

RESIDENTIAL PARKING STUDY: PUBLIC INPUT AND CITY / CONSULTANT RESPONSE

DATE: October 16, 2015
SUBJECT: Burlington, VT Residential Parking Study: Response to Public Comments

The following comments were collected at the July 7th Advisory Committee meeting, the July 15th Public Works Commission meeting and other public input. The response and subsequent changes to the plan have been summarized in the second column.

Issue / Concern	Response
Report format was found to be confusing and long	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An executive summary was added to the beginning of the report to provide a quick summary of the strategies. • The recommendations (Chapter 5) have been renumbered to be in the order of implementation. • Strategies have been consolidated and rearranged where possible to improve readability.
Too many transferable permits could be acquired for each residential dwelling unit – putting more parking demand on residential streets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Current policy</u>: Each unit can get one permit for every registered vehicle of each resident (plus 2 guest passes) – allowing unlimited permits. A number of residential dwelling units (RDU) have 5-7 fixed permits plus 2 guest passes. • <u>Previous recommendation</u>: Maximum of four transferrable permits per RDU but not tied to registered vehicle – so potentially each RDU could get 4 permits even if they don’t have any vehicles. • <u>Current recommendation</u>: A fixed permit for up to 2 registered vehicles and 2 transferrable passes – resulting in a system that would not increase, and would almost certainly reduce, the number of permits per Residential Parking Program (RPP) zone compared to the current policy.

Theft / reproduction of transferrable permits	<p>Revised the recommendations to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit number of transferrable permits to 2 per unit – same number as today’s 2 guest passes. • Restate that new transferrable permits would have more sophisticated security features to significantly diminish chance of reproduction of transferable permits
Resale of transferrable of permits	<p>Today’s 2 guest passes per residential dwelling unit (RDU) are transferrable and have a liability of being sold and/or counterfeited. The current recommendation seeks to reduce that risk by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limiting number of transferrable permits to 2 per unit – same number as today’s 2 guest passes. • Using a holographic stamp on the transferable permit that cannot be copied. • Recommending ordinance language to specifically prohibit the resale of permits and have the penalty be the loss of all RPP privileges.
Size of each RPP area	<p>Revised the recommendations to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redefine potential RPP area to be a “small walkable area” to tighten the size of any future multi-street RPP areas. • State in the implementation section that this “not an enormous problem” and that “at this time, there is not a need to revise the existing geographic structure of the system.”
Paying for permits	<p>Maintained the recommendation to have a graduated fee scale for permits in place to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fund the efficiency and customer service upgrades to the program. • Reduce the number of permits issued to those that are actually needed.



Commuter permit pilot program	<p>Revised the recommendations to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define the time limit of the pilot to three years. • Further clarify language that this pilot would not be implemented in existing RPP areas unless requested by a majority of property owners in the area. • Commuter permits should not be issued in areas where Institutions are creating the demand for commuter permits.
Corner lot flexibility	<p>Revised the recommendations to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow property owners of corner lots only with different RPP areas on each adjacent street to choose which RPP street/area they want to be in. • Restate that corner lots other than those above be associated with their street address only.
Ithaca data in the report was thought to be incorrect	<p>Followed up with Ithaca to confirm data was correct. Wrote a follow up letter to the concerned resident.</p>
Missing language in report regarding sustainable transportation and the need to repurpose some streets for multi-modal travel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Sustainable Transportation Modes section mentions the many current and past studies devoted to sustainable parking. • Added language to say that sustainable transportation facilities may be more appropriate than parking on major corridors. • At this point, the report does not recommend removing RPP anywhere, and therefore does not recommend repurposing specific streets for multi-modal travel.
Language needed regarding how this plan addresses potential neighborhood impacts from downtown parking & transportation study recommendations	<p>Revised Chapter 5 to first describe “general management approaches” (increased penalties for lawn parking violations, striping parking stalls, implementing parking time limits, on-street meters).</p>



Strengthen lawn parking ban enforcement	The report summarizes current practices and recommends that the City continues to encourage parking in the garages during parking bans. BPD will consider raising the fine from \$75 to \$125.
More info on UVM's and other institutions' parking plans and how they are coordinated with City plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Institutions' plans, including JIPMP and the UVM Active Transportation Plan, are mentioned in both the Sustainable Transportation Modes section and the Satellite Parking section. • Commuter permits (Strategy #3) will assess commuter demand and not issue passes on streets where demand will come primarily from the Institutions. • However, a comprehensive review of these plans is beyond the scope of this study.
Include Exit 14 park and ride concept	The Intercept Facility is specifically mentioned in the Satellite Parking Section
Impact on lower income residents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategy #6 seeks to make the petition process more transparent and based on objective data. • Initial permit cost of \$10 is set to be affordable. • Strategies that specifically reduce impacts on lower income residents were not found in the best practices review.
Minimum on-site residential parking requirements were not directly relevant to this report.	The recommendations regarding on-site minimums have been removed from this report as a specific strategy. The on-site minimums will be addressed outside of the residential parking management plan.



