

January 20, 2022

Meeting of the City Council-Stakeholder Committee

North Winooski Parking Management Plan (PMP) Committee Members present:

- Councilors Barlow, Hanson, Stromberg
- Community members: Kirsten Merriman Shapiro (KMS), Kelly Duggan, Charlie Sizemore
- The project team: Nicole Losch (Burlington Department of Public Works), Jonathan Slason (RSG), Bryan Davis (CCRPC), Chapin Spencer (Burlington Department of Public Works)

Approximately 20 members of the public were present.

1. Welcome, Introductions, no Changes to the Agenda

- Bryan identified committee members in attendance.
- Jonathan reviewed City Council directives for the Committee and process, why we're working on a parking management plan, the current schedule and next steps.
- Chapin explained that the PMP is an outgrowth of the City Council decision in March 2020, which follows other adopted plans. The project seeks to find balance between parking and transportation needs in a busy corridor. Many perspectives have been shared during the process, there remains a high degree of concern, and he's here for full meeting to listen and participate. Committee can choose to take action on PMP tonight, and he asks that everyone be respectful.

2. Public Comment Period

- Tiki Archambeau – for context, he used to be on city committees, his understanding of project is that it would explore alternatives for parking, and if alternatives weren't identified it wouldn't proceed. Voted for previous plans that accommodated bikes in other parts of the city. Wouldn't approve this plan. 1. Wants economic study to accompany this type of study. 2. Don't see data gauging current use of bike lane on Win Ave. Parking seems to be used more often than bike lanes especially in winter. 3. Safety is a concern. By comparison, ONE Greenway there was concern about bikers facing traffic so rerouted to ride with traffic. 4. People likely to switch to EVs so will want/need space to park. 5. There's room to maneuver if we revisit residential parking permit program, if we move to zone situation like other cities there may be possibility to park on other streets. 6. Broke wrist so can't bike, so consider who else can't bike, lots of examples of people who can't or choose not to, elderly, new parents, inexperienced, sick, don't like weather, carry groceries, etc. In conclusion, respects time and effort into plan, from engineering this can be done, from social perspective it's not ready for prime time so please halt for now.
- Kim Anderson – works at Community Health Centers of Burlington (CHCB), appreciate all the work, at first was excited to work with team on shared vision but back again to express concern about the plan, encourage seeking alternative solutions. Think about legacy you'll create if passed, it won't be a good one, you'll prevent neighbors access to care they need to survive. This is the opposite of equity we're seeking to achieve. Language about CHCB in report is slanted, yes people are competing for spaces. When CHCB built building didn't expect the numbers of new people that would come each month. CHCB is economic driver and this plan would have impact, keeps asking if committee knows of other places to park and yet committee forges ahead. Removing any parking is not a minor change. City and others should do whatever is possible to meet parking needs. This plan is a tone deaf answer to who rides a bike for pleasure or for survival.

- Chris Rivers – echoes Kim, thanks for work on plan. Take a pause, consider neighbors as we voice in unison, lives between North and Grant, following project since survey, which was after decision was made to add bike lane. There is shortage of parking every day. We already have bike lanes, they are not answer to climate solution. Have not captured useful data to replace all parking that would be lost. Committee doesn't have adequate answers on key questions on where we'll put cars. Process has been flawed from outset, uses old data, not reliable, not clear inclusiveness and awareness of project and process, people were shocked to learn about this decision. Consider pausing, reevaluate, go door to door and talk to people.
- Jean Bessette – North Win Ave resident, part of 150 people who signed petition, heard Ms. Anderson sound alarm, has seen businesses sign petition, team recognizes those who keep speaking up, overwhelming perspective is begging to reconsider so disheartening to read latest report and doubling down of sticking with decisions. Even title is misleading. Not corridor but neighborhood. Does team even know how dense it is? How many people live in each unit? Are we factoring in housing shortage impacts? We come to meetings, invited people to walk with us to see firsthand, which some have. Reading report that says certain percent of spaces are open which doesn't play out in real time. Take away parking and replace with meters means that resident parking is taken away during day. Plan says this will reduce demand, how is that so? May support vision but doesn't make vision work. I'll keep driving around to find parking, will probably drive more. Desperate for an answer of why this is needed when bike lanes are already there. Please restore faith in process.
- Beth Sightler – longtime owner, North and Grant, is on board of health center, challenges with parking. Intent isn't to kill the plan, just don't approve it, slow it down and listen to people. Agree that people need access to safe bike lanes. Understand we're out of time regarding climate change, but this isn't the solution on this street. Vision is to create safe corridor for city, agree with that, effort is commendable but this isn't solution for this street. To make change we all need to be engaged and included in process, our neighbors haven't been considered. Continued narrative about robust communication is false, disrespectful about how much outreach was done. Petition took two hours for neighbors to get signatures, similar effort wasn't taken by committee. Data about parking is wrong, the narrative won't change the data and reality. People were invited to visit. There are alternative solutions out there. Sharing parking isn't of interest to others shown by survey. Transit solutions possible. Was it possible to return report to council and say it's not feasible? Please consider how to advance in partnership, slow down, don't harm neighbors. Please don't approve the plan.
- Lee Anderson – owns Radio Bean, calling in to say plan isn't good for Burlington, lives on North Win Ave for 22 years, owned business for 21 years, there's no off street parking so competing for parking. Loves biking, like others, business is very bike friendly but doesn't think putting in bike lanes and taking out parking is good plan, residents will be affected, side streets will be impacted by this change. City streets that aren't already resident only would likely change to permits since they'll see more people parked on their streets. Loading zone is used constantly by businesses in the block. Will be major impact so deeply consider where we are – we're not Seattle, San Fran, Amsterdam, we're small state where people need cars, transit doesn't run 24 hours a day, people rely on cars. This will be a really big deal, it will impact people more than report says it will. Massive impact. I oppose this plan.
- Liz Curry – thanks. Lots of questions about data, will share later. Lot of reference to council resolution, doesn't think this plan meets it (https://www.ccrpcvt.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/Resolution_WinAveStudy_FINAL.pdf). It doesn't direct committee to implement bike lanes, it has context that arrives at different conclusion. Second, I've been involved in community efforts on this road for a long time, CHCB was central gem to anchor the

