



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

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

Tuesday, July 24, 2007

5:00 PM

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

PLEASE NOTE: Items are reported in agenda order.

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 5:09 PM.

Present: Judy Compton, Robbie Webber, Paul E. Skidmore, Mark N. Shahan, Mary P. Conroy, Susan M. De Vos and Patricia A. Ball

Absent: Charles W. Strawser III and Aaron S. P. Crandall

Excused: Brian W. Ohm and Cheryl E. Wittke

Crandall arrived at 5:45 p.m. during discussion of agenda item C.3.

A. Public Comment

Registrant Laura Hofmann, 3104 Bluff Street #4, 53705, spoke before the group. As a bike commuter, she said she regularly traveled on the bike path along Monona Terrace and encountered hazards (especially at the blind curve of the path coming off of John Nolen Drive) because of people fishing off the Terrace and blocking the path with their gear. She suggested that "No Fishing" signs be placed along the Terrace section of the path.

Skidmore asked that the issue referred to a future meeting, and that feedback should be sought from Parks, MPD, Monona Terrace and the City Attorney's Office regarding existing regulations and what could be done about this.

B. Approval of Minutes - 6/26/07 (Will be available at next month's meeting)

C. New Business Items

- C.1. [06471](#) Amending the Master List of Street Names and Designations and amending the City Engineer's Street Numbering Map, referred to in Sections 10.34(1) and 10.35, Madison General Ordinances by changing the name of Murray Street, North to East Campus Mall from Regent Street to State Street. (8th AD)

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

- C.2. [04272](#) SECOND SUBSTITUTE - Creating Section 12.792 entitled "Neighborhood Electric Vehicles Allowed" to permit and regulate the operation of such vehicles on Madison streets and amending Section 1.08(3)(a) to establish a bail deposit

amount for violations of the section.

A motion was made by Compton, seconded by Skidmore, to Refer to the PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION Sponsor of the proposal, Alder Mark Clear (19th AD), spoke before the group. He had asked this item be referred back when it came up at the Council because a number of good changes suggested by PBMVC and PSRB had not been included in the draft of the ordinance.

He thought that proposed ordinance was unnecessarily complex, and he distributed information from Green Bay, LaCrosse and Sun Prairie regarding their ordinances and sample registration form used in LaCrosse. Clear said that these items provided examples of ordinances that were simple, mirrored state law, and treated electric vehicles much like bicycles. He said that there was movement at state level to have State DOT handle registration of these vehicles but that this didn't need to stop Madison from proceeding with its ordinance, which could be sunseted if the state took over the process. He hoped enactment and implementation would be a simple and timely process. His next step would be to redraft the proposal and send it back to the Commission for another look.

Arthur Ross of Traffic Engineering said that staff wanted to recommend referral of the item. In light of certain changes that had been made to the draft, involved alders and staff needed to meet to work out some issues and develop a proposal that folks agreed on (re: registration and streets of operation), which could then be brought back to PBMVC and PSRB.

Compton/Skidmore moved to refer the item.

Compton was happy that the proposal would mirror state law and wanted electric vehicles to be treated more like cars than like bicycles or golf carts. She had safety concerns about the vehicles if they were to stop suddenly in traffic. She also wanted them to be licensed to operate.

Shahan supported referral and wondered what happened to the changes that PBMVC had recommended to the draft. He hoped that the state would take over registration (so that each municipality would not have to set up their own agencies for this).

The motion passed by acclamation.

Please note: A Roll Call is shown here to reflect that Aaron Crandall arrived at the meeting during discussion of Agenda Item C.3.

Present: Judy Compton, Robbie Webber, Paul E. Skidmore, Mark N. Shahan, Mary P. Conroy, Susan M. De Vos, Patricia A. Ball and Aaron S. P. Crandall

Absent: Charles W. Strawser III

Excused: Brian W. Ohm and Cheryl E. Wittke

C.3. [06823](#)

Pavement Marking Plan for Hammersley Road traffic calming project - Appeal of Traffic Engineering decision by neighborhood

Dan McCormick of Traffic Engineering said that TE had already installed traffic islands on Hammersley Road as part of the traffic-calming project. He noted that Hammersley was a designated bike route and that most traffic calming projects

do not have lane markings.

