



City of Madison

City of Madison
Madison, WI 53703
www.cityofmadison.com

Meeting Minutes - Approved PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION

Tuesday, September 23, 2008

5:00 PM

Room 260, Madison Municipal Building
215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
(After 6 pm, use Doty St. entrance.)

Items reported in the order listed on the agenda.

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Present: 10 -

Beth A. Whitaker; Aaron S. P. Crandall; Jason Schulman; Robbie Webber;
Paul E. Skidmore; Mark N. Shahan; Charles W. Strawser III; Mary P.
Conroy; Cheryl E. Wittke and Susan M. De Vos

Absent: 1 -

Judy Compton

Alder Compton arrived at 6:05 p.m.

Whitaker left at 6:00 p.m.

Webber left at 7:00 p.m.

Conroy left before the meeting ended, time unknown.

A. PUBLIC COMMENT - None

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by De Vos, seconded by Skidmore, to Approve the Minutes . The motion passed by voice vote/other.

A roll call is taken here to reflect that Whitaker left at 6:00 p.m. and Compton arrived at approximately 6:05 p.m.

Present: 10 -

Aaron S. P. Crandall; Jason Schulman; Judy Compton; Robbie Webber;
Paul E. Skidmore; Mark N. Shahan; Charles W. Strawser III; Mary P.
Conroy; Cheryl E. Wittke and Susan M. De Vos

Absent: 1 -

Beth A. Whitaker

C. 6:00 P.M. PUBLIC HEARING ON ANNUAL TRAFFIC SIGNAL PRIORITY LIST

C.1. [12012](#) Annual Traffic Signal Priority List

Shahan opened the public hearing. There were no registrants so Shahan

closed the public hearing.

Ross referenced the material provided by Traffic Engineering staff, including the list of requests received this year for new signals.

Brian Smith, Traffic Signal Engineer, noted that there are two parts to this agenda item: the public hearing, and then discussion by PBMVC and identification of intersections for which the Commission would like additional traffic data to be collected. Staff will do the special studies and report back at the November meeting for the PBMVC to make a final decision on which intersections should be approved for signal installation in 2009.

Skidmore mentioned that westside residents are grateful for the signal installed at Gammon Road-Tree Lane. He mentioned that a citizen in his district keeps him informed of accidents at the Old Sauk-Westfield intersection and has asked when a signal will be installed. Skidmore said he has been informed by TE staff that the intersection geometrics are not good for a signal. However, this is a very bad intersection and many motorists modify their travel plans so they don't have to turn against traffic. Smith advised that TE staff have done a number of studies at Old Sauk-Westfield but it has never met the criteria for a signal. Geometric changes would be necessary for a signal. Skidmore asked that staff do a study to provide details of the changes that would be necessary.

Skidmore noted that one of the requests received this year is for a signal at Mineral Point-Pleasant View, but he has not heard complaints about this and it's not his radar screen. Smith stated that a roundabout is scheduled to be constructed here in 2010 so he did not add it to the Signal Priority list. It was Skidmore's opinion that traffic issues related to Mineral Point-Junction and Mineral Point-Pleasant View need a bigger design study. De Vos expressed concern about roundabouts because she has heard a lot of people complain that blind pedestrians have a difficult time navigating them. Has TE received feedback from the disabled community about this issue, or has the impact on disabled pedestrians been studied? Smith acknowledged that a drawback of roundabouts is that they don't provide an audible signal for visually impaired pedestrians. Roundabouts are not typically considered in a central urban area where there is the greatest diversity of users. De Vos asked whether this issue should be brought to the PBMVC or some other body, but Smith couldn't answer that.

Motion by Skidmore/Strawser to suspend the rules to reopen the public hearing to allow public testimony, carried unanimously.

Corinne Engelman, 110 Shepard Terrace, representing the VanChaMasShe Neighborhood Association, registered in support of a signal on University near Ridge. There is a signal at Farley and then much farther down. Many people have to walk out of their way to cross or try crossing at Ridge, which is unsafe. Ridge is a busy crossing area due to the shopping, medical centers, bus stop, etc.

Shahan asked if a study has been done here. Smith said it's been studied many times and has been on the Signal Priority List, but it was just taken off because TE has recommended several times that a signal not be installed, and

the PBMVC has approved that recommendation. The main problem is the traffic progression on University would be disrupted by a signal at Ridge. To have two-way progression requires that signals be placed in an optimal relationship to other signals. A signal at Ridge would create back-ups and TE believes it would lead to an increase in the crash rate.

Wittke asked if TE has considered ped-activated lights at this location. Smith indicated there's not a good way to do that; it would need to be a full signal. Wittke then asked if there are any engineering solutions to locations where you have a major arterial and significant ped activity. Smith didn't recall the recommendations made previously for this location. He believed there was a lack of sidewalk on the Shorewood side and the City has asked Shorewood to help out with this location. He indicated he would review the reports he brought with him to see if he could find the earlier study for University-Ridge.

