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1.0 Introduction

1.1 Project Background

Park and Rides have long been recognized as an important component of Vermont’s and Chittenden County’s transportation system. The importance and value of Park and Rides have increased over the years as transportation costs, traffic volumes, and congestion increases. This is most evident with the recent increase in fuel costs, contributing to approximately a 20% increase in Park and Ride use statewide.

The Chittenden County Metropolitan Planning Organization (CCMPO) has long sought to plan and facilitate the development of Park and Ride lots throughout Chittenden County. Most recently these efforts included a Chittenden County Park and Ride Facility Prioritization Plan adopted February 18, 2004. Using the 20 potential locations for new Park and Ride lots mentioned in a 1999 study, 14 sites were identified for further action. Interestingly, potential Park and Ride facilities identified in this report included a number of village settings where there is a confluence of collector and arterial roadways. This included Hinesburg Village, Milton Village, Westford Village, Richmond Village and Shelburne Village. Of these, the Hinesburg Village facility received the highest priority. The Chittenden County existing and proposed facilities identified in this plan are shown on the following page.

The 2005 Chittenden County Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) adopted January 19, 2005, included strategies and projects for the VT Route 116 corridor. A new Park and Ride facility in Hinesburg Village was mentioned as a recommended project.

Based on this, the CCMPO and the Town of Hinesburg initiated this study to solicit public input and interest, identify potential alternative sites, provide an evaluation of alternative sites, and seek a preferred alternative.

1.2 Project Area

The project area initially considered the complete Town of Hinesburg. With further discussion and identification of potential alternative sites, the project area for alternatives narrowed to Hinesburg Village from Buck Hill Road to CVU Road along VT Route 116. This area is characterized as a traditional village center with a main north/south arterial, VT Route 116.

Much like the locations of other successful Park and Rides, a number of feeder roads converge on VT Route 116 at Hinesburg Village. These include Silver Street from the south and east/west connections from Charlotte Road, Falls Road, CVU Road, and Mechanicsville Road. The VT Route 116 corridor links Hinesburg and rural northeastern Addison County towns to Chittenden County’s employment and commercial centers, creating significant traffic volumes during commuter peak hours.
Figure 1  Chittenden County existing and proposed Park and Ride facilities
2.0 Existing Conditions

An existing conditions map is shown on the following page. This utilizes available aerial photos and incorporates available GIS information such as flood plains, wetlands, and property lines.

2.1 Existing Park and Ride Facilities

There are two formal Park and Ride facilities within the influence of the Hinesburg area. These are the VT Route 17/VT Route 116 Bristol facility and the proposed VT Route 22A/US 7 Park and Ride facility in Vergennes, Vermont.

2.2 Existing Traffic Conditions

Traffic volumes on VT Route 116 vary from an average annual daily traffic (AADT) volume of 5000 vpd south of Hinesburg Village to an annual average daily traffic volume of 10,000 vpd north of Hinesburg. During the AM Peak commuting hour, northbound volumes south of the village on VT Route 116 are on the order of 400 vehicles per hour. North of the village, this AM volume increases to 800 vehicles per hour demonstrating the effects of Silver Street, Charlotte Road, and Mechanicsville Road converging on VT Route 116. The result is increasing congestion and delay at many of the unsignalized intersections along VT Route 116. Recent analyses suggest signals are warranted or are soon to be warranted at Charlotte Road, Mechanicsville Road, and Commerce Street. The design and eventual construction of a signal at Charlotte Road at VT Route 116 is currently being pursued with anticipated installation in 2006/2007.

For AADT's of adjoining roads see the Existing Conditions map on the following page.

2.3 Public Transportation

Currently Hinesburg is not served by public transportation. The 2025 MTP does mention "peak hour commuter transit service to Hinesburg Village" as a VT Route 116 corridor strategy.

A privately run van service, "On The Go", does provide regularly scheduled and on-demand van services. Currently, there is no formal meeting place for this service.

2.4 Local Concerns Meeting

On February 20, 2006, a local concerns meeting was held at the Hinesburg Town Hall in conjunction with a regularly scheduled Selectboard meeting. It was well attended by over 20 registered attendees.
Meeting notes were produced to record the various public comments. These notes are in the appendix. There was general support for a Park and Ride facility in the Hinesburg village area. There were some residents from the Creekside development expressing concerns with the compatibility of siting a park and ride on town property off Farmall Drive.

Alternative sites mentioned included:

- Alternative A – Creekside Development
- Alternative B – NRG property
- Alternative C – Ballard’s Corner
- Alternative D – Town Hall lot
- Alternative E – Quonset Hut
- Alternative F – Richmond Road / Texas Hill Road intersection
- Alternative G – Ballard’s store
- Alternative H – Commerce Park, Lot 15

This information was reviewed by subsequent project committee meetings and used in the development and evaluation of alternatives.
3.0 Purpose and Need

3.1 Project Purpose

To provide a safe and efficient facility for patrons to transfer to a higher occupancy form of travel.