whole corridor, and yes this is a neighborhood, it has everything that people need. This rush to blame people who drive cars for climate crisis and put onus on them is individualized solution. It's insensitive. Glad Jean brought up Just Transition, neighborhood is full of community based participation, social service activity is huge and compatible with businesses. Was talking to people yesterday like Dana Kaplan from Outright VT who said he's unhappy about the plan and the main concerns on his end are for the folks seeking some anonymity accessing Outright who feel it may not be safe or it's too much of a barrier to park far away or a block away, and when COVID isn't acute Outright hopes to have community events and forums and street parking ensures we can do that, so he's echoing same concerns of CHCB as a service provider for safe access to their services. Also talked to the Awhaiteys who own the African Market, and son Prince, he said wow those people must be so powerful to be able to do that. It's really unfortunate that people are choosing to use their power in this way when just transitions created this neighborhood. Different groups have come together to inform and create this neighborhood, it was not top down professional planners who say you need this stuff. If riding the bus saves more greenhouse gases than bikes, why aren't we advocating for more transit, a more regional solution, instead we're talking about 10 people who bike in the winter.

- Kara Greenblott – lives between Grant and North, avid biker, proud of infrastructure, work at Howard Center, drives clients to different places, current plan to remove 75-100 parking will cause unnecessary hardship to me and those who are vulnerable. There is a bike lane one block over which pairs with existing bike lane on Win Ave so please maintain existing lanes year round. Tiki talked about safety, I don't believe adding a bike lane that goes against traffic could be safer. Data used is faulty, deceptive, outdated. This plan is inaccurate and I invite anyone to come check this block out, we circle block 3-4 times to find a space, people block driveways. With COVID more professionals are working from home so more people are parked on street day and night. We can't rely on 2017 data for today's planning. Report has some corrections but isn't taking into account the premise. Neighbors had tenants move out because of lack of parking. Any plan that includes meters or permits doesn't address parking crunch. Current plan prioritizes a privileged minority who don't need or depend on cars over residents and essential workers like myself and others who live and work in this neighborhood. Please consider rejecting this plan until there's more engagement in the planning process, and a plan can be constructed that doesn't cause undue hardships to residents, non-profits, businesses and vulnerable members of community.
- Eric Kratochvil – I wear a couple hats, avid biker, have respect for what city is doing, creating safer infrastructure. I don't currently feel as safe as I would like to when biking. Also am on board of CHCB, and as board member and patient am aware of parking challenges there, patients and staff both need access to on street parking. I attended BTVstat presentation where Burlington planner talked about consciously reducing parking as way to move away from automotive transport, to make it harder to drive in Burlington. When I drive around and see cars on the road I'm shocked at how many side mirrors are knocked off, they're not parking there because they want to, they park there because they have to. For the city to turn the screws on people who have nowhere else to park, I worry that that's impacting people who may be less advantaged, who don't have an off street spot.

3. Discuss Draft PMP Report and Recommendations

- The presentation is available at: http://www.ccrpcvt.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/WinAvePMP_Mtg4.pdf
- Jonathan presented the types of parking management strategies considered during a project such as this one. He then presented slides showing specific parking changes and

recommendations for each block of Winooski Avenue from Pearl to Riverside. In total the plan would remove 82 spaces on the east side of Win Ave. The team hears that the block from North to Grant is challenging and acknowledges that longer term changes will have to occur to offset parking removal.

- Riverside to Archibald – 37 spaces would remain on west side, of which 22 would be time limited. Remove parking on east. It would be up to DPW Commission to determine specific time lengths, but committee is welcome to discuss ideas. 15 spaces would be unmanaged. In the evening all 37 would be unmanaged. Charlie – bike lane would result in 1.7% reduction in parking demand? Jonathan said yes. This reduction is more appropriate for employer/businesses, and this is an annual percent. Charlie – so this is assumption we're making. Seems optimistic.
- Archibald to Union/Decatur – 26 spaces would remain on west side, remove parking on east. Weekday Daytime (8am-6pm): 1 space accessible, 1 space (30 minute). Near McClure Center. 3 spaces (loading). Near McClure Center. 21 spaces (2-hour limits). Evening (6pm-8am) and Weekend: 1 space accessible, 1 space (30 minute). Near McClure Center. 24 spaces (unmanaged).
- No change between Union/Decatur and North, only restripe to add northbound bike lanes.
- North to Grant – 32 spaces would remain on west side, remove parking on east. Weekday Daytime (8am-6pm): 1 space (15-minute), 15 spaces (Brown-top meters), 15 spaces (Blue-top meters). Evening (6pm-8am) and Weekend: 1 space (15-minute), 30 spaces (unmanaged). Residential parking permit system not desired as stated at last meeting. Proposed meter solution would assist with employees. Heard committee suggestion to emulate Pearl to Grant section here. Need to consider if meter mix is right. Maybe there's a system through which a certain number of metered spaces are available to residents. There are a number of possible reasons why this block is over parked, which we've heard.
- Grant to Pearl – no change on west side, 14 spaces plus loading zone, remove parking on east. Loading zone would shift to west side.
- Councilor Barlow – spoke with Director Spencer about looking into off street parking options, any headway? Chapin – spoke with some owners who have some off street supply, there have been 1-3 of those 5 willing to further the conversation, none have said yes at this point. 2 of 6 said not able to provide shared parking. Still waiting to hear back from a couple others.
- Nicole – reminder that in addition to those conversations, city is also working with Stantec to identify potential spaces to add in as part of future paving by Vermont Agency of Transportation, especially in lower blocks.
- Kirsten – in the plan was the idea that parking is scarce but people will choose to use driveways more if changes are made, and property owners could create new off-street parking; any thought given to permitting needs for that, lot coverage requirements, impervious regulations, etc.? Jonathan – we're aware that North to Grant has 40% lot coverage maximum, seems there is some space on some properties to add more off street parking, but no specific answers on how to treat stormwater, for example. Kirsten – struggle with one of assumptions, the idea that census data shows that lower income, or if you're Black or brown you're more likely to walk or bike or take transit to destination. That may be more due to necessity than by choice. Clear the goal is to force mode shift to some extent but I'm blessed to have a job, have cars, have space to park them, support bikes, have privilege for these choices, and have economic opportunity to buy a house and make these choices, I have to wonder are those choices available to those affected by systemic oppression over many years. Does anyone else want to talk about this? Councilor Hanson – this part of report struck me as well, could have been included in

