



City of Madison
Meeting Minutes - Final
PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/MOTOR
VEHICLE COMMISSION

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

Wednesday, September 28, 2005

5:00 PM

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

A CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Present: Ald. Robbie Webber, Michael Forster Rothbart, Mark N. Shahan, Matthew A. Logan, Mary P. Conroy, Cheryl E. Wittke, Susan M. De Vos, Charles W. Strawser III and Carl R. Kugler

Excused: Ald. Judy Compton and Ald. Paul E. Skidmore

Staff Present: Dan McCormick, Brian Smith, and Arthur Ross, Traffic Engineering

B 5:00 P.M. - PUBLIC HEARING - ANNUAL TRAFFIC SIGNAL PRIORITY

Brian Smith noted a couple of changes in the signal priority list update: #3 Cottage Grove and Thompson, #6 Franklin and Johnson, and #11 High Point and Star Grass.

Allen Barkoff (2930 Barlow Street) registered and spoke about pedestrian safety concerns for crossing of Ridge and University. Using graphics, he outlined the traffic conditions as it related to the intersection with its three lanes of traffic in each direction, narrow refuge island, location of bus stops and turning maneuvers that occur, all of which contribute to a very dangerous situation for pedestrians trying to cross this street. He asked for consideration of pedestrian actuated signals or at least posting of "no u-turns".

DeVos asked if this was a multi-jurisdiction intersection, e.g., Shorewood Village and Madison; yes it was.

Wittke asked if the registrant had spoken with others about his concerns. Barkoff responded that he had talked with his Alderperson in the past. A few years ago some neighbors had come before PBMVC and were told at that time that a signal was not feasible because of the hill and the inability of motorists being able to see to stop in time for a traffic signal. He suggested if that is the case, how could one expect the motorist to be able to see to stop for a pedestrian.

Kugler noted the medical facilities located on the north side of University and how that would account for a number of pedestrians desiring to use the intersection.

Asked if he had suggestions other than a signal, Barkoff said ideally there should be a traffic signal and at the very least U-turns be prohibited.

Wittke asked if a traffic signal were not appropriate, was the location a candidate for a pedestrian arterial project or did staff have suggestions about other ways to address the problems. McCormick said a signal had been looked at, but it has a significant impact on the University Avenue corridor, which carries about 60,000 vehicles per day. When funds are available, they were considering eliminating the exclusive left turn lane, would widen the median, then restrict left turns and U-turns, and would check out the bus stop locations. They would try to coordinate it with any street project City Engineering might undertake in this area.

Shahan asked if the biggest issue related to signals at this location was the phasing of signals with others along the corridor; McCormick responded yes. The platooning and coordination in the corridor couldn't be timed for both directions and resulted in more interruptions in traffic flow.

Barkoff asked if the signals couldn't be timed to operate only when pedestrians activated the button and then have it coordinated with the signals already located east and west of the intersection. McCormick said the technology was out there and they were looking into it; they are called half-signals. They wouldn't be able to coordinate traffic in both directions; so in one direction traffic flow would be interrupted. Smith said that at Babcock and University, traffic for either the inbound or outbound direction is interrupted for pedestrian crossings, and the pedestrian crossing is set to coordinate with the traffic flow, but this is a one-way corridor and there is no intersecting street traffic to be considered. At this location there would be no way to set the timing to provide progressive flow in

both directions. They could have it set so that vehicles would activate for perhaps a shorter amount time for the cross street. However, this still impacted one of the traffic flow movements.

Barkoff noted that under the present conditions, there were short gaps in traffic on the corridor but often these gaps were minimized by turning vehicles and vehicles making U-turns.

Kugler asked for further explanation of the problems related to locating a signal at this location since it appeared as if the priority was toward balancing the needs of vehicles vs. those of pedestrians. McCormick responded that basically one flow of traffic would be stopped, resulting in traffic backing up to the prior signal. Because of the traffic on the corridor and peak travel periods, this would have significant impacts on traffic flow, which would only be regained after several signal cycles. McCormick said they could show the model at a future time to explain these impacts more clearly if desired. An example of the situation that might result would be what's being experienced at Erin and Park Street, where during the peak periods, traffic is being backed up past several intersections from Erin and Park, but would likely be of a bigger impact on University Avenue.

Webber asked theoretically at what point does pedestrian safety or fear of crossing a street become important enough to interrupt vehicle traffic flow? McCormick said they had to consider the customer base and they try to balance the demands between the users. Webber followed up by restating at what point does the problem for pedestrians get so bad that something is done. McCormick said the question was larger than just that; one was dealing with service in the City and University Avenue, for example, is a main artery. As steps are taken to restrict traffic flow, it impacted many modes. He understood it was a difficult question to answer simply-e,g, should they be looking at wider medians, pedestrian overpasses, or other incremental measures which might improve the crossing opportunities for pedestrians? Webber asked if injury or fatality would factor into the question. McCormick said yes; and Smith followed that if there was such a trend, it was likely a signal would be installed.

Shahan pointed out this is a public hearing so members might want to hold discussion and that this location might be one they would have for further investigation.

Strawser said that if members were to accept the argument that interrupting traffic flow at peak travel demand times is not acceptable, what about University Avenue being at peak capacity and being so congested that peak travel would interrupt traffic flow just by the sheer number of cars. At that point would it be acceptable to make accommodations for pedestrians or would the approach be to expand the capacity of the road and thus make it even worse. McCormick responded that as stated previously, it is a challenge to find the balance and suggested they provide more information. Strawser said that if the capacity of the road were increased, it would result in a nightmare situation so why shouldn't they move forward and accommodate people (pedestrians) who weren't contributing to the problem. McCormick commented the Council could make that decision, but he believed there would be a negative reaction to it. Strawser said he was thinking more generally; what he was hearing was that traffic shouldn't be interrupted to accommodate pedestrians. McCormick reminded members that signals would not be the only answer and suggested that more information could

be presented at a future meeting.

Forster Rothbart suggested that if there were sidewalks on the north side of the Farley intersection, it would provide an option for pedestrians to reach a signalized crossing. DeVos and Shahan pointed out that sidewalks on that side of University were under the jurisdiction of Shorewood Village.

Conroy asked if the crosswalk was clearly identified for pedestrian crossings; McCormick believed they were so marked. McCormick commented that these highly traveled corridors are the most troublesome for pedestrians and the industry did not have good answers for them. There was some recent information being published in the National Cooperative Research Highway reports and they were tracking this.

There being no other appearances, the public hearing was closed.

**C 6:00 P.M. - JOINT MEETING WITH TRANSIT AND PARKING
COMMISSION AND DOWNTOWN COORDINATING COMMITTEE RE.
REPORT ON RESTORING PARKING ON THE CAPITOL SQUARE**

[02080](#)

Report re. Parking on the Capitol Square

Present:

PBMVC: (see roll call above from regular meeting)

TPC: Ald. Sanborn, Amanda White, Tim Wong, Kevin Hoag, Diane Paoni, Ken Streit (excused absences: Ald. Radomski, McCabe, Ald. Golden)

DTCC: Ald. Verveer, Megan Christiansen, Paul Haskey, Jeremy Levin, Mary Lang Sollinger, Christine Grutzner (Note that a quorum of this body did not occur until about 7:30 p.m.)

Shahan as chair of the PBMVC called PBMVC to order at 6:05 p.m. and declared that a quorum of PBMVC was present.

Durocher as chair of TPC called TPC to order at 6:05 p.m. and declared that a quorum of TPC was present.

