

# City of Rutland Department of Public Works

## COMPLETE STREETS GUIDANCE DOCUMENT

### Public Comments Responsiveness Summary

On Tuesday, June 13<sup>th</sup>, 2017 between 5:30 PM – 7:00 PM, the Department of Public Works held a public meeting at the Rutland Recreation Department's Courcelle Building on North Street Extension to take public comments on the Draft Complete Streets guidance document. Nine area residents attended in addition to DPW staff. In addition to the comments received that evening, the Department invited written comments to be submitted through the end of June 2017.

The Department has carefully reviewed all of the comments and adopted some of them into the revised Draft. Those changes are show in in red in the document. Below is a summary of the comments received and the Department's response.

*Comment 1: Incorporate bike paths into Woodstock Avenue and Main Street.*

Response: The volume of traffic and number of curb cuts would create a dangerous situation along these roads. Other, lower volume streets that run parallel to Main Street and Woodstock Ave have been identified as Bicycle Priority for the purpose of providing cyclists safer corridors connecting the same areas.

*Comment 2: The uphill section of Killington Avenue (from Stratton to Town Line Road) needs either a pedestrian, bicycle or multi-use path.*

Response: We agree. Working within existing site constraints, a sidewalk would probably be the best fit. A sidewalk would provide significant benefit since it would link the City's existing sidewalk network to all the side streets off of Killington Avenue, east of Stratton Road.

*Comment 3: Provide a connection between the Creek Path and downtown, including the winter Farmer's Market.*

Response: We agree. Some type of multi-use corridor should be identified or planned to allow phased construction to connect these areas. A proposed path to West St is shown on the map.

*Comment 4: Repair the sidewalk between Seabury and Crescent on Grove Street.*

Response: The purpose of this document is to provide guidance for planners and project scoping by the Department of Public Works. It is not appropriate to incorporate specific infrastructure improvements into this document.

*Comment 5: Businesses pile plowed lot snow on sidewalks. This is a hazard for folks who have to go into street to pass these large piles.*

Response: We agree, however, this is a matter for local ordinance and enforcement and is not appropriate for this guidance.

*Comment 6: How about a bike route or path on Grove Street to downtown?*

Response: Grove Street is currently designated Bicycle Priority. A Bike path would be one of the features considered the next time a project is considered on this route.

*Comment 7: Church Street should be designated bicycle priority from Crescent Street to West Street, and be given a striped bike lane, providing safer access to the transit center.*

Response: We agree. Church and Wales Streets are designated bicycle priority on the revised maps.

*Comment 8: Wales Street should be designated as bike priority and have a marked bike lane added. Merchants Row may be too busy for many cyclists to feel comfortable; Wales Street offers a less congested route.*

Response: See response to Comment 7.

*Comment 9: Please consider giving Pearl St bicycle and pedestrian priority its whole length.*

Response: Grove, Lincoln and Church Streets are now bicycle priority. We believe this provides ample opportunity for north-south cycling in this area of the City.

*Comment 10: Narrow the vehicle travel lanes on Stratton Road to allow bike lanes between the fog lines and the curb in each direction.*

Response: The purpose of this document is to provide guidance for planners and project scoping by the Department of Public Works. It is not appropriate to incorporate specific infrastructure improvements into this document.

*Comment 11: Build a roundabout for the intersection of South Main and Strongs Avenue, coupled with pedestrian crossings of those streets a short distance outside of the roundabout.*

Response: The purpose of this document is to provide guidance for planners and project scoping by the Department of Public Works. It is not appropriate to incorporate specific infrastructure improvements into this document. This idea would require a detailed traffic study before it could be considered.

*Comment 12: Build a pedestrian crossing on North Main Street, at Kendall/Temple Ave. and/or at Seward's Restaurant.*

Response: The purpose of this document is to provide guidance for planners and project scoping by the Department of Public Works. It is not appropriate to incorporate specific infrastructure improvements into this document.

*Comment 13: I believe the bus routes that are marked on the map are outdated in two small areas. The North bus now turns off Woodstock at Tremont, not the end of Temple. Also, I'm pretty sure that the West bus now turns off Pearl at Vernon, and no longer goes up to Field.*

Response: We verified with The Bus that the routes shown on their website are accurate. The Transit Priority Map was revised accordingly.

