

To: Transportation Commission

From: Lakeside Neighbors Group

**(800 block** – Steve Davis, Janelle Munns, Carrie Rothburd, Martin Saunders, Lori Smetana, Cindy Snyder, Jeff Swiggum, Daniel Thurs, Stefan Westman; **600 block** – Joe Koss; **100 block east** – Janelle Munns, Sharon Paukert, Charlene Sweeney, Duncan Szarmes)

Re: Request to Follow-through on TC's Discussion of Lakeside Street Calming from March 10 and April 29, 2021

Date: January 27, 2021

---

#### Last year's decisions regarding Lakeside

We were encouraged last year at the March 10, 2021, TC meeting when this body approved the motion to install on Lakeside Street 1 traffic circle and 2 speed humps (in addition to TE's proposed 2 speed humps near Franklin School). This motion included the provision that, should MFD veto the additional 2 humps on the 100 and 800 blocks, TC would invite MFD to an upcoming meeting to question MFD about its rationale for rejection.

We were further encouraged when TC approved the motion on April 24, 2021, to move the speed boards to the 100 and 800 block (neighbors' proposed intermediate solution to speeding in the absence of the additional speed humps). At this meeting, the commissioners' conversation ranged from the opinion that TC should stand by its original decision in favor of 4 speed humps on Lakeside, overriding MFD's objection, to suggesting that TC should refer the conflict between TC's and MFD's decisions to TPPB for a policy discussion.

We believe that, with the appropriate number and placement of traffic-calming devices, we can achieve the traffic calming that is critical to multimodal safety on Lakeside Street. This is important, given the long history of speeding on Lakeside Street, and especially important in light of the increasing density on Park Street and John Nolen Drive that is putting more traffic pressure on Lakeside.

#### Lakeside history

The unsafe situation caused by drivers speeding along Lakeside has concerned neighbors and the city for at least 20 years. Up until last year, MFD would not allow any traffic calming devices on this street on the grounds that Lakeside is a collector street and an ambulance route. The traffic refuge islands installed in 2012 at Whittier and Lowell are not intended to contribute to traffic calming, according to TE. This is verified by Lakeside neighbors' observation. Lakeside neighbors who replied to TE's poll last year about installing traffic-calming measures on Lakeside, approved the 2 speed humps on Lakeside in the vicinity of Franklin School and the traffic circle at Whittier by an overwhelming majority (about 90% in favor of speed humps and 80% in favor of the traffic circle).

#### The current situation on Lakeside Street

The data that TE collected this past summer at 518 West Lakeside, a short distance from one of the speed humps, confirms what we've observed since installation: The traffic-calming devices are working to slow cars a short distance to their east and west, but their effect does not extend far enough from their location to truly calm traffic over the entire length of the street. This becomes most obvious furthest from the speed humps at the 100 and 800 blocks. As discussed at both the March 10<sup>th</sup> and April 14<sup>th</sup> TC meetings last year, the east and west ends of the block have always suffered the worst effects of Lakeside speeding. The reason for this, we believe, is the dangerously high speed at which cars turn into Lakeside from South Park and John Nolen. This speeding sets the stage for high speeds along the rest of the street and especially midway.

We understand that the Safe Streets program introduces the new traffic-calming priority of fatal accidents. However, we think that the 2021 NTMP criteria for establishing appropriate speeds for street safety should govern the TC's follow-up discussion and decision about traffic-calming on Lakeside because TC's conversation was intended for completion before the current criteria went into effect.

#### Specifically, we request that TC:

- Ask MFD to its upcoming meeting to present MFD's rationale for denying the 2 additional traffic-calming speed humps that TC approved in 2021 for the 100 and 800 blocks of Lakeside Street.
- Consider approving 2 more speed humps on the 100 and 800 blocks of Lakeside. Or refer the matter to TPPB to answer whether TC has final authority over implementation of its March 10<sup>th</sup> decision about Lakeside calming. Should TPPB support MFD's right to veto, then TC should:
  - Consider directing TE to come up with a different, comprehensive, proactive, and effective traffic-calming solution (with neighbors' input and feedback) for Lakeside Street. This new plan should take into account speeding at both ends of Lakeside and in the middle; the proposed bike route between Rowell and Gilson; the prospect of increased traffic; parking for the business district and elsewhere along Lakeside Street and draw

on the proposed whole-street plan that Lakeside Neighbors Group submitted last year. TC will then discuss and vote on the new proposal for Lakeside this year.