3.2 Project Need

- Locate with convenient access and visibility to maximize use by commuters.
- Provide adequate parking capacity and expansion capabilities.
- Contribute to potential future transit use.
- Locate for alternative uses such as parking for recreation, village events, and adjacent public facilities.
4.0 Park and Ride Design Criteria

4.1 Parking Lot Size

The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) has developed a methodology for determining the size of Park and Ride lots. Based on national statistics, this methodology sites approximately 4% of adjacent street peak hour volume are expected to use Park and Ride lots. Based on past experience with existing Vermont Park and Ride lots, lot usage is highly variable with usage varying from 2%-4%. Using the conservative 4% usage, the resulting lot size for a facility on VT Route 116 in Hinesburg Village, in the year 2025, would be approximately 40 vehicles.

Through discussions with the project committee and experience on past Park and Ride projects, it is proposed the initial Park and Ride construction accommodate approximately 20 vehicles. Ideally, the site would accommodate a future expansion to 40 vehicles.

4.2 Parking Lot Design Criteria

Based on the AASHTO "Guide for Park and Ride Facilities", dated November 2004, a Hinesburg Park and Ride is likely to function as a "Suburban Park and Ride lot". These are defined as lots that are four (4) to 30 miles from the major employment/activity center, and provide a modal change between the private automobile, transit, carpool, vanpool, bicycle and pedestrian. The following table provides criteria for the design of a Suburban Park and Ride lot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking spaces</td>
<td>9’ x 18’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicap spaces</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus circulation</td>
<td>40 foot busses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus shelter</td>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning setbacks</td>
<td>None for parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping/screening</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.0 Park and Ride Alternative Sites

The project committee met on three occasions to discuss alternative sites and a well attended Local Concerns meeting provided much information on issues, concerns, and potential sites.

Some residents expressed interest in locating the Park and Ride to intercept traffic prior to entering the Village, thereby reducing village traffic. It was noted that traffic volumes on VT Route 116 and filter streets south of the village are typically less than 5000 vpd. This is a relatively low traffic volume and suggests a lot less than 10 cars may be required if it is constructed south of the Village.

The study did evaluate the possibility of locating a Park and Ride south of the Village. There is a Park and Ride 11 miles south of Hinesburg Village, at the VT Route 17/VT Route 116 intersection. This gravel lot accommodates approximately 10 vehicles and seldom has greater than four (4) or five (5) parked cars. Locating a Park and Ride along Silver Street would be difficult because of land use, topographic and environmental constraints. The intersection of VT Route 116 and Hollow Road, however, was mentioned as a potential location. This intersection is approximately four (4) miles south of the village, and may attract commuters/carpoolers from Bristol, Huntington, and beyond.

The concept of multiple smaller satellite lots was discussed among committee members. While there is value in this concept, a central lot in the Village would draw users from all directions and provide more opportunity to consolidate trips. It was concluded the satellite lot concept should be discussed in future regional discussions, including coordination with the Addison County Regional Planning Commission (ACRPC) and perhaps pursued under the State funded Park and Ride municipal program.

The following list and description of alternative Park and Ride sites resulted from public input and suggestions and project committee discussions. A plan showing their location is shown on the following page.
5.1 **Alternative Site A - Creekside**

This site is on Town of Hinesburg property, behind the Hinesburg Fire Station and Police Department offices. It is in the front portion of the Creekside Development, a new residential development. This site has the following characteristics:

- Lot is on the northern side of Hinesburg Village.
- Lot size is approximately two (2) acres, undeveloped, and relatively level.
- A small class III wetland was identified on the Creekside subdivision plan.
- Access from VT Route 116 is via Farmall Drive, opposite Commerce Drive.
- Adequate space exists for future expansion to 40 spaces.
- Location allows alternative use such as Fire Station/Municipal event parking and recreation path user parking.
- Northern location provides the potential to attract users from VT Route 116 south, Silver Street, Charlotte Road, and Mechanicsville Road.
- Adjacent land use is residential homes and municipal facilities.
- Future land use for the remaining portion of the lot may be a recreation facility/park.

5.2 **Alternative Site B - NRG**

This site is on the east side of VT Route 116 North of Commerce Street. It was pointed out that a master plan was being developed for this property, and there may be an opportunity for a Park and Ride lot to fit with these future plans. Through discussions with the owners and planners, it was learned their plan included future business expansion and a residential subdivision. With these plans, the existing site constraints and the limited connectivity to the village, this site was discarded from further evaluation.

