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

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

Approximately 30 members of the public were present.

1. **Welcome, Introductions, no Changes to the Agenda​**

* Chapin led introductions and reviewed the agenda.

1. **Discuss Issues Raised at January Meeting**

* Nicole reviewed the City Council resolution from March 2020 that led to the PMP and reviewed key components related to the bike lanes and committee.
* Nicole then summarized how we’ve identified essential needs and parking demand.
* Nicole addressed previous questions about whether North Winooski Avenue is the right place for bike lanes, as well as consideration of other potential bike routes, contraflow bike lanes, and seasonal bike lanes. Research indicates that a lack of bike lane maintenance and connectivity are more of a deterrent to use than poor weather.
* Nicole summarized the project team’s additional community outreach since the January committee meeting, conversations with off-street parking owners, BIPOC-owned and small enterprises north of Union Street, and exploration of notched-in parking into the greenbelt.
* Nicole then highlighted a change in the recommendation which is a phased approach for the parking strategies and bike lanes. Chapin indicted he didn’t take the phased approach lightly but is a result of the additional work this past month and feedback from the community. His memo provides information related to his decision: <https://www.ccrpcvt.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/DPW_Director_Memo_WinAvePMP_Stakeholder_Committee_Feb2022.pdf>
* Jonathan noted that the updated draft PMP includes this phased proposal, with phase 1 focused on the Riverside to Union segment, and then reviewed the parking data relative to those blocks.
* Jonathan summarized the PMP revisions which include: phased approach, city pursuing off-street parking options as well as time-limited parking on side streets if requested, reduced recommendation to add meters in phase 2 south of North Street, and added recommendation for Greenride Bikeshare hub near Community Health Center (CHC).
* Summary for phase 1: time limited parking during daytime would provide for more parking turnover to support access to services and local businesses, maintain accessible spaces on west side and relocate loading zones, allow unrestricted parking in evenings, overnight, weekends for residents, support employee parking through transportation demand management (TDM) and conversations with property owners.