Other cities around the United States have implemented holistic traffic-calming solutions and innovative devices (offset speed humps, speed pads) as a way to resolve what Fire Marshall Ed Ruckriegel has called the illogical conflict between residential on-street safety and the safe passage of EMS and MFD vehicles on Lakeside and other collector streets.

We can too! Thank you for your time. We look forward to engaging in more conversations with TC and TE about completing the holistic traffic-calming plan for Lakeside begun last year.

## ATTACHMENTS

### A) Motion from TC Meeting of March 10, 2021 (from minutes)

Foster moved to approval Staff recommendation with the addition of speed humps at either end of Lakeside Street near Park Street and John Nolen Drive, subject to MFD approval and to return to TC if MFD says no, and leaving speed boards in place, seconded by Bremer. After minimal discussion, the motion passed by voice vote/other.

[See blue highlighted text below for clearer wording of follow-up step as expressed during the meeting.]

### B) Partial Transcript from the Transportation Commission meeting of March 10, 2021

Alder Evers: First of all, thanks. I wish to express strong sense of gratitude on behalf of BC residents and those who live on Lakeside that the city is prepared to...enact traffic-calming measures as part of the NTMP. As you know, in the past residents on Lakeside have been told that despite many instances of near misses, accidents, and concerns—and the fact that [Lakeside Street] has been on the list...going back two decades—residents were told that nothing could be done because Lakeside is an emergency route. Great news that now progress is being made [with the two speed humps and traffic circle]...but in light of the excessive speeds that have been going on on Lakeside all the way from John Nolen to South Park, this is only a first step and I encourage the Commission to take seriously the concerns of those that live toward the edges of the street and not just in the interior because they do suffer the brunt of these excessive speeds. So perhaps a holistic traffic-calming approach and in stages...that staff be encouraged to have a plan going forth to really take on a full and complete traffic-calming approach that will finally resolve the long-going concerns on Lakeside.

These residents [Lakeside Neighbors Group] are unique in the sense that they have taken this seriously and formed their own traffic and transportation committee. So the work that they have done here is really quite unusual is top-notch work...

Tom Mohr: The rationale for not including speed humps on 100 and 800 block is because MFD's desire to minimize total number of speed humps.

Grant Foster: I move approval of everything that's recommended [the two speed humps and 1 traffic circle] and additionally a speed hump on both ends [of Lakeside] by Park and John Nolen. (After questions from Anne Kovich, Foster added the following)...leaving the speed boards as is for now and possibly moving them in the future, subject to MFD approval and if they say no, then they would come back and we would look at it again.

*(Foster acknowledged that Lakeside Neighbors Group had made clear that its request to move the speed boards to the 100 and 800 blocks were a second-best solution based on TE's explanation that MFD would only allow 2 speed humps and only in the middle of the street east to west. Motion was unanimously approved.)*

Grant Foster: I think it's really important to understand the needs of the Fire Department. I actually had a really great conversation about two weeks ago, not on Lakeside specifically but in follow up on the conversation we've been having as the Traffic-calming Subcommittee around this exact point and what flexibility we have for places that are designated as emergency routes. And I feel like the value of those two additional speed humps would be extraordinary here. It's really critical to slow people down when they are turning onto the street, particularly when they are turning off of really high-speed streets, and that is the case with both John Nolen and Park...The residents are...right that you really need to nip it in the bud right away where folks are turning onto the street. So I recommend these [two additional speed humps] with the expectation that TE would follow up with MFD...with the hope that they would say it's okay with the understanding that this is a high priority—they would allow for them—and if they still have concerns, perhaps they can come back to the Transportation Commission and share those more directly with us because I think the additional speed humps will get at the

heart of what we're trying to accomplish with the traffic-calming work. And based on my conversations with MFD it seems there really is quite a bit of flexibility. And it really does need to be a give and take in conversation between balancing fast access for emergency vehicles with the needs to really being able to slow down cars.

If MFD says no, then the ask they should be asked to come to future TC meeting to talk through the rationale for not having it. If they say no, then the TC would come back and look at it again.

### C) Partial Transcript from TC Meeting on April 28, 2021

Harald Kliems: I would like to address the question with MFD and what decided at our last meeting. I understood the motion was that we want to get input from MFD, but if they do have concerns then it would have been helpful for representatives from MFD to have been here and to be available...to have the discussion. Otherwise what was the point of the motion? We approved two speed humps and other speed humps, pending MFD approval. What do we talk about here then?