Strawser wanted to know if staff had data on the delay for peds wishing to cross here. Smith replied that staff previously did detailed studies for several hours of the day in which they counted peds and their delay. Strawser asked how the ped delay compared to the projected delay for motor vehicles if a signal were installed. Smith recalled that the actual delay would be greater if peds had to wait for a signal. He pointed out that if staff can't achieve two-way signal coordination, they try to have coordination for at least the heavier direction of travel flow. This resulted in a cycle length sometimes of 100-110 seconds at Ridge. Actual ped delays now are considerably less. He realized that peds don't feel comfortable crossing without signal but there are gaps in each direction, just not at the same time, so peds have to wait at the median.

Engelman confirmed that at certain times of the day when traffic isn't heavy, crossing isn't too bad. But for several hours in the morning and several in the afternoon/evening, it is completely unsafe to cross here. Peds have to go out of their way, and then there's no sidewalk on one side and they have to walk through parking lots. There is a bus stop here, and it's very unsafe. In response to a question by Shahan, Engelman stated the median is not good for a two-stage crossing. When she tried crossing with a stroller, the median was not wide enough. She said it's been so long since she's tried crossing here that she couldn't really recall any details about the median. Smith advised that when University Avenue is reconstructed, one suggested improvement is to widen the median here.

Shahan closed the public hearing at 6:19.

Shahan reminded members they should come up with a list of maybe four to five locations where they want staff to conduct traffic counts and/or more detailed studies.

Smith reviewed previously approved locations: signals were installed this year at Gammon-Tree, Manchester-McKee, and Murray-University (for peds). In 2009, staff is looking to put in signals at: (1) Watts-Sam's Club but first need to get an easement from Sam's; (2) Frey-Segoe if development occurs; (3) two signalized intersections at the East Washington-Highway 30 interchange as part of the East Washington reconstruction project, and (4) perhaps at Anderson-Hoffman by MATC (if MATC does some improvements).

Crandall asked if West Main-Bedford was studied. Parking on the street makes it difficult for people heading south on W. Main at the stop sign to see if traffic is coming on Bedford so they have to pull out into the intersection. Or perhaps "No Parking" could be installed. Smith didn't think this intersection will meet the warrants but it has not been studied. He indicated that counts could be done and have it added to the list.

Compton referenced the Monona Drive-Panther-Tompkins intersection and assumed it will be done as part of the Monona Drive reconstruction. Something not on the list that she would like to see is the addition of a left-turn arrow at Pflaum and Monona. Smith agreed that this has been an issue and staff has done studies showing the delay. They considered adding an arrow but then the other side wanted an arrow as well, which would not work. Compton urged staff to put in an arrow on the Madison side to improve safety for trips to/from school.

Shahan asked if anything could be done at Ridge-University as an interim improvement. Webber suggested painting a crosswalk. Having a visible crosswalk would remind drivers there is a crossing. There are transit stops on either side of the street at this location. She indicated that Shorewood Hills is very eager for a signal and she believed they would be willing to participate in the cost. Webber recognized staff's concern that the sight line coming over the hill is poor and this location is too close to the other signal for good traffic flow.

Skidmore referenced the request for a signal at Mineral Point Road-South Point due to traffic concerns associated with Blackhawk Church. He said the church has hired off-duty sheriff's deputies to do traffic control during services, but he was not sure there were problems during other times. Smith said staff will take additional counts. However, he has heard that other nearby intersections like Junction-Mineral Point can't handle the traffic when church gets out and he suggested that even if a signal is installed at South Point, the church may still need off-duty officers to direct traffic. Skidmore indicated it might be a bigger corridor issue where signal will not necessarily help.

In response to Shahan's question, Smith said this is the first time for Buttonwood-American Parkway to be on the list so staff will take counts and see where it lands. He mentioned that when the American Center development went in, underground conduits and loops were put in at the American Family Drive and Eastpark (already signalized) intersections with American Parkway. Buttonwood is between these two intersections and does not have underground wiring.

Schulman asked about the Edgewood-Monroe intersection. Smith said counts were taken in 2007. He was not sure how a signal here would affect progression; the proximity to the existing signal might be a problem.

Smith clarified that just because an intersection ranked high doesn't mean a signal should go in. He pointed out that Gorham-Carroll meets the warrants but Ald. Verveer does not want a signal. Meeting the numerical warrants doesn't automatically mean a signal should go in, it means you should do a more detailed engineering study to see if a signal would improve safety and/or improve the operation of the intersection. If the study finds that a signal would

worsen the operation or safety, it should not go in.