Mary Lang Sollinger as chair of DTCC indicated that a quorum was not yet present but she understood that other members were expected to be in attendance.

Shahan outlined the format for the joint meeting including the need for each body to take its own action if action is desired at some point. Otherwise, the bodies would basically meet as a committee of the whole with Shahan serving as chair.

McCormick introduced himself and others available on the issue: Arthur Ross, Pedestrian-Bicycle Coordinator; Bill Knobloch, Parking Operations Manager; and Catherine Debo, Metro General Manager. The resolution adopted in February requested "that as a part of the implementation process a test of the revised lane configurations and width be initiated; and that after the test, staff report back to the Board of Estimates, to a joint meeting of the Transit and Parking Commission and the Pedestrian-Bicycle-Motor Vehicle Commission, and to the Common Council prior to full implementation." The test was initiated in early May and subsequently the lane configuration was modified due primarily from the negative feedback from bicyclists over the separate bicycle lane. Since the last change, the lane configuration appeared to be working well; limited comments had been received. McCormick referred to the other factors included in the report as additional reference and he was available to respond to questions.

Shahan suggested they hear from the registrants first.

Laura Brown (607 Piper Drive), representing herself, appeared in opposition to allowing parking on Saturdays on the Square. Restricting her comments to Saturdays she identified the problems she experienced as a bicyclist trying to frequent the Farmer's Market. Besides problems they had in the past, the presence of parking had brought more traffic to the Square, motorists were stopping in the right lane and waiting for a parking space, were driving around the Square, motorists were taking over the bus lane and using it to wait for a space, etc. Some of the meters have been hooded while others had not and she said nothing is being enforced. She asked why in a time of gas shortage, were drivers being favored over bus riders or bicyclists? Why are buses excluded from the bus-bike lane when cars are encouraged? She pointed out the shortage of bicycle parking although she understood that more would be added. Why the urgency to provide car parking and not bike parking? She claimed the experience was now so unpleasant for her that she was now patronized the West Side Farmer's market. She noted that initially the proposal as requested by the

Farmer's Market representative was that the parking meters be restricted and this was included in the resolution that was adopted; yet parking was being allowed. She urged removal of the parking on Saturday mornings.

John Taylor (18 ½ North Carroll) appeared and noted his long-term investments in the City of Madison, including being a major supporter of the Genesis Enterprise Center, had funded Madison Cultural Art Center and Food for Thought Festival. Additionally, he had owned several businesses and his perspective was that there was a significant increase in bicycle riders. He suggested that the core of the City depended upon the idea of parking. He referred to his store, J Taylor, maker of Madison Flags. He was present when there was no parking and since the change to add parking. He offered 10 hours of his time in strategic planning and organizational nurturing in establishing and maintaining this strong core for Central Madison. He spoke of getting a vision or great perspective before "starting to shoot at the first target."

Strawser asked the speaker if he was in favor of parking on the Square; Taylor responded he was in favor of a healthy city.

Susan Schmitz (210 Marinette Trail), representing DMI registered in support of parking on the Square. She too supported the concept of a vibrant downtown and believed it was accomplished by allowing cars, bikes and pedestrian. Movement in the downtown was toward this vibrancy and this was good. Parking was working for the businesses and she pointed out when people contacted her about locating downtown a question often asked is where is the customer parking. Personally she indicated she was virtually car-free, and was one who biked seven miles per day to work and used it as a mode for personal trips. She was familiar with the Square lane configurations and from her experience the current figuration worked well-that the separate bike lane had not. She believed traffic moved slowly on the Square so she felt it was safer there than at other locations. She did believe the markings of the lane should include a bike; she claimed it was not marked at all and it needed to be clear that this was a shared lane and this is where the bicyclists should be. She agreed with the sentiment that there be more bicycle parking and understood it was in the works. She suggested that they needed to also provide signing to guide people to the available parking. She said DMI was very committed to the project and was offering its assistance as appropriate.

DeVos asked if there was no parking on the Square and a customer asked where he/she could park, wouldn't that be sufficient. Schmitz said yes, but for some businesses the ability to park in close proximity was critical to their business even if the need was for a short-term time.

Hoag noted that initially the reasons for parking were anecdotal and he wondered if they now had any real data that could be shared. Schmitz said yes, there was some and representatives from the Square were in the audience and could be asked when they made their appearance.

Diane Paoni said that when this was first discussed at TPC there had been a lot of discussion about how signage could be better since there are a lot of parking structures that are available to users of the Central area. Parking ramp vacancy figures show that there are spaces available. She asked if there was any progress during the test period on improving signage. Schmitz responded that

there had been some discussion with Dave Dryer and Bill Knobloch about marketing parking and someone had come to Madison to speak about it. They were moving in the direction of signage and marketing of parking.

Durocher asked what impact the availability of parking on the Square has impacted short-term deliveries. Schmitz said she wasn't the best one to answer this; there were other business owners present who would be better suited to do so.

Logan asked Schmitz for a comparison of her experiences before and after parking was put in. Schmitz responded she felt it was pretty much the same. She did feel with the parking on the Square traffic might be slower and she hadn't personally experienced any issues with the lane and a parked car.

Shahan asked Schmitz where she biked in the shared lane; out from the cars? Schmitz said it depended on where she was destined and where she turned off.

Larry Johnson (P O Box 1485 Madison), representing the Dane County Farmer's Market, reviewed his experiences with the restoration of parking on the Square as it related to the Farmer's Market. He acknowledged that the Dane County Farmer's Market had requested that parking be restricted on Saturdays because of concerns as it related to loading/unloadings which occur. He had assumed that the meters would be appropriately marked with "no parking on Saturdays" or that the City would place parking bags on the meters. Instead they learned that they would have to buy the paper meter bags and place them themselves. Initially they did this. There was some customer confusion. In the past customers had used the curb lane/bus loading area to stop and pick up goods, but with the meters bagged there was concern that they couldn't do this and it resulted in customers parking in the traffic lane while loading goods. Because of the time it took to place bags on the meter, and the Board in June decided to try it without restricted parking. Since this has been done, they have not seen any major problems and have since stopped bagging meters except possibly in some locations. He didn't believe there was much problem in the early morning; however, later in the day, things get a little tight-especially around the State Street corner due to the significant pedestrian movement in that area.

Kugler asked if he understood correctly that the Farmer's Market did not believe they needed to restrict parking; Johnson said customers liked it and his only concern was safety during the end of a day around the State Street corner. Forster Rothbart asked if he would support restricted parking if it were done by the City; Johnson said he wasn't sure.

Lang-Sollinger suggested that the congestion at State Street and the Square was due to pedestrian and vendors; there was no parking allowed in that area. Johnson said customers might be parking in the bus lane in that area and there were two lanes of traffic turning and this added to the congestion.

Shahan referred to the prior testimony about the congestion created with people looking for parking and those who have found a place staying for a longer period of time. Did Johnson feel people were parking for longer periods than they had in the past? Johnson said he wouldn't know; he is more involved with the vendors than parking. Shahan asked if Johnson felt there was an increase in the amount of car traffic at State Street from prior conditions; Johnson said he couldn't say.

Wittke asked if it were more a loading zone issue or were people parking for longer periods; Johnson said it was some of both. Wittke asked if he felt there shouldn't be parking during Farmer's Market to allow loading to occur. Johnson said he was not sure he had a position; there are advantages and disadvantages to both.

Stacy Nemeth (150 East Gilman of the Fiore Companies), representing Business Improvement District registered in support and available to answer questions. Kugler asked about the parking situation; Nemeth responded that businesses in the downtown were already at a disadvantage due to the lack of adjacent parking. Most business locate in the downtown due to commitments to the downtown and having some parking available provides some of the competitiveness to a suburban site.