presentation but it's in the report, data on income, car ownership... there is a correlation and I think that fact has been lost in some areas. Those folks aren't necessarily coming out to these meetings and voicing concerns but we're trying to make decisions that support people rather than continue with car-centric planning. Some people might think data is skewed by college students due to low income but data shows info for respondents older than 25 and how they get around. We're not currently serving non-auto modes and this corridor is key to creating a safe network. Kirsten – somewhat offensive to assume that people under those circumstances, they may wish to drive, versus the generalized census data. It feels like another way to penalize the poor or limit their choices. Jonathan said survey didn't ask people their desired travel choice, tables 4 and 6 are powerful data points that show, of the existing data, those that take transit, only 62% are white, and white people make up larger percent of population than 62%, and in table 5 transit users are underrepresented by white individuals. Kirsten – important for people to have choices, did we find in the survey, if we look at Black and brown people, is there a sense of how many use a vehicle versus other modes? Jonathan said the survey data reflects an alignment that resident populations, people of color and people with low to moderate incomes, their behavior was aligned with census data at large, but to your point, is that really what they want. Councilor Hanson – that's the point, no one was assuming this is a choice, it's extremely expensive to own and maintain a vehicle so if your income is low, it's hard to access a vehicle. There's a population facing a barrier to vehicle access. Are we telling that group of people you're on your own, figure it out, or do we help create a safe multimodal system? They should still have the right to move about the community safely.

- Councilor Barlow said we're talking about either/or decision, it's worth having a discussion of other options to meet community needs.
- Charlie – do we have good data on winter use of current bike lanes, given that it's going to be so cold? I ride as much as possible but not in winter, some people choose to gear up but do we know numbers, percentage of travelers? Nicole – no we don't have clear numbers, Local Motion is working to collect this but not available yet. Focus of this project was parking management even though biking and parking are intertwined. Goal is to implement council direction to manage parking in a way that allows for bike lane installation.
- Kelly – to Charlie's point, bike lanes are poorly maintained in winter, I commute year round, I work at Old Spokes Home, and my experience and our customer experience is that people are challenged to use bike lanes in winter when they aren't maintained. Hard to use California model when things are different here.
- Kirsten – other things to understand, one is concept of unbundled parking. This means that you would pay rent for parking and rent for apartment? Jonathan – Correct, parking cost isn't tied into base rent. KMS – Champlain Housing Trust provides affordable housing and I don't see us unbundling, see it as adding a burden to those already burdened. Might work for renters at higher end of the market. Makes me also think of removing parking minimums, is that going to spur gentrification in neighborhood, more than what's already happening? Jonathan said he can't address gentrification but unbundling works in other areas, people in those places tend to own fewer vehicles. This isn't put in as a specific recommendation in the report but may occur as new development occurs. KMS – so we don't think it will lead to more gentrification? Jonathan – we don't know. Councilor Hanson – can speak to unbundling, council worked on this, idea is that developers can roll parking cost into rent whether or not renter owns a car, unbundling allows tenants to forego cost. This decision was independent of this study. KMS – so if you have housing development, what is percent that is affordable? For any new development, some has to be affordable, so what happens to affordability when unbundled? Councilor Hanson

– parking cost would be the same, but rent is different for affordable and market rate units. KMS
– we see gentrification already, want to understand if unbundling exacerbates it.

