thing I forgot to mention is that with the recent changes at Old Spokes / Good News Garage, there are about 14 new spots in that lot that were essentially gifted to the neighborhood businesses during the transaction. There were 10 in the fenced in area, and another 7 out back... which GNG no longer owns. OSH did stripe out a new loading zone in front of the shop, which I think took about 3 spots? They've all been absorbed for the most part by local customers/residents since almost everybody who works at OSH rides bikes to work.



On a side note, was there ever an option drawn up that didn't have a dedicated NB bike lane from Pearl to Union (which would have bike traffic diverted to Union?) I'm not sure if that would still meet project goals, or how others would feel about it. In current conditions I have to take that route pretty often, but taking the lane on Pearl eastbound to make the left onto Union definitely isn't an "all ages & abilities" sort of move.

After listening to the presentation last night, it does seem to make things challenging that the City doesn't designate any project budget range up front. Seems like the default cheap option (like with North Ave) would be all paint & plastic within existing curb to curb. That won't be particularly safe, or attractive for many new users, but would be mostly fine or an improvement for people who are already riding bikes. There is such a huge delta between that & full blown rebuild with legit protected bike lanes on both sides, plus preservation of parking. If I recall correctly from North Ave, the paint/plastic option was about \$150k and the full blown deluxe option was in the ballpark of \$11M.

Do you know when you'll have an event page set up for the June 4th?

LG

From: Lynn Eisenbrey <63lynnc@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 20, 2019 9:24 AM
To: Bryan Davis <bdavis@ccrcvt.org>
Subject: Walk/Bike options

Brian,

I looked over the options for biking and walking which are being discussed. I'd like to say that, currently, I believe that option 2B would best suit visitors and residents.

Most people are used to going up one side of a street and returning down the other. Having bike lanes only on one side of the roads would irritate and confuse most people.

The other point is that 2B allows for parking on both sides as well. We can handle an expanded road with less greenspace as long as the cars have more locations to park.

I'd rather have more parking garages with rainwater collection capabilities located throughout the city.

I'd also like property owners with parking lots that only provide small numbers of parking spaces to be worked with for building such structures.

We need better water catchment surfaces and methods to trap unwanted cigarette butts and other trash so as to be separated from what goes down our sewers. These should be implemented whenever construction occurs.

Sincerely,
Lynn Eisenbrey

From: Liam Griffin <liamgriffin@me.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 25, 2019 10:56 AM
To: Bryan Davis <bdavis@ccrcvt.org>
Subject: Re: thanks

Yo! All good... I've looked through the drafts & have some initial ideas & opinions, and got to chat with Nicole a bit at the end.

Based on my initial read, either option 1 or option 3 seem to work within existing curb lines & without removing crazy amounts of parking. Looking back at North Ave, none of the options presented that involved moving curbs were "real" options because of costs/space and I sort of assumed that would be

the case with Winooski as well. Easy on paper to throw out options that involve moving curbs and taking more ROW, but in reality not sure how feasible any of those options are. Nicole did mention that there are currently some sections with no curb, so there is some potential to maybe adjust road surface width in a few areas. It wasn't clear if there would be actual budget for that though?

The two way protected lane does seem like the shortest path to get to what is in PlanBTV Walk/Bike, but I'd really need to take a look at individual intersection designs, bike boxes, etc for the contraflow direction. Obviously it works fine for Northbound bike traffic if the TWPBL is on the east side, but how do southbound turns work? Would we need bike specific signal phases? Trying to think about turning west onto College St while going South on Winooski and I can't really picture a simple solution. Ditto for an even bigger intersection like Main/Winooski. I've been looking at streets like Rue Rachel E in Montreal which are similar, but without quite as many driveways, but they just seem to let people figure it out (no signals or bike boxes for turns?)

The traditional lanes / road diet (Option 1) I think works fine for people like me who already ride, but if North Ave is any indication I don't think we'd see too much increased use by more casual riders because it is still fairly high stress with only paint as protection in most segments (especially the busiest one from Pearl to Main).