Jim Bradley (2210 Van Hise), representing Savings Bank, registered in support. He pointed out they were a local institution, they were very committed to the community both economically and environmentally. They strongly advocated alternative modes of transportation as evidenced by their sponsorship of car-free challenge, sale of Metro bus passes, etc. They very much supported continuation of parking on the Square. Their customers were not only those coming by vehicles but by foot and bicycle. They had received overwhelming positive feedback with the addition of parking and he cited a couple examples. He referred to the retail environment around their neighborhood, including Capitol Kids, Wintersilks, and Barriques and having the opportunity for convenient, accessible and visible parking is important. He echoed prior comments about the desirability of having more bike parking.

Wong asked the average customer stay; Bradley explained there were typically two types of customer visits: 1) financial planning or loan applications, which would be a longer visits and 2) prior arranged pickups which were short visits and this was the group who could make use of the 25 minute meters. Wong wondered about just providing short-term (25 minute) meters since he felt visits that would be longer than that could take advantage of adjacent ramp parking. Wong pointed out that parking even on the periphery is not immediately adjacent to the site-often in a large parking lot. Bradley said he could see having the two 25-minute meters and conversion of the 2-hour to 1 hour, that would be fine with them. He pointed out that people were creatures of convenience, and just having the opportunity to find a place close to one's destination played a part in people's decisions. He wanted to see this same opportunity afforded to downtown businesses that was found elsewhere. Having parking was important to having a vibrant downtown.

DeVos pointed out that the plan that appeared most likely provided that three bus shelters would be removed and replaced with benches and other amenities. She saw this as being environmentally contradictory. Presumably one would want to do things to encourage bus riding, such as providing amenities such as a bus shelter. She asked how removing bus shelters was environmentally friendly; Bradley said they were not advocating the removal of the bus shelters and he had no other opinion to offer. He believed the shelters themselves should be attractive with good sight lines through the shelter and a lighter appearance; that they presented a comfortable place to wait briefly but not spend any extended time within them. He summarized that he believed there was now a good balance

between buses, bicycles, parking on the Square.

Paoni asked if Bradley had an opinion about the before and after conditions as it related to bus riders and use of his bank. Bradley said he didn't have an opinion and had had no feedback from Metro users.

Peg Scholtes (115 S Franklin #103) registered in support of the parking. She said she was the owner of Capitol Kids at 810 North Carroll. During the experiment she felt they had learned a lot and changes were made. A lot of the observations were still anecdotal since there wasn't enough data gathered to make comparisons. She said they were making change for dollars so she inferred the meters were being used. She pointed out that some additional bike parking had been installed on Carroll Street, although she noted that when she did her own field check of the bike racks located around the corner she found many open racks. She suggested people didn't know where the bike racks were and so maybe they had to do a better job in this area. She pointed out that as the weather becomes colder there would be a shift away from bicycling. She said they saw new customers who ventured in to her store after parking was installed and she believed the existence of parking had brought more people to the Square. She suggested there hadn't been a really good trial period due to all the construction around the Square-much associated with the fountains. She saw a need to continue to educate the tour bus drivers to unload/load passengers and then go to an off-Square site to park.

Shahan asked about her customer base in terms of time of day. Scholtes said she had extra staff during the noon hour, but there were day-to-day fluctuations based on what was happening in the community; e.g., school vacations or other activities scheduled in the area. Saturday mornings are their busiest periods but they had not opposed restricting parking for Farmer's Market Saturdays.

Carlsen asked if there had been a change in tour bus practices after the initial trial and efforts to inform them of what was desired. Scholtes said it was hard to know what would happen next spring, that it would be a continuing effort to educate the tour companies. She said even those buses which were parking were not sitting there idling their buses. Scholtes added that there were some delivery issues because it was not marked and she believed once properly marked the situation would improve. Webber asked for clarification on the area in question and the signing and Shahan suggested this be a question to ask of staff.

Strawser said from the reading of the report tour bus operators were not be remain on the Square even if they plugged the meter; Scholtes said it did occur.

Maria Milsted (106 W. Mifflin) registered in support. She had business property and was landowner in the 100 block of State Street and she was grateful for the extra spaces. She addressed the convenience of these spaces and remembered back when there was parallel parking on the Square and State Street and how vibrant the area was at that time. She believed life was coming back to the Square. She considered herself a person who needed to drive even though she rode a bike recreationally. She addressed the need for the different modes to respect the rights of each and that facilities be provided. She urged the continuation of the parking and support for the current lane configuration for the shared bike-bus-turn lane.

Rosemary Lee (111 W. Wilson Street #108), registered in support and pointed out she was a downtown resident who did not own a car and walked to most of her destinations. However, to encourage dynamic growth downtown, she said it was a small price to pay to allow parking on the Square. She said none of the bus stops were eliminated, only those on State Street when the new bus shelters were purchased. She suggested that every citizen needed to realize that sometimes they might be inconvenienced for the common good of the City. She contended that the situation that exists on State Street and Square was not a result of parking being allowed; rather it was due to the concentration of vendors. She referred to the time when there was retail around the Square along with diagonal parking and believed it was a good thing for the City and efforts to bring it back were worthwhile. They needed to keep the parking.

There being no other speakers, Shahan opened the item for discussion at about 7:00 p.m.

Kugler asked for clarification on the bus shelter issue. Debo reported that there are seven stops on the Square and seven stops would remain. There is a proposal to reduce the number of shelters from seven to four and they had been identified in the materials provided. These stops were considered somewhat redundant since there are other stops available with shelters for people waiting to board another bus.

Webber referred to TPC's request for comments from drivers and although she had seen the memo from Debo, she wondered if they had solicited comments from the drivers. Debo said they had a lot of in-house discussions with drivers and understood the request had come directly from Webber rather than the TPC. By in large, the drivers had done well; they are professional drivers and accommodating the conditions on the Square might be considered no different than situations they face in other areas on a route. She said one issue that would help them would be to have the loading zones marked better. For example, one location would be at Main and Carroll-a major loading and time point for the system. There were experiencing motorists parking in the space because of the lack of loading zone signage. They would suggest using the first bus length from the intersection of MLK to the west as a loading zone and signed accordingly. In that way, individuals would use the loading zone area rather than bus stops for their business. Webber said that in summary the drivers were not having a problem with parking being restored to the Square. Debo responded that there were no major problems and that in general the change had worked out well.

Wong referred to the comment related to those bus stops that were losing shelters as being redundant. He referred to the stop at Main and King by Walgreen's and suggested the closest sheltered stop would be two blocks away at Main and Carroll.

Conroy asked if there had been any feedback from users; Debo said they had received no complaints from customers. She didn't believe transit customers had been impacted in anyway with the change.

Shahan referred to a statement in the report in which it said that users were basically taking the lane and he wondered what time of day the observation was made. Ross said they had done some observations initially when the first bike lane configuration was done and then recently during late morning and early

afternoon. They found that most bicyclists were centered to the left side of the lane and they hadn't observed much conflict between them and motorists. It was very similar to the conditions pre-parking on the Square. Shahan referred to the email he had forwarded and his observations between the 4:30-5:30 time period-basically 50% of these bicyclists were biking within 3 ft. of parked cars, most of the rest tended to take the lane and a small segment biking on the sidewalk. He wondered about the difference in observations; was it due to time of day? Ross replied it could be and pointed out he had not seen the email. Shahan asked Ross to rate the bike-ability and pedestrian atmosphere before the change and since the change, was it better, worse or unchanged? Ross said he would probably say unchanged; he didn't think he had any basis to say it had improved; he supposed that with more traffic on the Square one might say it was a little worse. Shahan asked if he had witnessed conditions on Farmer's Market Saturdays and Ross said he had not.