1. **Public Comment Period​**

* Lee Anderson, Radio Bean owner and Winooski Ave resident, read memo for phased implementation, big relief for him, what will qualify phase 2 into action, is there a date or time estimate? Understands desire to connect bike lanes to Winooski, but what are metrics to start phase 2 after phase 1 is implemented? Grateful not to lose parking during phase 1.
* Geoffrey DeSena, new to town, positive feedback on direction of planning and infrastructure. Drawn to Burlington due to ability to get around without a car. Lived in other places, Oslo is favorite, they are removing parking to make it easier to get around in other ways, has improved livability, achieved vision zero with no deaths. Cities aren’t loud, cars are loud. In favor of Winooski Ave redesign, if that means phased, then so be it.
* Josh Katz, data analysist with CATMA, South End resident, happy to see project moving forward, he uses Winooski Ave to bike commute, he’s experienced biker but feels unsafe on this road. CATMA’s annual survey has shown that better bike lanes would get more people to bike. People want to bike but need resources and infrastructure. Need to focus on better winter maintenance, especially with two-way bike lanes on one-way streets.
* Natalee Braun, Essex resident, provides leadership in 350 VT, exceptional plan and commend effort. Primary concern is around climate emergency and the PMP provides a bold commitment to addressing the climate emergency. For Vermont in particular, supporting people-powered mobility is central to climate change. Other people mentioned positive aspects of this plan.
* Alec W, I don’t see many bikers, don’t see any accidents with bikers, lived here 6 years. Supports lessening the impacts of fossil fuels but if people have to circle to find parking, that contributes to the problem. I don’t think this is necessary at all, haven’t heard of accidents, never see bikers, saw in notes this is most populated area in region, how will bike lanes make a difference, people are trying to find parking, they’re not biking. Seems like goal is to make it easier for people to bike through rather than make it easier for people who live here to park. Don’t see how this will help businesses, they don’t bike to local businesses, there are garages and restaurants. If some is time limited, will people have to feed the meter? This seems more complicated than necessary. Where is the additional off-street parking? Do people on committee live in the area and have to park a car? How much total taxpayer money is spent on these plans?
* Sarah Sciortino, lives on School Street, as biker feels unsafe and has to dodge cars due to lack of bike infrastructure, which is part of sustainable community and equity. Knows too many people who don’t bike out of fear because there aren’t enough bike lanes. She’s been in bike accident in that area so it would be useful to have bike lane.
* Dan Castrigana, Ward 4 resident, remove as much on street parking as possible to address climate crisis, became a father last year, works for non-profit doing climate education, largest GHG emissions come from cars so need to get more off the road. Bike lanes would make North Winooski Ave safer, more equitable transportation system for those who can’t afford to own a car, would be quieter, less air pollution. Remove as much parking as possible, as quickly as possible.
* Beth Sightler, lives on Winooski Ave, appreciate recommendation to phase plan and wait on changes to lower blocks. Concerned about what will happen when people have to move their cars, the need to talk about transit and more multimodal transportation, appreciates better outreach to businesses and social service agencies on Winooski Ave, she’s on the CHC board and this is the second time she’s missed the board meeting to join this meeting, she’s concerned about access to social services, doesn’t seem clear that there would be good access to social services in the upper blocks, doesn’t seem like there’s been options secured for parking in north part of corridor, can’t support plan even with recent compromises, important for her to know that plan will meet the needs of walkers, bikers, people with physical disabilities, residents and those who need to access businesses and services. I work in disability services for 30 years, so many people didn’t know what was happening on our street despite being told there were many opportunities to be involved. What would have happened if we wouldn’t have spoken up, why weren’t people in corridor invited to participate, understands that people are frustrated that this has taken a long time and desire for action, appreciates DPW memo about decision to phase, feels like plan didn’t get participation and buy in from people on corridor. Agree that biking corridor is important and wanted, but decision to change street didn’t get input from businesses and residents. Ask to pause whole plan and to come up with solutions together.
* Jason Stuffle, Colchester Ave resident, parking removed there, in front of his house, made roadway safer for emergency vehicles, people had to change their habits, to move forward with using right of way differently, we have to make a change, encourage everyone to vote in favor, it won’t be perfect but is a start, you rarely park right in front of where you are going, he bikes to Old Spokes and Taco Gordo, removing parking will be a little hard but like Colchester Ave will work.
* Jean Bessette, respond to previous person, is also a biker, roads in city have different uses and North Winooski Ave has two sides of densely populated apartment buildings, people walk, bike, drive but removing parking says we can’t own cars. Agree with fighting climate change but not on the backs of vulnerable people. Burlington isn’t like Amsterdam and other places, we don’t have the other types of transportation infrastructure, still need a car here to get around. We’re not being greedy, we just live in an old place where infrastructure for cars isn’t there so already paved locations for parking are vital. She’s a biker and has felt unsafe but more due to lack of maintenance, potholes, street not plowed to curb. Crashes occur at the intersections, not in the roadway, which is why mini roundabouts were proposed. Still concerned about businesses and residents north of her. If goal is connected bike infrastructure then why is phase 2 necessary?
* Liz Curry thanked Chapin and committee for listening and stopping process that was in play and turning attention to people bringing concerns, shows what’s possible when the city includes the voices of neighbors but echoes how hard it was to get attention after the 2020 resolution passed. She’s white, middle class, educated, able bodied, privileged, can bike, we all want safe bike infrastructure, we want to solve climate crisis, I see people with power and privilege not remembering that we have systems of inequality and that people are invisible because of color skin or not safe to show up, or they use a wheelchair, and safety means something different for people of color, in wheelchairs, LGBTQ, and how far you have to park from where you’re, and if you’re a black person circling the block, so when people are talking about safety we have to remember our privilege and check that. We’re not like Oslo and having subsidized transportation, it’s not who we are, just like white people created racism, the auto industry and land use planners created the spacial jobs mismatch and a transportation system that doesn’t work, we have a capitalistic system that doesn’t subsidize public transit, we’re all a part of that, just because people use cars doesn’t mean that have to bear the burden to solve the climate crisis, when you blame cars you’re blaming people, and the people in this neighborhood have the least resources to address the climate crisis, and a just transition recognizes that, so asks the committee to adopt the principles of a just transition process so that the people who are most impacted by the change are the people who should not be left out of the process or solution. I appreciate you slowing down and I think it’s going in the right direction, it’s a shame Pat Bannerman had to go on the news to get attention, she should have been talked to first, but she’ll probably be fine if customers park on the west side, but she’ll be competing with cars from the new Richard Kemp Center, Pho Hong, low income tenants in brightly colored houses, some of whom have hidden disabilities, all those people in the block which is the downtown of the ONE, there should be no change until there are signed agreements with CHC and Outright and Legal Aid to reduce competition. And there should be parity across the city, there’s free one and two hour parking near Dealer, Dedalus, I’m against meters here, there should be parking parity and people in a poor neighborhood shouldn’t be charged. There’s only one ADA space, there needs to be more on west side.
* Jeff McKee, CEO of CHCB, resident, enthusiastic supporter of goals of the city’s initiative to support environment, healthy communities, bike friendly, we love the concept and will support when possible but can’t support current proposal to remove parking near us because will have direct and significant impact on most vulnerable of community who live, work, visit ONE. What’s proposed isn’t parking management but rather parking reduction plan with the hope that solutions will emerge. We’re pleased city has reached out recently to find parking solutions but parking options won’t happen anytime soon. If and when parking solutions emerge, the idea that a non-profit such as ours can make a large capital or operational investment is entirely unreasonable. We’re struggling to find staff, can’t keep pace with wages, any funds spent on parking is wages that doesn’t go to staff. We’re confident we can find solution with city but this proposal harms staff, organization, community, neighbors. When parking is lost or converted to time limited, staff will scramble for all day parking within a 10 minute walk from here. Soutions haven’t been found and vetted, they won’t have a choice. While phasing is designed to lower the impact on neighbors, it will have the opposite effect. We want to reduce our parking footprint and reduce dependency on street parking but can’t get that done this summer, need more time, need city support to work with neighbors to find balanced plan.
* Thomas Pashby asks if this plan is socially just, and how we can look at that is who stands to benefit and who stands to be hurt. Benefit are those who commute by bike downtown, people who own homes further afield, and those hurt are local residents, renters, small business owners. If you look at what’s happening to neighbors as a whole, this plan will enhance forces of gentrification, will force out renters, small business owners, some of whom are immigrants, people of color, plan isn’t socially just, progressives should be concerned by that. Seems to be the idea that all that stand between Burlington and other countries is that we don’t have enough bike paths, but climate, transit is different, we can’t get to rest of state without a car, we’re not going to get there by building bike paths
* Sandy with 350 VT, urge to approve some version of the plan, sounds like there might need to be some changes but need to move forward in general. Shared use paths are dangerous for people walking so bike lanes should be for bikes only. Are there places closer to home that could give examples rather than the Netherlands, maybe there’s a town closer to us as an example. What will people without cars going to do?