5.3 **Alternative Site C - Ballards Corner**

This is an undeveloped lot, part of the Ballards Corner Commercial Subdivision, and currently for sale. This site has the following features:

- Lot is approximately one (1) acre and is adjacent to VT Route 116, with direct visibility.
- Access is off Shelburne Falls Road on an existing commercial drive.
- An existing stream borders the property on the south side and appears there are two small wetlands are on the site.
- Lot is relatively level and will accommodate initially 20 vehicles with expansion to 40 vehicles likely.
- Northern location increases potential for users from CVU Road and Shelburne Falls Road.
- Adjacent land uses are primarily commercial.
- Due to its potential for commercial development, its access and visibility, the land cost is likely significant.
5.4 **Alternative Site D - Town Hall**

The area west of the existing Town Hall parking lot serves as the access drive to the Town Hall and is currently widened to provide additional parking for the adjacent recreation fields and Town Hall. This site has the following features:

- It contains a gravel parking area, with approximately 20 spaces perpendicular to the Town Hall access drive.
- The land is owned by the Town of Hinesburg.
- Access from VT Route 116 is off Charlotte Road.
- A signal is planned for 2007 construction at VT Route 116/Charlotte Road, providing better access from Charlotte Road.
- Adjacent land uses are municipal, with residential/commercial beyond.
- Location provides potential for alternative uses such as municipal event and recreation path uses.
- Visibility from VT Route 116 is limited.
- Construction cost is low due to limited site work, paving, and lighting needed.

5.5 **Alternative Site E - Quonset Hut**

Located adjacent to VT Route 116, this property currently hosts an auto business. The current owner, Vic Giroux has an interest in leasing a portion of the remaining property and potentially accommodating a Park and Ride. This site has the following features:

- Direct access and visibility from VT Route 116.
- Available lot area is approximately one half acre, and is level.
- Expansion beyond 20 cars is limited.
- Adjacent land use is commercial.
- Location provides access for pedestrians and bicyclists with potential alternative uses for municipal events and recreation path users.
- Development cost is relatively low, but requires long term lease costs.

5.6 **Alternative Site H – Commerce Park, Lot 15**

This is an undeveloped lot in the Commerce Park subdivision. It is located behind the post office and Trillium. The current owner is Vic Giroux and is interested in leasing the property. This site has the following features:

- Access from Commerce Street, with limited visibility from VT Route 116.
- Lot is approximately 5 acres and provides future lot expansion capabilities.
- Location provides access for pedestrians and bicyclists with direct link to shared use path along Mechanicsville Road.
- Location provides potential for alternative uses such as municipal events and recreation path users.
- A large portion of the site is classified as wetlands, limiting development potential.
- Past discussions have included using this parcel as a public park or green.
5.7 Alternatives Evaluation

Working with the project committee, the evaluation criteria and criteria scoring for alternative evaluation purposes was discussed and resolved. The resulting criteria and assumptions are shown on the following page. These criteria and assumptions were derived from other Park and Ride alternative evaluations and adapted to this project.

Once criteria and assumptions were set, the alternatives were scored and the scores reviewed with the project committee. Edits were provided and scores finalized. The resulting scores are shown on the following page.

This scoring indicates Alternative D - Town Hall lot, scores the highest at 84% and Alternative A - Creekside Development scores the second highest at 80%. The Town Hall lot scores high because it is already owned by the town, development costs are low since the parking area already exists and its ease of access through the anticipated signal at VT Route 116/Charlotte Road intersection. Its limited expansion capabilities and reduced visibility from VT 116 provide lower points in this evaluation.

The Creekside lot scored similarly but had higher development cost and less compatibility with the surrounding land use. It did have greater capability for expansion and greater visibility and security.

To assist with the evaluation, a concept plan and cost estimate was developed for Alternative Site A - Creekside and Alternative Site D - Town Hall. A summary of costs are shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE A Creekside</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE D Town Hall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Costs</td>
<td>$216,514</td>
<td>$78,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering (20%)</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Project Management (10%)</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW costs ($100,000/acre)</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Engineering (15%)</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total project costs</td>
<td>$315,514</td>
<td>$114,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rounded Project Costs</td>
<td>$316,000</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1 Estimated Costs*

The concept plans are shown on the following pages.
Figure 4 Alternative Site A Concept Plan.
Figure 5  Alternative Site D Concept Plan.
5.8 Preferred Alternative