Smith located in his materials a copy of the previous report on Marshall-Ridge-University and passed it around. It shows the delay to peds that was observed. He explained the progression map. Coming from Midvale, the entire platoon of vehicles would stop at a Ridge signal and back up. When the platoon got a green, it would get a red light again at University Bay. More cars stopping means more rear-end crashes. Smith noted the report also shows measured ped delays and gaps during peak hours. Staff used a camera to count the gaps between vehicles. Every time a ped came up, they measured how long the ped waited. The average delay for peds was less than they would wait if a signal went in. The fact that the median is not a good waiting space is a problem. Smith said they measured the sight distance, i.e., how long can a ped see vehicles coming, and they found that peds had sufficient sight distance to cross safely. Webber interjected that she thought the concern with sight distance related to eastbound motorists not being able to see a signal before they came over the hill and thus wouldn't be able to react in time. Smith replied that staff have studied the sight distance from the ped standpoint. Webber commented that she has a hard time crossing this intersection when she is in a car so needless to say a ped would have a very difficult time. There is no way she would want to cross there. But transit stops on either side means a lot of people cross every day. She gets a lot of complaints about this intersection even though it's not in her district. Wittke wondered whether something to improve the intersection could be done through the Pedestrian Arterial Program. This intersection comes up every year and Safe Communities gets a lot of calls about it. She wanted to see some steps taken to address the issue, even if it's not a signal. Shahan understood why a signal might not be recommended but noted that it may be several years before University Avenue is reconstructed so he would like to get some interim improvements. Perhaps this needs to be a separate future agenda item.

Referencing Nakoma-Seminole-Yuma, Shahan thought a signal was supposed to go in. Smith said they did an additional study last year and it didn't meet the numerical criteria. There is also concern about a signal resulting in cut-through traffic.

Shahan directed members' attention to the comments column which provides additional information, e.g., the Edgewood-Monroe intersection mentioned earlier by Schulman has five comments, including signal progression problems, geometric problems, need to coordinate with existing adjacent signals, etc.

Compton asked Smith whether the Monona-Panther-Tompkins intersection will be revisited through the Monona Drive reconstruction. Smith stated he was not involved with the project and did not know its scope.

Strawser commented on the Ridge-University report being passed around. He had no doubt that staff has done good job of documenting the existing conditions. The chart clearly shows that the delay to observed peds is significantly lower than what would be expected with a signal. However, what is not being acknowledged is that the population of peds being observed is a fairly specific population, i.e., the registrant said that it has been quite some

time she tried crossing there and instead she walks two blocks out of her way. So what you have is the average delay of the peds willing to cross here. There is no acknowledgement of the peds that won't try crossing. It needs to be acknowledged that the peds willing to cross at Ridge are not necessarily representative of the peds who are asking for a traffic signal.

Wittke again referenced the Pedestrian Arterial Program in the TE budget. There's a real problem in figuring out how to cross a major street if there's no signal. In some areas the city is divided in half because it's so difficult to cross the street. She would definitely like a report from staff on what improvements can be made from that point of view. She also requested an annual report, like the one PBMVC receives on the NTMP, that covers the projects proposed and implemented through the Ped Arterial Program. Shahan asked for clarification on Ridge-University whether she wanted a report back on a traffic signal or a report on other improvements short of a signal that could be done now. Wittke said she would like to see both, including costs and benefits. Webber advised that in 2008, the approved budget for NTMP was \$550,000 and the proposed 2009 budget is \$50,000. The 2008 approved budget for the Ped Arterial Program was \$180,000 and the proposed 2009 budget is \$50,000. When this came up at the BOE budget meeting, the explanation was that the projects being proposed for these programs are not meeting the criteria so TE would like to take a year off to assess the programs.

Motion by Skidmore/Conroy for staff to collect data as follows: traffic counts only for Bedford-Main and American Parkway-Buttonwood and full signal studies for Old Sauk-Westfield, Cottage Grove-Thompson, Monona-Panther-Tompkins and Marshall-Ridge-University, carried unanimously.

D. NEW BUSINESS

- D.1. [11800](#) Approving plans for the restoration of East Campus Mall (FNA North Murray Street) in accordance with the Permit to Excavate in the Right of Way and Agreement to provide maintenance of North Murray Street/East Campus Mall from University Avenue to State Street.

A motion was made by Skidmore, seconded by Conroy, to Rerefer to the PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

DISCUSSION

UW staff present included Julie Grove, Gary Brown and Rob Kennedy.

Brown used an aerial map to show the East Campus Mall, which runs south from Regent Street to Lake Mendota. The mall is being done in sections. The first portion was done as part of the Park Street redevelopment/new Ogg Hall. The second piece is part of the University Square redevelopment, which is almost completed. The third piece, which is the portion referenced in this agenda item, is being done as part of the Chazen Museum project. Another piece between Dayton and Johnson will be done as part of the Gordon Commons project. The last piece is the north end of the mall, which includes Library Mall and north of Langdon Street to Lake Mendota.

Grove briefly reviewed the Chazen project. This particular area of campus is setting the stage for development of the east campus arts district, with the Chazen addition as the "crown jewel." Further development will include enhancements to Vilas Hall and a future music performance building. Grove used a drawing depicting the University Avenue side of the project. A gallery bridge will connect the existing Elvehjem building and the new Chazen addition. The East Campus Mall will flow under the gallery bridge and eventually to Lake Mendota when completed.