Carlsen referred to the meter survey and whether or not they had checked to see if the same vehicle was in a space every day. Knobloch responded that by Quiznos there was the same vehicle parking and this was not in one of the two DIS/VET spots. By Starbucks there was good turnover of the DIS/VET space. From his experience walking the Square, he noted that the DIS/VET space over by the Museum was not well used. Carlsen asked if they had checked into the vehicle that was parked consistently; was it someone who worked on the Square and had a valid tag; Knobloch said they had and it was a valid tag.

Paoni asked why the bus shelters were being removed at the three stops. Debo responded said the shelters were secondary issues and not directly related to the restoring parking to the Square. As they looked at the shelter locations, they found these locations not well utilized and after looking at whether they needed them all, staff made a recommendation that three could be eliminated but the stops would remain. Debo referred to the material provided which showed time points and location. Paoni wondered if there was adequate room for these transfer points. Debo said during some times of the day it was tight but if drivers followed protocol, there shouldn't be much of a problem. Paoni sought clarification; if the shelters were removed and stop-go stops established, these locations couldn't be used as layover points. Debo said drivers could use the spot but drivers had locations designated for layovers, which generally only happen during non-peak hours.

Paoni asked if there was any connection to the parking being restored and the elimination of the shelters. Debo responded no; they were two different issues. Shelters could be located at these three sites but an issue that was considered was the cost of shelters and the interest in replacing them with a newer style of shelters. She said the existing shelters were built in an era of big, massive structures and the newer shelters provided a see-through structure that made customers more comfortable. Debo said she understood that there was to be funding in the budget for four such shelters. Shahan referred to the adopted resolution, item 6 "a recommendation on the Square bus shelters be studied by staff and brought back to TPC" and so it was basically a separate issue from the parking and did not need to be linked to restoring parking on the Square.

Webber wanted to clarify the situation with the right lane on the Square. Since the parking was in the farthest right-lane, turns had to be made from this right lane and it resulted in motorists remaining in the lane longer than they should.

She understood there had to be some restrictions due to some Fixed Guide way funding which Metro receives. She asked if regular vehicular traffic had to be restricted from the lane; Debo said that was true. Webber asked if there was enforcement of this since there were motorists driving around in the right lane. Debo said she couldn't answer that question. Webber asked Debo if she was concerned that the lane was not functioning as FTA thinks it functions and thus were federal funds in jeopardy? Debo said she felt from her observations that the lane was functioning well. She understood they could expect more people in the lane than before because of those seeking a parking spot. Webber clarified her question was there any possibility that the City would lose Federal funding by putting parking in the lane since it was not enforced as an exclusive transit lane? Debo said she was not concerned because they had looked into it. Webber asked if FTA had said they could put parking in the lane. Debo said that parking was not a problem; the lane that they were receiving money for is the shared bus-bike and turn lane and she acknowledged that cars would cross and be in the lane in seeking a parking place. She had no concern about meeting federal requirements. Webber said that when FTA was here for MPO recertification, they specifically said they look at parking as a violation of that. Debo said she had had interviews with FTA at the MPO recertification review and no one raised the subject with her. Webber said her purpose for continuing the line of questioning was that she wanted to make sure that they would not jeopardize this federal funding and that they had a very clear ruling with FTA on it. Debo remarked they had checked into and there was no problem.

Webber asked if there were any counts on the number of motorists driving in the right lane looking for parking. Shahan said no; he said the discussion at that time the resolution was passed was that there would not be a lot of data collection undertaken. Webber asked if delivery vehicles could legally park in yellow zones. Knobloch responded they could as long as they weren't at intersections or crosswalk or an unattended vehicle. Webber suggested that once the driver leaves the vehicle and walks away wasn't it an unattended vehicle. Knobloch said that No Parking zones allowed attended vehicles to be parked. He believed the enforcement was based on whether they could see constant activity occurring. McCormick followed up that there were two types of no parking: 1) No Parking and 2) No Stopping, Standing or Parking. In the latter situation, no vehicle-attended or otherwise-was to stop in the signed location. He would defer to Police as to the interpretation they apply for attended vs. unattended parking. They had asked the police enforcement officers if enforcement on the Square was any different than any other similar areas in the City and they had responded that it was not.

Webber asked if there plans to mark loading zones. Knobloch didn't think so; they find when a loading zone is marked, it gets used all day and delivery trucks are forced to other areas where they are not desired.

Forster Rothbart asked about comments from one of the speakers and if there was any interest in re-evaluating the policy of locating buses off the Square on Farmer's Market Saturdays. Debo said they have been off the Square with the Farmer's Market Saturdays for some 4-5 years; they believed it was safer for them to be off the Square during the Farmer's Market.

Lang Sollinger shared some information she had received as a result of an email to Capt. Mary Shauf when asked if she had any complaints in the last four

months; she had replied that they had not.

DeVos remembered a memo before the experiment was undertaken when there was a definite link between putting parking on the Square and taking bus stops off. In that memo, it indicated there would be no problems for patrons to walk a block or two off the Square. Wasn't this a correct recollection? Debo responded that much has transpired over the period of time since the idea was first put forth and then implemented. Parking on the Square and retention of bus stops changed over a period of time. Originally they had talked about removing the three stops, but then eventually they decided against this.

DeVos questioned removing shelters that provided shelter from wind and rain and not replacing them on what appeared to be an aesthetic and economic basis. Debo commended that she could not speak for the patrons; but she could say that the bus shelters planned on the Square are similar to the ones on State Street and experience is that many more people use the redesigned shelters than the former ones.

Durocher pointed out the original resolution from the Council called for no parking on the Square during Farmer's Market Saturdays. The status of this was unclear to him based on recent practices. Would it be that approval of the report should include reference to not having to bag the meters on Saturday? He wondered if they technically needed to deal with this issue. Knobloch said that since the resolution allowed the Farmer's Market to bag the meters, they made such arrangements and charged them the rate that would be charged to anyone else. At first the Farmer's Market didn't bag the meters and then did and then again stopped. A bagged meter meant no one could park there, including those there for loading/unloading. The Market had bagged only some meter, but Knobloch felt that created a worse situation because there was no consistency in whether there were cars parked or not. As a visitor to the Market he had on occasion parked in one of the stalls and walked around the Square and found by in large the parked spaces were being used by customers to the Market-not the vendors. He saw high turnover on the use of these meters. He saw a change not to bag the meters as appropriate; it could be an issue to be revisited with Farmer's Market staff to see what direction should be taken. He believed that if meters were to be bagged; all of them should be including the DIS/VET.

Wong said he understood if one were in the right lane, the driver is to turn right at the next intersection. When the Square was first built, turns weren't allowed at the diagonal street, but he thought that had changed. Was this correct? McCormick said it was. Wong pointed out that there wasn't 100% compliance in the pre-parking period and wondered about the impact now with the extra cars on the Square looking for parking. Were these motorists looking for parking continuing through an intersection in the right lane? Ross said they had no before data to compare after data with. He could only make observations and Ross said it was difficult to determine if someone was in the right lane because of looking for a parking space or if they are just using the right lane as a through lane. Wong wondered the percentage of motorists who do not turn right. McCormick said they did not have any numbers. He said it could be looked at from the perspective that before there was parking, people were using the two lanes as through traffic lanes because the lane appeared more open than today with parking there.