Using the draft feasibility study, evaluation matrix, and cost estimate, town staff discussed the alternatives at a July 24, 2006 Selectboard meeting. These discussions included the application for the Vermont Agency of Transportation 2007 Grant Program, due July 31, 2006. Based on these discussions the Selectboard agreed to submit a grant application for the Town Hall parking lot site – Alternative D.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item / Criteria</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
<th>Do Nothing</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Information</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Creekside Development behind fire station</td>
<td>NRG, off VT 116 north</td>
<td>Ballard's Corner vacant lot</td>
<td>Town Hall Municipal lot expanded westerly</td>
<td>Quonset Hut off VT 116</td>
<td>Commerce Park vacant lot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Bittersdorf</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Giroux</td>
<td>Giroux</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic (33%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Acquisition</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Cost</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Points - Economic Considerations</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location (33%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to VT 116 corridor</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use potential</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility / Security</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Convenience/Safety/Congestion</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike / Pedestrian Access</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Points - Location Considerations</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site (33%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts to Resources</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compatibility</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Spaces &amp; Expansion</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitability</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Points - Site Considerations</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weighted Ave% of Maximum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRITERIA</td>
<td>GRADE</td>
<td>ASSUMPTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Acquisition</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Town owned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Purchase/Lease possible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Condemnation necessary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Cost</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Reasonable/Less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>excessive &gt; $500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL POTENTIAL POINTS</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Proximity to VT Route 116 corridor | 20 | Access directly off VT 116 |
| | 10 | Access within 500 feet |
| | 0 | Access farther than 500 feet |
| Multi-use Potential | 10 | Adjacent municipal facilities (i.e. recreation, events, etc) |
| | 5 | Municipal facilities > 1000 feet |
| | 0 | No adjacent municipal facilities |
| Visibility / Security | 10 | Very visible from a major roadway / major activity |
| | 5 | Some visibility from a roadway / major activity |
| | 0 | Not visible from any roadway / major activity |
| Access Convenience, Safety, and Congestion | 20 | Good ingress and egress |
| | 10 | Fair ingress/egress |
| | 0 | Poor ingress/egress |
| Bike Pedestrian Access | 10 | Very Good - connects to existing facilities |
| | 5 | Fair - connections possible |
| | 0 | None - connections difficult |
| TOTAL POTENTIAL POINTS | | 70 |

| Impact to Environmental Resources | 10 | Minimal Impacts |
| | 5 | Some Impacts |
| | 0 | Serious Impacts |
| Compatibility with adjacent or planned land use | 10 | Very compatible |
| | 5 | Some Compatibility |
| | 0 | No Compatibility |
| Large enough to accommodate 20 spaces plus have expansion potential | 20 | Site large enough to handle 20 spaces with plenty of expansion potential |
| | 10 | Site large enough to handle 20 spaces with little expansion potential |
| | 0 | Site able to handle 20 spaces or less |
| Permitability | 10 | Readily permitted |
| | 5 | Some issues |
| | 0 | Permitting questionable |
| TOTAL POTENTIAL POINTS | | 50 |

SUBTOTAL (Raw Score) | 150 |
APPENDIX

Correspondence and Meeting Notes
Greg,

After further review of the NRG/Blittersdorf site, I'm convinced that we should eliminate it as an option for a possible village area park & ride location. They are actively pursuing an expansion of the business and a residential subdivision. I've talked with their lead architect and project manager (Bill MaClay), and we both agreed that there really isn't a good spot for a park and ride given their future plans and the site constraints.

I contacted Vic Giroux regarding his comfort level with the Quonset hut site on Route 116 (east side) and the Commerce Park (lot 15) site on Commerce Street – both of which he owns. He said that he sees potential at both these sites, and was agreeable to having the Town keep them on our list of possible park&ride locations.

My notes from our May 4 meeting indicate that you'll have the draft feasibility study ready around 6/15. According to the plan we discussed, Jeanne and I will take charge at that point and get it to the Selectboard, so they can review the draft report at one of their meetings in late July. We'll then get feedback to you so you can wrap it up with a final draft. Sound good?

Cheers.

Alex Weinhagen
Director of Planning & Zoning
Town of Hinesburg
hinesburgplanning@gmavt.net
www.hinesburg.org - Planning/Zoning page
802-482-3619
P.O. Box 133
Hinesburg, VT 05461
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Meeting Notes

Meeting: Project Committee Meeting No. 3  
Meeting Date: 05/04/06  
Project No.: 6320020.10

Team Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Next Meeting</th>
<th>Next Time</th>
<th>Prepared by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05/04/06</td>
<td>2:00 pm</td>
<td>3:30 pm</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Greg Edwards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Location: Hinesburg Town Hall

Attended By
- Jeanne Wilson, Town of Hinesburg
- Alex Weinhegen, Town of Hinesburg
- Greg Edwards, Stantec
- Greg Goyette, Stantec

Copies To
- Attendees
- Christine Forde, CCMPO

If content contained within is not complete, accurate, or in context, please notify Stantec of such discrepancy within ten (10) days of this record.

Meeting Purpose:
- Discuss alternative sites and develop the next steps of the project development.