Brown went over some of the East Campus Mall details on the site plan. The mall will use concrete pavers laid on a concrete base to facilitate use by emergency vehicles. The courtyard between the Chazen addition and the existing Elvehjem will use a different paving material. He referenced the existing fire lane that runs east-west between the Pres House Apartments and the new Chazen addition. This will also serve as a loading dock for the Chazen addition as well as Pres House and St. Paul's. Trucks will enter using Fitch Court. Brown stated that part of the agreement with the City was to look at how this use will change over time as the block develops (i.e., new music performance space). Big trucks need a way to get in/out. Brown indicated that development of the music performance and academic space is probably 5-10 years out.

Brown noted that the University Avenue crossing will include two columns to designate the entrance to the ped/bike mall. Another feature will be a loading/unloading zone off University Avenue to get buses and other vehicles off the street while dropping off or picking up people.

Brown advised that bike parking is spread across the site, with 108 stalls. Moped pkg is off-site on the east side of the Humanities Building.

Referencing the truck loading dock, Webber asked whether the trucks will pull in but then have to back out. Brown advised that the trucks will come in through the alleyway, pull into the fire lane, back into the loading dock, and then drive head out. Loading for the other buildings (Pres House Apartments, UW Club, etc.) will be handled similarly.

Webber wanted to confirm that there will be no motor vehicle traffic on the mall except emergency vehicles. Brown stated this is correct. Webber commented that there was an area of the State Street Mall that had bollards but they're now gone and the area has more motor vehicle traffic than what was originally envisioned. She did not want that to happen here. Brown responded that the East Campus Mall will not have bollards due to emergency access issues but the intent is to limit motor vehicle traffic. The pavement will look different than the street to help visually separate the spaces. Webber asked whether it's possible to put in breakaway bollards, and Brown stated it could be looked at although the Fire Department has had issues with them in the past (could get caught under the fire truck wheels). He also wasn't sure they would be needed on the East Campus Mall but could be added later if necessary. Webber wanted to make sure the mall doesn't become an entrance for service vehicles. Kennedy stated that the UW will be sitting down with the City to talk about the north end of the East Campus Mall (where it meets Library Mall) and access issues will be discussed. For trucks using Fitch Court and the fire lane for deliveries, Webber asked that the property owners

emphasize to the delivery people that the trucks should not pull onto the mall itself, deliveries should be unloaded from the trucks with a handcart whenever possible.

Schulman asked about the estimated timeframe for completing the East Campus Mall. Brown stated the next phase is the Dayton-Johnson segment related to the Gordon Commons project. The last two pieces are the Library Mall and the segment by the Memorial Union parking lot. He indicated there is active fundraising for the Union segment so that may happen first.

Brown stated that the East Campus Mall will not have separate bike lanes; it will be a combined space for peds and bicyclists. Having a combined space tends to slow down the bicyclists which is desired given the large number of peds in this area. Shahan noted that the Library Mall does not allow bike riding, so will there be "Walk Bikes" signing where the East Campus Mall meets the Library Mall? Brown stated that signing is likely. Staff will need to address how bikes get through this area when the Library Mall and north pieces are completed. Shahan commented that if bicyclists are given north-south access across Library Mall, they will also want east-west access. Brown stated this will have to be worked out.

Referencing the gallery bridge, Crandall asked whether either Elvehjem or the Chazen addition will have an entrance onto the mall that might conflict with through bike traffic. Brown pointed out the museum entrance, which is off the path.

Motion by Webber/Crandall to approve.

Skidmore noted that the resolution is to approve the plans for the restoration of East Campus Mall and asked whether any plans were provided. Shahan replied no.

Substitute motion by Skidmore/Conroy to refer to the next meeting in order to have the plans provided to the PBMVC for review.

Skidmore commented that he didn't have a problem with the project but would like to review the materials before approving it. Webber asked about the timeline for the project. Grove stated they are getting ready to go out to bid but a one month delay would probably be okay. She indicated the UW had not been requested to provide plans. Webber commented that when a resolution mentions "approving plans," the plans are usually provided to the referral agencies. There was some question about the status of this item. Webber advised it was introduced to the Common Council on 9/2/08 and referred to the Board of Public Works (lead referral) and to the PBMVC. Brown commented that part of the confusion might be that there are three pieces: the Chazen project, which has been approved by the Council; the maintenance agreement, which has been approved by the Council; and now the plans and specifications for the mall restoration. Webber noted that not only does the PBMVC want to see the plans but also the BPW and the Council when the resolution comes back for adoption. Shahan indicated he had been a little confused about the lack of plans, noting that when the PBMVC recommended approval of the maintenance agreement at its July meeting, there had been discussion about whether they were approving just the maintenance

agreement. At that meeting, the PBMVC had requested that the plans and specifications come back to them.