- Councilor Barlow has a process question: if we don't vote, what happens? We vote yes to approve and it goes to council and DPW. If we don't approve, what happens, what if we need more time? I'm not ready to vote, I have a lot of questions. It needs more work and there's still some things we don't know, like off street parking, or what essential parking is, there are residents and businesses that show up again and again, I'm not ready to approve. What are various options of how this could play out. Chapin – it's up to committee. If there are specific things committee would like to see then let's be as explicit as possible and work to come back to another meeting. There is a timeline to coordinate with repaving so hope is to make a decision by February but if group needs more time I will support it.
- Councilor Stromberg – thanks to everyone who spoke up, there are lots of valid concerns, lots of people use the corridor, agree with Councilor Barlow about balance, I really want to see bike lanes on Win Ave, I hear from people who want them. I'm hearing over and over there are no alternatives, and in some way that's true, would like to see one alternative to move forward, I don't want to take the chance of having any of one of worst case scenarios come up, what is one good alternative, like a remote lot. Recognize there is a time crunch.
- Charlie – thanks Mark and Jane, feel same way, my understanding was that PMP would look at current needs and what we would be removing and finding other places for it, I don't feel confident that's what been achieved, I'm resident of Crombie, parking is stressful, I don't think we've come up with appropriate alternatives. Pushing forward because of paving, and cost on standard of living, I can't in good conscious act on moving forward.
- Councilor Stromberg – is there a way to balance this with seasons, maybe allow more parking in winter? I think we need to move forward, it is time sensitive. Can we inform public of transit options, things we can do simultaneously to the plan. Is seasonality even viable, where the bike lane becomes a parking lane over the winter? Jonathan said seasonality is listed at end of document as a potential alternative but we're not finding good examples of that, there are planning reasons why not to do it but there's a practical application here in winter.
- Nicole – good question and if committee members have other ideas and questions, let's focus on those now and at a next meeting the project team can bring more information about those kinds of alternatives, and we'll share the chat thread as well.
- Chapin – since we're still waiting for Stantec report, and I'm waiting to connect with other businesses, it makes sense to get more feedback from committee and then bring forward again.
- Charlie – glad Jane brought seasonality up, it makes sense to me. Few people use bike lanes in winter. An alternative like that makes a lot of sense.
- Kirsten – if this goes to future meeting with other alternatives, would alternatives at end of report still remove east side parking? This would still impact social services and other uses on corridor. If people can park a block off Winooski, then could people bike a block off Winooski? Also consider other options that would ameliorate impacts of removing parking, like subsidizing rideshares. Don't want to see long term affordability and diversity damaged so want to understand other options. At this point I'm not comfortable with this as proposed.
- Councilor Stromberg – I hear that, and we need to keep in mind coming up with a solution, we do need to move forward, I hear concerns and they are valid, we need to move forward responsibly, get to next meeting with more information. Can we engage residents and businesses in this short amount of time, talk about options like seasonality and remote lots, I'm open to ideas. I'm transparent about wanting to move forward but recognize time limits.

Changes to other major streets in the city show this can work, it's not easy, this is what we're tasked to do.

- Councilor Barlow – echo Kirsten, how does use of Union bike lane ameliorate pressure of removing parking. This is somewhat outside the scope, was not on council that voted to approve bike lanes in both directions. Want to understand if there are viable options.
- Councilor Hanson – echo some of what Jane said, keeping in context of what's trying to be done, we had a two year process about what we want the corridor to look like, there were a lot of people sharing a lot of different perspectives. The advisory committee and council approved this scenario and so now how to we get to a PMP that is satisfactory. Our role isn't to reverse two years of work, the council could do that but hasn't to this point, so up to us to find PMP that works.
- Kirsten – if bike lanes are going to happen regardless, then what does it matter if we vote tonight or in two weeks. I think this plan will have adverse impacts. I believed it would, and now we're hearing from them that this will negatively impact them.
- Jonathan said if we go forward with another meeting, we need to know what to address: Seasonality, use of Union St/how many parking spaces would be saved, Kirsten's option of using Hyde St, feasibility of using remote lots, where is future of transit, how will it function.
- Jonathan suggests have public comment period then move to have another meeting to share additional information.

4. Public Comment Period

- Chapin suggested we use this forum to hear from the public about additional information to consider.
- Jean – 1. need clear articulation of what council approved in March 2020. Does committee and council have shared understanding of this? 2. Is there evidence that current bike lane configuration on Winooski Ave and Union St isn't safe enough. Previous heat map showed that crashes are mostly south of Pearl St. What proves they're unsafe, and how do we know besides the fact that they're not maintained so people bike in middle of road? Also hear from Jane about what's not working for her about bike lane, what's motivating the people she's hearing from about why Winooski Ave needs to change.
- Tiki – there's no time crunch. Would just be repainting so what's the rush?
- Beth – good info in the chat about recommendations, I hear desire for progress on street, what does that look like, clarify what's needed and not needed. Parking plan should be plan for how it works, not "might" or "could" work. Look at transit, find ways to talk to landlords, see if there are alternatives to Win Ave like Union or Archibald. Please don't approve the plan.
- Liz – thanks again, I put a bunch of questions in the Q&A, don't need to answer now, but can I get them answered at some point? Question for Kelly, I like the ONE audit project. Old Spokes got a grant from CCRPC and interviewed over 100 people, liked the process, conclusion was that people aren't invited to participate enough. Was that audit incorporated into this process? Kelly responded that the project tried to target underrepresented populations, spoke with people at Food Shelf and also worked with AALV. I advocated for methods as part of this committee. People without a car doesn't mean they have bikes or would bike if there were lanes. Liz – residents have worked fewer hours and talked to more people than paid consultants, how is that possible? Report raises a lot of good questions which could be phase 1, there could be phase 2 that answers those questions. Would be great to say to council that this is premature, was approved before COVID so need to look at it again. 16% of households with zero vehicles,

but link to FHWA data is for individuals, not households so...? Jonathan is happy to look into that more.

- Kara – 1. Jane noted that process has been going on for long time so need to make progress tonight, I suggest that reason for lot of people coming out for these meetings and putting up barriers is that outreach was not as robust as it could have been, likes idea of this as phase 1. Beg for committee to consider what everyone has said tonight. 2. Jack noted that not moving forward with plan is saying poor people are out of luck. Bike lane doesn't promote access to services. I advocate for maintenance of existing bike lanes, use is low, barriers are broken, there's snow, people drive in bike lane, so hope is to consider better maintenance.

5. Action: Approve Parking Management Plan Strategies

- Rather than take action tonight, the Committee agreed to meet again in two weeks when the project team will present additional information based on issues and questions raised tonight.

6. Next steps

- The project team will review the meeting notes, chat log and Q&A to prepare for the next meeting in about two weeks, date to be determined quickly.

Zoom Q&A log

Liz Curry, she/her, CommonLand Solutions, LLC 07:39 PM

Is the Committee voting on a draft that has many gaps, many unanswered questions, and placeholders for additional information? What public body votes on an incomplete product?