Happy to chat more at some point, and definitely keep me posted on future meetings.

LG

**Comments from Winooski Ave Ward 4/7 NPA meeting
May 22, 2019**

Is there a way to use the Howard Center parking lot as City Market access? This would give extra distance between Bank St and CM if there is a center turn lane.

Two way protected bike lane would be unsafe since cars would be turning across it.

Section between Bank St and CM is terrible. Traffic already backs up. How would a center turn lane even function with left turns onto Bank and left turns into CM?

People won't come into Burlington if more parking is removed. There are already people who won't or have stopped coming to town because it's too hard to find parking.

More signage would help people understand where parking is, what the bike routes are, etc.

Need to talk to the Health Center at Riverside since they have so many employees that park on the street.

There needs to be citywide consistency with travel lanes and bike lanes, there needs to be rules on how these things work. It's confusing to have so many different variations of things.

Example of right in/right out is at Smitty's Pub in the NNE. This could be example if that's considered at CM.

Roundabouts should be considered as intersection treatments.

There are safety issues for bikers in Alternative 1 since it's only a striped, conventional bike lane with no separation from parked cars.

There are also pedestrian safety issues which should be considered.

Public comment from CEDO event on April 18, 2019



tiny.cc/WinooskiAveStudy
Bryan Davis, CCRPC
bdavis@ccrpcvt.org
802-861-0129

4-18-19

What do you like about Winooski Avenue, and why?

What is your biggest issue with Winooski Avenue?

*Winooski -
Lower Hillbrook
Cdn*

What are 3 things you would change on Winooski Avenue?

*way finding signs in diff language
riding bus but don't know when going*

Other comments: *need to work w/ GUST
translate signs into Nepali - or create Nepali map
safer & more intuitive to get around*

Winooski Ave public comments, Ward 2/3 meeting, April 11, 2019

Compiled by Alissa Faber

I was handed a pile of maps with notes on them after the meeting. I wanted to type up comments so you had them during this month of public input. I will bring the maps (there are some drawings) to the next advisory meeting.

Sorry if some of these comments don't make the most sense I tried my best to decipher handwriting and stay true to comments.

What do you like about Winooski Ave and why?

- its paved
- direct central travel up the center of downtown
- It has a lot of great businesses and connects downtown to the ONE. I live on the street. I work on the street.
- It's a main artery to access points in the city. It feels like a neighborhood street with interesting architecture in places and changes as it travels through the city.

What is your biggest issue with Winooski Ave?

- no protected bike lanes
- no protected bike lanes
- Too much public space is dedicated to the automobile. We need protected bike lanes.
- The speed of automobile traffic and unwelcoming feel to pedestrians and bicyclists.

What are 3 things you would change on Winooski Ave?

- protected bikes lanes
- protected bikes lanes
- Take from 4 lanes to 3 and middle turning lane from Maine to Pearl.
- Put a green arrow for a hard turning from Winooski traveling South to turn on to Main street north.
- Less parking
- protected bikes lanes
- wider sidewalks
- spread of traffic and flow of traffic
- entrance/exits near downtown core at parking garages and service stations
- better/more responsive pedestrian cross lights

We have been talking about bike lanes on N. Winooski for 17 years!!!!

Street trees would be nice too.

Density- people live on Winooski and need cars to get to 2nd/3rd shifts with cars.

Street trees? Are adding trees and not just saving existing trees part of the plan?

Have you researched bike lane use in winter? How do other cities our size and climate deal with bike lanes in winter?

"Sharrow" term is not used in the bike community anymore. false safety

Winooski is a truck route

Put the bike lanes on streets that are not bus routes and delivery routes for businesses, like Union, Intervale and Elmwood so our kids can ride the BUS safely and not have to get off in the middle of the street.

Reduce speed on Winooski to 10MPH

Like open street. Parked cars in bike lane and bike lane in parked car lane.