He then outlined previous discussions and balloting with the neighborhood about options for Hammersley Road (from Whitney Way to Rae/Brookwood):

- Option 2: Marked 8-foot parking lanes on both sides, with 10-foot traffic lanes with "centered" center line, and no dedicated bike lanes; and
- Option 3: Unmarked "offset" centerline in two 9-foot traffic lanes, 7-foot marked parking lane on one side, and dedicated marked bike lanes.

TE had installed the islands and marked an offset dashed centerline, with 14 feet on one side and 22 feet on the other (allowing parking on that side). After completing this, TE reviewed its final marking plan and realized it would be a mistake to pursue marked parking lanes (Option 2) because they would exclude bikes. TE went back to the neighborhood to offer Option 3 with bike lanes, which was not received well. After further discussions, TE and the neighborhood had not reached agreement about this. At this point, staff recommended marked bike lanes or no markings at all, while the neighborhood preferred the marked parking option (#2). McCormick concluded by saying that TE would mark the street whichever way the community decided.

Alder Jed Sanborn (1st AD), alder for the neighborhood, appeared before the group. He said the neighborhood had overwhelmingly voted for Option 2. He thought many residents were bikers and understood the needs of bikers. He observed that typically there were very few parked cars on the street. He felt that the experience for bicyclists would be virtually the same under either option, because bikers would have to be aware of cars under either option. He felt that Option 2 with more marking would produce more traffic calming, while Option 3 would maintain the wide-open feeling of a connector and the speeding associated with that. He urged the Commission to stick with what the neighborhood wanted.

Registrants were invited to speak before the group. The following people appeared in opposition to Option 3 and in support of Option 2:

- Terry Kleinschmidt, 5713 Hammersley Road, 53711, appeared on behalf of himself and neighbors Ken Bennet, Kevin Smith, Jeff Sledge and Tim Howe. After several well-attended neighborhood meetings in the summer of 2005 in which TE voiced no preference for one option or another, neighbors voted 36 to 5 (88%) in favor of Option 2, because it would accommodate multi-users of the street (buses, bikers and pedestrians). They also suggested posting Parking/Biking/Right Turn Only signs (as were used in other parts of the city, where parking/biking lanes were marked). He also demonstrated that eastbound traffic would not have to divert at islands under Option 3, while traffic would have to divert in both directions under Option 2. Responding to a question, staff pointed out that the suggested signage could only be used in parking/bike lanes where there was a minimum of 12 feet; Option 2 provided only 8 feet.
- Susan Doane, 5900 Hammersley Road, 53711, discussed two issues. TE had reported that the neighborhood had declined the idea of a traffic circle; but Doane noted that it was folks from outlying streets who had objected to this idea, not the residents of Hammersley itself (who initiated the traffic-calming project). This idea/option was taken off the table, and residents were not able to vote on that choice. She felt that lines were needed because drivers who now diverted around islands, did not return back to the middle of the road, but stayed way too close to

the curb. She said that neighbors would never have approved of a plan without markings (currently the situation on Hammersley).

- Martha Howell, 5917 Hammersley Road, 53711, talked about the steep hill on Hammersley near Rae Lane. She felt that lines were needed to keep cars moving in/out and slowing them down rather than riding the gutter as they were now doing. She found the current situation at the hill especially dangerous, with poor visibility, drivers who rode the gutter, and bikers who sometimes weaved out into the road when climbing the hill. She hoped a solid line would keep people from riding in the gutter. She did not feel that marked bike lanes would provide greater safety than a parking lane that was rarely used for parking.
- Cynthia Moore, 5905 Hammersley Road, 53711, felt that probably the only way to stop chronic speeders would be speed bumps, but since this was not realistic, she supported Option 2, which provided parking on both sides of the street.
- Tina Hutchinson, 5909 Hammersley Road, 53711, said the neighborhood chose Option 2 because they felt that it would divert traffic and slow drivers down. The painted lines would keep drivers in traffic lanes more, and would provide a multi-purpose parking/bike lane. When dotted lines appeared for bike lanes in the summer of 2006, neighbors asked that the process be stopped and that TE come out to reevaluate the situation. In later comments, she said that it might be best to have a "No Parking" zone on the hill by 5900-6000 Whitney Way near Rae Lane, because of visibility problems there.