Shahan referred to earlier comments about it not being a good situation for buses to be on the Square on Saturdays during Farmer's Market and the history related to the configuration that was put in place in 1975-was the same reason used for pulling the buses off the Square. Debo said she couldn't say. When she first came to Metro, she took a look at a lot of possibilities and was disappointed that buses were pulled off the Square on weekends but after lengthy discussions with transit staff, they determined it was just not safe to keep the buses on the Square.

Shahan referred to an email to Knobloch and the response that indicated the arrangement was working ok and it provided convenience for people to be able to park. Given the fact that parking on the Square might contribute to more traffic and the comments as it related to safety with buses being on the Square on Farmer's Market days, he wondered if it was really safe to attract more cars to the Square when one considered the amount of pedestrian traffic. Knobloch said it was a question for Traffic Engineering to decide; it was not in his expertise to comment about pedestrian traffic and its relationship with the vehicles on the Square.

Shahan followed up that one of the things that had changed with having parking on Saturdays it that some people do stay for a longer period and he described the conditions as somewhat "zooy" and yet he understood the need for people to be able to load/unload their goods for the Market without double parking people in. He wondered about a parking restriction for loading only-need to be an attended vehicle parking just like it is for businesses the rest of the week. He wondered if this would be an option. Knobloch asked if he was asking if all of the metered areas became loading/unloading areas? Shahan asked if there would be a way to define these spots for loading purposes only on Saturday. Knobloch responded that it would be difficult operationally to pursue and he wasn't sure if it would/could be enforced. Knobloch added that basically most of the spaces were used in this manner anyway on Saturday. He acknowledged the conditions related to people stopping in the inside through lane to place an order and travel around the Square and come back to pick up the order. Shahan said this is a conflict he sees and it was the one referenced by the first speaker. Knobloch wasn't sure it was any worse than what existed pre-parking.

Shahan asked Ross if it was desirable to encourage more parking demand on Saturdays and Ross said this was more a political policy decision. McCormick referred to the resolution that called for them to be bagged because of the concerns raised by adding an additional element to an already busy mix of activities. Shahan said there were degrees of activity on the Square with the Farmer's Market adding complexities on Saturdays and other special events such as Taste of Madison. He wondered at what point did it present enough of a hazard with the pedestrian activity that the parking should be restricted. McCormick said the City has an event management team and it might be something for them to look into. Ross interjected that for some events the Square is totally closed to all traffic on a Saturday (e.g., Cow's on the Concourse), and it basically was a political policy decision. One could take the position that if it isn't safe for buses to be on the Square, it isn't safe for any vehicles to be on the Square, but he didn't see the situation being that bad.

Wittke asked the plans for pavement markings. Ross replied they would be similar to what is there now. There were some bends on the corners to be straightened out, and there would just be the single line separating the left and

right lanes of traffic. Wittke asked if there would be any bikes or diamonds stenciled on the pavement. McCormick said the diamond would be reinstalled, the joint line wouldn't be replaced. The marking plan could be brought back. Ross pointed out there would be no changes regardless until Spring. Wittke wondered about some tree trimming to make the overhead signs more visible, particularly when there was no supplemental pavement marking. McCormick said this is something that could be looked into.

Durocher said TPC would soon lose quorum so he agreed with Shahan that the individual commissions should place this item on their next agenda for further discussion and action if desired.

Lang-Sollinger asked if the report would be automatically sent to the Council. Shahan saw the action being requested as acceptance of the report and to forward any modifications as a part of this report. TPC was identified as lead, and as such reports from the other bodies would be expected to be sent to them and they forward it to the Council.

Logan asked if in the construction of the fountains had they found any service lines because when the curb cut options were being considered one of the concerns was the cost associated with service lines and he wanted to know what they had found. McCormick said that would be a question City Engineering would need to answer. Logan asked when the next reconstruction of the Square would be. McCormick said the curbing was relatively new although there might be some concrete repair. Logan asked the lifetime of the curbing; McCormick thought 20 or more years.

Logan asked if there were any qualitative data on bicycle traffic since the change; Ross said he didn't have any.

Strawser said that although he didn't think they would ever have compliance to motorists in the right lane turning right at the intersection, he thought they could reduce the number of people not following through by better pavement markings. He asked why they would replace the diamond markings; doesn't it refer to a high-occupancy vehicle lane and he wondered why they weren't considering the markings that had been suggested by Mike Rewey-right turn arrow in front of every signal except State Street. McCormick said they would like to bring back the marking plan to the PBMVC. They had talked with the Federal highway representative in charge of markings and have that information as well as the suggestion by Rewey, an engineer, and as engineers to the city they would have their recommendations. Strawser added that the diamond wasn't meaningful to motorists behind him as a bicyclist and he thought the right-turn arrow might convey the concept more clearly. Shahan asked if this information would be available at the next meeting and McCormick responded he believed so.

Paoni understood that the diamond lane meant bus only and Metro gets fixed guide way funding for that on the condition that it not be a travel lane shared with cars. She referred to when they were talking about adding spaces to the Square, ideas about trying to work with the State government on the inner Square lane had been rejected because it was under State ownership. What was happening during Farmer's Market since vendors were using those spaces? Was there a mechanism for that to happen? Levin noted that as a former Capitol employee they would be reminded that on certain times their vehicles needed to be

removed. Ross said he understood that the Farmer's Market has a permit with the State Capitol-not with the City and this issue is likely addressed in that permit.

Paul Haskey observed that the Saturday traffic on the Square except for buses consists of pedestrians, bicyclists and motorist destined for the Saturday events and there is the expectation that there will be this hustle and bustle-that there will be in a crowd. The buses meanwhile are not destined for the event, but rather are traveling through so it is appropriate for them to be relocated off the Square. He suggested that as one approached the Square one's level of alertness and excitement reflects the fact that one has arrived at a special event.

Grutzner submitted some materials to the body; letters from business owners in favor of maintaining parking on the Square.

Logan/Webber moved to suspend the rules for PBMVC to meet beyond 8 p.m.

Each of the bodies adjourned their meetings and PBMVC moved to its regular meeting business.

Motion by Webber/Logan to refer to the item to the October meeting carried unanimously.

XX REGULAR PBMVC MEETING ITEMS:

D PUBLIC COMMENT

Vern Kempfer (1449 MacArthur), representing the Mayfair Park Neighborhood, appeared to request a stop sign at MacArthur and Sycamore. He presented written material, outlining the concerns. They were primarily (1) School bus stop for kids, (2) visibility, (3) traffic speeds, (4) traffic volume due to adjacent land uses, (5) presence of a blind person in the area, and (6) support by the residents for a stop sign. Included in his material were some photos showing the area of concern.

Shahan asked when the stop sign list would be before the body again; he recalled it had been here recently. DeVos wondered if a traffic island was considered; McCormick said it had been further east and this island had yet to be constructed.

Wittke asked if the problems were most evident when children were going to/from school. Kempfer said that with the reconstruction of East Washington Avenue, conditions have changed and there are issues over longer periods of the day. Wittke wondered if some of the problems might relate to school drop offs and pick ups. Kempfer said some of the concerns relate to the school bus loadings/unloadings-there were four different buses serving the area. Wittke explained that she was trying to get a handle on whether parents dropping off and picking up children contributed to the problem and that it might be an area to look at to improve the situation. Kempfer did not believe that this was an issue. He referred to the housing density with a relatively high number of children needing to board buses.