Item | Items Discussed                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Action By
---|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---
3-1 | **Alternative Site Updates:**  
- Site A (Creekside): Land use along VT 117 is being reviewed by the Town as part of a look at rezoning to accommodate growth. Requires an ACT 250 permit.  
- Site B (NRG): Alex will continue to follow-up and learn the owner's interest or compatibility with their plans.  
- Site C (Ballards Corner): No additional information.  
- Site D (Town Hall): Site development should include lighting. Expansion area will not work with trucking operation. Assume expansion is limited.  
- Site E (Quonset Hut):  
  - Alex will discuss with owner, their interest and plans  
  - Existing uncontrolled access  
  - Likely to be rezoned for redevelopment and P&R may or may not be compatible  
  - May have a high value and cost  
- Site H (Commerce park lot):  
  - Wetland constraints, Class III wetlands  
  - Potential Town Green  
  - Limited visibility | Town

---
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|   | o Poor soils  
|   | o Subject to ACT 250 |
| **3-2** Evaluation Scoring: | Committee revised scores and provided some edits as shown on the attached |
| **3-3** Next Steps: |   |
|   | 1. Develop draft feasibility study by June 15th  
|   | 2. Discuss project budget status, remaining scope any need for amended contract amount with Christine. | DH  
|   |   | DH |
Hinesburg Park-and-Ride  
Hinesburg, Vermont
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Meeting: Local Concerns Meeting  
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Dufresne-Henry, Inc.  
55 Green Mountain Drive, P.O. Box 2246  
South Burlington, Vermont 05407  
Tel: 802-864-0223 Fax: 802-864-0165  
e-mail: firstinitial.lastname@dufresne-henry.com

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Next Meeting</th>
<th>Next Time</th>
<th>Prepared By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/20/06</td>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
<td>8:30 pm</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Greg Goyette</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attended By
CCMPO:  
Christine Forde

Hinesburg:  
Jeanne Kundell Wilson, Alex Weinlagen, Andrea Morgante, Randy Volk

Others:  
See attached list

Copies To:  
Attendees

If content contained within is not complete, accurate, or in context, please notify Dufresne-Henry of such discrepancy within ten (10) days of this record.

Meeting Purpose: The purpose of the meeting is to present and solicit public comment on potential park-and-ride sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Public Comment/Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hinesburg is a good meeting place for folks that commute to Rutland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Many Town residents car pool to Burlington for musical events during off-peak hours – they typically use the United Church parking lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The CVU parking lot is ‘maxed out’ on weekdays. CVU students use local residences for overflow parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A park-and-ride located in close proximity to local businesses would be ideal for those who like to run errands by foot.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5         | Has a survey been conducted to determine usage patterns?  
Response: A survey has not been conducted. It is difficult to determine who the potential users are, therefore a survey may not provide results from those who will actually use the facility. |
<p>| 6         | Hinesburg has a large confluence of vehicles, and therefore is a good location for a park-and-ride. |
| 7         | I see the park-and-ride as being a precursor to mass transit. The park-and-ride will be more convenient if located in town. |
| 8         | Should the park-and-ride be sized and located for Hinesburg residents or for the general traveling public? |
| 9         | The logical place for the park-and-ride is closer to the village along Route 116. Due to the small size of the facility (20 – 40 vehicles), local traffic impacts should be minimal. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A commuter shuttle or bus would be great, however locating a park-and-ride within a housing development is of concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Creekside Resident: I’m opposed to locating the park-and-ride within the Creekside development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|12 | How will side road traffic enter onto Route 116 if Park-and-Ride is located within Creekside Development?  
Response: As a condition of the zoning permit, the developer will construct a right turn lane on the side road for right turning vehicles entering Route 116. **Creekside Development - Alternative Site A** |
|13 | A park-and-ride located south of town should be considered due to the confluence of traffic that occurs south of town. |
|14 | NRG has some available property that they are looking to develop. Due to the nature of their business, the owners may be interested in a park-and-ride constructed on their property. **NRG - Alternative Site B** |
|15 | Lighting should be included with the facility. Lighting will have negative impact on residential areas. |
|16 | Ballard’s corner should be considered as a location. Nine roads converge at this location. **Ballard’s Corner – Alternative Site C** |
|17 | A facility existing as more than just a park-and-ride during peak traffic hours is desirable. |
|18 | Can we share existing facilities in Town?  
Response: Possibilities include the extension of the Town Hall lot, backside of Lantman’s store, Estes parking lot. **Town Hall Lot – Alternative Site D** |
|19 | Lantman’s and Estes parking lots are at capacity during the peak hours of the day. |
|20 | Are any church lots available to use for a park-and-ride?  
Response: St. Jude’s church not interested in sharing park-and-lot. Sharing the lot may interfere with special events. |
|21 | The library near Ballard’s store may be a potential location. |
|22 | The used car lot should be considered. Currently, development plans only account for approximately a quarter of the property. **Used Car Lot – Alternative Site E** |
|23 | An informal park-and-ride exists at the North Road/Richmond Road intersection. **North Road/Richmond Road Informal Park-and-Ride – Alternative Site F** |
|24 | Concerns for constructing the park-and-ride in a residential area include child safety, homeowner safety, light pollution, and aesthetics. |
|25 | See attached write-in comment. **Ballard’s Store – Alternative Site G, Post Office/Trillium Lot – Alternative Site H** |
Hi everyone,