Ross and Webber commented that under Option 2, optimally bicyclists should ride in the 10-foot travel lanes and should not travel in the parking lane; and added that they should not ride in the gutter either. Sanborn said that while he understood this position, the difference between Option 2 and 3 would be minimal for bikers. Referring to Odana Road, he believed Option 2 would be better than Option 3 for slowing down traffic because it called for islands and lane markings. Shahan later remarked that bike traffic was what had slowed traffic down on Odana. Sanborn added that he felt Option 3 would be more dangerous than Option 2, if drivers were reckless.

Public comment was concluded. McCormick and Ross responded to questions, as follows:

- It was not unusual for similar streets with similar traffic volumes to have islands and no center lines or markings.
- At islands, there would be no markings because the space would be too narrow for them; wouldn't want to create an expectation that there was a dedicated space for walking/biking.
- On streets that are collectors (like Hammersley), the City has a policy to promote bicycling. These streets were evaluated to determine the need for marked bike lanes. On Hammersley, TE didn't want to go backwards on bike space accommodation, which marking a parking lane would do. With current situation (22-foot side with parking and 14-foot side without parking), there are wide curb lanes in both directions, with space for bicycling on both sides.
- Based on research discussed at Platinum Bike Committee, dedicated facilities (marked bike lanes) for bicyclists was a way to promote more modal share.
- Experience showed that neighborhoods were not as satisfied with traffic islands (as a device) for slowing speeds, as they'd expected to be. But islands did break up street length.
- It wasn't clear how effective islands would be on Hammersley, where so many drivers don't obey speed limits (which TE reduced from 30 to 25 mph) and where police enforcement is low. In general, islands and more signs and marking can

help to divert/slow most traffic. TE's concern was that people could start abusing a parking lane if cars were not parked there.

- Two different effects of traffic calming devices/islands on speeds: Usually saw only a small change in 85th percentile of average speeds; but saw the range of speeds tighten up (with the speeders on the high end, dropping off).

Compton/Skidmore moved to approve Option 2. Compton said that there were no guarantees with either option, but she liked lines in Option 2, which gave drivers curved lines to slow them down (vs. Option 3, which gave drivers a straighter shot). She said she would entertain a friendly amendment for "No Parking" in the Rae Lane section. After due diligence, the neighborhood had voted 88% for Option 2, and she recommended listening to the Alder and the neighborhood about their decision.

Webber/Crandall made a substitute motion to recommend Option 3. Explaining her position, Webber said that what the neighborhood expected to happen with Option 2 was not borne out by the studies or experience: a physical horizontal diversion was not the critical factor in speed. Although people took the options shown in the line schematics literally, the key question on the ballot was whether the neighborhood wanted traffic islands or not, and the neighborhood voted for traffic islands. She had a significant concern about the traffic islands, which were reported to squeeze bicyclists; especially because Hammersley was a designated bike route and a connector. Option 3 tried to follow the current research and practice to put bike accommodations on the street wherever possible. She preferred that bicyclists (and pedestrians) have a designated space rather than using the parking lane, where cars would increasingly be parking. With Option 2, people who were not driving were not given their share of the road, which was a bad policy. She didn't think the line markings in Option 2 would create a consistent change in speed over Option 3, which did provide a designated space on the street for people not using cars.