Shahan asked that the item be referred to staff for follow up report on future agenda.

E APPROVAL OF MINUTES - August 24, 2005

A motion was made by Ald. Webber, seconded by Logan, to Approve the Minutes. The motion passed by acclamation.

F MADISON POLICE DEPARTMENT REPORT ON TRAFFIC RELATED ISSUES - None

G SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS - None

H OLD BUSINESS ITEMS (Note items may required action)

H.1 [02073](#) TRAFFIC SIGNAL PRIORITY LIST FOR 2005

Shahan asked if there was any further discussion and desire by commissioners to request more detailed information on intersections that might be considered for inclusion on the 2006 list of projects. McCormick summarized that this was the second of three meetings used for this process and the final list for review and approval would be expected on the November agenda.

Shahan suggested that Ridge and University should be put on the list for follow up review and asked if there were others.

Smith suggested a couple of locations that staff would recommend for further study:

- Sam's Club driveway and Watts Road. There had been a study done for Sam's Club because of some planned improvements and staff would use the information in the report as well.
- Anderson and Hoffman. Smith reported that studies had been done last year and due to the continuing growth, it was suggested that the information be updated.

Shahan asked if there were others, and McCormick pointed out that Cottage Grove and Thompson would be a potential one since the bridge over the Interstate was scheduled for 2006 and there would be a new police station being sited there. He understood Ald. Compton was interested in this being looked into and Smith said the Police Captain had requested it.

Webber asked for some clarification on the warrant table; was she correct in assuming that everything with the negative number under "overall % below warrant". Smith said that was correct but it applied only to whether the intersection met Warrants A or B; the other factors were not taken into consideration in the numerical totals. Smith provided additional explanation to how the warrants were applied and how the warrants other than A and B were factored into the analysis, there was a key found at the bottom of the table.

Webber referred to the intersection of Highland, Regent and Speedway where there had been a serious pedestrian crash and she wondered how the pedestrian warrant factored into locations such as this. If they wanted review would that mean pedestrian data would be collected?

DeVos asked if there wasn't a crossing guard at Edgewood and Monroe to facilitate school crossings. Ross reported that there is a crossing guard assigned to that location. DeVos asked the relationship of assigned crossing guards to the need for signals; McCormick said they were independent issues.

Forster Rothbart pointed out that the only location not showing a "no" for pedestrian warrant was Johnson and Randall and Engineering Drive. Smith reminded members that the numerical ranking did not take into account any of the factors other than Warrant 1-A ;and Warrant 1-B. This numerical ranking did not mean that a signal couldn't be approved for installation based on one or a combination of the other warrants. Forster Rothbart asked what he should expect in terms of approving projects to move forward based on this ranking. Shahan indicated that generally the Commission has supported use of the 1A and 1B warrants although there have been situations where signals were recommended which had not met these two warrants; e.g., University Avenue and

Spring Harbor. There have been locations in which future projections led to a signal being installed before it was warranted, such as around East Towne and West Towne.

Strawser asked if he understood the pedestrian warrant; it was a warrant that could be used to justify a traffic signal. However, if an environment is so hostile for pedestrians that they avoid a location, it seemed they were in kind of a circular argument of whether an intersection should be signalized to accommodate pedestrians. Wittke asked for an example of a signal being put in under the pedestrian warrant; Smith responded at Dryden and Northport, Jenifer and Williamson, and most recently on Johnson Street at Murray.

Shahan reminded members about Raymond and Whitney in which they had had appearances during the year requesting that the all-way stop be changed to a signalized intersection; accordingly he suggested it be added to the list. However, he reminded members that signals wouldn't necessarily improve an intersection's safety performance and referred to McKenna and Raymond where a signal had been installed and they experienced more crashes. Strawser wondered if in this analysis they distinguished between the type and severity since he contended that a higher number of crashes at lower severity would be a more desirable outcome than the other.

Shahan identified locations for further investigation/report:

- Ridge and University
- Sam's/Walmart Driveways to Watts Road
- Anderson and Hoffman
- Cottage Grove and Thompson
- Highland, Regent and Speedway (pedestrian count)
- Whitney and Raymond

Motion by Webber/Conroy to approve the above identified locations for further study carried unanimously.

- H.2. [01191](#) Revising the Neighborhood Traffic Management Program (NTMP) to allow for the use of speed humps on local or collector streets with volumes of 5000 vpd or less.

A motion was made by Ald. Webber, seconded by Strawser III, to Refer to the PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION. The motion passed by acclamation.

I NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

- I.2. [01969](#) To Vacate/Discontinue Moulton Court, declare portions of Eastwood Drive and South First Street as surplus right-of-way and authorize the Mayor and City Clerk to execute all necessary documents associated with both actions. (6th AD)

A motion was made by Ald. Webber, seconded by Conroy, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS

McCormick said that in addition to the material provided, there was a handout showing the background basically from the Schenk Atwood Business Plan and the Potential First Street, Winnebago Street and Atwood Avenue Transportation Changes. Different alignments were shown and they were looking into how much right-of-way could be released for a new development between First and Moulton Court. The neighborhood plan had contemplated needing to do this and they had since worked with a developer and Alderperson to see what the lane configurations would need to be. Currently at First Street there are four lanes but it is barreled off to provide three lanes so there was excess right-of-way. They were able to make a realignment change to the west which allowed space for the developer, retained the three lanes, maintain the bike lanes on First Street. Moulton Court is related to the development project, but not really First Street. It is an old remnant. The Krupp Development Company had purchased all of the properties fronting on Moulton on Court so there no longer was a need for the street since it would be incorporated into the development project. He referred to the right-of-way no longer at First Street and Eastwood; there would be no change in the lane configuration for Eastwood.

Joe Krupp registered in support and available to answer questions. He indicated on his registration: "All property owners contiguous to vacated Moulton Court support vacation. Applicant has an accepted offer to purchase 1901 Winnebago which is the only other property served by Moulton Court." He pointed out the McCormick had summarized the situation well.

Ald. Judy Olson registered in support and referred to the email she had provided to members. She pointed out that this was a discussion in the neighborhood for some time and was part of an adopted plan by the City (Schenk-Atwood Business District Master Plan in 2000). Prior to adoption the subject plan went through a pretty good neighborhood discussion effort. There were concerns that the proposal to narrow the right-of-way would invoke something identified as two-way Winnebago. It was matter of great concern but she believed that issue had been adequately addressed by making sure that they were not redirecting traffic and they were retaining the right hand turn lane so there won't be traffic stacked such that at a future date it might make it necessary to have a two-way Winnebago. The engineering department was concerned and insisted on creating bike lanes in both directions and to do so primarily because of the bike lanes that would be created on other segments of First Street with a reconstruction project in 2006. It raised the question she had posed in her email and she emphasized that this was not something that had to be answered tonight. It suggested a future agenda item. If there were going to have bike lanes on the segment from Winnebago to Eastwood on First Street, the bike lanes needed to go somewhere. She was therefore asking PBMVC and others who might be involved to look into providing good access and connection between First Street and the Isthmus Bike path.

Shahan said he too wondered about Eastwood and First Street and the First Street reconstruction; and the main thing he wanted to know was that if they vacate portions of First Street they not regret it because some future need. Was the diagram on page 12 an accurate reflection of what would be needed for right-of-way or did they need to defer on the vacation of the First Street portion? He understood the others but wasn't confident on First Street.

