



# City of Madison

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

## Master

**File Number: 11560**

**File ID:** 11560

**File Type:** Resolution

**Status:** Filed

**Version:** 1

**Reference:**

**Controlling Body:** TRANSIT AND  
 PARKING  
 COMMISSION

**File Created Date :** 08/05/2008

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

**Final Action:** 11/18/2008

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

**Notes:** INTRO FROM FLOOR

**CC Agenda Date:** 08/05/2008

**Sponsors:** Brenda K. Konkel, Michael E. Verveer, Marsha A.  
 Rummel, Robbie Webber, Satya V. Rhodes-Conway  
 and Eli Judge

**Enactment Date:**

**Attachments:** Planning Division Rpt 061107.pdf ,Excerpt E Wash  
 Cap Gateway Corridor Plan 2008.pdf  
 ,ID-11560-draft4-marked-up

**Enactment Number:**

**Author:** Ald. Brenda Konkel, District 2

**Hearing Date:**

**Entered by:** lveldran@cityofmadison.com

**Published Date:**

### History of Legislative File

Ver- sion:	Acting Body:	Date:	Action:	Sent To:	Due Date:	Return Date:	Result:
1	COMMON COUNCIL	08/05/2008	Refer	DOWNTOWN COORDINATING COMMITTEE		12/18/2008	
	<b>Action Text:</b>		This Resolution was Refer to the DOWNTOWN COORDINATING COMMITTEE				
	<b>Notes:</b>	Additional Referral(s): Long Range Transportation Planning Commission, Pedestrian/Bicycle/Motor Vehicle Commission and Transit & Parking Commission					
1	Council Office	08/05/2008	Referred for Introduction				
	<b>Action Text:</b>	This Resolution was Referred for Introduction					
	<b>Notes:</b>	Downtown Coordinating Committee, Long Range Transportation Planning Commission, Pedestrian/Bicycle/Motor Vehicle Commission and Transit & Parking Commission					
1	DOWNTOWN COORDINATING COMMITTEE	08/05/2008	Refer	LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATI ON PLANNING COMMISSION		10/16/2008	
	<b>Action Text:</b>	This Resolution was Refer to the LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING COMMISSION					
	<b>Notes:</b>						

1	DOWNTOWN COORDINATING COMMITTEE	08/05/2008	Refer	PEDESTRIAN/BIC YCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION		
	<b>Action Text:</b> This Resolution was Refer to the PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION					
	<b>Notes:</b>					
1	DOWNTOWN COORDINATING COMMITTEE	08/05/2008	Refer	TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION		
	<b>Action Text:</b> This Resolution was Refer to the TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION					
	<b>Notes:</b>					
1	LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING COMMISSION	08/21/2008	Refer	LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATI ON PLANNING COMMISSION	10/16/2008	Pass
	<b>Action Text:</b> This Resolution was Refer to the LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING COMMISSION					
	<p>Brad Murphy (Planning Division Director) noted that the resolution calls for a major study but does not allocate resources to adequately fund it. He added that staff has some concerns about the need for this effort, given other priorities within the Planning Division.</p> <p>Ald. Paul Skidmore said that two of the resolutions sponsors (Ald. Robbie Webber and Ald. Satya Rhodes-Conway) were not present. He said that further discussion of the issue should take place when they could explain their objectives for the resolution and be available to answer questions from Commissioners.</p> <p>The Commission then voted unanimously to refer Resolution ID 11560 to a future meeting, on a motion submitted by Ald. Paul Skidmore/Ald. Tim Gruber.</p>					
	<b>Notes:</b>					
1	PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/ MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION	08/26/2008				
1	COMMON COUNCIL	09/02/2008				
1	TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION	09/04/2008	Rerefer	TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION		Pass

**Action Text:** Patrick McDonnell, 441 N. Paterson, 53703, representing the Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Association, provided a statement in support of the resolution. [Electronic or hard copies of this statement are available by contacting the Recording Secretary, Anne Benishek-Clark, at 267-8751.] Durocher read McDonnell's statement, which said that a comprehensive multi-modal transportation and parking design for central Madison was consistent with the transportation recommendations in the Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Plan; and responded to needs expressed by the Marquette, SASY, Capitol Neighborhoods and to a recommendation in the East Washington Capitol Gateway Corridor BUILD Plan. The statement went on to say that the resolution would serve to integrate and implement recommendations from several mode-specific studies into a comprehensive design; and acknowledged that the resulting task might be costly, but that the potential benefit to the vitality and economic development of Madison was huge.

Susan Schmitz, 210 Marinette Trail, 53705, representing Downtown Madison Incorporated (DMI), spoke before the Commission. While registered neither in support/against the resolution, she very much supported it and thought it well written, but was concerned that the proposal was moving too fast, getting ahead of some other initiatives that needed to be completed first. She pointed out that the Parking Strategic Plan was not yet been finished and had not been presented to the TPC. With DMI supporting regional transportation solutions such as an RTA, she thought the proposal represented an important piece, but that it had to fit into something that DMI thought was more regional in scope, vis à vis connectors and other issues. She didn't want the community to get ahead of itself on this.

Brad Murphy, Planning Division Director of the Department of Planning & Community & Economic Development, was invited to speak before the Commission about the resolution. He said staff was not involved in the drafting of the resolution and had no input into it, so wasn't sure if he could speak to the intent of the resolution. But he said he could fill people in on what was contained inside the City's Comprehensive Plan and the E. Washington Capitol Gateway Plan, and offer some comments on the proposed resolution.