Answering questions, TE staff said that 9-foot traffic lanes were the minimum needed to place a center line; but with a line, cars tended to hug the bike lane, which wasn't comfortable for bikers. On roads with no center line and low volume (opposing) traffic, cars would often make more space for bikers.

Compton reiterated her position that lines, narrower lanes and obstacles induced drivers to pay attention and reduced speeds, which created a safer situation for everyone. She said that she would be interested in hearing from TE about the best places for no parking zones.

Shahan urged that TE not include lane markings in its traffic calming proposals; to be consistent with guidelines, he felt that lane marking should be used only for local traffic situations, not for long stretches of road. He didn't like either of the two options: 10-foot travel lanes in Option 2 didn't offer much room for bikers to maneuver; and with 6+-foot vehicles in travel and parking lanes, the lane widths in Option 3 were bare minimum, offering questionable comfort level for bikers in bike lane. An unspoken issue was lack of pedestrian space, with Option 3 offering a slightly better choice.

Along with Shahan, Skidmore expressed concerns about both options, but felt that the vote of the neighborhood should be respected. DeVos agreed.

Shahan called for a vote on the substitute motion, to approve Option 3. The motion failed, as follows:

Ayes: Webber and Crandall

Noes: Ball, Compton, Conroy, DeVos, Skidmore

Non-voting: Shahan

Shahan called for a vote on the main motion, to approve Option 2. The motion carried, as follows:

Ayes: Ball, Compton, Conroy, DeVos, Skidmore

Abstain: Webber and Crandall

Non-voting: Shahan

Please note that a Roll Call is shown here to reflect that Compton left the meeting after action on Item C.3. was taken.

Present: Robbie Webber, Paul E. Skidmore, Mark N. Shahan, Mary P. Conroy, Susan M. De Vos, Patricia A. Ball and Aaron S. P. Crandall

Absent: Charles W. Strawser III

Excused: Judy Compton, Brian W. Ohm and Cheryl E. Wittke

C.4. [06761](#)

Adopting the Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Plan as a supplement to the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan.

A motion was made by Skidmore, seconded by Webber, to Refer to the PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION

The motion passed by acclamation.

Shahan introduced Linda Horvath of City Planning, and Patrick McDonnell (441 N. Paterson, 53703) of the Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Association, who presented the Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Plan. Horvath said that the Plan had been almost entirely developed by the neighborhood, with some guidance from City staff.

McDonnell stated that the Plan was undertaken in 2005 with the help of a City grant. He said that much had changed since the previous neighborhood Plan had been adopted by the Council in 1995, and the neighborhood felt that a change was needed in that earlier Plan. He distributed copies of the Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Vision statement and a summary of the Central Madison Comprehensive Transportation and Parking Plan.

Anticipating more growth and a trend towards families with children, the neighborhood supported increased residential density, building the East Isthmus as employment center, and development of more multi-modal transportation options. McDonnell noted housing trends, from student-rental to owner-occupied housing, and outlined neighborhood initiatives: to encourage first-time home buyers to take advantage of city programs, to coordinate "live close to work" programs, to maintain Lapham School, to support growth of E. Johnson business district, to maintain and improve local parks.

McDonnell noted that the Plan emphasized the important connection between transportation and land use planning, in which transportation planning supports land use goals. Consistent with Madison's Comprehensive Plan adopted last

year, the Plan called for the creation of a new version of the Isthmus Traffic Redirection Study completed in 1979. Referring to the Comprehensive Transportation and Parking Plan, McDonnell said the neighborhood would like a more multi-modal plan, which included parking.

The neighborhood would like to see auto traffic diversified to other modes, such as rail, bike and transit, in order to decrease the arterial use of E. Johnson and E. Gorham Streets, which historically had served as collector and residential streets. Whether or not these streets could be returned to their former status, use of them as primary arterials had been detrimental to the neighborhood's environment. The neighborhood felt that all the central neighborhoods could benefit by a more proactive transportation and parking management strategy that the Plan urged the City to undertake. The Plan had goals for promoting bicycling for commuting and recreation, as well as for diversifying to other transit modes.