Liz Curry, she/her, CommonLand Solutions, LLC 07:40 PM

Stantek was mentioned - what is the scope of work they are being engaged for? How many spaces would they add, where and what kind? How will this data affect the "models?"

Liz Curry, she/her, CommonLand Solutions, LLC 07:41 PM

Why are we relying on 11 year old data that has transportation to work data - mode and times - when this is completely irrelevant now given the rental turn-over, pandemic work pattern shifts, and changes in businesses?

Liz Curry, she/her, CommonLand Solutions, LLC 07:47 PM

The Report on page 2 (pdf page 10) shows the study area. One set of minutes defines it as 300' from No Win Ave, and then the report mentions 600' from No Win Ave. Can you please clarify the study area in relation to this image?

Liz Curry, she/her, CommonLand Solutions, LLC 07:49 PM

With regards to the study area, it covers 2 census tracts and many census blocks within those tracts. The FHWA image cited in the Report has direct links to the census data, and that data has all of the transportation mode by percentage of people. Is that the data being used?

Liz Curry, she/her, CommonLand Solutions, LLC 07:53 PM

The Report conflates census and survey data on pdf page 17. Also, pdf page 16 cites percentages of households, but the census data being cited doesn't have the number of households, it has the number of people (i.e. individuals).

Liz Curry, she/her, CommonLand Solutions, LLC 08:08 PM

Has the Committee talked to Legal Aid about losing an ADA space? Pathways is right across the street and requested a few ADA spaces. Will they compete with each other? How will people using a

wheelchair cross the street to Legal Aid from the west side of the street? In the winter they'll have to go all the way up to the light and back down, which is not equity

Zoom Chat Log

From steph pappas to Everyone 05:58 PM

is meeting in session I don't hear anyone..?

From Me to Everyone 05:59 PM

not started yet

From steph pappas to Everyone 06:01 PM

thanx

how many people on zoom?

From prince awhaitey to All Panelists 06:01 PM

Hello everyone

From prince awhaitey to Everyone 06:02 PM

Hello everyone

From Liz Curry, she/her, CommonLand Solutions, LLC to Everyone 06:02 PM



From Kim Anderson, CHCB (she/her) to All Panelists 06:04 PM

Also raising hand to speak in the public comment. Thanks all!

From steph pappas to Everyone 06:06 PM

Ya'll get the petition that went around to keep parking? From residents & bizzness?

From Jack Hanson to Everyone 06:07 PM

Hi all, so sorry I'm late

From Tiki Archambeau to Everyone 06:07 PM

My hand is raised simply to ask to speak in public forum. Will take it down if that's distracting.

From Jack Hanson to Everyone 06:07 PM

Please promote me to panelist when possible

From steph pappas to Everyone 06:13 PM

i did squeeze in one live show and two on line haha- city hall park haha

From Randy to Everyone 06:26 PM

I have asked repeatedly for use data and have not received them. Asked for similar data for the Wiggle, etc. without response.

From steph pappas to Everyone 06:28 PM

good point..actually MOST people do not bike..

From Randy to Everyone 06:32 PM

The way CHCB was portrayed in the report was unprofessional. Referring nurses and other staff as using public land to store their cars borders on disgusting and shows a clear bias by this committee.

From Solveig to All Panelists 06:33 PM

Has the CHCB provided any data on how many of their clients walk to the health center and how many drive?

From Randy to Everyone 06:33 PM

Again and again, little by little, the report presents that the loss of 22 spaces here, 14 there really isn't a big deal! It adds up. It is a big deal to residents, businesses and social service providers.

From steph pappas to Everyone 06:40 PM

What Jean Bessette says ...! hera hear!

From Randy to Everyone 06:44 PM

Jean, yes! This is the real stuff! This is what should matter!

It is unfortunate that Beth and others feel that they need to apologize for saying that they don't think that this is a sound plan. There should be no apology necessary for asking this be reconsidered.

From Tiki Archambeau to Everyone 06:44 PM

We need more civility like Beth's in today's world.

From Solveig to All Panelists 06:45 PM

Another statistic that would be useful: how many people who keep cars on the streets need to "store" their car as was just mentioned, and how many use them daily to get to work or school. There needs to be a place for people who don't use their car every day to "store" them so those who MUST use their car to get to work or school daily can use the spaces.

From steph pappas to Everyone 06:49 PM

wow!

What Lee says! I don't need to speak ya'll r hitting the nail!

From Solveig to All Panelists 06:50 PM

Should the use of cut-outs into the green belt for retaining parking spots at specific locations be better explained to people? I saw on an intro slide that opportunities for those will get reviewed later as part of the paving plan.

From oliviatubio to Everyone 06:51 PM

Thank you to everyone who is speaking up. I don't feel informed enough to do so, but I agree with the sentiments being expressed

From Randy to Everyone 06:51 PM

Thank you Lee.

From steph pappas to Everyone 06:59 PM

wow that was heartfelt...great stuff Liz!

From Lee Anderson to Everyone 07:02 PM

That is absolutely inaccurate.

There's almost never parking, 24 hours a day on NWA between Grant and North.

From Randy to Everyone 07:06 PM

Their numbers are way off especially for these 2 most south blocks. I and others have attempted to point this out so it can be remedied, but this has made no change to their outdated data nor to the models based on this faulty data.

From Randy to Everyone 07:14 PM

This is speculation. Most of the "plan" is assumptions and this type of speculation.

From Liz Curry, she/her, CommonLand Solutions, LLC to Everyone 07:14 PM

Let's listen to what the people say, not the models

From Jean Bessette to All Panelists 07:15 PM

What are these percentages based on? To my mind, this is magical thinking.

From Randy to Everyone 07:15 PM

Right and then wonder why the models don't look like the real life conditions.

From Kim Anderson, CHCB (she/her) to Everyone 07:16 PM

It also needs to be noted that the average CHCB appointment is 1.5 hours.