1. **Discuss Draft PMP Report and Recommendations​**

* Available on the project website: [bit.ly/WinAvePMP](https://www.ccrpcvt.org/our-work/transportation/current-projects/technical-assistance/north-winooski-avenue-parking-management-plan/)
* Chapin notes that Councilor Stromberg and Kelly Duggan have joined. He asked if it would be friendly to address some public comments, the committee agreed:
  + Lee asked about Phase 2, there is no firm plan for phase 2 at this point. Allow phase 1 to function and try out the scenario, secure other funding, and other considerations to help guide phase 2.
  + Alec W asked if all spaces would be time limited and metered. Some would be metered between Grant and North, some time limited parking sprinkled throughout, with resident access evenings, overnight, weekends. He also asked if there is proposed off street parking, none is secured at this time but still talking to property owners in phase 1 area.
  + Jean asked why is phase 2 needed. Phase 1 allows us to evaluate if phase 2 needed. Plan BVT Walk Bike recommended continuous facility.
  + Thomas asked if this plan is socially just. Note that the plan includes some information and discussion, this is a complex issue with a lot of variables.
* Kirsten likes to bike, isn’t against bike lanes, is concerned about parking removal without addressing essential parking needs of social service providers, small businesses, residents who don’t have a choice to ride bikes. She also works for Champlain Housing Trust (CHT) and shared data on their residents’ income, are considered housing burdened, income burdened, don’t have access to resources that many of us do. She also provided data on resident race and number of people in households, some of which have four or more people, so having a vehicle may be necessary, using bikes to transport a family isn’t an easy task. Report includes racial equity data but also need to consider economic equity. A lot of social services located on corridor because there was a density of population with need, and opportunity to bring services closer to people, make them more accessible. Even in phase 1 approach still hear that there will be impacts, don’t see in report acknowledgement of this impact, executive summary doesn’t mention impacts to social services that have been brought up by various entities such as Outright, Children’s’ Space, CHC, Feeding Chittenden, Pathways. During pandemic these entities have seen the need for services grow, but it’s not noted in the report. CHC is mentioned on one page but other entities on the block aren’t mentioned, so asks the team to include that when finalizing the report. I think the equity analysis misses some of the things that I think about, equity is everyone has access, the need to balance all modes. Director Spencer has worked to reach entities listed in the memo, 6 aren’t open to off-street shared parking, 2 aren’t confirmed, that’s a concern. Chapin notes he’s still talking to 3, appreciates comment. Kirsten interested in outreach to 9 businesses that sent letters and residents that signed the petition, what were the results, was it mixed feedback? Nicole says yes it was mixed, of the 9 businesses we reached out to, we spoke with 7 of them, 3 were still concerned, 2 were neutral, 1 said thanks but didn’t have more feedback, 2 we haven’t connected with yet.
* Councilor Hanson says there was something mentioned in comment that we haven’t addressed is car ownership rate of people who responded to survey. How are we weighing the feedback of people who don’t own cars in the neighborhood, how is that being represented. Jonathan replied that as we’ve seen, there are impacts to removing parking, we’re not trying to replace it, we’re trying to meet the needs of residents and businesses and believe we’ve done that in an accurate way. We have public census data that helps us understand number of households in census tracts that may be living without a vehicle, and we’re trying to understand the travel behavior that occurs along the corridor. This area has some of the highest percentage of households living without a vehicle in the state, along with Winooski and perhaps in Barre. Survey was conducted in a way to represent the census characteristics of the residents, so is confident that we are representing the average vehicle ownership rates appropriately. He believes that the way the data shows who lives in the area, how they travel, how they get to work, is represented accurately from professional point of view. Councilor Hanson said thanks, this is helpful and feels like those people without cars tend to be undercounted. The framing around this has been that it’s good for climate, safety, but it’s inherently going to harm people’s ability to get around, normal people’s ability, I think we’ve created a narrative that we’ve discounted the fact that some people get around without a car and that this will make it easier for them to get around.
* Kirsten appreciates use of the data but there’s a level of granularity that’s missing. Talked to Kelly Duggan about ONE Mobility Audit, which identified desire for better sidewalks, better snow removal, having my own car, bike lanes, crosswalks and other things that should be informing what we’re thinking about here.
* Councilor Barlow is encouraged by where we are tonight, I don’t think we have a totally workable solution but we’re closer, appreciate Director Spencer’s outreach and trying to find parking options. A commenter questioned if this is phase 1, or if this is the solution, if we can figure out parking then maybe this is suitable bike infrastructure. I’m hoping we can still work on finding off street parking before we decide to move forward. Encouraged by work done and supportive of proposal.