Responding to questions about the first priority of the Plan to turn one-way E. Johnson and Gorham streets into two-way streets, McDonnell made the following remarks:

- While anticipating objections, this goal would most promote growth as a residential neighborhood with families. It was believed that E. Washington could absorb more through-traffic.
- With a goal of reducing traffic on these two streets, the question was how to meet traffic demand through other modes such as commuter rail or Park-and-Rides. For example, having observed commuters parking on neighborhood streets, neighbors saw a latent demand for Park-and-Rides to be sited on the perimeter of the downtown district, where drivers could get out of their cars and take a shuttle bus or bicycle.
- Nurturing alternatives to one-occupant cars would also reduce congestion for drivers as well as residents in the central city.
- In response to a statement that E. Washington and the Beltline were near capacity, McDonnell said that Johnson/Gorham currently carry more traffic per lane (10,000 cars/lane) than E. Washington (9,000 cars/lane), which supported the supposition that E. Washington could absorb more traffic. He said that this was an idea that could be explored in an updated transportation study, which could also look at different modes available to meet trip demand on the Isthmus.
- As one of its first priorities, the time frame for reducing arterial use of Johnson/Gorham depends on how fast other modes are implemented: Commuter rail was probably a ways off, but Park-and-Rides or Park-and-Bikes could be achieved sooner. Reconstruction of Johnson Street was scheduled for 2011; though aggressive, this might be a time to target realignment, which would have to be part of a more comprehensive multi-modal strategy.

Shahan remarked that it was not certain how much more capacity could be squeezed out of the E. Washington and the Beltline, and that perhaps the other goals (#2 and #3) needed to be accomplished first. Though presented in a specific order in the resolution, McDonnell said that the three goals were not necessarily stated in order of implementation, and the neighborhood would be flexible on that point.

In further discussion about ease of traveling on E. Washington, McDonnell said that short of directionality changes, certain types of street management could immediately begin to help reduce traffic on Johnson/Gorham -- such as providing two left-turn lanes at First Street and Packers Avenue to direct more traffic over to

E. Washington. Concerning local businesses, the E. Johnson Business Association had not so much said that traffic congestion was an issue, as they had said that slower two-way traffic would be a boon to them. Except for agreeing on the need for a comprehensive downtown transportation/parking analysis and plan, McDonnell said that specific recommendations affecting other neighborhoods (such as Park & Rides) had not yet been run by other neighborhoods. However, the Tenney-Lapham Association had been talking to other neighborhoods since 2004, and the success of achieving their goals would depend on larger transportation strategies, which could not be accomplished unilaterally.

Referring to "Agency Comments on March 30, 2007 Plan", Dan McCormick made the following comments:

- While receptive to undertaking traffic analysis and planning, agencies did not think it sustainable to directly change Johnson/Gorham streets to two-way traffic based on info about the streets' capacity and existing land use plans.
- They were open to supporting neighborhood goals concerning families and businesses through other measures however.
- The City had no fiscal plan for creating alternatives like Park-and-Rides, proposed in the Plan as ways to reduce traffic in the neighborhood.
- TE worked with Planning to make recommendations, to develop a more comprehensive plan for the downtown -- a major undertaking to weave ideas together from various groups like Transport 2020, the transit development program, parking, etc.
- A proportion of traffic on Johnson/Gorham had been diverted to the Beltline; and E. Washington was carrying a greater load and growing 5%/year, while Johnson/Gorham was growing by 2%/year.
- As a result, agencies had recommended modifying or rejecting the Plan, because it wasn't consistent with the current transportation system or the City's Comprehensive Plan.

In response to Webber, McDonnell said Alder Konkel was supportive of the Plan. Webber said she thought there were a lot of issues that needed to be worked out, to get other neighborhoods and agencies on board, in order for the PBMVC to accept or adopt the Plan. She asked McDonnell if he would prefer that the PBMVC receive the Plan without recommendations, or if he would prefer that the group refer the Plan so that some of the issues could be worked out.

