



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes - Approved SUSTAINABLE MADISON TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (Madison in Motion)

Thursday, December 18, 2014

5:00 PM

Room 300, Madison Municipal Building
215 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard

1 CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Chair Gary Poulson called the 12-18-14 meeting of the Madison in Motion (Transportation Master Plan) Oversight Committee to order.

Present: 6 - John Strasser; Rob Kennedy; Gary L. Poulson; Ken Golden; Jay B. Ferm and Michael W. Rewey

Excused: 5 - Maurice S. Cheeks; Chris Schmidt; Denise DeMarb; Lynn K. Hobbie and Craig P. Stanley

2 APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM NOVEMBER 20, 2014 MEETING

The Minutes of the 11-20-14 Transportation Master Plan Oversight Committee meeting was unanimously approved, on a motion submitted by Jay Ferm/Michael Rewey.

3 PUBLIC COMMENT

Sophia Rogers spoke in favor of BRT. She stated that she was impressed and encouraged by the Madison Metro study and pursuit of BRT, and was most impressed with groundwork they have laid for BRT. This is the most effective way for transit to be provided.

There were no other members of the public wishing to speak in regard to future Committee agendas.

4 DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

There were no disclosures or recusals reported by Committee members.

NEW BUSINESS

[32012](#)

MEETING MATERIALS: TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN
OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

5 [35566](#)

Accepting the Madison Transit Corridor (BRT) Study Report, endorsing the

recommendations contained in the Report as a conceptual component of the City's strategy for addressing future transportation system planning and development, and to authorize moving forward to the next phase of project development, environmental evaluation and project implementation.

This Resolution was RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER

LRTPC recommended modifications to the resolution are at url below:

<https://madison.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=3435098&GUID=4490D474-2FE0-4DB6-A01C-4DCA3BB71DCF>

=====

Rob Kennedy/Michael Rewey submitted a motion to recommend adoption of Resolution ID 35566.

Ken Golden suggested taking a current "Whereas" clause and making it a "Be it Further Resolved" clause, to give it more weight. Ken Golden/Ald. John Strasser submitted an amendment to the motion, recommending this change (see new BIFR clause below):

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the BRT project development/implementation process will address how paratransit services may be enhanced and/or integrated with BRT service, will revisit the analysis of the BRT corridors and specifically address equity issues (in terms of travel time savings, job connectivity, access to low-income populations and redevelopment) and will address any federal Title VI issues pertaining to the project; and,"

Ken Golden/Ald. John Strasser then submitted a second amendment to the motion, recommending the change to one of the "Whereas" clauses (see new "Whereas" clause below):

"WHEREAS the next steps in the BRT project development/implementation process of the Start-Up System will include environmental documentation as required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), a more detailed analysis of alternative routes and alignments, further refinement of the BRT operating plans, identification of potential solutions to transit vehicle storage and maintenance facility needs, preparation of a detailed economic impact evaluation, further evaluation of the funding and management mechanisms under which the system will operate, and further evaluation of community and neighborhood impacts, including mitigation measures; and,"

The Committee then unanimously recommended adoption of Resolution ID 35566, as amended, on the original motion submitted by Rob Kennedy/Michael Rewey.

David Trowbridge summarized the changes to the resolution recommended by the other referral committees. He distributed a modified version of the resolution, with the comments integrated. In summary, he noted that the resolution was strongly recommended for adoption by the Common Council.

Rob Kennedy/Michael Rewey submitted a motion to recommend adoption of Resolution ID 35566.

Rob Kennedy asked if there were any maps showing potential routes. Trowbridge responded that the resolution accepts the Madison Transit Corridor Study report, which includes several routes

Ken Golden suggested taking a current “Whereas” clause and making it a “Be it Further Resolved” clause, to give it more weight. Ken Golden/Ald. John Strasser submitted an amendment to the motion, recommending this change (see new BIFR clause below):

“BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the BRT project development/implementation process will address how paratransit services may be enhanced and/or integrated with BRT service, will revisit the analysis of the BRT corridors and specifically address equity issues (in terms of travel time savings, job connectivity, access to low-income populations and redevelopment) and will address any federal Title VI issues pertaining to the project; and,”

Ken Golden asked if a lack of bus storage would really impede transit efficiency and operations and asked if this resolution should cover bus vehicle maintenance and storage more clearly. Chuck Kamp (Metro General Manager) agreed with that assessment.

Ken Golden/Ald. John Strasser then submitted a second amendment to the motion, recommending the change to one of the “Whereas” clauses (see new “Whereas” clause below):

“WHEREAS the next steps in the BRT project development/implementation process of the Start-Up System will include environmental documentation as required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), a more detailed analysis of alternative routes and alignments, further refinement of the BRT operating plans, identification of potential solutions to transit vehicle storage and maintenance facility needs, preparation of a detailed economic impact evaluation, further evaluation of the funding and management mechanisms under which the system will operate, and further evaluation of community and neighborhood impacts, including mitigation measures; and,”

The Committee then unanimously recommended adoption of Resolution ID 35566,

as amended, on the original motion submitted by Rob Kennedy/Michael Rewey.

