



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

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

---

Tuesday, May 23, 2006

5:00 PM

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

---

## CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

**Present:** Ald. Judy Compton, Ald. Robbie Webber, Ald. Paul E. Skidmore, Michael Forster Rothbart, Mark N. Shahan, Matthew A. Logan, Mary P. Conroy, Susan M. De Vos and Charles W. Strawser III

**Excused:** Cheryl E. Wittke and Carl R. Kugler

Conroy left at approximately 6:00 p.m. Forster Rothbart left at approximately 6:30 p.m.

## A. ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

### A.1. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair

Motion by Logan/Strawser to nominate Mark Shahan as Chair.

There were no other nominations. Shahan was unanimously elected Chair.

Motion by DeVos/Strawser to nominate Matt Logan as Vice-Chair.

There were no other nominations. Logan was unanimously elected Vice-Chair.

### A.2. [03725](#) Approval of PBMVC Rules and Procedures

Referencing Section II, Item (D) Agenda, Shahan pointed out that the City's electronic legislative file program (Legistar) has changed the timeline for materials being presented to staff. This section states that agenda materials shall be received by the Executive Secretary no later than eight days prior to the scheduled meeting, and he wondered about perhaps wording this more vaguely or changing it to say six days. Shahan also suggested re-working the agenda order of business since the stated procedure for New Business is routinely not followed.

DeVos asked about cross-membership between the PBMVC and TPC. Shahan noted that Madison ordinances used to require that there be overlapping membership but it became difficult to find someone to serve on both commissions. Overlapping membership is now encouraged but not required.

DeVos inquired as to the process for developing the agenda each month. Item (D) on page 4 says that the agenda shall be prepared by the Executive Secretary but she was under the impression that the Chair works with the Executive Secretary. Shahan confirmed that he consults with David Dryer about the agenda. The final agenda often reflects staff discretion and whether staff is available to appear on

certain items. If a requested item can't be on the agenda for some reason, staff will contact the Chair.

Section IV, Item (B)(2): DeVos suggested adding email addresses, and Shahan indicated that could be done.

Section II, Item (E): Shahan questioned the language requiring concurrence by the PBMVC members to allow citizen speakers. The PBMVC does not follow this, and historically anyone who has registered has been allowed to speak. Shahan suggested removing the language ". . . and subsequent concurrence by the Commission, by a majority vote if necessary." Compton was unclear as to the meaning of this phrase and commented that perhaps it was included for an eventuality. Webber indicated that not all commissions take public testimony on items, whereas the PBMVC has always allowed it.

Motion by Compton/Conroy to request an opinion from the City Attorney's office whether it's necessary to retain the concurrence phrase.

Forster Rothbart was unclear which items have a public hearing and which don't. The procedure is substantially the same other than public hearing registrants get a longer time to speak. Shahan noted that public hearing items are noticed as such on the agenda.

Referencing his earlier comments, Shahan suggested that Section II (D) Agenda be revised to state materials will be provided to the Executive Secretary no later than six days (rather than eight) prior to the meeting. He also suggested referring the New Business portion of the Order of Business for revisions, noting that staff does not use the cover sheet format much anymore.

Compton accepted Shahan's two suggestions as friendly amendments,

Motion carried unanimously to (a) revise Section II (D) by changing "eight" to "six"; (b) revise Section IV (B)(2) to add email addresses; (c) refer Section II (D) Order of Business--New Order of Business for wordsmithing; and (d) seek an opinion from the City Attorney re: the language in Section II (E) Appearances.

### **A.3. Reaffirm meeting date of fourth Tuesday of the month at 5:00 p.m.**

Motion by Compton/Skidmore to reaffirm the regular meeting schedule as the fourth Tuesday of the month at 5:00 p.m.