I had planned to attend the meeting tonight at 7pm, but something has come up unexpectedly, and I am unable to attend. I am very interested in there being a park and ride lot for the community or others from neighboring communities to meet at and carpool to work, pleasure and whatever. I have used the Richmond Park & Ride for my 18 years of commuting to Montpelier, and I have to believe there would be use of this facility for those who commute to Essex, Burlington, South Burlington etc. And now when I meet someone in Hinesburg, we have to park at the church or one of the store parking lots.

I do urge that we attempt to utilize an existing paved lot either because there is room for commuter vehicles (I honestly doubt this is the case), or we attempt to enlarge or extend an existing lot. Paving a new area altogether should be the last choice, and finding a site that works from a convenience point of view as well as one that has as little an impact as possible would be best. No place comes to mind, but maybe there is a way to extend the lot at Ballard's, maybe the post office/Trillium lot.

Sorry to miss the hearing.

Carl
Hinesburg Park & Ride Local Concerns Meeting
February 10, 2006

Attendees

Name
Randy Volk

Affiliation
Select Board

Email
Volvk@qemail.net

Home
Randy Volk

Affiliation
Select Board

Email
SPB&O@vtc.org

Home
Val Spadafora

Affiliation
CMPO

Email
CMPO@vtc.org

Home
Christina Fisch

Affiliation
Creekside Resident

Email
CFischer@hinesburg.net

Home
Jonathan Hemmen

Affiliation
Hinesburg Resident

Email
dolufse@qmail.net

Home
Doug Cluppes

Affiliation
Creekside Resident

Email
DCluppes@hinesburg.net

Home
Karien George Meuser

Affiliation
Hinesburg Resident

Email
gunner@hinesburg.net

Home
Robenson Abramovici

Affiliation
Hinesburg Resident

Email
Dfpp176@msn.com

Home
David Ken

Affiliation
Hinesburg Resident

Email
gunner@hinesburg.net

Home
Wendy Patterson

Affiliation
Hinesburg Conservation Com.

Email
WendyPeterson@hinesburg.net

Home
Rob Farley

Affiliation
TOH

Email
HinesburgCon@aol.com

Home
Rob Farley

Affiliation
TOH

Email
HinesburgCon@aol.com

Home
Jessie Liptak

Affiliation
Hinesburg Resident

Email
hipes@vermont-collages.org

Home
Derek Perssault

Affiliation
Hinesburg Resident

Email
DerekPerssault@yahoo.com

Home
Wendy Keenig

Affiliation
Creekside Resident

Email
WKeenig@vermont-collages.org

Home
Steven Alexander

Affiliation
Hinesburg Resident

Email
david@qemail.net

Home
Reidman Cott

Affiliation
Hinesburg Resident

Email
Empty@empty.com

Home
Donna Constantine

Affiliation
89 Hill Rd Hinesburg, Micro-rad

Email
Donna@89HillRd.com
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55 Green Mountain Drive, P.O. Box 2246
South Burlington, Vermont 05407
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**Team Meeting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Next Meeting</th>
<th>Next Time</th>
<th>Prepared by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/09/06</td>
<td>11:00 am</td>
<td>12:30pm</td>
<td>05/04/06</td>
<td>2:00 pm</td>
<td>Greg Edwards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location:** Hinesburg Town Hall

---

**Attended By**
Jeanne Wilson, Town of Hinesburg
Alex Weinig, Town of Hinesburg
Christine Forde, CCMPO
Greg Edwards, Dufresne-Henry
Greg Goyette, Dufresne-Henry

---

**Copies To**
Attendees

---

*If content contained within is not complete, accurate, or in context, please notify Dufresne-Henry of such discrepancy within ten (10) days of this record.*

**Meeting Purpose:**
- Review the results of the Local Concerns / Alternatives Presentation Meeting. Discuss alternative sites and develop the next steps of the project development.