Brown said he will work with staff as to what to provide. Webber indicated perhaps a version of the drawings/designs presented at tonight's meeting. Shahan advised that a descriptive narrative would be helpful as well as something showing the bike parking and pedestrian accommodations.

Motion to refer to the October meeting carried unanimously.

D.2. [08820](#)

SUBSTITUTE - Creating new Section 12.1335(4)(d), renumbering current Section 12.1335(4)(d) to Section 12.1335(4)(e), creating Section 12.1335(6), amending Section 12.1339, amending Section 12.141(2), creating new Section 12.141(3), renumbering current Sections 12.141(3)-(9) to Sections 12.141(4)-(10), and amending Section 1.08(3)(a) of the Madison General Ordinances to further deter snow parking violations and more efficiently allow for cleaning of the streets.

A motion was made by Conroy, seconded by Skidmore, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

DISCUSSION

Conroy/Skidmore moved approval.

It was De Vos' understanding that this was going to be part of an overall recommendation from Alders Konkel and Rhodes-Conway about snow emergency parking, but this just deals with raising money. It appears the rest has been ignored. Webber advised that there were quite a few meetings with various City agencies (IT, Streets, Engineering, alders, and Mayor's office). The main reason is not to raise money but to make it more imperative to people to move their cars when they are supposed to. Many people figure it's worth a \$30 ticket not to shovel out their car in order to move it. But then the streets don't get plowed. The higher fine is a bigger incentive to move their cars. De Vos thought part of the proposal was to make parking in City ramps more affordable so people could get their cars off the street. Webber confirmed an expansion of the time limit when people can park in structures for free is part of the overall proposal. However, that change is administrative. The ordinance before the PBMVC only affects street parking during snow emergencies. Another part of the proposal is making sure there will be better communication as to when there is a snow emergency and alternate locations for parking their cars.

Ray Harmon, Mayor's office, and Chris Kelly, Streets, were present. Harmon stated he worked closely with Alders Webber, Konkel, Cnare, Clear and Rhodes-Conway to come up with the complete package alluded to by De Vos. Opening up the City ramps and Parks parking lots is part of it. Another element is a text messaging program to alert people when there is a snow emergency; the City is piggybacking on a messaging program set up by the UW. Streets is also developing a program to educate the public.

Motion carried unanimously.

D.3. [11505](#)

Authorizing the execution of a First Amendment to Easement pertaining to a

Public Utility Easement from the City to Wisconsin Bell, Inc., d/b/a AT&T Wisconsin, within the Isthmus Bike Path located at 320 Division Street.

A motion was made by Strawser III, seconded by Skidmore, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER . The motion passed by voice vote/other.

DISCUSSION

Ross explained that AT&T has an existing easement with a cabinet and wants to put in a new cabinet. The cabinet location would be in the corner near the property line, a good distance from the path. It should not create sight distance conflicts.

Tony DeBlasio, agent for AT&T, was present and distributed a photo of the new cabinet. He described it being a little smaller than the existing one. Any shrubbery removed for the installation will be restored (part of the easement agreement)..

Skidmore asked whether this will have a functional impact on the bike path and Ross replied no. The bike path is close to the street and the cabinet is near the property line. The new cabinet will be located within the existing shrubbery and won't create any sight distance problems. Strawser confirmed this, saying he had checked out the location of the existing cabinet and could hardly see it.

D.4. [11425](#)

Authorizing the Traffic Engineering Division to apply for and accept grant funding up to \$15,000 to undertake a survey of bicycling in Madison and amending the Traffic Engineering operating budget as appropriate.

This Resolution was RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL WITH THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS - REPORT OF OFFICER

DISCUSSION

Ross stated he had received a solicitation from Bikes Belong, an industry organization, to apply for grant based on Madison's bike-friendly status. He reviewed the Platinum Plan top priorities and felt the survey was appropriate for the grant application. They received the maximum grant amount of \$15,000.

Webber asked what the survey would entail, and Ross responded that the application was fairly open. Things the Platinum Committee had talked about were mode split, barriers to bicycling, and what does it take to encourage more people to bicycle. It could be one survey or two-three surveys to address each element. An RFP will be issued to see if the UW or some other group is interested in undertaking the survey.

Skidmore thought the PBMVC should have some idea of what the survey will ask. Ross indicated the City can accept the grant and then staff can come back with the proposal before the money is spent.

Webber/Skidmore: moved approval with the additional paragraph: "Be it further resolved that the RFP, and later the survey plan, including the questions to be asked, methods of survey and timeline, be presented to and approved by the PBMVC before the survey proceeds."

Webber pointed out that the PBMVC is the body designated to oversee the implementation and progress of the Platinum Report. The survey is a priority recommendation from the report. She felt the PBMVC should look at the survey plan and make sure it's appropriate and meets the Platinum Report intent.