McDonnell disagreed with the characterization that the Plan called for immediate action, but added that the neighborhood (along with others) did think the City should start to develop a transportation management plan for the central city that would implement TSM and TDM strategies; and as part of that, to explore ways to reduce arterial operation of Johnson/Gorham. He also felt that the Plan was consistent with the City's long-term goals: increasing work force housing, decreasing auto commuting, increasing mass transit, promoting a healthy environment. He concluded by saying he would prefer that the Plan be referred rather than received (without adoption).

Skidmore/Webber moved referral on the item.

Skidmore said he'd rather refer it than vote against the Plan. He was not comfortable supporting it without hearing from the alder, with important agency questions unanswered, with the bold initiatives being proposed in the Plan, and

with a bare quorum to vote on it.

DeVos made a substitute motion for approval of the Plan, which failed for lack of a second.

Shahan made the following remarks and suggestions for the Plan:

- Make undertaking a downtown transportation study the primary goal, which might mollify concerns of City staff and would not presuppose the outcomes of such a study.
- Double-lefts on First Street could create issues for other neighborhoods, because it raised concerns about crossing times for pedestrians.
- Expand on alternative transportation modes; include pedestrian issues, to discuss crosswalk treatments and improvements needed at problem intersections where people had trouble crossing.
- Mention bike connections to other neighborhoods (i.e., Sherman Flyer).
- Include standards for bike parking, where bike parking is needed.
- Make recommendations for bus route changes (such as a circulator from one side of E. Washington to the other).
- Include some discussion of TMA's for business districts or initiatives for large housing projects.

Other members made the following comments:

- DeVos liked that the Plan was written by the neighborhood.
- Webber noted that two-way streets created problems for pedestrians, and suggested having more discussion about this.

The motion passed by acclamation.

Please note that Item C. 6. was taken up before Item C.5. A Roll Call is shown here to reflect that Skidmore and Conroy left the meeting before action was taken on Item C.6., and before C.5. was considered.

Present: Robbie Webber, Mark N. Shahan, Susan M. De Vos, Patricia A. Ball and Aaron S. P. Crandall

Absent: Charles W. Strawser III

Excused: Judy Compton, Paul E. Skidmore, Brian W. Ohm, Mary P. Conroy and Cheryl E. Wittke

C.5. [05532](#)

Accepting the Final Report of the East Washington Capitol Gateway Plan Advisory Committee and adopting the East Washington Capitol Gateway Corridor Plan and Urban Design Guidelines as a supplement to the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan, and other City plans to be used to guide future land use and development within the East Washington Capitol Gateway Corridor.

Mark Olinger and Brad Murphy of City Planning appeared before the Commission. Olinger provided some background about why the Capitol Gateway Plan was developed. Over the years, a lot of people had talked about enhancing employment opportunities on the Isthmus; i.e., Isthmus 2020 discussed the need for transportation improvements to have significant growth in the employment base on the Isthmus. Over past 10-12 years, new construction in the core of the City had continued to erode opportunities to create new employment in the core. In 2004, Planning applied to Dane County for \$25K grant, to take a focused look at E. Washington between Mifflin and Main, from Blair to First Street (the Capitol

Gateway Corridor): to look at opportunities to provide for new development and land use, and how this might look. They created a 20-member committee of neighborhood representatives, alders, business owners, and property developers.

Among the many recommendations made, people seemed to want to focus on the height issue. Through the approval process with the Economic Development and Urban Design Commissions, questions emerged as to how to handle densities on E. Washington if Plan recommendations were made, esp. how they would mitigate the transportation effects of such densities.

Olinger discussed some features of the Corridor:

- The history of E. Washington Avenue has been to push more and more traffic onto it.
- The corridor contained large 4½-acre blocks (twice the size of downtown blocks).
- The area had been Madison's traditional employment base, its old industrial district that as it transitioned, was a place where there were opportunities for redevelopment.
- Looking at the geography of the Isthmus, there wasn't much available land to maintain a vibrant downtown over the next forty years, except in the Corridor.