---

**Item** | **Items Discussed** | **Action By**
---|---|---
2-1 | **Purpose and Need:** A copy of the draft Purpose and Need as presented at the Local Concerns Meeting was distributed for committee member comments. The project Purpose will be "wordsmithed" for clarity and the Town will provide suggestions. The project Needs should include: Contributes to the possibility of multi-use for other municipal uses such as recreation, community events, transportation path users. | DH/Town |
2-2 | **Alternative Evaluation Criteria:** The Evaluation Criteria used on the Williston Park-and-Ride was distributed and discussed. It was determined the Criteria should include a potential for multi-use. | DH |
2-3 | **Alternative Sites**
  - Alternative Site A - Creekside: Much is already known about this site. An evaluation can be done.
  - Alternative Site B - NRG: It was pointed out that the owners are developing a master plan and the Town will discuss with the owners their interest in accommodating a Park-and-Ride facility. This site would have a limited connectivity to the village and limited visibility, since it is likely to be located near their existing facility and not adjacent to VT 116. Its access would likely be the existing access to the NRG facility and this is on the "inbound" side for AM

---
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meeting minutes  
dufresne-henry, inc.  
meeting: project team meeting #2  
meeting date: march 9, 2006

- commuting users.
  - alternative site c - ballards corner: this is an empty lot adjacent to vt 116 and accessed from an existing commercial drive of shelburne falls road. an existing stream borders the property on the south side. current zoning regulations require a 75 foot set back from the stream. the site would be readily accessible, but may have a significant land cost due to its potential for development. a brief field review subsequent to the meeting suggests the site contains two (2) wetlands, potentially limiting its developable land.
  - alternative site d - the town hall site: the area west of the existing town hall parking lot adjacent to the entry road is a likely location. the land is currently owned by the town and borders a recreation field containing a small wetland. the town will provide exiting mapping showing these delineated wetlands. development costs are expected to be limited. its location would require signing and its accessibility would be greatly enhanced with the proposed signal installation at vt 116 and charlotte road. dh will develop a lot layout using the exiting aerial ortho photos. this layout will consider integration with the exits town hall parking.
  - alternative site e - the quonset hut: this site currently contain an auto business. there maybe sufficient land available for a park-and-ride site. this would need to be discussed with the owner. the current zoning is commercial and would likely require a subdivision or a lease to accommodate a park-and-ride.
  - alternative site f - richmond road/texas hill road intersection: a triangular area within the intersection is currently available for parking, although not maintained in the winter months. this will not provide for vt 116 commuters to the Burlington area and perhaps will should be pursued through the state funded program for park-and-rides. it was determined the evaluation of this site would be discarded for this study, but maybe included as a potential site in future discussions.
  - alternative site g - the jiffymart store at ballards corners: availability of this site is questionable given the current owners are considering relocating or redeveloping this site. due to this, its limited size, and potential costs, it was determined to discard for further evaluation.

2-4 satellite lots: the possibility of smaller satellite lots such as one at hollow road and vt116 was questioned at the local concerns meeting. the committee indicated these would likely be smaller sites supplemental to the other alternative sites. satellite lots should be mentioned in the feasibility study and recommended to be part of a regional plan.

town dh dh
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Alternative Site Property Owner Discussion:</th>
<th>Since the Town is currently evaluation rezoning areas at the Alternatives Sites, it was proposed the Town conduct these discussions once the proposed changes are determined. These are likely to occur in April or May.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>Next Steps:</td>
<td>Dufresne-Henry will develop a draft evaluation of the proposed sites using the criteria previously discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-7</td>
<td>Next Meeting:</td>
<td>Thursday, May 4, 2006 at 2:00pm, Hinesburg Town Hall.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CCMPO Hinesburg Park and Ride
Hinesburg, Vermont
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Meeting: Project Committee Meeting No. 1
Meeting Date: 12/21/05
Project No.: 6320020.10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Next Meeting</th>
<th>Next Time</th>
<th>Prepared by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/21/05</td>
<td>11:00 am</td>
<td>12:30 pm</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greg Edwards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Location: Hinesburg Town Hall

Attended By
Jeanne Wilson, Town of Hinesburg
Alex Weinlagen, Town of Hinesburg
Christine Forde, CCMPO
Greg Edwards, Dufresne-Henry
Greg Goyette, Dufresne-Henry

Copies To
Attendees

If content contained within is not complete, accurate, or in context, please notify Dufresne-Henry of such discrepancy within ten (10) days of this record.