De Vos felt this is an example of the need for an advisory subcommittee of the Platinum Bike that could make a recommendation for the PBMVC to approve, rather than the PBMVC having to go through a lot of rigmarole. Ross commented that basically there is a subcommittee and they are aware of the grant and they have been working with him on it. Shahan pointed out that even if there were a subcommittee to review the survey, the PBMVC would still need to review it. Neither a subcommittee nor the PBMVC is set up to actually develop a survey, which is why it there will be a RFP.

Referencing Ross's statement, Webber clarified that there is not an official subcommittee. However, there are people who have been overseeing the Platinum Report recommendations and working with the Mayor's office and TE. But when the Platinum Report was approved, the PBMVC was designated as the oversight body. Having the survey come back to the PBMVC for review makes it available to the public as well, which is a crucial piece.

Wittke suggested having a regular update on what's happening with implementation of the Platinum Report. Shahan mentioned that he was going to bring up something similar under Items for Future Agenda because there was supposed to be an annual review by the PBMVC.

Motion carried unanimously.

D.5. [11302](#)

Petition dated July 2, 2008 from G. & M. Graper, 6114 Barton Rd., Madison re: request to install a light in the greenway located to the north of Barton Rd. and Redwood Ln.

A motion was made by Conroy, seconded by Skidmore, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

DISCUSSION

Ross advised that this is a petition received by the City to install a light in the greenway where the walks from Barton Rd., Prairie Rd., and Loreen Dr. intersect. This is a neighborhood request and TE does not have any objections.

Motion by Conroy/Skidmore to approve.

Skidmore asked if the intent is to install the light now or put this project on the ped/bike capital projects ranking. Ross said it is not expensive, estimated cost of \$2,100. De Vos thought Skidmore brought up a good point. It doesn't make sense to leapfrog over everything else on the capital project list and approve one thing, even if it is inexpensive relative to others.

Ross noted that this is a streetlight project. There is a utility pole at the location. TE gets requests for street lighting all the time.

Shahan pointed out that the small cap projects ranking is on the agenda for later and felt the cost of this project would fall into line with some of those. Is there some sort of other process used for streetlights? Ross said the money is available in the TE budget to do this. Skidmore wanted to know if this is an important enough issue that it has to be implemented now—is it a safety issue? Ross pointed out that the petition indicates it is a safety issue. The neighborhood is asking for the light not as a project to improve the pathway so much as a safety issue for neighborhood residents. He recommended approval.

Motion carried unanimously.

Wittke questioned why the PBMVC would be looking at an item like this but not in the context of the larger TE budget. Webber advised that the entire 2008 City budget is online, both capital and operating. The proposed 2009 capital budget is also online and the proposed 2009 operating budget will be coming out soon. She encouraged members to review both the TE and Engineering budgets. Shahan remarked that this might be something for a future agenda; the PBMVC has sometimes had the TE budget as an agenda item, with an overview of how TE's funding is allocated. They may want to have that again.

D.6. [11560](#)

Creating and implementing a comprehensive, multi-modal transportation and parking design for central Madison.

A motion was made by Compton, seconded by Skidmore, to Rerefer to the PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

DISCUSSION

Shahan reported that LRTPC had a lengthy discussion on the resolution and is working with Planning staff to draft a Substitute. Staff will come back with suggested language. He would like PBMVC to refer the resolution and wait for the Substitute.

Compton/Skidmore moved referral.

Ald. Konkel, one of the sponsors, was present and wished to speak. She was not at the LRTPC meeting due to another commitment so wasn't sure of the issues but thought staff was confused as to what the sponsors were trying to do. The BUILD for the East Washington corridor includes some pretty high densities, and approval of those densities included an acknowledgement by all parties that there needs to be a very good transportation and transit plan for the corridor. One problem is that there are a lot of plans but each is piecemeal and there's no oversight as to how they interrelate. The resolution sponsors are trying to ensure that instead of addressing transportation issues for each individual project and having each developer do a traffic impact plan, they want to look at how the entire corridor is affected, how these plans work together and how the City ensures that transportation issues are part and parcel of every development in the corridor. They did not want the situation where one development did not provide enough parking and then the next development has to bear the brunt of something done by another developer. Konkel thought some of the confusion is that staff thinks the sponsors are asking for an expensive plan. However, the sponsors are trying to take this to the higher level—how does the development impact the neighborhoods. That

is the concept and plan, but some seem to think there's more to it. She felt it was pretty straightforward.

Shahan reported that at the LRTPC meeting, Alder Rhodes-Conway explained that the sponsors were not asking staff to write a plan; it was more about the timeline, scope and possibly a RFP. But the resolution talks about actually doing a plan, which would require modeling and would be expensive. Konkel reiterated that the sponsors are not talking about a plan that includes modeling and such; they're talking about a higher-level plan that looks at the big picture, what are the needs for the planned densities. Shahan commented that perhaps the confusion is coming from the how the resolution is worded.

