



DATE: November 17, 2015

SUBJECT: Burlington Residential Parking Management Plan: Advisory Committee Meeting #5

Attendees: Chapin Spencer (DPW Director), Nicole Losch (DPW), Jim Barr (Public Works Commission / UVM), Emily Lee (Planning Commission / Ward 8), Abby Mattera (Ward 5), Charles Simpson (Ward 6), Meagan Tuttle (Department of Planning & Zoning), Tony Redington (Ward 2/3), Richard Hillyard (Ward 1), Caryn Long (Ward 1), Peter Keating (CCRPC), Clare Wool (Ward 6), Adam Roof (City Council, Ward 8), Jane Knodell (City Council President, Central District), residents Liz Curry, Barbara Headrick, Jonathan, Michael, Molly Walsh (Seven Days), Public Works Commissioners Tiki Archambeau and Tom Simon

Chapin Spencer, DPW Director, summarized process since last Committee meeting and upcoming schedule, preparing for December Public Works Commission meeting. Asked Committee for comments on November 13, 2015 draft plan and on revisions since October.

Comments from Advisory Committee

Charles Simpson, Ward 6: thanked Chapin and Nicole for updates. Sustainable Transportations section needs work: Pg. 59 encourages closing UVM bus routes through campus and instead circulate outside of campus, instead it should identify remote lots on Colchester Ave, Main Street, 189 exit, Lakeside Ave.; UVM's South Prospect shuttle duplicates other buses; Lakeside Ave lot may be compromised by Champlain Parkway and should be addressed. Applauds discussion of in-lieu fees for developers to fund satellite lots instead of on-site parking but needs to be more specific. Still need a clear statement that metered parking isn't to be applied in residential neighborhoods. Still need to avoid UVM building parking structures adjacent to residential neighborhoods. South Prospect should have parking on one side and bike lane, with resident only parking on west side. LPR should be eliminated – large investment, winter presents challenges for enforcement and handicapped parking; too complicated. (written comments provided at meeting)

Tony Redington, Ward 2/3: TDM section and buses – TDM talks about city employees but Burlington School District isn't included and doesn't recognize how many employees and students drive at BHS. Question: how can parking be repurposed for other projects? Does it take place with the other projects? Primary concern is for arterials.

Chapin: plan does address mention process as it relates to other plans – planBTV Walk Bike will dictate where we will have those conversations

Richard Hillyard, Ward 1: regret that there isn't a greater onus for institutions in this plan. They should participate more in satellite parking – needs to be more specific and in JIPMP. Appreciates and respects work done to date, significant change in tone and collaboration between City and Committee, residents. Felt trust had been abused 3 weeks ago but have taken steps to mitigate this and is grateful. However, where does the city

stand to make tactical changes not reflected in plan: how will the public be notified if meters and new RPP is established? One size doesn't fit all, so areas like East Avenue have different issues and needs than Prospect and Maple.

Caryn Long, Ward 1 alternate: Plan doesn't address root of the problem which allows unlimited bedrooms in rental properties without review. Thought this was what this parking study would be about. Suggests block-by-block review of residential development and bring non-complying units into compliance. More enforcement won't really help. Pg. 18 assumes less car ownership but how can this be proved? Should be removed if data can't support it. Neighborhood Livability: worthy goal but what specific actions are being taken to achieve this? Doesn't want Henry Street to become a wall of cars and how is this plan preventing this. Is 85% still a goal? Many people don't like the idea of paying for permits – taxpayers pay for many things that aren't direct services (schools, library). Are costs to manage the program accurate? BPD isn't very efficient e.g. tenant had to return 4 times because new information is needed each time. Need to clarify what information is needed and make it available online. Efficiency would lower the city's costs. Meters: unfriendly for guests, even in the downtown. Downtown residents already have a very difficult time finding parking. Being told that downtown has excess parking doesn't match the reality for downtown residents. Instead of contractor permits why not just allow guest passes? Past practice was that contractors with their name on their truck wouldn't get a ticket. Can that just be kept? North Winooski new development charges a fee for parking. How was that allowed? Tenants are parking on the street and seniors can't access Multi-Gen Center. (written comments provided at meeting)

Chapin: 85% was in Commuter section, which has been removed. 85% threshold is still within DPW staff / Commission review and approval process to clarify how to initiate residential parking. Contractors could use guest passes or contractor pass – allows greater number of permits and for longer term. Will check with BPD about contractor policy, still could allow contractors commuting to park in neighborhoods. Developments that unbundle parking may benefit from management tools we are proposing to prevent tenants parking on street.