The City's Comprehensive Plan included a recommendation to update the 1979 Traffic Redirection Study for the isthmus. In addition, the desire to prepare a comprehensive multi-modal transportation plan was also included in the E. Washington Capitol Gateway BUILD (EWCGB) Plan, in response to concerns expressed by neighborhoods about the potential magnitude of development that might occur as a result the scale and massing recommendations contained in the E. Washington Plan.

As a part of the preparation of the EWCGB Plan, documents were provided to Plan Commission and the Common Council, which outlined some of the elements that might be included in a comprehensive transportation plan for the central city, and some of the potential cost and staffing implications of undertaking such a project. Murphy agreed with McDonnell that it would be major project and multi-year effort, and would require the allocation of significant staff resources to the project, as well as the hiring of consulting services in order to complete the project. Planning would recommend that adequate funding be provided at the outset of the project, and adequate budget authority to undertake and complete the project. It wasn't clear what the budget authority might be and how much. During the discussion of the EWCGB Plan, Planning contacted the City of Denver, which had prepared a comprehensive transportation plan for their downtown, for which they budgeted and spent about \$1 million. About a third of that was spent on traffic modeling of intersections and streets that comprised the circulation system within the downtown. Murphy said that in order to update the Traffic Redirection Study of 1979 and to fully evaluate alternatives and potential modifications to the circulation system, a detailed operational model would be needed at the intersection level, prepared and calibrated so that alternatives could be considered and evaluated, and good, hard recommendations could be made. This would not be an inexpensive undertaking, and adequate funding would have to be considered.

Murphy then commented on timing, wondering whether this was an appropriate time to start a project like this, given the availability of staff to support the effort. The resolution indicated that the Planning Division would provide staffing for the project along with Traffic Engineering support. Planning was currently involved in several major planning initiatives (preparing a downtown plan, rewriting the City zoning code, as well as preparing some major neighborhood plans throughout the City). The availability of Planning staff to support this effort was very limited, and Planning was concerned that staff might not be able to devote the type and kind of attention to the effort that it deserved. While not arguing that this was a desirable project that should be undertaken, Planning was concerned about the timing of the project and the availability of adequate resources to get it done.

Murphy responded to questions. He didn't know what the difference would be between a "transportation design district" and a "transportation plan". He wondered about this as well, and could

only speculate as to what it might be. To him, "district" implied it would be a geographic area, within which there would be some special initiatives or funding available or assessments or requirements that didn't now exist. He thought of "overlay districts" in terms of zoning, where there might be basic zoning such as residential, which then might be overlaid by an urban design district, having additional regulations and requirements that would then be put in place. Flood plain districts were also examples of overlay districts. He wasn't sure if this was what the resolution had in mind or not. He wondered if it might be a tool to be used to implement recommendations that may be included in the plan. But to include this implementation tool as a given, before the plan was prepared, seemed to pre-judge the recommendations that would be included in the plan, and the assessment of alternative methods that might be used to achieve the recommendations.

Durocher appreciated the caveats expressed by Murphy regarding the resolution, and invited members to comment on the item. In discussion about the committee referrals and the referral process, Solomon observed that one of the secondaries, LRTPC, had referred the item back to itself. Noting that he and David Dryer attended the August meeting and offered similar comments, Murphy said that the LRTPC took this action because none of the sponsors were available at the meeting to discuss the item. Solomon hoped that some of the concerns raised about the resolution might be addressed (perhaps at LRTPC) before the TPC took action on it.

Hoag stated that he had mixed feelings about the resolution:

- The resolution would create a new group to work on this issue and which in some ways seemed redundant of the work of other groups, such as LRTPC. He questioned the idea of creating an ad hoc group to do that. In general, he was concerned about the hidden costs involved in this; though not paying people to do the work over and above what they got paid, there were hidden costs because other things were not getting done. Plus, all the listed representation was either represented at LRTPC, or had the opportunity to speak there.
- He was concerned that apparently staff had not provided input into the resolution.
- Though valuable, creating circulation and intersection models was very expensive. He observed that fuel prices had probably not yet peaked yet, but when they did, they would have a big impact on traffic patterns. He was concerned about spending a lot of money on things that could change very quickly; even with good consultants and modeling, the models would come apart when energy prices went up at a faster rate than now.

As a result, he too was comfortable with deferring action on the resolution.

Bergamini said she wanted to suspend discussion and refer the item. Streit suggested that the action to refer be conditional, until a fiscal estimate was provided. And if there weren't extra money, he wanted to know what other projects would not get done, and to what extent the proposal overlapped. He felt that members were not ready to discuss the item until at least those three things were addressed. Bergamini then suggested some language for the motion: To refer until such time a fiscal analysis has been completed and staff has been consulted about a reasonable implementation schedule for conducting such study. Sanborn thought it might be difficult for staff to track and determine when these conditions had been met. He suggested that the item be referred to the next meeting, and if the action requested by members wasn't taken, then the item could be referred again.

A motion was made by Bergamini, seconded by Solomon, to Rerefer to the TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION. Hinz offered a friendly amendment that the Chair send a letter to the Lead committee (DCC) to relay the various concerns expressed by members.

Durocher echoed previous comments, as follows:

- He found it difficult to support anything that appears to be replicating other bodies and efforts that are already under way.
- As the Transit and Parking Commission, the TPC by its very title and charge, had some responsibility for taking the overview that this study committee would attempt to take.
- There might be some sense of usurpation of responsibility by setting up something, to do what the TPC had been set up to do, in a more difficult sort of way because of the replication in that additional committees did require more staff time.
- He was completely supportive of the idea of taking a look at parking in a more comprehensive way than looking at one ramp and its merits, at a time.
- He was aware that there were competing ideas about moving people around in public transit – BRT, commuter rail. So the idea of having a comprehensive overview of transportation and multi-modal approaches was understandable.
- However, he was not entirely convinced that yet another body was needed to do that. He thought people could move ahead with those questions with the commitments that had been made in existing

bodies.