Suggestions from LRTPC included: (1) defining the area boundaries, (2) have the LRTPC be the committee rather than establishing a new committee since the LRTPC includes members from other transportation-related committees; (3) focus on getting a scope and timeline to flesh out what it is that's being requested in the resolution. If an RFP comes out of this, then that gets put out for additional Planning help. But as written, the resolution seems to be asking staff to do a plan.

Shahan reported that regardless of what is being requested, Planning staff indicated they are busy until the zoning code rewrite gets finished. If it's anything very involved, staff won't have time to devote to it. If it's pared down, or it's made clear that it's not the full-blown thing that people think it is, it might fit on staff's plate.

Webber suggested that the sponsors get together and clarify the language before it comes back to LRTPC.

Wittke remarked that as the PB MVC has worked through the different plans such as the Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Plan, the Comprehensive Plan, the East Washington BUILD, etc., what is striking is how separate transportation planning and land use planning seem to be. Her sense from the resolution is that they're trying to pull together these two pieces that are so integrally related. She didn't understand how these land use plans could move forward if this type of process envisioned in the resolution is not undertaken. People "wig out" when they hear about another plan, but it's to ensure that existing plans are coordinated and don't sit on the shelf. There needs to be discussion about the impacts across different plans, and she thought that was what this resolution is trying to accomplish. If it's just a matter of clarifying language, that's one thing; but if it's a matter of pushing this off to be looked at in the future, independent of other things that are happening, she can't support that.

Shahan relayed that staff's perspective is that the way the resolution is worded requires impact studies that will take a lot of work.

Konkel felt staff is still stuck on issues related to last year's Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Plan recommendation to make Johnson and Gorham two-way. This is a completely different issue. The reason the sponsors suggested creation of a new committee rather than going through LRTPC is that there are a significant number of people who have already put the time into planning for this area and they know what the other land use issues are. If it's limited to LRTPC members, we will lose a lot of the expertise that developed from

creating these plans.

Skidmore said that a number of LRTPC members had a different version of the resolution than what Konkel described tonight; and if they get language that reflects Konkel's explanation of what the sponsors are looking for, the resolution would probably go through without problems.

Compton clarified her motion to refer was to refer to the next meeting. Shahan felt that was reasonable. Planning staff was meeting with Rhodes-Conway on proposed changes. The resolution needs to be wordsmithed to make the intention clearer. The resolution doesn't reflect what Konkel said tonight.

Motion to refer to the next meeting carried unanimously.

E. OLD BUSINESS

E.1. [08224](#) Pedestrian/bicycle capital projects ranking

Shahan referenced the memo he had prepared for last month's meeting in which he had identified his own priorities for trying to move along some of these projects.

Larry Nelson, City Engineer, and Scott Langer, Traffic Engineering, were present to answer questions.

Nelson indicated he was not quite sure of the priorities, noting the list has three tiers plus a list of large capital projects. Shahan identified the large cap projects as being more expensive and the PBMVC's priorities for large cap projects basically mirror the TIP. His recommendations focused more on the small cap projects that tend to get forgotten.

LARGE CAP

Sherman Flyer: Nelson advised that the original plan was to strike out from the Yahara River/Johnson Street area and head northwest to Sherman Ave. However, the location required use of the railroad ROW and the City was unable to negotiate with the Union Pacific Railroad. Included in the 2009 budget is the alternative plan called the Huxley cut-off. Instead of the railroad ROW it would use Fordem Avenue, some local streets, a re-marked Commercial Avenue and then hopefully go along the Oscar Mayer/Kraft property line to Aberg where it would tie in with the existing bike route.

Isthmus path to MATC: Nelson commented that he has heard that this project has been approved for WisDOT enhancement funding. Ross stated nothing official has been announced.

Wisconsin River Rail Corridor Path: Nelson noted that the UW has put into service a section of this through the campus. He suggested the plan be extended to at least Stonefield Road and quite possibly to the vicinity of the intersection of Highway 12 and Highway 14 in the railroad corridor. This would involve the WisDOT, City of Middleton and Madison so the City could ask the MPO to put a slot in their work plan to convene a group to proceed on this. A schematic plan is absolutely necessary to get enthusiasm going for it. Ross

understood that the City of Middleton is in the process of updating their Bicycle Transportation Plan and he got a call from their consultant asking about this project so he believes there is interest on Middleton's part.

Capital City Trail from Buckeye to east City limit: Nelson reported that the City was unable to get a response from the Union Pacific as to use of the railroad corridor, even with a \$200,000 incentive offered to the railroad. The proposed alternative would build about 75-80% of that same extension but use one of the spur paths as an interim connection. It has been approved by the Board of Public Works and is going to the Common Council for approval. The money has been reauthorized in the 2009 budget. It will get bicyclists to Buckeye Road where there are marked bike lanes.