*Comment 14: Part of the West bus route is missing entirely. Eastbound on State, the bus turns left onto Pierpont, then right onto Crescent, then north on Baxter, then right on Oak, north on Grove, right onto North, then left onto Pearl.*

Response: See comment 13.

*Comment 15: The Guidance needs to include the protected crosswalk as a pedestrian feature. This is where all traffic stops to allow pedestrians to cross from any direction. Examples include Woodstock Avenue by Beauchamp & O'Rourke and Merchants Row by the Bardwell House.*

Response: We agree. This feature has been included in the guidance.

*Comment 16: Better connect existing pieces of bike lane/bike path to create a more logical transit system.*

Response: Lacking an existing City bicycle path plan, this document attempted to create one. If there are pieces missing, specific recommendations are requested.

*Comment 17: include the following direct quotes from the Rutland City Master Plan - "Despite the difficulty of mixing bicycles with vehicular traffic in an urban setting, the city nonetheless endorses and supports all reasonable projects that encourage increased usage of this alternative mode. In practical applications, the bicycle can ease congestion and reduce the environmental impact of transportation."- and - "A key advantage of location in an urban area is the ability to move around on foot. The city strives to provide safe, attractive pedestrian access within and between neighborhoods."*

Response: We agree. A new section has been included with direct quotation of the entire section of the master plan pertaining to these issues.

*Comment 18: Under the section DOCUMENT IMPLEMENTATION, #4, Consult all other appropriate information needed to make informed decisions (i.e. local/regional plans, traffic data, accident data, etc.)*

Response: Public Participation has been solicited and obtained in creating the Guidance Document. It is up to the professionals in City Hall to use these guidelines to properly advance the priorities established in the document.

*Comment 19: Adopt Vision Zero, (adopted by both New York City & Boston), which aims for zero accidents or deaths for ALL USERS. It is similar to our national aeronautics agency for our planes and*

*space flights in that the stated goal is to prevent accidents. This would be far stronger than the "consideration" only of safer options.*

Response: See Comment 18.

*Comment 20: Need sidewalks on Hillside and North St Extension.*

Response: Both are Pedestrian Priority.

*Comment 21: Are traffic volume projections considered in this? Should there be a mention?*

Response: There are some general comments regarding volume of traffic, but not specific traffic counts. Designers need to be able to use their professional judgement without being locked into outcomes that are predetermined based upon traffic counts.

*Comment 22: Should there be some statement that the guidance needs to be revisited periodically (5 years? 10?).*

Response: We agree. The Guidance now includes a paragraph recommending a review every five years.

*Comment 23: Increase use of curbing and reestablishment of green strips*

Response: We agree, however these items are project and location specific and need to be considered on a case by case basis.

*Comment 24: Increase locations for bus pull-offs.*

Response: These are listed features to be considered on all Transit Priority streets.

*Comment 25: Create on street parking that is safe for businesses on corridors and neighborhoods.*

Response: How and where to do this is one of the goals of this Guidance.

*Comment 26: Move the bus stop at top of West St to the park.*

Response: This has been done.

*Comment 27: Make East St to Whites playground and Allen St bicycle priority.*

Response: Both are bicycle priority streets.

*Comment 28: Make Deer Street pedestrian priority?*

Response: We agree. The updated Guidance reflects this change.

*Comment 29: The southwest side of River Street should be a bike path – there are good connections.*

Response: River Street is currently a Bicycle Priority. A bike path is one of the features that will be considered the next time a project is considered on River Street.

*Comment 30: The east end of North St (dead end) bicycle priority makes no sense - bikes cross at Crescent.*

Response: We agree. The updated Guidance reflects this change.

*Comment 31: Use North Street Extension for bike route - better than Temple?*

Response: Both streets are classified as Bike Priority. Further evaluation will be done to determine which site is more appropriate for such a feature.

*Comment 32: Painted bike routes - Where are they? Need markings on Stratton, bike friendly grates, signs, traffic calming.*

Response: These measures are included for consideration in the Guidance.

*Comment 33: Hillpond Road off Stratton should be a bike route – could be a back way to RHS.*

Response: This is a Bicycle Priority street.