Webber wanted to make the PBMVC aware that the Common Council is considering the idea of reserving the fourth Tuesday for additional Council meetings when necessary. Skidmore noted that the Council talked about scheduling a special meeting to discuss inclusionary zoning but he felt it would be rare that the Council would hold a third meeting in the month. Compton asked whether there would be a quorum problem for the PBMVC if the alders had a special meeting on the fourth Tuesday. Shahan advised that the PBMVC quorum is 5. Compton didn't see a problem and noted that if the alders had to leave by 6:30 p.m., actions that required action could be taken up first.

Motion carried unanimously.

**A.4. PBMVC representatives to the LRTPC (Chair or designee) and Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee**

Strawser was reappointed as the PBMVC's representative on the Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee. Logan was reappointed as the Chair's designee to the LRTPC.

Shahan encouraged members to let him know if there are ad hoc or study committees they would like to serve on.

**B. PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

**C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - 4/25/06**

Motion by Compton/Webber to approve the minutes, carried unanimously.

**D. MADISON POLICE DEPARTMENT REPORT ON TRAFFIC RELATED ISSUES - NONE**

None

**E. OLD BUSINESS ITEMS**

**E.1. [03727](#) Traffic Engineering staff report on 2005 public hearing re: annual pedestrian and bicycle improvement projects**

The agenda packet included the City of Madison 2006-2010 Pedestrian and Bicycle Work Program and staff's staff response to the 2005 public hearing (which was also handed out at the April PBMVC meeting) for PBMVC feedback.

Webber noticed that the staff comment for item SC10, Isthmus Path Speed Table Pilot Project, indicates there is no documented problem at any of these crossings. She felt this was incorrect since for the last three years or more, there have been requests for a level crossing of each of the streets that the path crosses. This is a consistent request, which she felt is a "documented problem," and she asked that the comment reflect this. Ross replied there has been no documented crash or safety problem. Webber noted that staff comments on other public hearing requests reflect things other than crashes, such as comfort level and ease of use. She suggested clarifying the comment to say "no documented history of crashes so we don't think we need a level crossing." But that's not the issue, the issue is that in many cases the Isthmus Path carries more traffic than the cross streets, so the path should be the through street at those intersections. And users of the path don't want to go up and down at each crossing, they want a level crossing. To say that there's no documented problem is to ignore the fact that this request comes up year after year. Forster Rothbart asked whether the staff comment could be reworded. Shahan advised that this request came up shortly after the PBMVC came into existence, and a number of people would like this path recognized as the through street at some of the intersections. There is a problem with the smoothness of the curb cuts as well as making the path crossing more visible. He felt a little wordsmithing might be in

order. Strawser wanted to know whether having neighborhood residents request stop signs at some of the intersections would move this request along. At many intersections, the stop signs would need to be located on the street, not the path. If the neighborhood requested stop signs, TE staff would have to look at this request. Webber clarified that the request is not so much to solve a motor vehicle/bike safety issue as it is to make the path a level, through right-of-way. Bicyclists represent the majority of traffic using these intersections and they have an uneven crossing. She felt that saying "no documented problem" is disingenuous to those who have pointed out the problem. Shahan asked whether a smoother curb cut, rather than a speed table, would go a long way to solving the problem. Webber noted that speed tables had been suggested because they would also slow the cross-traffic.

Webber requested, and Compton concurred, that staff provide a more complete response that recognizes that the public has documented this as a problem, even if the crash statistics have not.

DeVos referenced items SC7 and SC8, noting that the City wouldn't need a bump-out if the intersections had regular concrete corners that act to slow down turning vehicles. Shahan noted the bump-out serves the additional purpose of shortening the ped crossing distance, and the turning radius is a different issue. DeVos replied that a lot of regular intersections have the same effect as a bump-out. Compton referenced the bump-outs on Buckeye Road and noted they serve to keep traffic out of the bike lane at corners. The bump-outs also give a visual clue to drivers to reduce their speed. DeVos clarified that she didn't have anything against bump-outs but a regular intersection that is not leveled off to allow vehicles to turn faster does the same thing. But the City Engineer has been rounding the concrete corners even though Madison's Pedestrian Plan says that it should not be done. Webber noted that square intersection corners allow standing peds to be farther away from traffic and there is less street to cross. Corners in residential or neighborhood commercial areas should be square the way they used to be instead of making it easy for vehicles to go around the corners quickly. Shahan noted that a bump-out can have a more square radius. The other issue is very rounded corners that allow for high speed turns and also provide a single wheelchair ramp that directs wheelchair users towards the center of the intersection.