A vote was taken and the motion passed by voice vote/other.

**Notes:**

1 DOWNTOWN COORDINATING COMMITTEE 09/18/2008 Table Pass

**Action Text:** A motion was made by Crabb, seconded by Judge, to Table. The motion passed by voice vote.

**Notes:**

1 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING COMMISSION 09/18/2008 Refer LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING COMMISSION 10/16/2008 Pass

**Action Text:** Mark Shahan/Ald. Satya Rhodes-Conway submitted a motion to make some specific edits to the resolution:

- (1) directing LRTPC to develop an RFP and work plan and to delete the final "Be It Further Resolved" clause.
- (2) specifying "central Madison" as bounded by First Street, Park Street, Lake Mendota, West Washington Avenue and Proudfit Street.

The Commission unanimously approved the motion to make these edits.

The Commission then voted unanimously to refer Resolution ID 11560 to the next meeting, and asked staff to revise the text as appropriate (on a motion submitted by Michael Basford/Ald. Paul Skidmore).

**Notes:**

1 PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION 09/23/2008 Rerefer PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION Pass

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

DISCUSSION

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

Compton/Skidmore moved referral.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Konkel felt staff is still stuck on issues related to last year's Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Plan

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

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

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

Motion to refer to the next meeting carried unanimously.

**Notes:** Since the LRTPC is working on a substitute resolution, the PBMVC agreed to refer this to a future meeting.

1	TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION	10/02/2008	Rerefer	TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION	Pass
---	--------------------------------	------------	---------	--------------------------------	------

**Action Text:** Webber said that LRTPC had a long discussion about this item. She thought the LRTPC would take this effort on, as the committee to do this. LRTPC had members from various key committees, so could represent all of them. She said that the resolution was not about doing a study; it was about what should be done by a study. She said this issue would be clarified by LRTPC.

Durocher suggested that with other committees still working on the proposal, the Commission could refer the item. A motion was made by Bergamini, seconded by Webber, to Rerefer to a future meeting of the TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

**Notes:**

1	DOWNTOWN COORDINATING COMMITTEE	10/16/2008			
1	LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING COMMISSION	10/16/2008	Refer	LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING COMMISSION	Pass

**Action Text:** A motion was made by Rhodes Conway, seconded by Schaefer, to Refer to the LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING COMMISSION. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

Ald. Satya Rhodes-Conway/Ald. Tim Gruber submitted a motion to recommend approval of Resolution ID 11560, with the following amendments (see Legistar attachment for strikeouts and added text):

- add a new "Be It Further Resolved" clause, inserted after the first BIFR clause:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that it is the desire of the Common Council to provide guidance both to neighborhoods as they develop and implement neighborhood plans and to any future development in the plan area with respect to transportation access and accommodation.

- revise the (now) third BIFR clause to read:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, understanding that such an endeavor must be undertaken in phases, the Common Council directs the Long Range Transportation Planning Commission (LRTPC) to review all current land use and transportation plans covering the plan area for areas of disagreement or conflict and to consider:

- a. Policies, principles and mechanisms that will govern transportation investment decisions within the study area,
- b. Design principles for transportation facilities and services in the study area.

The LRTPC shall report back to the Common Council on these issues and make a recommendation whether or not to proceed to an RFP to continue this work.

- revise the final BIFR clause to read:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the LRTPC shall consult with representatives from central City neighborhood associations, Downtown Madison Inc., major property and business owners, the University of Wisconsin, Madison Metro, the Downtown Coordinating Committee, the Transit and Parking Commission and the Pedestrian/Bicycle/Motor Vehicle Commission.

The Commission unanimously approved the motion to make these edits.

The Commission then voted unanimously to refer Resolution ID 11560 to the next meeting, and asked staff to revise the text as recommended (on a motion submitted by Ald. Satya Rhodes-Conway/Bob Schaefer).

**Notes:**

1	PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/ MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION	10/29/2008	Refer	PEDESTRIAN/BIC YCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION	Pass
---	--	------------	-------	---	------



**Action Text:** A motion was made by Webber, seconded by Conroy, to Refer to the PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

The PBMVC moved referral to their next meeting pending a redraft from the LRTPC and requested that the resolution lead referral be changed from the Downtown Coordinating Committee to the LRTPC.

**DISCUSSION**

Shahan reported that the LRTPC is working on substitute language, including a recommendation that the LRTPC take the lead on developing the Request for Proposals.

Motion by Webber/Conroy to refer this to the next meeting. Further, that the PBMVC recommends to the lead (Downtown Coordinating Committee) that the LRTPC be the new lead on the resolution. The PBMVC feels strongly that this is an important topic to be undertaken and it looks forward to a multi-modal transportation and parking recommendation to come out of the effort.

De Vos reiterated testimony offered at the TPC meeting that Planning staff is not ready to take on this work and there are other things that need to be done before this. She was uncomfortable with the fact that there are no representatives from the disabled community on the LRTPC. Someone from the Commission on People with Disabilities should be on any body that develops the transportation plan.

Webber commented that the LRTPC had a long discussion and did talk about the composition of the body that would be taking this up. She also mentioned that apparently there was some misunderstanding at the staff level as to what was being requested in the resolution; staff thought they were being asked to do the study. The LRTPC is recommending that there be a RFP, with staff looking at what needs to be included in the study. Webber noted that the original resolution proposed the creation of a new committee and listed the groups to be included. The LRTPC is recommending that it be the lead body rather than forming a new committee. While the LRTPC does not have a member from the disabled community, the LRTPC would seek input from many sources, including downtown residents, users of all modes of transportation, the disabled community, business groups, etc. There will be a mechanism to get input from all these groups without forming a new committee.