From Jean Bessette to Everyone 07:17 PM

We're using California models?

From Liz Curry, she/her, CommonLand Solutions, LLC to Everyone 07:18 PM

Yes, there isn't data for VT!

From Randy to Everyone 07:18 PM

Again, let's use national averages and studies from California.

From Liz Curry, she/her, CommonLand Solutions, LLC to Everyone 07:18 PM

The data they are citing is only available for warm states!

From Jean Bessette to Everyone 07:18 PM

1.7% reduction in car use is not worth the massive disruption to the neighborhood.

From Solveig to All Panelists 07:19 PM

The decision by the City to remove requirements for off-street parking when developers create developments clearly was intended to encourage tenants not to own cars in the future. The painful transition to less dependence on cars is in process here. People will need to re-assess the way they live. Residents who remain car-dependent for their daily needs likely will migrate to housing where there is off-street parking available. People who don't need a car daily do need satellite parking to "store" their car for when they need it.

From steph pappas to All Panelists 07:21 PM

All about the tourist and they don't like the plan either FYI

From Jean Bessette to Everyone 07:22 PM

Who didn't desire the residential parking solution?

From Randy to Everyone 07:23 PM

The meters is an absolutely ridiculous idea!

From Jean Bessette to Everyone 07:23 PM

Meters remove 100% of resident daytime parking in any meaningful way. I am astonished at this proposal.

From Liz Curry, she/her, CommonLand Solutions, LLC to Everyone 07:23 PM

The meters on the block between Pearl & Grant are the reason why Randy's et. al. block is over-parked

From Randy to Everyone 07:25 PM

How would the mayor or anyone else in the city want to return home every day after 6pm and leave before 8am every morning? ridiculous!

Nope, parking permits for over 140 households for 31 spaces?

You are depending on models which are wrong

From Jean Bessette to Everyone 07:25 PM

We should know the reasons before making radical decisions.

From Beth Sightler to All Panelists 07:26 PM

This is a terrible "solution" for this block and for our neighbors. Thank you for addressing that the model doesn't align with the actual parking reality. it's not a little bit off - it's a lot off. That's why we asked you to come and see it, not model it. It is a very dense residential area.

From Randy to Everyone 07:26 PM

Nothing in the report about Grant to North. Only mention of Crombie and Decatur

From Liz Curry, she/her, CommonLand Solutions, LLC to Everyone 07:26 PM

Lots of "maybe's" - very speculative

From steph pappas to Everyone 07:27 PM

I agree w/ what community said tonite the meters and residential parking and time limit signs we have now already don't work ...adding more seems wrong..Then bicycles will complain trucks r in the loading zone..etc...

From Jean Bessette to Everyone 07:32 PM

The environmental impact of paving green space for parking is not acceptable.

From steph pappas to Everyone 07:32 PM

Not real...

From Jean Bessette to Everyone 07:38 PM

I bike typically too, but still need the car! Typical biking doesn't remove the need for a car if one is privileged enough to own one.

From Randy to Everyone 07:39 PM

right, Jean

From Tiki Archambeau to Everyone 07:41 PM

Kirsten is right. Such an assumption is offensive. The elderly constitute a fair size of the "poor" population. Is the contention that they will suddenly use a 2nd bike path? I'm skeptical.

From steph pappas to Everyone 07:44 PM

poor people have cars FYI what is this % bizzness...

From Kim Anderson, CHCB (she/her) to Everyone 07:44 PM

I assure you, we don't see patients deciding to bike when they're sick. We see vans packed, most often with immigrant families of all ages.

From Liz Curry, she/her, CommonLand Solutions, LLC to Everyone 07:44 PM

It's also incredibly accusatory to say that there are a group of people here defending the existing infrastructure at the expense of captive riders. This narrative is divisive and is being directed at people who live and work side-by-side with captive riders, who have spent their lives working with them to improve their quality of life, and maintaining the safety network they rely on. It is incredibly arrogant to say that this group is creating a transportation system FOR people who don't have privileges.

There are no principles of a just transition reflected in this process and report

From steph pappas to Everyone 07:45 PM

we have both now ..leave north Winooski ave alone

From Tiki Archambeau to Everyone 07:47 PM

I grew up poor. My mom *HAD* to have a car to get to work. Ditto poor folks in rural VT today. It's complete fantasy to say poor people don't have cars. Maybe Councilor Hanson read about poverty in a book. Here in BTV, they are simply availing themselves of public transport because it's there. Doesn't that make the alternative screamingly obvious?

From Liz Curry, she/her, CommonLand Solutions, LLC to Everyone 07:48 PM

This week the streets, bike lanes and sidewalks were plowed cleaner than I've ever seen them. Thank you Chapin/DPW!

From Randy to Everyone 07:48 PM

There are those saying the bike lane on Union is poorly maintained and it appears that Councilor Hanson is saying it is not safe. Why isn't it safe and why isn't it maintained? Why are we to assume that an additional lane on Winooski is going to be better maintained and safer heading against traffic?

From Tiki Archambeau to Everyone 07:51 PM

Credit to Chapin and Lee Perry for working with the commission to prioritize snow maintenance of bike lanes.

From Jean Bessette to Everyone 07:52 PM

Yes, Randy. Additionally, what is the evidence that the bike lanes are unsafe for any reason other than a lack of maintenance? The heat map of accidents on N. Winooski Ave. showed that the vast majority of accidents occurred SOUTH of Pearl, which is not in the study area.

From Beth Sightler to All Panelists 07:52 PM

I'm hoping that you'll each consider not approving this and come back to the table with the community that's being impacted. We've been left out of the important part of the process and are trying to catch up - and what we're seeing is that the report just isn't accurate. I do think we could find an agreeable path forward together - one that's based on accurate information and addresses multi-modal needs. This plan just isn't it. It isn't this plan or nothing. It's NOT this plan and let's do better.