Emily: Planning Commission is working on how to address unlimited bedrooms in rental properties. For unbundled parking with new developments, paying for parking does change tenants behavior e.g. won't look for a second car, but unintended consequences may result. Whether fee is within rent or extra fee, tenants are paying for parking either way. This still allows unused parking to be rented to other users.

Richard: Bill Ward on Committee to respond to enforcement of bedroom issue?

Nicole: Bill is on the Committee and has received all communications but hasn't been able to make many meetings.

Emily Lee, Planning Commission / Ward 8: lives in high-density neighborhood. Allowing 4 permits per unit would allow too much parking. Many commuters, students, and renters park long term. Very high occupancy. If their street obtained RPP, YMCA and commuters couldn't park but the street would still have very high occupancy. For this type of neighborhood extra permits should be more expensive than UVM permit fees (e.g. YMCA rents spaces for \$100/mo so more than 1 permit should be \$100 / mo) and revenue could fund satellite parking. Meters: seems unfair to only consider neighborhoods near downtown when she would like to park on streets near campus to attend lectures, etc. – restricting parking in those neighborhoods doesn't only restrict students and employees but other residents.

Chapin: very valid perspective – different neighborhoods have different needs. Maybe different pricing for different neighborhoods? If RPP is merged with other tools e.g. time limits, could allow 2 hour time limit for public and still preserve options for neighborhood. Current system allows unlimited permits, so 4 permits would be a reduction of permits citywide.

Liz Curry, resident: engagement with institutions is critical. Reasonable to ask colleges to provide off-campus student addresses, charge their parking fees to city. Lives in Ward 3, densest part of the city: from a policy perspective to balance needs – “residents” includes all types of renters and low-income renters can’t afford meters during the day in high-density neighborhoods. For developers: if incentives are given to build fewer parking spaces and save development costs then they should put that saved money into a transportation fund.

Chapin: meters can be with or without RPP (also time limits, striping stalls, etc.) – reviewed proposed language from plan. Current system requires residents to pay for meters. Could constrain where meters go with sensitivity to low-income neighborhoods. Oakledge neighborhood example: moving to parking kiosks in parks. Meters will also require additional process with neighborhood and consideration by Commission.

Meagan Tuttle, Planning & Zoning Department: new to Committee and process – many recommendations are tools and process-related, which aren’t one-size-fits all approach. Should add references to other plans and policies E.g. Street Design Guide will review types of streets and what would be implemented on them.

Abby Mattera, Ward 5: as mostly homeowners on this Committee it’s easy to put the blame on renters but they also pay a lot to live in the city and are taxpayers. Some strategies could help discourage multiple vehicle ownership but also understand some situations require more vehicle ownership than others. Need to consider equity. Recognizes difficulty balancing competing needs in different neighborhoods. Likes context of higher fees for permits in different neighborhoods but what is the right number?

Chapin: permit costs above 1 permit have been made less expensive to respond to issues of equity. Very real concerns for low-income equity vs. management of high volume of parking.

Jim Barr, Public Works Commission / UVM: Chase Street resident surrounded by apartments – trouble understanding how 4 permits is going to be helpful. Doesn’t have a solution but it is a challenge. Is there a need for a transient renter to have 4 permits? Is it based on the definition of a dwelling? Satellite parking: Champlain and Medical Center do have satellite lots. Concern for requiring institutions or requiring landlords to have people park in other areas, how could that be enforced? UVM leases peripheral spaces to Medical Center and others.

Chapin: 1 community has issued permits by parcel but none have tried bedrooms.

Emily: use permit fees for satellite parking lot / system.

Barbara Headrick, resident: root of the problem is too many renters in buildings and too many permits in each building. Ithaca gives 2 permits for building and 4 per multi-unit building. // Plan doesn’t require use of satellite lots but “encourages.” Should be targeting more intercept lots – all employees, residential students, everyone. Satellite lots on campus but at the periphery creates students driving to those lots and then buses added to serve the students, which ends up degrading the neighborhood. Would like #1 goal / strategy to be getting commuter parking out of neighborhoods and into intercept lots. This actual metrics - # of lots, ID specific