Shahan pointed out that it will be a phased process. The first phase will be determining whether a RFP is necessary and if so, what the scope should be.

Compton felt that someone from the CPD should be on the LRTPC and encouraged the CPD to request the Mayor to change the composition of the LRTPC.

It was noted that the legislative file history showed that the LRTPC had taken final action on the resolution at its 10/16/08 meeting and this action had been reported to the Downtown Coordinating Committee. Shahan and Webber, who are also members of the LRTPC, were of the understanding that final action had not been taken and that the suggested substitute language was to come back at the LRTPC's next meeting. The LRTPC's 10/16/08 action will be clarified with LRTPC staff.

Webber accepted a friendly amendment by Compton to rephrase the motion as "to refer pending a redraft from the LRTPC and to request that the LRTPC be the lead referral on this resolution." Motion carried unanimously.

Staff will check with the Clerk's office as to the process for changing the lead referral.

[Skidmore left at 6:30 p.m., at the end of discussion on item E.1.]

**Notes:**

1	TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION	11/06/2008	Refer	TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION	Pass
---	--------------------------------	------------	-------	--------------------------------	------

**Action Text:** Webber updated members about the status of this proposal. LRTPC had a long discussion about it at its last meeting, esp. as regards DCC being the Lead on the resolution. It seemed that all parties (sponsors, LRTPC and staff) involved felt that it would be more logical for LRTPC to be the Lead. So Planning staff was re-drafting a new resolution, which would have to go back to Council to change the Lead to LRTPC. A clearer version of the resolution was currently being re-drafted, at which point it would return to Council where LRTPC would likely be named Lead.

A motion was made by Webber, seconded by Sanborn, to Refer the item to the TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION, until the proposal was re-drafted and sent back to the Common Council for re-referral. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

**Notes:**

1 COMMON COUNCIL 11/18/2008 Place On File Pass

**Action Text:** A motion was made by Ald. Konkel, seconded by Ald. Bruer, to Place On File. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

**Notes:**

1 LONG RANGE 11/20/2008  
TRANSPORTATION  
PLANNING  
COMMISSION

**Notes:**

1 DOWNTOWN 12/18/2008 Return to Lead with DOWNTOWN 12/18/2008 Pass  
COORDINATING the COORDINATING  
COMMITTEE Recommendation to COMMITTEE  
Place on File

**Action Text:** A motion was made by McDonnell, seconded by Zellers, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation to Place on File to the DOWNTOWN COORDINATING COMMITTEE, with the following recommendations:

- 1) Resolution #11560 should be incorporated into the "moving around" chapter of the Downtown Plan.
  - 2) McDonnell will draft a letter to the Planning Division communicating item #1 above, with copies going to Olinger, Murphy, and Fruhling.
- The motion passed by voice vote.

**Notes:**

---

## Text of Legislative File 11560

### Fiscal Note

A fiscal analysis has not yet been completed.

### Title

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

### Body

WHEREAS, central Madison - including downtown, the east Isthmus, the east Campus, and the north Park Street corridor - continues to grow as a regional center for business, culture, government, and academia and also continues to grow as a high-density residential area; and;

WHEREAS, the growth of central Madison will generate increased demand for travel to, through and around this part of the City, such demand originating both from an increasing number of local residents and from the ever-growing metropolitan region; and;

WHEREAS, Madison has recently completed a number of mode-specific studies including the Ad Hoc Long Range Metro Transit Plan, the Platinum Bike Study, the Parking Strategic Plan, the Streetcar Study, and Transport 2020 that identify opportunities for increased utilization of various transportation modes in addition to the automobile; and;

WHEREAS, near-exclusive reliance on the automobile for meeting both local and commuter travel demand is becoming increasingly problematic for economic, environmental, and social reasons; and;

WHEREAS, a number of adopted City plans, including the Comprehensive Plan, the East Washington Capitol Corridor Gateway Plan, and neighborhood plans have recommended that the City develop a comprehensive, multi-modal transportation and parking strategy for the central City,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Mayor and Common Council create an ad hoc committee to develop a comprehensive, multi-modal transportation and parking design and plan for central Madison. The plan shall establish central Madison as a Transportation Design District for the purposes of implementing near-term and long-term multi-modal transportation and parking management strategies. Strategies will include both Transportation System Management (TSM) and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) components. The comprehensive transportation design shall function as an overlay that supports the land use objectives for the area. Understanding that such an endeavor must be undertaken in phases, the committee shall first undertake, policy, scope, budget and planning deliverables to include:

- a. Policies, principles and mechanisms that will govern transportation investment decisions for the district,
- b. High-level design elements to be included in the comprehensive overlay district.
- c. Budget projects for further developing the plan including Requests for Proposals for consulting and engineering services for subsequent phases, and
- d. Project timeline and budget for subsequent phases.

The committee shall report back to the Common Council on these issues before proceeding with subsequent phases.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the committee shall ensure that the comprehensive design shall build upon and integrate previous and soon-to-be-completed mode-specific plans noted above and will:

- a. Establish policies and principles for balancing transportation investment across all modes - pedestrian, bicycle, automobile, bus and rail,
- b. Focus on strategies to achieve increased consumer inter-operability among present and future transportation modes,
- c. Use transportation investment to stimulate and support economic development and land use objectives for the downtown and the central urban neighborhoods
- d. Improve the residential quality of life for central urban neighborhoods and improve mobility/access options for all Madison area residents and visitors to the central City.
- e. Support Madison's regional role as the economic and cultural hub that is accessed via the larger regional transportation system.
- f. Promote a culture of mutual respect and entitlement among all transportation consumers - pedestrians, drivers, bicyclists, and transit riders - and ensure that the engineered environment embodies those values for all users.
- g. Implement other values and principles as the committee shall determine appropriate.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the committee shall consist of not more than eleven members including three alders, and representatives from central City neighborhood associations, Downtown Madison Inc., major property and business owners, the University of Wisconsin, Madison Metro, the Downtown Coordinating Committee, the Long Range Transportation Planning Commission, the Transit and Parking Commission and the Pedestrian/Bicycle/Motor Vehicle Commission. The committee shall be staffed by the Planning Unit with assistance from Traffic Engineering.