Meeting Purpose:
- Review project status, information collected, task completed and steps to be taken in preparation of the Local Concerns Meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Items Discussed</th>
<th>Action By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1</td>
<td>Collected Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dufresne-Henry now has accident listings, traffic data, base mapping, GIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>layers, and Creekside Lot #1 CADD files, and the Creekside Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic Impact Study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Aerial Orthophoto Base Mapping</td>
<td>DH / Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dufresne-Henry provided a draft existing conditions plan. DH will extend the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mapping to include the Buck Hill Road to the south on Route 116 and will include</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the ADT and/or DHV information for the major roads. Alex will email the GIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shape files for the flood / hazard areas. DH will incorporate this information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in the base mapping.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>Park and Ride Lot Size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using the ITE methodology and assuming 4% of the VT Route 116 northbound</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>traffic during the peak hour will use the lot, the resulting lot size is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33 vehicles for 2005 and 38 for 2025. Given the 4% has been a very</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**CCMPO Hinesburg Park & Ride**  
Hinesburg, Vermont
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>conservative value for other Vermont Park &amp; Rides and this is a national statistic including urban areas, the following was decided:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The initial lot construction would be planned for 20 vehicles. The expansion to a 40-vehicle lot will be included.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1-4 Design Criteria**

Alex indicated there is no local zoning requirement for setbacks for parking areas; parking spaces should be 9 x 18; additional handicap spaces should be provided; screening from adjacent homes considered; future bus accessibility considered; space for a future bus shelter provided; lighting provided; sidewalk connections to existing sidewalks or desire lines provided. This will be considered when evaluating alternatives.

**1-5 Local Concerns Meeting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The Town will develop, post and distribute a meeting notice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Town will provide a project introduction at the Local Concerns Meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. DH will develop an agenda and presentation based on past Park &amp; Ride Local Concerns meetings. This may include soliciting input on origin / destinations, potential users such as commuters, pedestrians, recreation, transit and event attendees. The agenda / presentation will be distributed for review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. DH will solicit available information from VTrans regarding mapping for the existing and proposed Park &amp; Ride facilities and examples of these facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. DH will prepare a sketch for the development of a Park &amp; Ride on Creekside Lot #1. It will be located toward the south end of the lot and will be presented for discussion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1-6 Alternatives**

The Town indicated there is some interest in a Park & Ride lot or multiple lots south of the village area to intercept Park & Ride users prior to the village and reduce traffic on Route 116 through the village. One potential area was the intersection of VT 116 and the Huntington Hollow Road. Discussion of alternative sites will be part of the Local Concerns Meeting. The Town will have a town map available for these discussions.

**1-7 Local Concerns Meeting Schedule**

It will be Monday, February 20, as part of a regularly scheduled Hinesburg Selectboard Meeting.
Selectboard Meeting  
February 20, 2006

Attending the meeting: Rob Bast, Andrea Morgante, Jon Trefry, Randy Volk, Howard Russell, Jeanne Wilson, see attached meeting sign in sheet.

Meeting called to order at 7:04 p.m.
Alex addressed the fact that both the Town and State have been interested in locating a park and ride in Hinesburg and with the help of the CCMPO have contracted the professional services of Dufresne-Henry.

Presentation by Greg Edwards of Dufresne-Henry / Hinesburg Park & Ride Facility Options –
Greg stated one purpose of this meeting was to identify who the typical users would be.
Residents in attendance had the following suggestions.
Some residents said they park in Town and travel south not just into the Burlington area. There was a need for parking for CVU students expressed.
Commuters will make stops on the way to and home from work for other purposes so a location close to services may increase usage to allow people to continue to do this.
Some expressed the need to somehow connect public transportation to a park and ride.
Questioned was if the goal of a park and ride is to reduce traffic traveling through Town or to create a gathering spot which may then increase traffic in Town.
It was questioned if a survey has been done to try to determine travel patterns. No survey has been done.
There was concern with locating this near a residential area. Residents of Creekside were opposed to locating near that development and further said that any decision to do so should not be made till Creekside homes are sold and residents who will be living there can have input into the decision.
There was a suggestion to utilize the front lot by NRG.
Need for lighting should be considered which may preclude placement near a residential neighborhood.
If Ballards Corner was used it would also answer the CVU parking problem.
There was suggestion to wait till the Town Plan is completed to see what it has set for a gateway into Hinesburg before looking at the Ballards Corner area.
Also noted was the possibility of shared use of an existing lot and not creating a new one.
It was suggested that a questionnaire about travel and a proposal for a park and ride be made available for residents at Town Meeting.
Greg said they will take the input from this meeting and incorporate into alternatives to be presented to the Town at the next alternatives meeting.

Presentation by Erik Sandblom of ESPC / Conceptual Plans for Hinesburg Village Streetscape Improvements – Rocky introduced Eric and gave background information on the sidewalk project.
Items discussed included: Sidewalk proposal of 5ft width and 4ft grass shoulder. Installation of a catch basin for storm water to be diverted to a bio-filter bed by the United Church to treat the flows.
Doug Olufson, representing the United Church, distributed a handout addressing points of the proposal from the Church's perspective. Doug addressed the current parking problem at the Church and has spoken with Rocky about possible use of the Town Hall lot with a maintained path leading to the Church lot. The proposed sidewalk plan will eliminate on street parking with the exception of 3 spaces in front of Town Hall.