To facilitate the process, Shahan thought it would be helpful to look at those projects that could be done in the short-term versus those down the road. The PBMVC could identify those things it would like to see happen in the near future. He felt SC8 is one of those and noted it will probably be taken up by LRTPC.

Webber identified two "perennial items" that are not on the list but for which she's been waiting for a staff response: (1) intersection of Farley-University Avenue-University Bay Drive. She has been promised a recommendation. (2) Improved indicators for the Square bike/bus/right turn only lane. This issue was included in the discussions about returning parking to the Square. Webber felt that motorists do not see the current signs and she felt it's because the signs are too high. Motorists in the bus/bike/RTO lane cut off bicyclists and follow too closely. She has brought up this problem every year for the past five years, and she had requested it be reviewed as part of the parking on the Square trial.

Forster Rothbart wanted to know what happens with the 2005 list with the staff

comments, i.e., is it provided for information or does the PBMVC need to approve it. Ross suggested that the PBMVC identify projects it wants staff to work on or give staff input on priorities. The intent of the public hearing is to get comments on capital budget projects and priorities for future budgets. Shahan suggested that members identify near-term versus long-term items and then prioritize them. Forster Rothbart asked whether some priorities might make it into the 2007 budget, and Ross responded yes. Ross emphasized that he wanted to bring the focus of the public hearing back to capital budget items. Shahan noted that the public hearing is also a place to bring up some of the little items that tend to get lost. Compton asked whether the items mentioned by Webber would be added to the list. Ross noted that if there are things not on the list that members want to see included as capital projects for the following year, they can bring them up in the discussion of what they want to see happen. The items don't necessarily have to come through the public hearing document. Since the 2006 public hearing will be on next month's agenda, Shahan suggested that members' additional items be put on the 2006 list; in that way the projects will be out there for public comment and will receive feedback from staff.

Compton was aware of speeding around schools and suggested an item to look at traffic calming near schools. Webber referenced the School Traffic Safety Team, of which she is a member. The committee has been working on pick-up/drop-off issues and has talked about widening their mission to include issues like speeding near the schools. Compton requested that the PBMVC ask Traffic Engineering to look at this, and they could refer it to other committees as appropriate. Shahan thought there was a special City program, with its own pot of money, to deal with traffic safety issues around schools. Compton requested a report from Traffic Engineering on traffic calming measures specific to school sites. Ross stated this could be added to the list.

Shahan highlighted the projects he thought could be done in the upcoming year or two: the Sherman Flyer was the top-ranked project for enhancement funding and should be started in the next year to two. MP12 could be done fairly easily and is doable in a year or so. For MP17, what's needed is a cut in the median on Whitney Way and a curb cut to get to Odana Lane. This is a linkage project that he felt should be given a higher priority.

In response to a question, Ross stated that MP20 will be done this year. BL1 is contingent on the bridge work, which Compton indicated will be done in 2007. Referencing BL2, Shahan commented that people do ride in the contra direction now so it should be formalized; this is a little connector that makes a big difference. Referencing BL5, Ross advised that the crack sealing is done almost every year but the new equipment should do a better job. BL11 is in progress, and plans for BL12 should be coming soon to the PBMVC. Shahan identified SW2 and SW3 as little sidewalk connections that could be squeezed in. Shahan noted that SC2 is on the NTMP list and should be done this year. The PBMVC has talked about SC6 (First-Johnson) several times during NTMP discussions, and Shahan suggested that residents apply through that process. Regarding SC8 (talked about earlier), City Engineering is working on updated standards that will probably be completed this fall. Regarding X4, Shahan felt skip-dash markings are effective and felt the PBMVC should talk about changing the City policy. He felt the City can do better than the MUTCD and AASHTO.