Without rethinking what could happen on E. Washington and left to its own devices, development would occur on a project-by-project basis (with each project providing its own parking on site, without planning how to use buses); and the City would end up with many one- or two-story buildings with surface parking lots on the side. Olinger said that the sort of urban redevelopment on E. Washington envisioned in the Plan would not be possible without rethinking parking and access to the sites.

In looking at massing models, they found that American Family Center - 1.2 million square feet -- could be put on two blocks of E. Washington Avenue. Looking at E. Washington now, it would be ideal for some intensity of development: it had 24 peak-hour buses, 48 to 63,000 cars a day, 132-foot wide rights of way, major bike paths two vibrant neighborhoods flanking it, and a potential for commuter rail. Multi-modal transportation already existed on E. Washington, which could probably be enhanced, especially with regard to parking and access. E. Washington had less employment now than 100 years ago, and traffic was going through the district rather than to the district. They had been meeting with Alders Rummel and Konkel, the Marquette and Tenney-Lapham neighborhood associations and DMI, to flesh out the transportation and parking components of the Plan. He felt that there were many transit and non-single occupancy vehicle options for the area now, and over time it would get better.

Murphy talked about a June Planning Division Report, which would incorporate language into pages 28 and 29 of draft, regarding alternative modes of transportation to decrease use of single occupant vehicles, by requiring traffic impact studies for major developments along Corridor, and by having major developments prepare TDM plans and participate in transportation management associations. They were planning to take the revised document with these additions back to the Planning Commission, and hopefully they would feel comfortable about adopting the revised Plan.

He said that suggestions to prepare an overall transportation plan for the Isthmus would involve all modes, with goals and objectives, assessment of alternatives, development of policies related to each mode, and integration with land use plans. The question remains as to what level of modeling and analysis they should perform as a basis for considering alternatives, and analyzing implications of those alternatives - a significant multi-year task requiring a significant investment. The intent would be to bring together the many recommendations of the mode-specific studies currently underway.

Responding to questions, Murphy said the housing built around Campus and downtown in recent years had not resulted in significant addition of children to the downtown. He said that the Plan emphasized family-oriented housing with amenities like recreational spaces and space to accommodate family housing. Olinger said they wanted to jump-start efforts to convert downtown rental property into owner occupancy, and added that the nearby neighborhoods provided built-in potential for family housing. Because E. Washington is not especially so, he would also want to keep Main and Mifflin streets pedestrian-friendly. Murphy and Olinger talked about shared parking, which potentially could be run by group of owners or BIDs, and a new provision for a parking reduction allowance for shared parking. Olinger said it would take a lot of time to fully develop E. Washington, and noted that it was important to get people in the area to think as a district.

At the conclusion of the discussion, Shahan said that no action was required on the item but he would want a downtown parking and transportation study to be a high priority in the budget and would watch for opportunities to promote this.

C.6. [06745](#)

Approving the geometric design for the Lien Road/Thompson Drive/Zeier Road intersection reconstruction project and authorizing the City to petition the State of Wisconsin Commissioner of Railroads to reconstruct the existing railroad crossings of Lien Road and Thompson Drive and add a new crossing of the railroad on Lien Road. (17th AD)

PBMVC approved the resolution, on the condition that the plans and specifications for the project come back to PBMVC before final approval.

A motion was made to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS. The motion passed by acclamation.

Dan McCormick of TE and Rob Phillips of CE appeared before the group. McCormick outlined the three alternatives: two traffic signal options, one at Level of Service C and one at Level of Service D, each with six to seven lanes across at each leg; and a two-lane round-about option at Level of Service B. Bicycles, pedestrians and safety issues were considered. Based upon review, TE recommended the round-about design. The neighborhood was concerned about traffic gaps along Thompson Drive, but TE said this issue wouldn't be materially different with any of the options, and they would work with the neighborhood to address that issue separately.