* Charlie feels similar to Mark, appreciates work done since last meeting and pivot in direction, shows consideration of concerns raised. Also echos comment hearing frustration about delay in project, this is working class neighborhood so as we get closer to implementation we’ll hear from more people so need more patience. I own a business on Winooski Ave but this doesn’t really bother me, we have young clientele, we have bike racks, we participate in bicycle benefits, the potential of a bike lane that goes from Winooski into downtown is exciting, I see that opposing this would pose a greater risk to my business than putting in the bike lane. The CHC Feeding Chittenden, Legal Aid, others on the corridor, if this happens and we inhibits them in any way, then this is a failure. Hearing Jeff from CHC talk about impacts to staff, people served, the community, that struck me, and we’re hearing it from others as well. It’s tough. Hearing him say that engagement with CHC seems to have happened late in process, I wish there was a way to engage these organizations to manage parking before changes are made, they can’t build a parking structure, these are non-profits with tight budgets, incredibly important organizations, would be great to find parking solutions before this goes forward.
* Councilor Stromberg likes the way Charles put it but would like to see it move forward, there are certain people and groups that are hearing this late and we should engage with them responsibly going forward, but I do think that residents and business owners, we’ve heard a lot of feedback from people who are open to this, if we continue to wait on progress and making changes, I don’t think we’re going to going to get as accurate as feedback as if we were to start it and engage further as it’s started. Hears that if we impede these incredible organizations, that would be cause for concern, discussion, changes but I think we’re just speculating going forward if we don’t actually try. I’d like to see us move forward as planned. I’m open to northbound on Union, southbound on Winooski Ave, might have more questions but happy to hear from others.
* Maxwell likes the effort to get more comments and agrees with Jane that this is a leap of faith and requires some action to kick off the change, the longer we deliberate there will always be a faction that doesn’t agree, but if we start this, and thanks Director Spencer for proposing phased approach, then more people will learn to adapt and in future those bueinsses and people that need parking more than others can be prioritized and finding options for them in phase 2. I like the phased approach and think we should move forward.
* Kelly appreciates hearing the public comments, likes that bikers voiced opinions today. Wish there had been more engagement with non-profits during this project but know that this has been going on for like five years so there has been some engagement, there needs to be some action to see what’s going to happen, we can talk about it but we won’t know what happens until we do something. To talk about representation and the ONE mobility audit again, we found that 30% of people we spoke to didn’t have access to a car, they said it would be important to have better sidewalk infrastructure, they said it would be easier for them if they had access to a car, I think that’s a reflection of how Burlington caters to the car culture, any move we can make towards pedestrian infrastructure would be better in my opinion, would also like to see sidewalk improvements in future projects.
* Councilor Hanson agree with Jane and Max and Kelly that we’re deep into the process over last 4 ½ years, we’ve heard a lot of feedback and need to move forward, and process doesn’t end here, it goes to Council and DPW Commission.
* Kirsten would like to see public comments and petitions included in appendix, and report should note that there will be impacts to businesses and non-profits, there needs to be understanding that committee members have a choice at this juncture. Jonathan says we have been receiving them up to this meeting and will public a full set soon.
* Councilor Barlow responds to “leap of faith” comment, we’re really close and there’s progress being made, but it would be irresponsible to move ahead knowing there are impacts, and be OK with that or find solutions.
* Charles echoes Mark, not terribly comfortable with leap of faith either, we have CHC rep, and yes neighborhood will adapt if change is implemented. CHC provides essential services, particularly to low income, seems like we’re not taking it seriously enough, doesn’t sit right with me, we’re not talking about my restaurant, or a house full of college kids, but rather a health center that provides services to those who need it. We’re not speculating about the impacts, we’re hearing from them how it will impact them. I don’t know it’s being taken seriously.
* Kirsten asked can we clarify timeline for work not in phase 1, and what is process to trigger phase 2, and what will be engagement? Chapin said he hasn’t worked with council yet but concept is to implement phase 1 in near term, have a chance to see what works and what doesn’t, phase 1 is timely because of VTrans paving project, relieves timeline pressure, then can work with council and community on timeline for phase 2, there’s no plan or timeline at this point, thought an incremental approach would be better at this point based on comments and concerns heard. Nicole notes process going forward would likely involve council again then would go to DPW commission, there would be public engagement again before phase 2. Kirsten said engagement would be at those meetings, so how would people know about it? Chapin says process outlined by Nicole is the required process, I expect we would have other public meetings before commission or others make a decision. Nicole adds this wouldn’t be a staff decision. Kirsten asked then why is phase 2 in the PMP? Nicole replied because the 2020 resolution includes the whole corridor.