Compton identified X1 as a priority.

Logan referenced MP7 and BL10 and noted that this is a very dangerous crossing and access needs to be improved.

Strawser would like to see both MP1 and an alternative that includes bike lanes on Sherman so that bicyclists have easy access to the businesses along Sherman Avenue. Shahan noted that in 1994, there was a proposal for a two-way left-turn lane on Sherman. However, the proposal failed on a 9-12 vote at the Common Council. In the late 1990s, Traffic Engineering piloted a short segment of a TWLTL in front of Northgate Shopping Center but the neighborhood canceled it. A modeling study of Sherman done in the early 1990s found that there would be better platooning of traffic with a TWLTL than the existing four lanes, but there has not been a buy-in from the neighborhood nor support from the alders. Strawser felt the trial project in front of Northgate was a flawed design (too short a distance). He also asked that the crosswalks be painted back where they were and encourage peds to cross the street.

Webber wanted to know where the projects came from that are listed on the Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvement Work Program. Ross advised that the list is provided each year. Some of the projects on the list go back 20 years or more. Some of the projects came out of public hearings over the years, some came from opportunities that presented themselves during new development. The public hearing and staff's response lead into adding items to this list. The projects shown as current year items are ones that have come through the process over the past several years.

Ross suggested the PBMVC decide what it wants to recommend for funding. Webber recalled that the PBMVC has had discussions about having input into priorities for the Transportation Improvement Program, and she wanted to know the timing to accomplish this. Ross noted that the only projects that need to be in the TIP are those for which the City is seeking state and federal funding. Shahan pointed out that the enhancement funding was recently approved but the TIP won't be submitted until September. Webber wanted to look at the timing issue so that the PBMVC can give input on enhancement funding and also the TIP.

Webber noted that some of the cost columns include figures while others include dollar signs but no number. Ross explained that some projects have estimated costs (numbers), but the numbers are always changing. Webber asked whether having a dollar amount means the money is allocated and Ross replied no. The only projects that have money allocated are those scheduled for 2006.

Shahan remarked that he had identified his priorities. He asked that the members and staff think about three to five projects that are the most important to move forward. Base it on need and importance to the users. Echoing Webber's request, Shahan stated he would like to change the process so that the PBMVC has input into projects submitted for enhancement funding. Strawser felt that reconfiguring Sherman to a TWLTL would be relatively cheap. Shahan encouraged members to think about projects for the public hearing and then in July or August the PBMVC can forward a priority list for consideration in the 2007 budget. In response to a question from Forster Rothbart, Shahan asked members to identify 3-5 large and 3-5 small projects, and priorities would be decided after the June public hearing. Ross reiterated that in order to be considered for the 2007 budget, the projects must be submitted by August.

E.2. [03728](#)

University Avenue pedestrian crossing issues: follow-up to PBMVC 4/25/06 agenda item

J. Matzner registered to speak and read a letter to the PBMVC. She expressed her gratitude to the PBMVC and TE staff for working on the ped safety issues and was grateful that TE staff have recommended increasing the WALK times at some campus intersections and installing countdown signals. Referencing audible signals, it was her understanding that the less expensive "clacker" audible device was going to be installed on campus signals. Having audible signals installed on a case-by-case basis, as referenced in the TE memo, may work well for permanent residents but probably not for students. It would make more sense to install audible signals at a few key University Ave intersections to benefit students and visitors. It's unclear how students would even know that audible signals are an option. There's also the issue of the timing between when the request was made and when the device became operational. Ms. Matzner was happy to hear that there's a City policy on audible signals and asked whether it could be added to the City's website. This would enable the greatest access to the policy. Currently there's no information on the TE website about audible signals and there's no way for someone to know that a policy exists.

Brian Smith, Traffic Engineering signal engineer, was present and reviewed the staff memo included in the PBMVC agenda packet.