locations, ID target deadline, include some type of enforcement if it isn't completed. // One-size doesn't fit all, should have a vote but multi-unit building should only have 1 vote so as not to overwhelm smaller properties. Votes should be within neighborhood and not Commission. Need more enforcement, could generate more revenue. // Permit fees for construction are too cheap (should be \$10/wk or \$60/mo). Redstone sells \$660 annual permits, which is double the UVM permits. Creates overflow on streets. // Pg. 60 "Install sustainable transportation facilities on main streets that go through neighborhoods." Very concerning phrase because not transparent – could be CNG buses which are not sustainable. Doesn't feel that bicycles need facilities. Also add language that UVM shouldn't create satellite parking in neighborhoods. Should strike "sustainable transportation" and replace with bike facilities, sidewalks, or active transportation. // LPR doesn't work in winter. // Meters should only be limited to downtown where residents know what they are moving into. // Thought permitting by area would be removed? DPW can change to area in 5 years after review, or if new request submitted can consider areas. Areas will help special interest groups and developers and should be deleted from report. // Cornell does collect vehicle info for everyone. Should include UVM map from their transportation plan pg. 84. // Pg. 33: Maple Street remains 30% occupied? Should remove commuter parking and just create a bike lane. // JIPMP says UVM wants to push traffic to streets surrounding campus and the parking plan shouldn't support this. "Close central campus to cars...satellite parking in peripheral areas." Jim clarified core would be pedestrianized and other parking is on campus. Plan can clarify intercept lots would be off campus. // Pg. 67 Work with institutions to explore access to shuttles. Should be...shuttles traveling between intercept lots and campus. // Corner lots: if homeowner should be able to choose side, except multi-unit should only park in front and not on side and shouldn't have more spots than they have building frontage on the street. // Some ideas should be presented in maps – meters, zones, etc.

Emily: supports zones.

Tiki Archambeau, Public Works Commission: process question – many suggestions for changes, what will be next?

Chapin: public comment through 24th. Taking all notes and making a final draft. Will take all ideas and try to distill the general sentiment for the final draft, posted online in early December, before Commission, then to Commission for action/deferral. Committed to successful completion, but completion. Many granular items will need Commission attention to implement.

Tom Simon, Public Works Commission: one problem: students all with cars on the streets for long periods of time. Trying to create disincentives by incremental permit fees, but maybe try Ithaca approach for parcel / unit with possible application for exception and hardship e.g. if residents have PT jobs outside of town. Who decides waiver? Commission?

Clare Wool, Ward 6: appreciates everyone's feedback and the change in tone. Room for growth in # of permits – likes concept of per parcel or per building. Landlords have gotten away with relying on streets. Is it environmentally responsible to fill street with cars? How do we ease streets to have fewer cars? Look to institutions, developments that don't require parking, Champlain growth has destroyed some streets. Institutions are still building in anticipation of large events in buildings, bringing more people to the city, but the city should be protecting their streets and neighborhoods. Pg. 59 "encourage" should be "implement"

Chapin: Councilors Knodell and Roof, the City is working through many issues beyond policy for parking. Could you address big picture negotiations with institutions?

Adam Room, City Council Ward 8: Institutions Committee is advising Mayor on direction for negotiations to go with institutions. Expect update within 2 weeks. In initial questions and meetings the Committee was very straightforward and clear about the need for institutions to take serious steps and partner with city on the issues brought up here and on housing implications. Will update FPF and City website for how negotiations are going.

Tony: thanked Chapin and Nicole for taking over process. UVM population is not growing. Champlain admissions capped. Traffic is leveling off. CarShare is expanding and showing reduced car ownership as a result. This Plan is happening while there is an opportunity to change pressures in neighborhoods where it may have been more difficult in the past. TDM and other options to help make parking available to residents.

Caryn: anything added for Bill Ward / John King to use residential permit to enforce no more than 4 unrelated? If 6 people live in an apartment, the RPP could prove it. Ithaca model could provide that information.

Chapin: will follow up with Bill Ward.

Charles: why LPR? Have functional system for handicapped hang tag, would be feasible for transferable passes.

Richard: is the plan finite or organic? To be reviewed regularly? It has come a long way and we will continue to learn as it is implemented. Suggests that if something is still in need of work, just remove it now and note to revisit it during review.

Chapin: Plan proposes 5 year review, will likely be in sections to make it more digestible.

Barbara: didn't understand proposal for public access for 2 hours to attend lectures.

Chapin: Olympia allows anyone to visit any RPP street for 2 hours once per day. Would require more process and review before that could be changed.

Chapin thanked everyone for their time and comments.