People turning left into City Market vs people turning left onto Bank street. How can they share a lane when it already backs up?

Switch the 2 way protected bike lane in alternative 3 to be on the west side of the street.

Add parking downtown between Pearl and Main where street is wider to help with all the parking loss on North Winooski.

Rep. Curt McCormack

"I am voting for alt #2 because it offers the best continuity as one side of bicycle throughout the whole street. Bike lanes are not as perfected or protected as in many places but many have relative protection all the way. If roundabouts and lights both scored high at the intersections the inherent advantages of the roundabouts would be them maybe they are preferable. Trees! more than anything else, make a street pleasant, beautiful and cooler. Please as many trees as possible. No T-bone collisions, calm traffic reduce greatly engine idling."

Curt also asked me if there was a way he could vote on an alternative. I thought that was a good way to get more public input instead of just the people willing to take time to make comments. He was also confused as to how to submit his comment because there is no formal voting or comment area on the map packet.

--

Alissa Faber, www.alissafaber.com, alluvialforms.etsy.com, 802-503-1081

From: TONY Redington <tonyrvt99@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, March 27, 2019 6:50 AM

To: Corey Mack <Corey.Mack@rsginc.com>; Jonathan Slason <jonathan.slason@rsginc.com>

Subject: Roundabouts, Roundabouts/Bicyclists

Good Day Winooski Corridor Project Advisory Committee:

This message addresses some of the questions raised at the Project Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting last evening at ONECC.

Thank you for your efforts making my street safe and thereby truly walkable and bikable by following landmark North Avenue Corridor Plan (2014) elements featuring the highest level of safety for all modes, cycle track (protected bike lanes) end to end, and at key intersections installing the "intersection safety belt," the modern roundabout.

(Please consider these comments and the attachments as part of the Winooski study record.)

Roundabouts are pretty much routine now with 14 in Vermont, a five-corridor roundabout commercial corridor under design on Putney Rd. in Brattleboro, Depot Street in Manchester Center being re-designed with a combination of roundabouts and full cycle track, and every Montpelier Main Street intersection from Keck Circle to an including Memorial/Northfield/River already found roundabout feasible in separate studies.

Please recall my insistence of "safety first" as per our City transportation plan which calls safety "critical" in transportation investment decisions. Regarding bicycling two-thirds of cyclists are male, mostly young adult and white. Cycle track, protected bike lane, is the sidewalk for cyclists, providing safety like the sidewalks do for pedestrians (sidewalks cut ped injury rates by 88%). Agree that for Riverside to North Street--and even from Pearl to at least College--cycle track be located at sidewalk level (similar to Dorset St. in S. Burlington). Having observed similar designs in Japan last fall bikes and pets do generally respect the space of the other but when reasonable to wander or utilize the space of the other mode. "Flexible" cycle track might be one way to term it.

The need for cycle track end to end of this corridor as called for in the Walk Bike Plan clearly is not just a knee jerk simple adherence to a plan, but the recognition that the Winooski Corridor is the only direct north-south corridor from ONE through the heart of the City and its key destinations ranging from City

Market, the library, churches and of course the public gathering and shopping mecca Marketplace. If no cycle track from Riverside to Howard Street then where?

With about 10% or 15 of the 150 highway injuries each year in our city on the Winooski, one about every six weeks on our street, safety must come first in bringing our street up to a quality level. Every week in Burlington a pedestrian or bicyclist is injured as well as two occupants. Most of Winooski injuries are at a half dozen intersections and the Alternatives prepared by RSG consultants properly show roundabouts at those key intersections. Why? Roundabouts cut serious and fatal injuries by about 90%. We have a half century—52 years—of six downtown VT roundabouts (Manchester, Middlebury and Montpelier) without a single bicyclist injury, one non-serious (treated and released at emergency) pedestrian injury and four minor car occupant injuries—one injury a decade. We have 17 intersections in Burlington averaging one injury a year! Those “dirty 17” include Winooski intersections of North, Pearl, Cherry, Bank, College and Main.