6 REVIEW OF BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN SYSTEM PLANNING AND EVALUATION

David Trowbridge introduced Ken Ray from the Toole Design Group Washington D.C. office. Ray gave the committee a presentation featuring bicycle and pedestrian facilities with an emphasis on innovative ideas for bicycle facilities. Some of the highlights from his presentation included the following:

- * Review of existing good ideas from throughout United States
- * Balancing the provision of bicycle and pedestrian facilities with costs and other impacts is often a challenge
- * Cities that are innovating - road diets, green pavement, back-in parking, buffered bike lanes, separated bike lanes, etc.
- * Minneapolis examples: bicycle trails are wider with pedestrians separated
- * Madison is a gold ranked city today through League of American Bicyclists - how can its ranking be improved?
- * New street typologies (in contrast to arterials, collectors, and local streets) and potential set of different standards mated with those street typologies
- * Different types of cycle tracks (separated bicycle lanes) were shown, as well as different types of vertical separation.
- * Examples of separated bicycle lanes from other cities were shown, with examples of how to board transit when these facilities are in place.
- * Madison concepts drawings were shown, including Mifflin and Bassett streets.

The committee had a number of questions and comments. Jay Ferm wanted numbers to document the use of these facilities and their charted progress. Rob Kennedy commented about some of the facilities shown might not be totally MUTCD compliant. Jay Ferm drew the committee's attention to the fact that many bicyclists were already using Mifflin Street in the counterblow direction by using the sidewalks. A facility that accommodated that direction of travel would address that current problem and usage pattern. Ferm also suggested that the consultant team

looks at Carlsbad, California for some additional innovative ideas. Ferm urged the team to looking at cutting edge and newer ideas that haven't been tried yet in Madison.

Ken Golden pressed the committee to step back and look at what role the plan will have:

- * Are there warrants or criteria for using some types of bicycle facilities?
- * The planners need to give serious thought to the scope of the plan - not too much detail, but not too little either. The plan should be focused on identifying issues and not all of the solutions.
- * The committee needs to be realistic - it is not likely that streets will be prioritized simply because they need a bicycle accommodation.

Mike Rewey indicated that WisDOT's lane width practices can present a problem because of their aversion to narrower lanes, which makes it difficult to divide up space in a street (and make more room for bicyclists). The plan needs to address these policies too.

Kevin Luecke of TDG presented the outcomes of Toile's pedestrian facility approach. In summary, Luecke's slides covered:

- *The current city policy is to provide sidewalks on both sides of streets
- * General approach was to identify missing sidewalks using two tiers. The tigers are not necessarily a reflection of the relative importance of where sidewalk gaps should be addressed.
- * Tier one includes missing sidewalk gaps on streets classified as arterials and collectors or local streets that are bus routes.
- * Tier two includes all other local streets where there are gaps in the sidewalk network on one or both sides of the street.
- * The results of this analysis can be used if funding becomes available to retrofit sidewalks where there are important gaps to fill. Without funding, these gaps will eventually be addressed when streets are reconstructed per the city's current sidewalk policy.

Mike Rewey indicated that the street layer is incorrect and suggested getting a copy of the local road data base. Committee members suggested getting a current school route map (perhaps from Arthur Ross) and having the analysis be informed by that. Rob Kennedy indicated that not every street around a school needs be a priority for sidewalks.

Tom Huber presented the planning approach for updating the bicycle network map. The goal is to update the two network maps in the 2000 MPO/County Bicycle Plan. Tom presented a series of maps through slides:

- Map displaying all arterial streets and collector streets that are rated worse than B using the Bicycle Level of Service (BLOS) indicator that currently do not include bicycle facilities.
- It is and has been the policy of the City and the MPO to include bikeways on major streets when major work is done. Deficient streets, or those lacking bikeways, are opportunities for improvement and expansion of the bike network.

Rob Kennedy asked about streets that are shown as deficient but have a good alternative nearby? Williamson Street was just narrowed for the benefit of pedestrians and additional terrace space was provided in large part because the Capital City Trail and Jenifer Street provide good bicycle alternatives just a block away. Maybe these streets should be a different color on the map. Huber responded that the map shows only deficient streets - it does not develop priorities. There are also streets included in this grouping that have peak hour travel lanes and those are tricky to assess. For example, streets like Williamson are likely to not rank particularly well as a current priority because of the proximity of alternatives, however, that does not mean that when a reconstruction opportunity arises that a bikeway should automatically not be included. Mike Rewey disagreed with Kennedy's premise for the question and advocated that all of these major streets should have bikeways regardless of nearby alternatives. He added that we do not make differentiations like these for motor vehicles, nor should we for bicycle access.

Ken Golden touched on the need for crossings of freeways citing the Beltline study and urged that the plan highlight areas where new crossings of major barriers like freeways are needed. Luecke responded that the map displaying off-street bikeways gets at that point.

The committee continued dialogue with a general discussion on bikeways. Jay Ferm stated that there was a real need to look at improving connections on the

west side and highlighting those connections to users. There are large issues of connectivity because a regular street grid does not exist once you travel far enough to the west in the city. It would be great to highlight where connections between cul-de-sacs or along utility rights-of-way can be made. These are important issues, but the actual identification of locations for opportunities is too detailed for this planning effort. However, the plan can include policy language and some best practices and examples depicting how this can be done.

7 NEXT STEPS/SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS

David Trowbridge mentioned that next Madison In Motion Committee meeting will be held February 19. There will be no meeting in January.

8 ADJOURNMENT

The Committee adjourned its meeting at 6:55 p.m.