TIER 1

T.1.1. – Nelson said the connectors at Manor Cross and Tocora have been evaluated. The City has submitted a schematic drawing to the Research Park Director and he has agreed to the location. Just need to work out an easement. Would be built with City funds.

T.1.3. – Nelson commented that there's always been a desire to have a parallel path system between East Washington and Johnson utilizing shopping center but it doesn't appear to be in the cards right now because of the conflicting needs of the shopping center. However, there is a widened walkway along Johnson Street and a paved connection between Johnson and across the Yahara River hooking up to the Yahara Parkway Path. Langer indicated another difficulty is the railroad, which doesn't want to grant an easement. Shahan wanted to keep this project on the back burner. The PBMVC gets requests every year for an official trail. Nelson commented that getting to Mifflin Street would be progress.

Shahan: T.1.6. – Shahan indicated there needs to be a safer connection into Olin Turville Park, the current alignment throws you out into the street in an unexpected way. Langer stated the ultimate design would be to align with Edgewater Court. Ross advised that staff from TE, Parks, and Engineering need to meet and agree upon an alignment.

T.1.2: -- Langer said staff now have an inventory of most of the libraries and parks and will review that to determine the worst ones to be addressed. He noted that Ross is working on some commercial areas to improve bike racks and if any money is left over from that, it might be used to upgrade a couple libraries. Ross said he is looking at commercial areas with zero lot line development and no off-street parking so the only place to do bike parking is in the public ROW terrace. He will look first at those areas where there have been requests and then look at some of the City locations. There is \$10,000 for this project that was an amendment to the 2008 budget.

T.1.4.—Langer said staff's recommendation is that whatever is done be grade-separated. This is a very congested area. He was not sure a grade-separated facility is possible given the houses. There is an existing easement towards the Beltline that has been pursued in the past but no political or residential support. Shahan indicated that the neighborhood plan for the Westmorland and Midvale Heights area recommended connecting both

east-west and north-south under the Beltline to get to Medical Circle and east to get to the Odana Lane bike lanes or the Southwest Path. Mike Rewey thought it could be done at-grade but Shahan was skeptical and recognized this might be a large cap project. Langer noted the one further to the south that would cross at the signals but probably would not have political support.

T.1.5.—Langer said staff have tried to identify where the signs could be placed on existing poles but didn't find good locations. Every intersection does have a Keep Right and it might be possible to replace those poles with a slighter higher pole and then attach the wrong way signs since they're not that large. There is some concern they could cause a visibility problem but the signs are small enough he didn't think it would cause a problem. Strawser asked about installing pavement markings instead. Langer indicated it could be looked at but markings are a maintenance issue and are also covered by snow. A sign is more permanent and he felt more effective. The key is finding a location where the sign will be seen. City Traffic Engineer Dryer has approved doing a couple signs a year.

T.1.7. – Nelson remarked that this is an unusual connection to a path – you go up a driveway and then on a short section of sidewalk onto the path. It does keep cars off the path, which might be a problem with a direction connection.

T.2.2. – Currently under construction.

T.2.4. – Currently under construction.

T.2.3. – Shahan noted this project keeps coming up. The estimate from staff is \$25,000. Is that for a sidewalk, a bike path, or something else? Is it more involved than just a sidewalk? Ross indicated the issue is what kind of structure is needed to bridge the drainage area. This is an undeveloped area without curb and gutter. More planning needs to be done to see what's needed and where. Would be a good connector.

T.2.1. – Shahan wanted a short little connector from the West Washington bike lane eastbound to West Shore, something that would not allow cars but that would provide a ped/bike connector.

Referencing his memo and what he heard tonight, Shahan asked staff if it was reasonable to move forward on T.1.1., T.1.5., T.1.2, and T.2.1. Langer indicated that T.1.1. is in the process and staff can start on T.1.5. The inventory for T.1.2. will be done in the next couple of weeks and staff will then know what the needs are and how much can be done with the available funding.

The other two projects from his list are T.1.6. which has alignment issues that need to be worked out with other agencies, and T.2.3. which at this time appears to be a no.

Motion by Compton/Strawser to request staff to move forward on T.1.1., T.1.5., T.1.2., and T.2.1., carried unanimously.

F. REPORTS - Not taken up

F.1. [10610](#) REPORTS OF OTHER COMMITTEES/COMMISSIONS (verbal reports for

information only)
Plan Commission
Long Range Transportation Planning Commission
Joint West Campus Area Committee
Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee
School Traffic Safety Committee

G. REPORTS OF OFFICERS AND MEMBERS FOR INFORMATION/DISCUSSION - Not taken up

- G.1. Executive Secretary Report (verbal report and/or announcements)
- G.2. Items by Chair (verbal report and/or announcements)
 - a. Reminder that next meeting is WEDNESDAY October 29
- G.3. Member requests for future agenda items and/or announcements

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Skidmore, seconded by Wittke, to Adjourn . The motion passed by voice vote/other. The meeting adjourned at 7:33 p.m.