So what would we expect for injury reductions with roundabouts at key intersections along the corridor as well as cycle track? Very possibly 2-3 injuries, likely not severe, a year—this would drop our percentage of injuries citywide from about 10% to about 1-2% yearly.

As important, a safe corridor with cycle track would be an “equality corridor” treating each mode with the highest level of safety—those who walk, bike and walk. We demand no less!

Note roundabouts reduce delay at intersections for all modes, especially for pedestrians. And at the busy intersections with reduced idle time the reductions in gas use at Pearl and Main are likely upwards of 10,000 gallons a year—all busy roundabout intersection reduce climate change emissions by about 30%.

“Ramp-off Ramp-on” New Graphic of Shelburne Street Roundabout

Thanks apparently to AOT's Michael Lacroix, the Shelburne Street roundabout project manager (next year construction begins and in 2021 the roundabout is installed) we have a new graphic of the design which precisely shows the ramp-off choice for cyclists on approaching narrowed and curved roundabout entry and the ramp-on back to the street beyond the intersection. The design is attached here. (See overall information at <https://www.burlingtonvt.gov/DPW/ShelburneStreetRoundabout>)

The roundabout is single lane—as would be the case for intersections along the Winooski—and each of the approaches and exits have a similar “choice” for cyclists. Right now none of the streets—Shelburne, Locust, S. Willard and St. Paul—have bike lanes so all cyclists share the road. As at all roundabout the vehicle travelway narrows and diverts from a straight line to a curve, the design practice today provides a choice to the cyclist, continue through the roundabout as vehicle or take the ramp off, negotiate on a shared basis with pedestrians one or more crossing and then ramp back on to the street beyond. That same approach will be used on Winooski roundabouts—the less skilled, risk-averse, younger/older (like myself!) will ramp off and ramp on from one cycle track end point to the beginning beyond the intersection. The bicyclist “choice” is very similar to what a cyclist faces southbound on North Winooski as the bike lane ends about 100 feet before the stop line at Pearl.

A full—though admittedly wonky description of how a bicyclist approaches a one lane roundabout like Shelburne Street and a 2-lane as considered at Colchester/Riverside/Barrett (COLBARI) is attached.

Note I generally favor roundabouts at each of the problem intersections—particularly Riverside, N. Union/Decatur, North, and the four Marketplace border intersections (Pearl, Cherry, Bank, College and Main). In addition, I support a roundabout at City Market to narrow the need for more than two lane access, reduce injury collisions and become part of an overall interface with Winooski and Union (add a roundabout there).

One additional point—mini-roundabouts are a natural for any four-way stop intersection so King and Maple could also be considered candidates if there is a perceived or actual safety problem at one or both intersections.

Two-way Bikeway and Roundabouts

Generally, I would reject two-way bikeways anywhere along the corridor with the possible exception of Main or below to Howard. I diverge here for a moment. How would one meld a roundabout and a two-way bikeway? Well, we in ONE have that very situation with the planned two-way bikeway between Pearl and Manhattan Drive. The primary cross street is North and it is signalized. To start we will likely live with a signal control. But after installation a serious look needs to be given to a shared space intersection where all modes intermingle. As bicycle volumes increase a raised crossing may be an attractive choice benefitting all modes, including safety.

Cost and Roundabout Expertise

Roundabouts are not always expensive. And the half million spent on the traffic signal in front of DPW though unusual (signal systems tend to be in the \$150,000 to \$200,000 range), signals require constant attention, electric bills, and maintenance—about \$5,000 a year.

Roundabouts designed for the Winooski would include those like Shelburne Street Roundabout with a central island (Main Street for sure would have this design making it a “gateway” to downtown), and some mountable centers called mini-roundabouts (likely Decatur/N Union, College, etc.). Mini-roundabouts can be very cheap, take a few weeks to design and install. Cost can be \$40-\$50,000 each. Minis often use existing curb lines and can retain current crosswalks. My preference is to set crosswalks the regular 25 feet from the circulating travelway—as is the case in the one Vermont mini-roundabout, part of our first roundabout corridor in Vermont in Manchester Center.