McCormick said they were confident. They had worked with Krupp and he believed that although compromises had been made, he believed the outcome was the best scenario. Many alternatives were analyzed and they were confident they had the lanes that were needed. Traffic counts were done and he pointed out there were very few turns being made at First Street and then turning left back to the neighborhood; they had good capacity and they were not experiencing any traffic queuing between Winnebago and Eastwood. He understood City Engineering was comfortable with the design proposal. In terms of the bike lanes they saw it as an opportunity to be able to cross Eastwood to the Isthmus bike path and it was something they would need to look at at a future meeting.

Shahan said that the design provided for the a southbound through the intersection and left onto Eastwood and for traffic going north, there is a left-hand lane for left hand turns and straight through movement and the right lane for right-turns only.

McCormick said that at Winnebago and First, there would be a left turn lane turning into Winnebago so it matched into the reconstruction of First Street from Winnebago to East Washington and Johnson. They were happy to be able to get the bike lanes on First Street to Winnebago and down.

Strawser asked about the northbound bike lane. McCormick referred to diagram 12 and he identified the bike lane location. There would be marked bike lanes on both sides of First Street from Eastwood to the north. To the east would be the same. Olson understood that the right turn lane was a shared bike lane. McCormick said they needed to look at the marking through there; he was not sure what the lane dimensions were and it could be checked out further, but the goal was to have space for bicyclists to the north. McCormick said there was space to accomplish it.

Forster Rothbart referred to diagram 12 and noted the sidewalks on the west did not show a curb cut to the intersection; McCormick say it was something missed on the drawing; there would be that provision.

Forster Rothbart asked if there would be any changes on the traffic island at Eastwood. McCormick said it would remain, and at some point the intersection would be redesigned. They would expect to keep the "hot" lane. They were look at a "hawk" signal that would have an advance stop bar and would be doing something different to alert motorists of the change in conditions. Normally the lane is controlled with a green but in the future when there is a crossing, they would need to make a change. They were looking into newer technology for a treatment to alert motorists of a change in conditions and need to prepare to stop. In terms of the crossing they also would need to look into as it related to the slopes involved and how they would be accommodated.

Olson asked if the southbound lane would be striped before the crossing; McCormick said normally they would but there would be no need for it. For now the treatment would be different until the connection had been made.

Shahan summarized that based on the information provided, there appeared to be sufficient space to accommodate the bike lanes if the right-of-way were vacated as described in the resolution before the body.

Strawser asked about any future possibility of making Winnebago two way. Olson responded that the resolution didn't address that issue one-way or the other. It was a question out there. Nothing that was happening with this project would either promote or prevent that opportunity.

Webber/Conroy moved approval of the resolution; carried unanimously. The motion passed by acclamation.

- I.3. Plan Commission Referral - Blackhawk Church Town Center - TDM Plan

McCormick introduced the item indicating it was a development project on Madison's west side; it was a General Development Plan (GDP) Rezoning, to be followed with a Specific Implementation Plan (SIP) Zoning. The PBMVC was being asked by the Council to review the PDM plan and representatives from the Blackhawk Church and Engineering firm were here to provide an overview.

Registering in support was Roderick Smith (5710 Wilshire Dr Fitchburg 53711), representing the Blackhawk Church, and available to answer questions and Jeff Held (Strand Associates 910 West Wingra Drive 53715), representing the church.

Held explained that the church currently located on Whitney Way serves 2500 people on a Sunday with the sanctuary seating approximately 350 and as a result the church provides 9 sanctuary and video café services. Traffic within the neighborhood had become an issue. In 2002 the church had approved the purchase of a 40 acre site located north of Mineral Point Road at South Point Road and the proposed Blackhawk Church Town Center is consistent with the greater vision of the neighborhood as set forth in the Elderberry neighborhood plan. The TDM plan as provided to members provided what they saw as some achievable objectives for the church and future uses that might be developed. Land uses outside of the church plan were not known at this time but it was envisioned as retail and office, possibly some residential.

Webber sought clarification of the street system into the development; basically there was none into the property at this time, but it would be served through an extension of South Point, which would connect to the north to Old Sauk Road. There would be a parallel road (Isaac) to Mineral Point within the property to serve as a collector to the area. Additionally, there was another north-south collector on the west side of the property, which connected to Old Sauk Road. Webber explained the reason for her question was to determine how people would walk or bike to the property. She asked if either of the through N-S streets had bike lanes; McCormick responded that South Point would but Schewe would not, although it would be compatible for bike use. Held interjected that part of the problem is that the Blackhawk Church plan was further along than the rest of the development in the Elderberry neighborhood, and he pointed out that the plans for Elderberry and Blackhawk Church address pedestrian accommodations being a priority.

Webber asked the timing for construction of connecting streets so that one could access the development from more than Mineral Point Road. McCormick said these would be addressed over time. In the second phase of development, South Point Road would cross Mineral Point Road. From the north, there were no streets constructed yet; Elderberry Road existed in the middle of the neighborhood.

Webber asked when the first phase of construction was expected; spring 2006 with it being occupied in mid-2007. Webber asked when there would be a connection into the development area other than off Mineral Point Road. Smith responded that was outside their control, and McCormick said it would be based on when additional development of the Elderberry neighborhood occurs. McCormick said that Brad Murphy in Planning might be able to provide more information on when development might occur.

Webber asked if there were other options to getting to the church property other

than driving a personal car based on the road network. DeVos suggested carpooling. Held said that they would be limited in the initial years unless other development surrounding the property occurred. However, he emphasized that the connections were planned as the property was developed.

DeVos understood the conditions that exist with the present site and believed that the church was moving in the right direction with its relocation plan and planned transportation demand management accommodations acknowledging the limited street infrastructure at this time.

Webber said PBMVC was being asked to comment on a TDM plan that apparently has no schedule for being able to provide the services identified. She was unsure what was expected of PBMVC.

McCormick commented that from a planning standpoint the church town center fit into the neighborhood plan uses, but until the other land uses occurred, there were would be shortcomings in the transportation accommodations that would be available. Metro transit would not serve the area until densities were sufficient to make it a viable alternative. The street network in the plan was strong, but wouldn't be constructed as a part of the development. The parking structure envisioned would serve more than the church property. The church would continue to provide its shuttle service to bring members to the services. He suggested this could be acknowledged in the comments given to Planning.

Webber referred to the comment on the church possibly not retaining the 40 acres but might possibly sell it. If that were the case, who would be in charge of making sure that the TDM elements are implemented. Members suggested the City would be. McCormick said they might suggest as a comment that as development goes forward, this TDM framework is what would need to be followed. Smith/Held understood that each element of the SIP would come before the Plan Commission and Council and that would be a time when this could be dealt with.

With the lack of a street network being shown, Webber was concerned that the network might not be built. She wanted some assurance that the street network shown and the one under which this development was conceived would be realized. She suggested the street network should be built right a way so that it would provide the connections for walking, biking and busing since it was not an option on Mineral Point Road and from the south, there was no way to cross except for Midtown Road which also was not bike-able. McCormick that such comments could be made to the Plan Commission and Council.

Forster Rothbart questioned the number of spaces in the planned parking structure; Held responded there would be a total of 545 stalls in a two-story structure. The adjoining land uses would share the parking. Forster Rothbart asked the timetable for the church and parking structure; Held said there were two versions of the SIP proposed - one, with a the lower level of a two level deck being constructed initially and the other be constructing both levels. The reason was based primarily on financial considerations. However, before the sites other than the church were developed, the second level of the parking deck would need to be constructed. Asked if the 545 spaces were expected to be used by church clientele, church representatives indicated they would and it was their hope to be able to cut back from the 9 service hours to something less than that (possibly

two in the a.m. and two in the p.m.).