## ATTACHMENT A

### PLANNING DIVISION REPORT

#### DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

June 11, 2007

At their March 19, 2007 meeting, the Plan Commission requested that staff provide additional information regarding the transportation-related implications of the East Washington Avenue BUILD Capital Gateway Corridor Plan, as well as additional information regarding the nature of a comprehensive transportation and parking study and plan for the Isthmus and how much such a study would cost. This report addresses the Plan Commission's request and recommends both a near-term and longer-term approach to addressing the transportation implications of development projects which may occur along East Washington Avenue in the future. The report was prepared by Planning Division staff including staff to the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board and Traffic Engineering.

At the Plan Commission meeting, there was some discussion about the ability of the transportation infrastructure to handle the large amount of new development which could potentially be allowed by the Capitol Gateway Corridor Plan (as indicated by the proposed building height limits, for example). Plans for redevelopment within established neighborhoods and corridors are inherently long-range in nature, however, and in this regard, the Capitol Gateway Corridor Plan is no different than other adopted City plans that recommend increased intensity and density of development over time. Plans such as the East Rail Corridor Plan, the Bassett Neighborhood Plan, or the Monroe Street Corridor Plan, often set relatively high upper limits on the amount of additional development recommended, and may provide design guidelines or other planning standards to guide the consideration of future development proposals. But these plans also recognize that redevelopment will occur over a long period of time, and that only a portion of the theoretical development potential may ever be realized.

#### **Recommendations to Address Near-Term Transportation Impacts**

The draft Capitol Gateway Corridor Plan recognizes that the scale and intensity of development shown in the plan would, if fully built-out, place significant demands on the existing transportation system, and that extensive analysis and implementation of alternative modes of transportation will be required as the Corridor develops over time. The plan also recognizes that the long-range options to provide alternative modes of transportation to serve the downtown and the Isthmus transcend the East Washington Avenue Corridor and must be addressed on a community-wide basis. However, many of the methods which can be used to encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation and reduce the demand for parking also can be addressed on a project-by-project basis as development occurs. The draft plan identifies the use of shared parking, parking cash-outs, transit opportunities, live-work development, and community cars as incentives to reduce the need for parking from the levels typically provided.

In order to further address the transportation implications of individual development projects, staff recommend that the draft Capitol Gateway Corridor Plan document be amended to include the following additional recommendations:

#### Project-Specific Traffic Studies

The plan should be amended to recommend that redevelopment projects needing conditional use approval or a zoning map amendment, and which exceed 100 employees, (or as may be required by the Traffic Engineer), must prepare a traffic study for the development for review by the Traffic Engineer.

The traffic study should include a description of the proposed project, an estimate of the projected transportation and vehicle traffic generation from the project, and an analysis and recommendations for addressing any potential traffic congestion or conflicts resulting from the project.

The study should include, for example, recommendations regarding required parking, site ingress and egress, potential traffic circulation diversion into or through the surrounding neighborhoods, traffic on primary access routes and at intersections, and recommended traffic control or traffic calming measures as may be needed to respond to the projected traffic increases. If the project is planned to occur in phases, the traffic study should address the cumulative impacts of each phase of the project. The assumptions and recommendations used in the traffic study should be coordinated and consistent with the assumptions and recommendations used in the transportation demand management plan. In their review of development proposals along the East Washington Avenue corridor, the Plan Commission will consider the information provided by the traffic study regarding the projected transportation impacts, and the adequacy of the measures proposed to address any potential traffic concerns, prior to recommending approval of the project.

### Transportation Demand Management Plan

The plan should be amended to recommend that redevelopment projects needing conditional use approval or a zoning map amendment, and which result in 100 or more full-time employees, should provide a transportation demand management plan (TDM), and/or participate in a transportation management association (TMA) if one is available in the area. The transportation demand management plan should generally describe the applicant's commitment to reducing the number of single-occupant automobile trips and list the methods the applicant intends to use. These methods should be based on the transportation choices currently available and it is recommended that they include an agreement to provide all employees with either the full price to purchase a monthly Madison Metro bus pass, or three or more of the following options:

- Ride sharing/carpool matching,
- Preferred parking for ride sharers,
- Secured bicycle parking, showers and lockers,
- Employee commuting subsidies or awards,
- Emergency ride home program,
- Employer subsidized bus passes,
- Provision of real-time transit information,
- Or other options proposed by the employer to discourage the use of single-occupant vehicles and as approved by the City.

The provisions of an employer's TDM plan should be available to all employees. The plan should describe the traffic and parking impacts of the proposed development and should provide specific details on the measures the employer will use to monitor the traffic and parking impacts. Developers are encouraged to seek ways to reduce off-street parking requirements. The TDM plan should be reviewed by the Traffic Engineer in concert with the Planning Division Director, and should be periodically updated at intervals not to exceed every two years. The Traffic Engineer should provide comments and suggestions for how the plan should be improved. In considering individual development proposals, the Plan Commission should consider the proximity to transit routes and bicycle paths, the availability and accessibility of alternative parking, existing and potential shared parking arrangements, the number of residential parking permits issued within the area, and the potential impact of on-site parking or lack thereof on adjacent residential neighborhoods.