Because Vermont was once a leader in the east United States, the top practitioners and designers from the world developing roundabouts in North America have been involved in one or more roundabout developments here.

Finally, please keep in mind the continued collapse of safety in America as, for example, pedestrian deaths increased by 50% since 2010 and are the highest since 1990. In the year 1990 we were tops in the world and have fallen like a stone to 20th with 22,000 excess deaths compared to the top four nations fatality rates per mile of travel (UK, Switzerland, Sweden and Finland). Roundabouts work to reduce both the occurrence of pedestrian injuries but also their severity—Sweden now has more roundabouts than signals and are in process of converting 40% of the remaining signals to roundabouts.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Tony Redington
20 North Winooski Ave #2
Burlington, VT 05401

From: Matthew Vaughan <vaughanmatt@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 15, 2019 1:28 PM
Subject: Winooski Ave Corridor planning

Dear Winooski Ave Transportation Study Committee members and other partners,

I recently reviewed the design alternatives for the Winooski Ave corridor presented on January 29. I am surprised and saddened to see that 3 of the 4 alternatives do not include protected bike facilities.

Fully protected bike lanes are requirements for the entire Winooski Ave corridor design (St. Paul St to Riverside Ave) according to [PlanBTV Walk-Bike](#) adopted by Burlington City Council in April 2017.

This is true for the 5-year and long-term plans ([see the plan here, pages 110-111](#)). This decision was made following nearly three years of public process and review from all city stakeholders for PlanBTV Walk-Bike ([see pages 44-52](#)); it is no longer up for debate. Fully protected facilities can likely be achieved as part of any of the four alternatives, but sharrows and unprotected bike lanes are absolutely not acceptable for any part of this corridor.

The Winooski Ave corridor is a central part of the low-stress bicycle network laid out in PlanBTV Walk-Bike that was adopted by City Council. Some City Councilors that unfortunately passed on opportunities to provide protected bike facilities on Bank and Cherry St re-designs expressed that they wanted to adhere strictly to the adopted PlanBTV Walk-Bike (May 2018). This is an excellent opportunity to follow the plan as they have requested.

I have several specific comments on the design alternatives that I am happy to share, but I want this message to be clear and singular: Fully protected bike lanes are requirements for the entire Winooski Ave Corridor, and no design alternatives should include unprotected bike lanes or sharrows. Other design accommodations must be made after this required criterion is met.

I look forward to working with you all to create excellent designs for our streets that include low-stress, physically protected bike infrastructure. I especially cannot wait to someday be able to bike safely with my young children on the streets of our city.

Sincerely,
Matthew Vaughan, PhD
PlantBTV Walk-Bike Implementation Committee member
36 Walnut St
566-0089

From: Damon Lane <damon@kth.se>
Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 11:07 AM
To: Bryan Davis <bdavis@ccrpcvt.org>
Subject: TMD comments on Winooski Ave

Hi Bryan, thanks for collecting feedback at Town Meeting Day! That's a great idea. I started to make comments after voting and before starting my shift as a poll worker, but they needed me right away. Later, the materials had been picked up before I dropped mine in. So can you please enter these comments, which unfortunately have now lost their anonymity, but have gained legibility?

Thanks!

Damon

Ward 3 TMD:

What do you like:

- It's in the middle of downtown activity (well those 4 blocks are)
- It runs straight through town

Biggest issue:

- The four lane section is a piece of arterial highway that is out of place downtown

3 things:

- Maybe a 4 to 3 lane conversion
- Sidewalk amenities that separate pedestrians from cars like bike racks, planters, etc. (this would be less important and maybe not necessarily with a 4 to 3 conversion)
- Complete Streets/Great Streets treatment

Other comments:

- The downtown blocks could feel very different than they do today. They could match the ends of the street better and feel "downtown" instead of arterial
