

**Montpelier in Motion  
Work Session 2 - Options  
October 2, 2014**

Attending: Jim Donovan, Bill Merrylees, Paul Carnahan, Eve Jacobs-Carnahan, Mike Miller, Hannah Reckhow, John Hollar, Mary Hooper, Carl Etnier, Zack Blodgett, Dona Bate, and others

6:30 PM Jim opened with a quick history of the Montpelier in Motion project and the goals of tonight's meeting

The Options report describes 6 types of options with 50+ different suggestions. Key question on each is whether we support the recommendation. Should it be changed or amended in any way.

Policies Options

There are 3 in the report. Winter maintenance is the first. Generally felt this is an important option. Paul Carnahan felt we should recommend prioritizing which sidewalks should get plowed first. Mary Hooper felt we have a lot of obstructions like parking meters in the way. Some changes to these could make maintenance faster.

City Road standards is second. Mike Miller pointed out we are applying for a grant to develop these standards.

Third is police policies regarding walking and biking. This would apply to regulating bikes and pedestrian but also drivers and how they interact with bikes and pedestrians.

A new policy was recommended after printing of the draft report. This new option recommends establishing an overall parking policy Eve recommends that the policy is good but it should further our bike and pedestrian plan. Bill Merrylees suggested looking for a specific number of spaces to remove. It was noted that rather than a specific number of spaces the plan could identify priority areas for removing parking. Mary Hooper suggested a transit policy as well.

Education Options

Bike smart walk smart programs should be kept going. Same with adult safe biking. There is a proposal to add public relations about safe biking. Paul Suggested doing with other communities. People liked the idea of rewarding good behavior.

Another option was to create a comprehensive website with laws, resources, maps, feedback. That option was not given much support because of the upkeep and whether a regional entity should be managing something and not the City.

It was felt that motorist education was not highlighted enough in the above education options.

Encouragement Options

There are seven encouragement options: creating outreach materials; continue and expand current events; develop a comprehensive demand management for parking (strong support from Mary Hooper); Free bike program (renamed earn a bike); Adopt a path; expanded bike racks on buses; think about mountain biking a transit and not just recreation.

These were all generally supported except for the earn-a-bike program which people felt needed a careful review, and adopt a path which people were skeptical of.

### Enforcement options

The enforcement options were only speed and crosswalk. Speed enforcement was mostly for traffic calming while the crosswalk enforcement may not be needed. For the most part drivers are respectful of the pedestrians in Montpelier.

### Engineering options

These are the meat of the discussions. What on the ground changes are being proposed? Pedestrian is focused on the gaps in sidewalks. People felt they wanted to look more carefully at the map and get back to Jim with thoughts.

The bike engineering proposal was summarized onto a short term proposed map. These can be accomplished with little cost such as line striping. It was noted that the mountain bike paths were not on the map. Again the proposed bike facilities will be examined more carefully over the next week so people can make suggestions.

It was recommended that Jim add which routes are prioritized. It was suggested that he add a long term map which would have solutions that may need engineering or more time to develop. These will be integrated into the next planning project which will look at route typologies and what bike, parking, and sidewalk facilities will be present throughout town. A quick review of critical bike routes included all the class 1 and 2 roadways in the city.

### Evaluation options

There are seven listed evaluations which can be used as benchmarks over time to determine effectiveness of our program.

Next public meeting will be in early December when a full draft report will be presented.

Meeting closed 9:15PM