From Liz Curry, she/her, CommonLand Solutions, LLC to Everyone 07:56 PM

There is a well-known correlation between gentrification following bike lanes in neighborhoods that don't follow just transition principles, which center the voices of those the white community marginalizes the most

So the inclusionary unit occupants will pay a higher percentage of their income for housing since the parking would be over and above their rent

From Randy to Everyone 07:57 PM

The idea that unbundling would not result in some paying higher amounts doesn't make sense. I know of multiple examples of exactly this happening.

From steph pappas to Everyone 07:57 PM

We have bike lane(s) on NOWinooki Ave

From Liz Curry, she/her, CommonLand Solutions, LLC to Everyone 07:57 PM

What RSG said is false. This does not address in what ways other modes will be increased/developed

From steph pappas to Everyone 07:58 PM

ThankYOU! More time!

From Randy to Everyone 07:58 PM

There is no block as far out as Grant to North from downtown that has metered parking and add to this the residential density here.

From Liz Curry, she/her, CommonLand Solutions, LLC to Everyone 08:00 PM

Why isn't it worth taking the time to do this right and based on just transition principles, and spend more money? Isn't equity all about delivering more resources to low-income neighborhoods?

From Tiki Archambeau to Everyone 08:00 PM

This decision should not hinge on paving. If this goes forward, it only requires new paint. This is exactly how we changed the mid-town section of N. Winooski Ave to have a center turn lane.

From Kim Anderson, CHCB (she/her) to Everyone 08:02 PM

There was a plan that expanded bike lanes and kept parking. Please review that again!

From Randy to Everyone 08:02 PM

Liz and Tiki, yes, of course, should not be driving this.

From Solveig to Everyone 08:02 PM

Car ownership is an expensive convenience. Best if we make it possible to work or go to school, and do shopping errands using other modes in Burlington. This requires walkability and bikeability enhancements, good public transportation, car sharing, and cab services.. This is a challenging but necessary transition Burlington is trying to make. The feelings of disruption expressed are understandable. I hope this committee moves forward with this plan so that it can be tested and adjusted in the future if necessary.

From Tiki Archambeau to Everyone 08:03 PM

Please committee. There is no time crunch. The street footprint will not change even if this goes forward. It's nothing more than paint changes. Paving can move forward regardless.

From Liz Curry, she/her, CommonLand Solutions, LLC to Everyone 08:04 PM

Here's an alternative: organize with Colchester, Essex, Williston, and So Burlington to pass ordinances for local car registration fees, and build support through VPTAC, then bring it to the legislature so that we can use the revenue for public transit.

From steph pappas to Everyone 08:04 PM

Thanx Charles! Crombie St speaks!

From Jean Bessette to Everyone 08:04 PM

I wish the committee was reading this thread and asking the community for ideas, which are being suggested here in this thread.

From steph pappas to Everyone 08:06 PM

Is the committee reading the thread? We here r wondering..is all?

From Randy to Everyone 08:06 PM

They should have the opportunity to review these comments I think.

From steph pappas to Everyone 08:07 PM

Yes committee please review the chat and what folks stood up and said at this meeting..

From Tiki Archambeau to Everyone 08:09 PM

Solveig, you've fought ardently against the argument that things can be changed in the future. You know as well as I do it's an excuse to silence dissent. This needs to be done correctly now. By not seeking buy-in from the community, you risk all that wish to accomplish towards walkability.

From Liz Curry, she/her, CommonLand Solutions, LLC to Everyone 08:15 PM

How about the new No Champlain bike lane going outbound and the inbound bike lane being on the west side of No Win Ave?

How about making No Union open only to residents, buses and bikes, with no through traffic, then zig zag people up to No Willard who are going to Riverside

Why does this process always talk about "essential parking" but never talk about "essential services" that are provided on No Win Ave?

Maybe residents and other occupants of No Win Ave would have some ideas? Maybe you could hold a public meeting?

From Tiki Archambeau to Everyone 08:15 PM

Creating a 2nd bike lane is not the task, Councilor Stromberg. A public comment earlier was eloquent on that front.

From Jean Bessette to Everyone 08:15 PM

Thank you, Tiki. I hope you bring up all your excellent points in the public comment. These are really important.

From Kara to Everyone 08:17 PM

jane, with respect, the council did not vote to implement a second bike lane on n. winooski. it was to examine many different options.

From Lee Anderson to Everyone 08:18 PM

Committee, Thank you for your public service. If this was put to a city wide referendum/vote how do you honestly believe that vote would go? Please consider this whenever you do cast your vote. I personally believe it would not be approved.

From Liz Curry, she/her, CommonLand Solutions, LLC to Everyone 08:18 PM

Exactly, the Council did not endorse any configuration

From Jean Bessette to Everyone 08:18 PM

I hear a lot about this two-year process of making decisions about what the "corridor wants to be," but as a resident and homeowner was not made aware at any point.

From Randy to Everyone 08:19 PM

This has been the fuzzy area, the ambiguity that has allowed this committee to go unchecked for this long.

From Tiki Archambeau to Everyone 08:19 PM

No. Union is narrower than No. Winooski and somewhat problematic to have a bike lane there (or parking on both sides). The police don't use that stretch of road if they have to throw the lights on for an emergency because people don't pull over. Where do they pull over legally? Do they pull into the bike lane? Do they continue until there's a safe space to pull over? Or do they simply stop and hold up the emergency response time.

From Liz Curry, she/her, CommonLand Solutions, LLC to Everyone 08:20 PM

The crux of the problem is that No Winooski is one way, which displaces the bus onto No Union

From Kara to Everyone 08:20 PM

jack, is it possible that outreach was not robust enough the first time? and that's why we are now showing up to tell you that this plan is going to have a very negative impact on vulnerable people in this neighborhood?