The list of locations of countdown signals was expanded to include all the locations shown on the University's draft Count Down Priority List.

As far as audible signals, TE staff believe it's best to respond to requests on a case-by-case basis. Some intersections have three tones for crossing the intersection, and the visually impaired ped needs to know which tone is for crossing which leg of the intersection. Staff can also provide information on the signal sequencing. It's important that the visually impaired peds receive this information, and this is more easily accomplished when dealing with the requests on a case-by-case basis. Smith advised that when staff receives a request for an audible signal, it's usually only a short period of time before the change is made.

The staff memo also addressed the issue of increasing capacity for ped crossings of University Avenue. As mentioned at the last PBMVC meeting, changes have been made to increase ped walk times at a few key intersections. These changes comply with the new proposed MUTCD rules scheduled to take effect in December 2008 and also comply with the changes proposed by the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (even though there's no compliance date for those recommendations). Further, additional increases to ped walk times during non-peak periods are planned for the Brooks, Mills, Charter and Randall intersections with University Avenue. He anticipated these changes being made in the next few weeks. Similar changes were made to the crosswalks around the Capitol Loop a few years ago.

TE staff is also recommending to widen (repaint) the University Avenue crosswalks to 20 feet. It's anticipated that having the wider crosswalk and longer walk time will allow more peds to get through.

Compton asked whether TE staff would be able to address Ms. Matzner's request that the audible signal policy be added to the TE website. Smith said it's possible

but he would check with City Traffic Engineer Dryer. Compton asked whether it would be possible to hear the various audible tones on the website but Smith wasn't sure about that. He also noted that TE staff will be working with the UW McBurney Disability Resource Center and that McBurney Center clients will be advised to contact TE about requests for audible signals. PBMVC members supported adding the policy to the website. DeVos noted that many people wouldn't know to ask for audible signals, nor would they know there's a policy. She preferred that Madison would be a proactive community in making it easy for people to cross the street and not require the people to ask for the audible signals. The idea of hospitality for visitors is to have things like this. Smith advised that currently about 10% of the signals in Madison are audible. He noted that audible signals are not much good if the visually impaired don't know that the signal is audible or how it operates. He also noted that some residents complain when the audible feature is activated every cycle, even when no one is waiting to cross. DeVos referenced the audible signal that was installed for crossing University at Mills and the fact that the ped has to push a button to activate it. Someone with poor vision would not know they have to push a button. On the other hand, if "clackers" were installed, no one would have to push a button. Smith noted that a majority of the audible signals in Madison have to be activated by pushing a button. DeVos noted that the area of University Avenue in question is not in a residential area so having the audible come on with every cycle should not be an issue. Smith was not sure of the rationale for the push button at Mills but there was a reason that it was installed.

Strawser was pleased to see the changes proposed by staff, especially the widened crosswalks. Smith stated that they will most likely be zebra crosswalks. The majority of the crosswalks go through the median separating the bike lane from the traffic lane, and that opening will be widened as well. However, the curb ramp at the sidewalk will not be widened. Strawser commented that the wider median cut could be helpful for bicyclists.

Shahan appreciated staff's report and felt it addresses the PBMVC's issues. He referenced the two letters from visually impaired people requesting audible signals (letters from Mr. Liu and Ms. Claire were handed out by Ms. Matzner at last month's meeting) and asked whether TE staff has contacted them. Smith was not aware of the letters. Shahan suggested Smith contact Mr. Liu and Ms. Claire to see if they had a specific intersection in mind for audible signals. Compton wanted to make sure that letters sent to the PBMVC are forwarded to appropriate staff for follow up.

Motion by Compton/Skidmore to accept the report, with a friendly amendment by DeVos that TE staff follow up on (1) contacting the two visually impaired people who wrote letters requesting audible signals, and (2) adding the TE policy on audible signals to the website. Motion carried unanimously.

## F. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

F.1. [03726](#) Review/approve ballot results for West Lawn NTMP project

Ross reported that 66% of the respondents supported the traffic calming.