1. **Public Comment Period​**

* Alec W notes that someone asked if there would be metered or unregulated parking? Chapin says no meters in phase 1. Alec asked where can I find source of stats noted in ONE? Jonthan said most comes from the census and are included in the report. Are there similar projects proposed and implemented? Nicole says yes and can follow up after meeting. Alec says if people are worried about biker safety, imagine the same number of people looking for parking, doesn’t seem to make any sense. People would be pulling into the bike lane, that’s unsafe.
* Liz says Alec’s question was hers, refers to footnote on page 33, but when you open link, it contradicts data in report. How do you reconcile that data? Also wanted to say that whatever you’re going to pass, please include baselines like cars parked on side streets, and include other key performance indicators for council, how impact will be measured, like immigrant owned, include parking parity with Pine Street, add ADA spaces.
* Randy echoes appreciation to committee and work put into this. Think locally as possible, be concerned about those in our city, we’re not against bike lanes, we shouldn’t put by the wayside other key issues like affordable rents. We have a commitment to BIPOC. Want to maintain the vitality of our city. Jack mentioned that we should be moving forward and there’s been plenty of input, but most has been in last few months or weeks, not past 4 years.
* Jason said this isn’t a new study, he was involved in early 2000s and we’re still talking about the same thing, making the streets calmer and slower, this is a positive thing that transforms neighborhood, hard to see years down the road, we won’t get very far if we only think about cars.

1. **Action: Approve Parking Management Plan Strategies​**

* Kirsten said she prepared two motions, and after listening and trying to meet people where they are on each side, offered this motion:

Text, letter

Description automatically generated

* Kirsten see this as an interim solution, I feel like the city should pursue additional resources to address the corridor, from sidewalks to stormwater, all of the modes.
* Seconded by Councilor Barlow.
* Charlie likes the idea of more time for engagement, particularly for nonprofit service providers. Also acknowledges frustration of slowing down process.
* Councilor Barlow also supports slowing down a little bit but doesn’t think that slowing down isn’t incompatible with a way to get it done with VTrans paving projects. Not sure how far along conversations with potential off-street parking options are. Supportive of a pause.
* Councilor Hanson doesn’t support this, comment from Jason says first study was in 2000, goes to earlier conversation about speculation of impacts but nobody knows, what I’ve seen with these projects in Burlington and other places, they’ve made dramatic changes in short time and after implemented they were supported. In Burlington too, like Colchester Ave and North Ave, they’re always controversial and concerns about impacts and access, but for projects I’ve seen implement in Burlington and elsewhere have proven to be effective and improved safety, access, climate, equity, haven’t seen need to reverse decision. At this point we need to decide, we’ll never know the impacts unless we move ahead. Public input hasn’t just started, I’ve bene to meetings with 100 people, and worked with UVM students that surveyed entire Winooski Ave in support of this, with testimonials of people injured on the corridor, at the end of the day it’s a debate of what’s the status quo and speculating about impacts. We are in climate emergency and need to change our transportation infrastructure. I think we should move forward and not pause.
* Kelly says with this motion I’m wondering about the capacity of RSG and CCRPC to go more in depth into engagement, also capacity for committee to be able to have input if motion carries. Also wondering about pilot projects like downtown that became permanent, wondering if pilot would be better compromise. Nicole says too early to know how it would unfold, if it would be city led effort, would need to be other conversations. As for pilots the city has a history of them so could be possible.
* Charlie is open to pilot. Could there be painted bike lane, keep the parking, like in front of Barrio? Nicole says there isn’t enough room for bike lane without removing parking. Jonathan says there are no proposed changes between North and Union/Decatur because the roadway is wide enough to add bike lanes without removing parking, but blocks north aren’t wide enough to do that.
* Kirsten asks if Kelly’s idea for a pilot could be an amendment that we consider amongst other options, that over the summer there be a pilot of a bike lane, get some data on impacts to parking. Not sure if that aligns with paving project. I’m open to an amenable change. Nicole says too many unknowns with a pilot to put a schedule on it so don’t worry about thinking about the extra details if we decide to go that route. Kelly said yes, she would be more comfortable with a pilot as part of the motion.
* Councilor Hanson asks how would pilot lane concept be compatible with motion since it says not to remove parking. Kirsten says pause permanent removal of parking to give DPW time to work on parking options, transit improvements, DPW has done these pilots around the city, they seem like they’re 8-10 weeks long or so, that could be added as a bullet, a temporary pilot. Nicole asks to be open about timing, city will need flexibility to adjust to changes.
* Counselor Barlow likes pilot idea, to minimize impacts to organizations on corridor is to collaborate with them to limit undue impacts. Needs to better understand impacts but they will be real. Could be minimal or significant.
* Nicole says we can vote on motion as is, see what happens, then vote on amended version if needed.
* Jonathan notes that pilot is short term, takes time for parking changes to impact people’s behavior so need to be sensitive that pilot needs to go on long enough to understand potential impacts and changes. Nicole emphasizes that we can’t put a time frame on it right now.
* Councilor Hanson doesn’t feel comfortable with the motion, having been involved in the project for years, the committee was tasked with developing the PMP and voting, but if committee feels that the PMP isn’t good, then we can take that vote, but previous Winooski Avenue committee approved plan unanimously, doesn’t make sense at final stage for this committee to make dramatic changes to the project itself, we should express where we’re at with the PMP that we were tasked with dealing with, and if we say we don’t like it then that’s fine, but changing the the overall project isn’t the role of the committee so I can’t support this.
* Nicole says this adds a layer of complexity, there are two pieces that we’re trying to coordinate but also keep separate, the PMP which the committee was tasked with, and the bike lanes which we’re trying to move forward separately but is related to this, tricky to weave through recommendations from this committee that impact both of them. I suggest we take a vote on original motion unless there are clear amendments from Kirsten or Councilor Barlow, otherwise I’ll come back with other things that might be friendly to the PMP process.
* Maxwell comment on the pilot, there are a few limitations there, in taking steps of phase 1 it will force us to look at off street options, putting a plan in action will set these other motions in place to find alternatives. I support voting on original PMP.
* Mark is vote with pilot? I’ll assume it’s in.
* Nicole asks for vote on the motion with pilot added:

Motion: The N. Winooski Avenue Parking Management Plan Steering Committee finds that the plan fails to meet essential parking needs for residents, business and service providers and makes the following recommendation to the Public Works Commission and City Council:

• Pause the permanent removal of parking.

• During the pause, the Public Works shall work with small businesses and service providers on TDM before removing parking. This shall include:

• Signed agreements for shared off street parking to mitigate the loss of parking for residents, business and service providers.

• Make improvements to transit – service 15 minute headways, routes and shelters along N. Winooski Avenue before removing parking

Pilot a temporary bike lane on N. Winooski Avenue between Union and Riverside to be developed by DPW to better understand impacts

• After the above effort, Public Works should present a new Parking Management Plan developed through a collaborative effort with the low-income and immigrant-owned businesses, social service agencies, and tenants that provides a comprehensive solution to the public for review and comment.

• During the pause, the City should take advantage of the state repaving as interim steps during this pause to add sharrows, improve crosswalks, post speed limit of 25mph and signs like above before removing parking.

Vote:

Councilor Barlow – Yes

Councilor Hanson – No

Councilor Stromberg – No. Doesn’t feel like this is in the scope of what we’re tasked with. Nicole says this gives DPW permission to go to council and commission to say we don’t have PMP.

Charlie – Yes

Kelly – Yes with pilot

Kirsten – Yes

Maxwell – No

Motion passes. Directs DPW to do a pilot without PMP strategies presented because they weren’t approved. Kirsten says motion has some strategies like working to find parking. Nicole notes transit probably won’t happen but Kirsten says we can keep pushing on it.

Councilor Barlow clarifies that this doesn’t scuttle everything, Nicole says we’ll take a closer look at what was passed.

1. **Next steps**

* DPW to review motion and determine appropriate next steps.

------------------------------------------------------------

**Zoom Chat log**

From Melinda to All Panelists 05:53 PM

Hi

From Me to Everyone 05:54 PM

thanks for joining. we'll start soon.

From Jason S. to Everyone 06:01 PM

Delayed opening, perhaps?

From matthewpeterson to All Panelists 06:02 PM

Hey chuck

From Jack Hanson to Everyone 06:04 PM

I'm on the attendee side

From Me to Everyone 06:04 PM

project website with materials: bit.ly/WinAvePMP

From Krista to Everyone 06:46 PM

Alec, As an ONE resident who works downtown, I have often ridden my bike from Union to Archibald along North Winooski Ave. It only takes a moment, so it would be easy to miss. If in fact there aren't a lot of cyclists using that stretch, it may be because the infrastructure doesn't feel safe enough...yet :)

From Jason S. to Everyone 06:49 PM

Bikers do patronize the businesses on that corridor. Personally, I bike to Taco Gordo, I bike to Barrio, and Jake's has a bike rack. N. Winooski Ave. connects the bike lanes on N. Union and Riveside.

From AW to All Panelists 06:55 PM

Krista - do you feel that stretch is unsafe currently?

From AW to All Panelists 07:03 PM

Jason - I wasn’t trying to suggest bikers don’t patronize the businesses in the areas at all. That is your choice to do that. However, what do you think is more crucial - people casually picking up food or groceries on a bike? Or people who live here having a place to park near their home?

From AW to All Panelists 07:12 PM

To all, if people had the choice whether to work within walking/biking distance to their home, I’m sure almost everyone would take it. That is clearly not the case for the vast majority of us. This proposal seems to not only be a solution to a problem that doesn’t exist, but undoubtedly will make life more difficult for the vast majority of people who live here and don’t have that choice.