From Liz Curry, she/her, CommonLand Solutions, LLC to Everyone 08:20 PM

We wiggle from downtown to Grant to No Champlain. Why not wiggle from No Union to Loomis to School & Hyde

From steph pappas to Everyone 08:21 PM

cc passed it during start of cvd while folks were struggling that's how and why it went thru and prior to that we had in person meetings where tons of folks spoke against this plan saying everything folks r saying tonite in chat..

From Solveig to Everyone 08:21 PM

We need to get ahead of the problems resulting from the traditional perception that individual car ownership is necessary to live a decent life in Burlington. We need to create facts on the ground that disprove that. This transition is the big challenge we are facing. Making walking and biking safer, and improving public transportation so everyone uses it, is necessary to make this perception change happen.

From Jeff McKee, CEO - CHCB to Everyone 08:21 PM

In two years our world has changed so much. It would be an enormous mistake to make today's decisions based on our thinking from two years ago. We can't ignore what we've learned about health equity, systemic racism, and the differential impact of the pandemic on our most vulnerable neighbors. We need to re-evaluate through today's lens.

From Randy to Everyone 08:22 PM

Remote lots do not allow customers and those receiving services critical access.

From Solveig to All Panelists 08:23 PM

The ability to copy the Chat is blocked. Can that be fixed for future meetings?

From Liz Curry, she/her, CommonLand Solutions, LLC to Everyone 08:25 PM

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that interim improvements are to be completed in 2020 to22 include a Parking Management Plan for North Winooski Avenue that identifies practical strategies for23 balancing parking supply and demand north of Pearl Street, with the goal of meeting essential parking24 needs while freeing up space for dedicated bike lanes , management strategies to mitigate the loss of on25 street parking, pilots or demonstrations of mini-roundabouts or other strategies for improving multimodal safety and performance at key intersections on North Winooski A venue, wayfinding between the27 southbound Winooski Avenue and northbound Union Street bike lane, finding solutions to commercial28 loading and driveway queueing on Winooski A venue in the downtown, and evaluating options to create29 protection for pedestrians and bicyclists in the downtown; and

From Tiki Archambeau to Everyone 08:25 PM

Making walking/biking is important. And there is an argument to be had about using public streets to store private vehicles. But removing parking from the east side will widen the street (from a driver's perspective) and therefore invite faster and more hazardous driving. We see it on No. Champlain St. which is the equivalent of a two-lane highway. Narrow that street and traffic will slow down.

From Liz Curry, she/her, CommonLand Solutions, LLC to Everyone 08:25 PM

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that shorter-term improvements are to be completed in 2021 to include36 new pavement markings for bicycle lanes in both directions between Pearl Street and Riverside Avenue,3 7 improvements for high-priority transit stops and pedestrian crossings north of Pearl Street, considerations for38 additional pedestrian safety improvements at the North Winooski Avenue intersections of Archibald Street39 and Riverside Avenue, and additional streetscape and safety enhancements south of Pearl Street; and

I'm copying and pasting the resolution language but you have to ignore the numbers, which are the lines in the document

From steph pappas to Everyone 08:26 PM

the accident rating report says it's downtown..

From Liz Curry, she/her, CommonLand Solutions, LLC to Everyone 08:26 PM

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Council hereby recommends and requests that the46 Department of Public Works (DPW) take all steps necessary within their control to implement47

improvements south of Pearl Street (including restriping to add bike lanes through downtown) as48 quickly as possible with a target of September 2020, and delay implementation of any lane49 reconfigurations north of Pearl until review and approval of the Parking Management Plan by Public50 Works Commission and City Council in December 2020

From steph pappas to Everyone 08:26 PM

we can spend the money on other things long story short..

From Kelly Duggan to All Panelists 08:30 PM

Thanks Liz, see the audit here: <https://www.oldspeakshome.com/one-mobility-audit>

From Randy to Everyone 08:30 PM

I would strongly urge committee members to not think of a pause, a reconsideration, a change in direction as a failure. You should feel like your final decision is something that is sound and you can feel good about and is not something that feels like you are forcing a small segment of Burlington's population to solve the climate crisis.

From Solveig to Everyone 08:31 PM

The strategic green-belt parking space cutouts would need to be identified prior to the paving process. See the parking cutout approved by PWC and installed on North Ave. beside the Scout Co. coffee shop. This was done during the design of the bike lane on North Ave.

From K Shapiro to All Panelists 08:32 PM

Thanks Kelly!

From Tiki Archambeau to Everyone 08:32 PM

It seems that the strategic cutouts would be wise to consider - and plan for - regardless of the decision that takes place with the committee. That would be smart long-range planning.

From steph pappas to Everyone 08:33 PM

those folks spoke at meetings and were ignored..

From Kelly Duggan to Everyone 08:33 PM

<https://www.oldspeakshome.com/one-mobility-audit>

From Solveig to Everyone 08:34 PM

Identifying the strategic parking spot cutouts are part of the plan. This has been overlooked in the discussion.

From steph pappas to Everyone 08:35 PM

that's what they said at meetings...that i posted just above didn't mean to sound rude..

From Randy to Everyone 08:37 PM

Information that would be helpful: Jonathan, first the census data that says 32% of HH's on west side of my block has to be wrong. What would be more helpful is to know the number of HH's on this block that have 2,3,4 or more cars per HH because there are plenty of students and young professionals with plenty of cars.

From K Shapiro to All Panelists 08:37 PM

I can't hear Kara

From Liz Curry, she/her, CommonLand Solutions, LLC to Everyone 08:38 PM

Randy, the census data for Tract 5, in your block, has the data by population, but the data isn't configured by household. Also, we are talking about 11 year old data if it's coming from the census