Motion by Compton/Strawser to approve the ballot results.

DeVos asked whether the comments from Mr. Lunda at the February PBMVC meeting were included. Shahan advised that the ballot went out after Mr. Lunda's appearance and he was included in the ballot area. He voted in opposition. DeVos felt the timing was wrong and suggested waiting to gather data until after the building (condos and grocery store) has been in use for a while. Webber noted that this is a neighborhood decision and the traffic calming initiative received enough votes to move forward. This particular projects is being paid for by the developer of Monroe Commons and was part of the approval of the development.

Motion carried unanimously.

- F.2. [03587](#) Authorizing the City to enter into an agreement to accept funds from Dane County to continue the Pedestrian-Bicycle Coordinator Program in the Traffic Engineering Division.

**A motion was made by Ald. Compton, seconded by Ald. Skidmore, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the BOARD OF ESTIMATES. The motion passed by acclamation.**

- F.3. [03621](#) Determining a Public Purpose and necessity and adopting Transportation Project Plat No. 5992-08-04-4.01 and 5992-08-04-4.02 for the City of Madison and State of Wisconsin to acquire the required land interests for the Starkweather Creek Public Bike Path improvements and authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to sign all necessary documents necessary to accomplish the acquisition of said land interests. (15th AD)

**A motion was made by Strawser III, seconded by Ald. Compton, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS. The motion passed by acclamation.**

- F.4. [03679](#) Authorizing the grant of a permanent limited easement and a temporary construction easement to American Transmission Company for an underground electric transmission line in a portion of the City's East Rail Corridor between East Washington Avenue and East Johnson Street. (2nd & 12th AD)

**A motion was made by Strawser III, seconded by Ald. Compton, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS. The motion passed by acclamation.**

## G. REPORTS OF OTHER COMMITTEES - SUMMARY OF ACTIVITY

### G.1. Plan Commission

Forster Rothbart left before this item came up.

### G.2. LRTPC - 4/20/06 minutes encl.

Shahan reported that at the May meeting they talked about referrals and ideas on how to get items referred that need oversight by transportation bodies. Some projects are slipping through the cracks. The LRTPC also had an update on Transport 2020.

**G.3. Joint West Campus Area Committee**

The meeting was canceled due to a lack of proper notice.

**G.4. Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee**

Strawser stated the meeting was canceled due to a lack of agenda items.

**H. REPORTS OF OFFICERS AND/OR MEMBERS FOR  
INFORMATION/DISCUSSION**

**H.1. Executive Secretary Report**

None

**H.2. Items by Chair**

Shahan reported that the June PBMVC meeting will include the ped/bike public hearing.

**H.3. Items for Referral and/or Announcements**

Webber asked that the School Traffic Safety Committee be added as a regular report on the agenda. She reported that much of their discussion has focused on the process of doing evaluations around schools and what the follow up will be. The Police Department is doing training for the school safety patrols. A PowerPoint presentation is being prepared so members can talk to neighborhood associations and PTO's about the process for evaluating and improving traffic around the schools. The committee needs better internal follow-up on deciding which schools need evaluation, when the evaluations will be done, and how the follow-up will occur. Shahan asked whether the issue has come up re: discouraging parents from driving their children to school. Webber noted there are bigger issues and there's not a lot of staff or money in this right now. The PBMVC, or at least its three alders, might want to consider whether the City wants to embark on a real Safe Route to School project that would encourage biking and walking and thereby discourage driving, and also evaluate the reasons why parents drive their children to school and thereby increase the congestion. Perhaps the City could take this up with the School District liaison to see if the School District could eliminate some of their transportation costs if they could eliminate some of the reasons that kids within a short distance of the school are being bused.

Compton urged the School Traffic Safety Committee to recommend that the City won't cut crossing guards if they want to encourage walking or biking to school. Need to encourage the addition of crossing guards, not the removal.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Upon a motion by Webber/Strawser, the meeting adjourned at 6:55 p.m.