From Kelly Duggan to Everyone 07:17 PM

Sandy, Montreal has a pretty robust and well-maintained bike lane network, a better model in terms of being close to home!

From Liz Curry she/her to Everyone 07:18 PM

Montreal also has wide boulevards, a robust public transit system, and a ton more jobs in the City than Burlington

From Leee A to Everyone 07:19 PM

Really well spoken everyone.

From Randy to Everyone 07:25 PM

Thanks for speaking Lee!

From Michael Arnold to All Panelists 07:31 PM

Coming in late, apologies. Wanted to check if the panelists had addressed concerns that the outreach survey underrepresented non-car owning householder by 300% to 600%. If not, what is being done to make sure the interests of the 30+% households who don’t own a car in the corridor are properly represented?

From Jean Bessette to Everyone 07:32 PM

We should note that 12 businesses did sign a petition expressing concern though.

From steph pappas to Everyone 07:32 PM

EVERYONE signed the petition Barrio on down to Pearl,,FYI

From Randy to Everyone 07:38 PM

Johnathan is depending on inaccurate data regarding HH's without cars. Many young professionals and students with multiple cars. Census numbers typically do not accurately track this more transient population. The same data map shows downtown Church St. HH's as having a higher car ownership.

From Jean Bessette to Everyone 07:49 PM

I hope we won’t force our vital services to risk themselves and vulnerable constituents in an experiment.

From Michael Arnold to All Panelists 07:49 PM

Since we’re worried about reduced access to services on the corridor, has increased transit service on the corridor been considered? Route 9 is the only GMT urban route connecting two municipalities that doesn’t receive 20 minute frequencies.

From Liz Curry she/her to Everyone 07:50 PM

Just a reminder that there were no businesses that came out in support of this plan. 12 businesses, including Charlie and 6 immigrant-owned and low-income businesses signed letters opposing this plan

From Jean Bessette to Everyone 07:51 PM

Sidewalk infrastructure sounds great. We should absolutely invest in that.

From Beth Sightler to All Panelists 07:51 PM

Setting a process in motion when you know it will cause harm is irresponsible. It's not about "satisfaction" and it's insulting to say that people will "need to learn to adapt". You (we?) can pause, learn more and move ahead with better information and a parking plan and it will be even better than taking a "well let's just see what happens" approach.

From Liz Curry she/her to Everyone 07:52 PM

"Catering to car culture" dehumanizes people who are hostage of a capitalist auto-centric economy that land use planners created. We have people with power and wealth to arrange their lives around comfort and convenience at the expense of those whose lives just get made harder when privileged people decide they want something.

From Jeff McKee - CHCB to Everyone 07:55 PM

I am truly astonished that folks would take a "leap of faith" without addressing the highly predictable harm that action will cause .

From Michael Arnold to All Panelists 07:56 PM

Just for perspective, today Paris announce plans to ban cars in an area of 5.4 square miles, an same as banning cars from the south end of BTV to Winooski.

From Randy to Everyone 07:56 PM

Those committee members feeling that they should take a leap of faith would only make sense in the context of an unwillingness to admit the process has been flawed.

From Michael Arnold to All Panelists 08:05 PM

Yes! Why were parking protected bike lanes not considered?

charles sizemore to Michael Arnold, All Panelists 08:06 PM

They were. It was one of many possible alternatives but was not chosen by the council.

From Solveig to Everyone 08:09 PM

A big value of living in the Old North End is the ability to walk and bike to services. Car ownership is expensive. The mix of those living in the Old North End definitely might transition even more toward those who choose not to own or can't afford a car. A big reason the social services are in the Old North End is to make it possible for those they serve to access their services conveniently because the services are helpfully located in the neighborhood people live. They can walk. They don't have to take a cab or take a bus. Yes, the providers employees themselves might live outside the Old North End so are driving in to do their jobs. That is a challenge for them. Other large employers have had to implement off-site parking for employees when they grow to have oversized impact on neighborhood parking. The CHCB may need to consider future alternative options for their employees. People living here need to have safe streets for biking and walking, and safe intersections. Please implement Phase 1.

From Michael Arnold to All Panelists 08:13 PM

More people walk to work in the ONE than drive a car in most of the census block groups adjacent to N. Winooski.

From Jean Bessette to Everyone 08:13 PM

I don’t see how removing parking calms the streets or slows down traffic. Speed limits and speed bumps do. That’s not what is at issue here.

From Alec Whitman to All Panelists 08:16 PM

I’m also curious how much money the various studies/evaluations have totaled over the last 4-5 years

From steph pappas to Everyone 08:18 PM

Revisiting peoples ideas at past meetings has lots of solutions.. during the pause we can bring those ideas back to life...

From Michael Arnold to All Panelists 08:19 PM

Haven’t sharrows been shown to increase bike accident rates?

From Thomas Pashby to Everyone 08:25 PM

I don’t see how this is relevant. We have brought up concerns to the Old North End and specific to this plan. Yes, it is hard to reverse these projects once implemented. Going forward with the plan, even if it has been under discussion for some time, will result in foreseeable harm. These harms have been pointed out by those that will be affected.