McCormick passed out an article written by Michael Moule, President of Association for Ped/Bike Professionals, which discussed pedestrians and bicycles at round-abouts. McCormick said that the TE design was consistent with the article. He noted that two-lane round-abouts were worse for bikes than single lanes, but accommodate bicyclists better than six-lane intersections.

Webber wondered how people entering at different points would know to yield to people already in the circle (even if in a different lane). McCormick said it was part of learning curve for round-about usage in the Madison area, and TE was studying signage options to help. Also emerging in the field was the use of lane markings. Design, driver behavior, education and enforcement were all factors in how well round-about worked. He said that TE was working on multi-lane designs that would create a speed of 20-25 mph inside the circle.

Webber expressed concerns about bicyclists in round-about. McCormick said that people were still searching for good designs to blend ped/bike and round-about. Data did show that two-lane round-about could be worse for bikes than traffic signals, depending on the scope of a signalled intersection. He also mentioned plans for a regional bike path nearby. But he said that there was still a need for bike lanes in the street and TE wanted to design them to be safe. He pointed out exit ramps to sidewalks along the round-about, and marked bike lanes that ended and merged bikes into traffic. Responding to a question from Webber about lowering the design speeds, McCormick said that speed, lane width and curves determined capacity, and TE had to balance these factors.

McCormick said that he would be glad to bring back more information about fastest paths and design features, but that TE and CE would like the Commission's approval. Rob Phillips said that with one Council meeting in August, it would cost a month's time if Commission delayed approval. He added that approval of the resolution would basically endorse the concept of a round-about (vs. other options), and would give staff the confidence to allow the consultant to proceed with the final design, as well as to petition the Commissioner of Railroads regarding the RR crossing there. Staff was hoping to build the project in 2008. McCormick said that the intent of the resolution was not to approve specific plans and specifications, but to approve the general geometric design concept of a round-about (vs. the other options). The plans and specs could be provided when the consultant had completed a final plan.

Registrant Bob Schaefer (6 Cottonwood Circle, 53704) of the Ridgewood Neighborhood Association appeared before the group. He stated that the Association had approved the round-about geometric over the traffic signal geometric. Because the intersection was a funnel out of the East Towne area, because of high traffic volumes and the fact that four lanes of traffic would funnel into two lanes, the neighborhood was concerned about having needed gaps in the traffic that traveled south on Thompson Drive. Without gaps, it would be difficult for vehicles/peds/bikes to exit out of neighboring cul-de-sacs. Along with the proposal, the neighborhood wanted to see something about how the issue of gaps would be handled, and not have to wait to see if it would turn into a big problem first.

Webber/Crandall moved approval of the resolution on the condition that the plans and specifications would come back to the PBMVC for comment before the final plan was approved.

Webber supported the round-about but felt there were some details that were extremely important for making it work for all road users; especially the internal 85th percentile design speed, the corners, and the exiting/entering radii. With two major bike routes and traffic volumes there, it would be essential to get design

speed down as much as possible in order to make this work for bicycles, lost drivers, etc.

Webber/DeVos made a motion to suspend the rules to continue the meeting past 8 PM. The motion carried unanimously.

The group proceeded to Agenda Item C.5.

D. Old Business Items

D.1. PBMVC Rules and Procedures - Referred to August meeting

E. Reports of Other Committees - Summary of Activity

E.1. Plan Commission - Referred to August meeting

E.2. Long Range Transportation Planning Commission - Referred to August meeting

E.3. Joint West Campus Area Committee - Referred to August meeting

E.4. Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee - Referred to August meeting

E.5. School Traffic Safety Committee - Referred to August meeting

E.6. Platinum Biking City Planning Committee - Referred to August meeting

F. Reports of Officers and Members for Information/Discussion

F.1. Executive Secretary Report - Referred to August meeting

F.2. Items by Chair - Not taken up

F.3. Items for referral and/or announcements - Not taken up

ADJOURNMENT

Upon a motion by Webber/Crandall, the meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.