Forster Rothbart asked if the expectation was for the vast majority of the church attendees to be able to use the parking structure with about 300 persons coming via some other means than single occupant vehicles. Held said that although parking would be available, they planned through TDM measures to encourage other modes so perhaps not all of the 545 spaces would be used. Forster Rothbart commented that with the lack of the infrastructure for modes other than vehicles and the reality that the way to get to the church would be by car, they would be setting themselves up to not succeed in meeting the TDM goals and he did not have a solution. He wondered about not constructing the entire ramp at the onset. McCormick again suggested this might be a comment to forward to the Plan Commission. He added that there may be retail uses that evolve that might be opened on Sunday and that might be a factor.

Church representatives acknowledged that some of the TDM strategies may not be able to be implemented initially, but having the plan helps to remind them that they need to be implemented. The Church intended to have a TDM Coordinator to work toward encouraging alternative modes. Held reminded members that church trips generally were not single occupancy.

Forster Rothbart referred to a recommended change on page 5-6 where it addressed the TDM coordinator and suggested the position not be confined to the church but other land uses. Shahan pointed out he had a suggested change for this that he would address later. Forster Rothbart said he had not found much about bicycle parking and thought it could at least acknowledge the lack of such facilities at the present and that accommodations for bicycle parking would be provided. Smith responded that this was addressed in the SIP with locations identified.

Strawser followed up on parking provisions and Held indicated that the two-tiered parking structure would provide 545 stalls and there were also 113 surface parking stalls.

Shahan echoed issues raised by Webber and Forster Rothbart as it related to a piece of development occurring before the infrastructure was in place. An initial thought was to use Elderberry and provide connections to the south. Also Watts Road traversed the Pioneer neighborhood and connect to South Point and then connected into the Elderberry neighborhood and he did not know the phasing for this street connectivity. He encouraged such connections as soon as possible; and wondered if the Plan Commission might consider not approving it because of the lack of the infrastructure since it meant that goals for the TDM would not be met for the foreseeable future. It was critical to develop people's habits/patterns early in a project. He suggested the Plan Commission look into finding ways to provide connections via Elderberry or Watts Road sooner rather than later.

Referring to Forster Rothbart's concern about developments outside of the church and having some assurance for a buy in to the TDM goals, Shahan suggested the formation of Transportation Management Association (TMA). Smaller employers could pool together and work with the TDM coordinator.

Shahan referred to some items not shown in the TDM but which were shown in Best Practices put out by EPA: 1) parking cash out, where people are paid a part

of the value of employee provided parking to those who do not use it. 2) Free bus passes or subsidized bus passes.

Noting the reference to 120 employees to define large employers, Shahan asked the source of the number. Held indicated it was a judgment call. Shahan wanted to see more justification for that number, and asked why not use 50-he felt 120 was on the high side. Held commented that when putting the number together they took into consideration not creating a hardship on the properties and thus make them less desirable and unattractive for development. Across the City a TDM plan is not required, so it could create a disadvantage to the church in marketing its other land uses. They had not wanted to set goals that would be unachievable by prospective tenants and that likely was a reason for not mentioning cash outs and he emphasized that there were a lot of TDM measure that were included in the document. Shahan said that as development occurs and if they find goals become unachievable, he would like to see a mechanism such that the plan would come back for revision. He referred to the projections in terms of street capacities at Mineral Point and the Beltline. Held believed that the idea was that the TDM plan would be re-evaluated with each of its elements so he wasn't sure that a change in the document was necessary. Shahan thought something should be included.

Wittke asked about the infrastructure improvements since the burden appeared to be on the City for that to occur. McCormick said the plans call for eventual bike lanes going north-south into Middleton and Metro service was dependent on densities being there to expand the service.

Smith pointed out that they might find other opportunities to shuttle people to the site as they currently do with the present site. He added that the site was more compatible to the abutting land uses than the current site that was predominantly residential and emphasized their commitment to using TDM measures.

Logan asked the nearest Metro bus line (a mile and a half away at Junction Road). Logan said if it would be possible for churchgoers to use the bus and then bike to the remaining distance.

McCormick referred to other developments including a neighborhood being developed kitty-corner across the street on South Point and the UW research park; and with this development, Metro service would be more likely.

Logan asked what the incentive was for property owners to meet the TDM goals. Held responded it would be no different than any other employer. In terms of monitoring and keeping the programs going, Held was not sure who the watchdog would be. Logan wondered about having incentives to meeting TDM including possibly a deferment of property tax. DeVos suggested it could be a part of the requirement.

Webber asked the number of employees at the church (30 employees). Smith noted the flexibility in work hours with these employees because of the expanded service hours for their parishioners.

Shahan sought clarification on whether other developers would be required to buy into the TDM plan or would it just be recommended. McCormick saw it as providing the framework to notify and share the information.

Forster Rothbart asked if it would be reasonable to ask for modifications of the GDP to require updates of the TDM Plan; Shahan support the recommendation and added that future development be required to sign onto the TDM Plan.

Shahan summarized the items heard:

- Need for streets shown to be built -
- TDM to be a condition for future developments and not just this applicant.
- Need for updating and revision with idea of having goals eventually placed in the revision.
- Proceed with one-deck in the parking ramp initially.
- Look at TMA's for smaller employers that wouldn't be covered by the large employee definition.
- Consider parking cash out and free bus passes.
- Look into definition of large employees and consider using trip generation instead.

Webber/Logan so moved that the above items be forwarded to the Plan Commission as comments of the PB MVC.

J REPORTS OF OTHER COMMITTEES - SUMMARY OF ACTIVITY

J.1. Plan Commission

Webber noted that the Plan Commission had referred the Monroe Street Credit Union project to PB MVC so it would be on the next agenda.

Forster Rothbart asked what was expected of him in the way of reports from the Plan Commission and Shahan said he would plan to meet with him to go over this.

J.2. LRTPC

Minutes of the meeting were provided.

J.3. Joint West Area Campus Committee

Meeting was being held concurrent with the PB MVC meeting.

J.4. Joint SE Campus Area Committee

Strawser noted the UW had presented their plan for the next 25 years which would provide for 7 million more square feet of space on campus by taking down buildings constructed in the 1950-1970 and replacing them and parking would be included as a part of the reconstruction.

Planning made a presentation on the Comprehensive Master plan that was scheduled for PB MVC at its next meeting.

K REPORTS OF OFFICERS AND/OR MEMBERS FOR INFORMATION

K.1. Executive Secretary - None

K.2. Items by Chair - None

K.3. Items for Referral and/or Announcements

Strawser noted that neighbors had wanted to speak about an all-way stop at Jenifer and Division and because of the Commission's agenda he had suggested they leave and that it could be the subject of a future agenda.

Webber noted that she would be forwarding a couple items for the October agenda; Shahan suggested she copy Dryer and Fahrbach.

Webber announced that the following week would be the "bike and walk to school" week campaign.

Wittke reported that Safe Community Coalition had received three federal grants which she would like to talk about at some meeting: 1) Older adult pedestrian grant, 2) Reducing impaired motorcycling, 3) increasing safety belt use among 8-14 year olds. It was suggested that it be a future agenda item - possibly in November.

L ADJOURNMENT at 9:30

A motion was made by Ald. Webber, seconded by Logan, to Adjourn. The motion passed by acclamation.

Informational Enclosure
8/16/05 Letter from Dana Evans, 1201 Drake Street

Prepared by Ev Fahrbach, Recording Secretary