From Michael Arnold to Everyone 08:25 PM

Thanks Councilor Hanson

From Solveig to Everyone 08:26 PM

Thank you Councilor Hanson.

From Liz Curry she/her to Everyone 08:28 PM

https://aoa.vermont.gov/sites/aoa/files/Boards/VCC/Guiding%20Principles%20for%20a%20Just%20Transition%20-%20Final%20Draft%20for%20Approval%208.2021.pdf

From Jean Bessette to Everyone 08:28 PM

It would be great to have access to Councilor Hanson’s study that he references. It is not available to the public or in any reports.

From Randy to Everyone 08:28 PM

Weren't there supposed to be pilot projects? That and wayfaring to the Union St. bike lane. I don't think either of those happened.

From Chapin Spencer to All Panelists 08:29 PM

Thank to everyone for your participation tonight. I am sorry I have to put my daughter to bed. Nicole and team will continue to stay on. Stay dry out there tonight!

From Liz Curry she/her to Everyone 08:29 PM

"Examples include delivering electric car sharingschemes to low-income neighbourhoods, increasingportions of zero- or low-carbon social housing,committing to a just transition by workingwith unions to set green job targets, involvinginformal waste pickers in landfill refurbishmentor increasing resilience of informal settlementsand slum dwellings. The ambitious climate actiondemanded by the Paris Agreement will not deliverthe maximum positive impacts unless it is inclusiveof all citizens and distributes resources and benefitsequitably. Delivering on the Paris Agreement thuspresents a unique opportunity to create a more justurban society, with new protections for those thathave been historically marginalised and with betterjobs, improved health and better air quality for all."

From Chapin Spencer to Everyone 08:29 PM

Thank to everyone for your participation tonight. I am sorry I have to put my daughter to bed. Nicole and team will continue to stay on. Stay dry out there tonight!

From Liz Curry she/her to Everyone 08:30 PM

Thank you Chapin!

From janeknodell to All Panelists 08:30 PM

If the City can do some focused work around identifying solutions for problems and harm we know will result from removing this many on street spaces, why wouldn’t we do that? This is far different from removing a handful of spaces on Colchester Avenue, for example.

From Thomas Pashby to Everyone 08:30 PM

This is very interesting, Liz. I think the plan does not obey these principles

From Liz Curry she/her to Everyone 08:31 PM

"Processes are rooted in genuine engagementwith a broad and diverse set of stakeholders,particularly those suffering from inequalityand the impacts of climate change.Policies are actively designed with people,fairness and justice at the centre of decisionmaking.

Clear mechanisms exist—or can be put

in place—for measuring, monitoring and

evaluating both the direct impacts and the

distribution of impacts of climate actions

across the population."

From Jean Bessette to Everyone 08:34 PM

What do people do with their cars in the meantime while the pilot proceeds?

From Beth Sightler to Everyone 08:34 PM

I get that many people want two bike lanes on Winooski corridor, and that can still happen if we (?) do the work first instead of just kind of hoping it will work because some people want it to happen right now. The real goal is to make it work, not just to force it through.

From Jean Bessette to Everyone 08:36 PM

A pilot will throw people into crisis. For your test period.

From Michael Arnold to All Panelists 08:38 PM

Do we have an idea of how many people will be injured in crashes without removing parking for safe dedicated space? Could the city allocate funds to cover their medical expenses while we wait?

From Alec Whitman to All Panelists 08:39 PM

I would remind everyone, particularly Councilor Hanson, of the massive planters that were installed during the restructuring of S. Winooski by City Market last year. While their inclusion may have been well-intended, they were clearly unsafe, unnecessary, and were quickly removed.

From Thomas Pashby to Everyone 08:39 PM

The council approved this process, not the plan

From Liz Curry she/her to Everyone 08:41 PM

The Resolutions says the Committee should "identify practical strategies..." A pilot can be a practical strategy

In fact, the Resolutions uses examples like "pilots or demonstrations of mini-roundabouts or other strategies for improving multimodal"

From Randy to Everyone 08:42 PM

Exactly, Tom. To see if they could develop a plan that managed the loss of parking. That has not been accomplished. Progress lately, yes. But only the beginning on genuine public participation by stakeholders.

From Liz Curry she/her to Everyone 08:45 PM

This is the City Council Resolution, "NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that interim improvements are to be completed in 2020 to include a Parking Management Plan for North Winooski Avenue that identifies practical strategies for balancing parking supply and demand north of Pearl Street, with the goal of meeting essential parking needs while freeing up space for dedicated bike lanes , PILOTS or demonstrations of mini-roundabouts or other strategies for improving multimodal safety and performance at key intersections on North Winooski A venue,

From Jean Bessette to Everyone 08:48 PM

Wait, so we’ve voted for a pilot without any strategies?

From Liz Curry she/her to Everyone 08:49 PM

There are plenty of strategies available

And yes, it will require more time, because this neighborhood is that important that it should have more time invested.

Go slow, go together. Go fast, go alone

###