Although the long-term development potential along the East Washington Avenue Capitol Gateway Corridor is substantial, the Planning Division staff considers the nearer-term potential for significant amounts of development, and particularly employment development, to be relatively modest. It is expected that interest in the Corridor as an employment and business location will increase over time as successful projects are developed, and as the improvements and amenities recommended in the Capitol Gateway Corridor Plan, the East Rail Corridor Plan and adjacent neighborhood's plans are implemented.

### **Downtown/Isthmus Area Transportation and Parking Study/Plan**

Some have expressed concerns regarding the potential transportation impacts of substantial redevelopment and increases in intensity along East Washington Avenue as envisioned in the Capitol Gateway Corridor BUILD Plan. But as noted above, many of the City's adopted plans and the existing zoning classifications for properties within the downtown/Isthmus area recommend or would allow significant increases in the intensity and density of development; and a substantial amount of new development has, in fact, taken place within this area over the last 10 to 15 years. The potential long-range traffic and transportation impacts of continued redevelopment within the downtown and Isthmus neighborhoods, including the East Rail Corridor and the East Washington Avenue corridor, is much broader than the potential impacts from the implementation of any one of these individual plans.

Both the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan and the Madison Area Metropolitan Planning Organization's Regional Transportation Plan recommend an update of the Isthmus Area Traffic Redirection Study that was substantially completed in 1979 and followed by subsequent more-detailed studies of particular recommended components. In addition, neighborhood plans, such as the Bassett Plan and the draft Tenney-Lapham Plan, often request traffic studies to address specific traffic concerns and issues within individual neighborhoods. The two cited neighborhood plans have also proposed the possibility of converting several major one-way, multi-lane streets back to two-way operation. However, the Isthmus is geographically constrained and has limited alternative through travel corridors. Implementing conversions of this type would need to be carefully analyzed because of the Isthmus and community-wide impacts that would result. Studies such as this, while including the downtown, would need to be much broader in order to adequately evaluate alternatives and the implications of alternative choices.

In addition, traffic circulation studies for individual neighborhoods, and transportation studies for the downtown/Isthmus area, including an update of the Isthmus Area Traffic Redirection Study, must consider not only the need to move automobile traffic to, through, and within the Isthmus, but also need to evaluate the role of transit and other transportation modes in moving people and goods through and within the Isthmus. The long range implications of traffic on the downtown, the Isthmus neighborhoods, and the larger community would need to be considered together. This expanded scope is reflective of elements commonly included in a comprehensive downtown transportation plan.

To conduct an analysis such as this and prepare an Isthmus Area transportation plan would be a significant multi-year undertaking. Extensive multi-modal travel-demand and travel operational/intersection modeling would be required. Data requirements to feed/drive, calibrate and validate the travel demand and operations models would be extensive. A major public participation effort would also be required.

Key components or elements of such a study could include:

- Establishing a realistic vision, expectations and strategy for how people and goods will move to, through and around the Isthmus in the future (2030-2040 planning horizon).
- Expanding upon, and incorporating into an updated Isthmus Area Transportation Plan, the recommendations of the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan, the MPO Regional Transportation Plan, and several mode-specific plans currently being prepared, including Transport 2020, the Streetcar Study Committee, the Platinum Biking Planning Committee, and the Madison Metro Planning Initiative.
- Focusing on maximum inter-operability among present and future modes.
- Introducing a fiscal policy perspective to balance investments across all modes.
- Integrating downtown/Isthmus transportation plan recommendations with the various land use recommendations included in adopted plans, including the Comprehensive Plan, the Downtown Plan, corridor plans, neighborhood plans, and special area plans.

The City of Denver, Colorado recently prepared a downtown multi-modal access plan which included some of the components identified above and would be similar in scope to the study required here. The plan was based on extensive public input over a two and one-half year period. The public process consisted of a series of open houses, topic-based workgroups, newsletters, public forums and meetings with individual stakeholder groups and neighborhood organizations. The plan was designed to complement and build upon previous and current planning efforts.

The purpose and need for the Denver project was clearly defined by representatives from the City and County of Denver, the Regional Transportation District, the Colorado Department of Transportation, the Denver Regional Council of Governments, and the Downtown Denver Partnership. A vision statement was prepared along with a series of goals and principles to guide the development and evaluation of future transportation scenarios and to frame complex trade-off decisions.

A set of innovative multi-modal simulation models was created to conduct the transportation analysis for the study area. The models used were sensitive to pedestrian, transit, and vehicular interactions, and included more than 160 downtown intersections. These operational models guided many of the plan recommendations that will be used by the city of Denver on an ongoing basis as tools for future downtown multi-modal analysis.

The total cost of the Denver project was around one million dollars, with one third of the cost used for modeling efforts. It is unknown if extensive data gathering was needed for the operations modeling component.

If the City of Madison wanted to pursue a planning initiative such as the Denver example, staff could research additional examples of comprehensive studies from other cities. A detailed scope of work would eventually be required, as would budget authority from the Common Council.

If the City decides that it wishes to undertake a multi-year, transportation planning study, including an update of the Isthmus Area traffic redirection plan, this study should include all modes of transportation, and must adequately consider the implications for the downtown, Isthmus neighborhoods, existing commercial corridors, and the entire Madison community. Because the vitality of the City's downtown and Isthmus neighborhoods is directly related to the health of the entire city and by extension, the region, significant changes to traffic circulation which affect access to, from, and through the Isthmus must be carefully considered. The costs and time involved in undertaking such a study should not be underestimated.



If it is decided that a comprehensive transportation study as described above should be undertaken, the recommendations of that study would be available to inform the review of proposed developments along the East Washington Avenue corridor long before development along the corridor even begins to approach the theoretical amount implied by the recommended design guidelines. Staff strongly recommend, therefore, that decisions about whether such a study is needed or when it should be scheduled be based on its own merits and the availability of staff and other resources, and not linked to consideration or approval of the East Washington Avenue Capitol Gateway Corridor Plan. Staff believes that project-level transportation traffic studies and transportation demand management approaches can adequately address the potential impacts from proposed developments in this area for the foreseeable future.

## TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING

A fundamental principle of the Madison Comprehensive Plan is that land use planning and transportation planning must be integrated and work in tandem. This is especially true for the geographically compact area of Madison's Downtown and East Isthmus where the Capitol Gateway Corridor is located. The scale and intensity of development shown in this plan will place significant demands on the existing transportation system, requiring extensive analysis and implementation of alternative modes of transportation. The development potential indicated by the recommended land uses and bulk standards in the plan cannot be achieved without a dramatic decrease in the percentage of employees, residents, and visitors to the area using personal automobiles. In addition, the amount, location and access points for large parking areas need to be carefully planned so as not to conflict with the Core Development Principles and the design and character recommendations in the Plan. The Plan recommends the implementation of strategies and programs to reduce the amount of parking typically required for individual developments along the Capitol Gateway Corridor in order to reduce the land area and building volume which must be devoted to parking and to reduce the demands on the existing transportation system.

Although the long-term development potential along the East Washington Avenue Capitol Gateway Corridor is substantial, the more near-term potential for significant amounts of development, and particularly employment development, is relatively moderate. It is expected that interest in the Corridor as an employment and business location will increase over time as projects consistent with the adoption of this Plan are developed, and as the improvements and amenities recommended in the Capitol Gateway Corridor Plan, the East Rail Corridor Plan and adjacent neighborhood plans are implemented.

The Plan recognizes that the long-range options to provide alternative modes of transportation to serve the Downtown and the Isthmus transcend the East Washington Avenue Capitol Gateway Corridor and must be addressed on a community-wide basis. The Plan, however, also recommends that methods should be used to encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation and to reduce the demand for parking on a project-by-project basis as development occurs. The City should take steps to address both the long-term need to better integrate all transportation modes serving the Isthmus with land use planning and to address transportation demand management and traffic effects on a project-by-project basis.

### **DOWNTOWN/ISTHMUS AREA TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING STUDY/PLAN**

In order to manage current and future transportation demand across multiple modes and to integrate the transportation infrastructure and services needed to serve the land use and development recommendations emanating from the City's adopted plans, the City should commit to the development of a comprehensive multi-modal Isthmus Area Transportation Plan and Parking Strategy. This multi-modal planning initiative should bring together and coordinate the recommendations from the transportation studies recently completed or currently underway including:

1. Transport 2020 Commuter Rail
2. Madison Streetcar Study
3. Platinum Bike Task Force
4. Ad Hoc Long-Range Madison Metro Committee
5. Parking Utility Strategic Plan and Policies
6. Metropolitan Planning Organization 2030 Regional Transportation Plan
7. High Speed Intercity Rail

Figure 33 shows the current possible future transportation services covering the Corridor.

Components or elements of such a study should include:

Establishing a realistic vision, expectations, and strategy for how people and goods will move to, through, and around the Isthmus in the future (a 2030-2040 planning horizon is recommended).

Expanding upon, and incorporating into an updated Isthmus Area Transportation Plan, the recommendations of the Madison Comprehensive Plan, the MPO Regional Transportation Plan, and several mode-specific plans currently being prepared.

Focusing on maximum inter-operability among present and future modes.

Introducing a fiscal policy perspective to balance investments across all modes.

Integrating Downtown and Isthmus Transportation Plan recommendations with the various land use recommendations included in adopted plans, including the Comprehensive Plan, Downtown Plan, Corridor Plans, neighborhood plans, and special area plans.

Both the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan and the Madison Area Metropolitan Planning Organization's Regional Transportation Plan recommend an update of the Isthmus Area Traffic Redirection Study that was

substantially completed in 1979 and followed by subsequent more-detailed studies of particular recommended components. In addition, neighborhood plans request traffic studies to evaluate changes to the circulation system, to address specific traffic concerns and issues within individual neighborhoods. Studies such as this, while including the downtown, would need to be much broader in order to adequately evaluate alternatives and the implications of alternative choices.

Traffic circulation studies for individual neighborhoods, and a transportation study for the downtown/Isthmus area, including an update of the Isthmus Area Traffic Redirection Study, would consider not only the need to move automobile traffic to, through, and within the Isthmus, but also need to evaluate the role of transit and other transportation modes in moving people and goods through and within the Isthmus. The long-range implications of traffic on the downtown, the Isthmus neighborhoods, and the larger community would need to be considered together. This scope is reflective of elements commonly included in a comprehensive downtown transportation plan.

To conduct an analysis such as this and prepare an Isthmus Area Transportation Plan would be a significant multi-year undertaking. Extensive multi-modal travel-demand and travel operational/ intersection modeling would be required. Data requirements to feed/drive, calibrate and validate the travel demand and operations models would be extensive. A major public participation effort would also be required.

A multi-year transportation planning initiative such as the one described above including an update of the Isthmus Area Traffic Redirection Plan, should include all modes of transportation and must adequately consider the implications for the Downtown/Central Business District, Isthmus neighborhoods, existing commercial corridors and the entire Madison community. Because the vitality of the City's Downtown and Isthmus neighborhoods is directly related to the health of the entire city and by extension the region, significant changes in traffic circulation which affect access to, from, within, and through the Isthmus must be carefully considered. The cost and time involved in undertaking an update of the Isthmus Area Traffic Redirection Plan (as recommended in the City's Comprehensive Plan) should not be underestimated. The City would need to identify adequate resources and budget funding for such a study.

**City of Madison Legislative File ID 11560 (draft 4: 10-17-08)**

**Revision Key**

LRTPC Revisions: Single underline and ~~single strikethrough~~

PL Division/City Staff Revisions: Double underline and ~~double strikethrough~~

=====

**Title**

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

**Body**

WHEREAS, central Madison – an area bounded by First Street Lake Monona, Lake Mendota, Proudfit Street, Regent Street and Park Street (note: study area may need to be expanded) including downtown, the east Isthmus, the east Campus, and the north Park Street corridor - continues to ~~grow as a~~ be an important regional center for business, culture, government, and academia, as well and ~~also continues to grow~~ as a growing high-density residential area; and;

WHEREAS, ~~the growth of~~ continued future employment and residential growth in central Madison, as recommended in adopted City plans, will generate increased demand for travel to, through and around this part of the City, such demand originating both from an increasing number of local residents and from the ever-growing metropolitan region; and;

WHEREAS, Madison has recently completed, or will soon complete, a number of mode-specific studies including the Ad Hoc Long Range Metro Transit Plan, the Platinum Bike Study, the Parking Utility Strategic Plan and Policies, the Streetcar Study, the Regional Transportation Plan 2030 (Madison Area MPO), the Madison Comprehensive Plan and Transport 2020 that identify opportunities for increased utilization of various transportation modes in addition to the automobile; and;

WHEREAS, ~~near-exclusive reliance on~~ the use of the automobile for meeting both local and commuter travel demand is becoming increasingly problematic for economic, environmental, and social reasons; and;

WHEREAS, a number of adopted City plans, including the Comprehensive Plan, the East Washington Capitol Corridor Gateway Plan, and neighborhood plans have recommended that the City update the 1979 Isthmus Traffic Redirection Study or to develop a comprehensive, multi-modal transportation plan and parking strategy for the ~~central City~~ Isthmus,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that it is the desire of the Mayor and Common Council ~~create an ad hoc committee~~ to develop a comprehensive, multi-modal transportation and parking ~~design and~~ plan for central Madison. The plan shall ~~establish central Madison as a Transportation Design District for the purposes of implementing~~ include near-term and long-term multi-modal transportation and parking management implementation strategies. Strategies will include both

Transportation System Management (TSM) and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) components. The comprehensive transportation ~~design plan~~ shall work in conjunction with and function as an overlay that supports the land use objectives for the area.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that it is the desire of the Common Council to provide guidance both to neighborhoods as they develop and implement neighborhood plans and to any future development in the plan area with respect to transportation access and accommodation.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, understanding that such an endeavor must be undertaken in phases, the Common Council directs the Long Range Transportation Planning Commission (LRTPC) to review all current land use and transportation plans covering the plan area for areas of disagreement or conflict and to consider: develop a draft scope of work, request for proposals (RFP) and budget/timeline for consultant and engineering services. The draft scope of work developed by LRTPC shall include, at a minimum, the following committee shall first undertake, policy, scope, budget and planning deliverables to be produced by a transportation planning consulting firm to include:

- a. Policies, principles and mechanisms that will govern transportation investment decisions within the study area for the district,
- b. Design principles for transportation facilities and services in the study area ~~High-level design elements to be included in the comprehensive overlay district.~~
- c. ~~Budget projects for further developing the plan including Requests for Proposals for consulting and engineering services for subsequent phases, and~~
- d. ~~Project timeline and budget for subsequent phases.~~

The LRTPC committee shall report back to the Common Council on these issues and make a recommendation whether or not to proceed to an RFP to continue this work before proceeding with subsequent phases.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the LRTPC committee shall ensure that the comprehensive ~~plan design~~ shall build upon and integrate ~~previous adopted~~ and soon-to-be-adopted completed mode-specific plans noted above and will:

- a. Establish policies and principles for balancing transportation investment across all modes - pedestrian, bicycle, automobile, bus and rail,
- b. Focus on strategies to achieve increased consumer inter-operability among present and future transportation modes,
- c. Use transportation investments to stimulate and support economic development (business and job growth) and land use objectives for the downtown and the central urban neighborhoods
- d. Improve the residential quality of life for central urban neighborhoods and improve mobility/access options for all Madison area residents and visitors to the central City.
- e. Support Madison's regional role as the economic and cultural center hub that is accessed via the larger regional transportation system.

- f. Promote a culture of mutual respect and entitlement among all transportation consumers - pedestrians, drivers, bicyclists, and transit riders - and ensure that the engineered environment embodies those values for all users.
- g. Include ~~Implement~~ other values and principles as ~~the committee shall~~ determined appropriate.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the LRTPC ~~committee~~ shall consult with ~~consist~~ of ~~not more than eleven members including three alders,~~ and representatives from central City neighborhood associations, Downtown Madison Inc., major property and business owners, the University of Wisconsin, Madison Metro, the Downtown Coordinating Committee, ~~the Long Range Transportation Planning Commission,~~ the Transit and Parking Commission and the Pedestrian/Bicycle/Motor Vehicle Commission. ~~The committee shall be staffed by the Planning Unit with assistance from Traffic Engineering.~~

**Fiscal Note**

Staff resources from the Planning, Traffic Engineering and Engineering agencies will be reallocated to support the efforts of the Long Range Transportation Planning Commission to develop a scope of work, a budget, and an RFP. No appropriation is anticipated during this phase, but this project will compete for staff resources with commitments made to other projects. There are no cost estimates at this time regarding implementation of specific recommendations; any such expenditures will require future Common Council consideration and approval.