This is a larger policy discussion in the longer term, but I do think this is something that should be done and done soon. I don't think the FD has any formal authority to veto the location of speed humps. This is our responsibility... We are the ones making decisions about these speed humps, taking into account the multiple competing priorities we have heard, MFD being one and an important one, but I think we do need to be more deliberate about that and not push it off too far into the future.

Chris McCahill: The intent of sending it to MFD was not simply for them to nix it and then us say, oh well. We had very in-depth conversation about what is safety and what does it mean to achieve safety on a road and striking those balances... I would support approving the full plan [four speed humps and a traffic circle] regardless of what MFD says, or if this requires a larger policy discussion, then referring this to TPPB.

Anne Kovich: I have to ask Tom, if the Commission goes back and considers approving it again even though FD says they did not support it, is city staff in a position to move forward with that without FD approval? I want to under what the possibilities are here...It seems to me to be a larger policy issue and discussion than just Lakeside. (AK also expressed the viewpoint that MFD had made its rationale clear.)

Grant Foster: My intent and understanding was that we did want to move forward to talk with MFD again, and, if they were not supportive, my expectation was that they would be back here again and there would be an opportunity for us to hear more clearly what the trade-offs are from their perspective and what their objections are and to have an opportunity for the TC to make an evaluation. I still think this is a good idea.

There is a larger policy issue as well and that needs to be discussed at TPPB and we have talked about it at the Traffic-calming subcommittee as well and will highlight it as needed in our report.

Until and unless we have some policy, we also don't have an adopted policy that says MFD has carte balance veto authority over where speed humps can go. That is kind of the practice but not adopted policy either. Barring any adopted policy, I think it is probably on TC to weigh all those things and MFD's concerns need to be appropriately weighed, but I just don't they can be if they aren't articulated. All we have heard so far is no. So if I were on the Commission, I would recommend bringing it back for a future discussion and explicitly ask MFD to be there and to dig in specifically as it relates to Lakeside—not at a broader policy level, but what are the specific concerns with the two speed humps that were recommended by the Commission before.

### D) COMMUNICATION WITH ED RUCKRIEGEL, MFD

From: Foster, Grant <district15@cityofmadison.com>  
Sent: Thursday, March 11, 2021 12:15 PM  
To: Ruckriegel, Edwin <ERuckriegel@cityofmadison.com>  
Cc: Mohr, Thomas <TMohr@cityofmadison.com>; Evers, Tag <district13@cityofmadison.com>  
Subject: Lakeside Speed Humps

Hi, Ed.

I wanted to follow up with you following our Transportation Commission meeting last night regarding traffic calming for Lakeside. This is an example of one of those streets where there's tension between a need for significant traffic calming interventions and the potential impact that would have on emergency vehicle access.

The commission voted to support installation of two additional speed humps on each end of Lakeside (Park and JN) contingent on approval from MFD. I'm sure Tom will be reaching out to you about this if he hasn't already but wanted to connect as well. I really appreciated our conversation acknowledging the give and take with these decisions and was hoping we could find a way to allow these additional humps to be installed. I'm confident it will make a significant difference in the conditions on the street and will be a significant improvement to safety.

Let me know if there's any value in me joining the conversation and thanks for your willingness to take a look at this.

Grant Foster  
District 15 Alder  
Madison Common Council  
608-285-2519  
<https://www.cityofmadison.com/council/district15/blog/>

---

From: Ruckriegel, Edwin  
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2021 12:56 PM  
To: Foster, Grant <district15@cityofmadison.com>  
Cc: Mohr, Thomas <tmohr@cityofmadison.com>; Evers, Tag <district13@cityofmadison.com>; Price, Arthur <aprice@cityofmadison.com>  
Subject: RE: Lakeside Speed Humps

Grant:

I too appreciated our conversation about traffic calming. Your perspectives were helpful in understanding some of the extreme conditions where speed humps are the only reasonable tool in reducing speeds to improved pedestrian and vehicle safety. Lakeside serves as a connector to St Mary's and Merriter [sic] hospitals. For our Medic units, it is used more as a route to transport sick and injured people to the two hospitals more than an emergency access route. Speed humps complicate patient care and in many cases inflict pain on the patient. For clarification, ". . .the Commission approved two additional speed humps on each end. . .". With two near the elementary school, does this mean six speed humps were approved? The MFD needs a clearer picture of the proposal.

Tom: Please send me a rough plan for where and how many speed humps were approved.

Thanks  
Ed  
---

From: Ruckriegel, Edwin  
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2021 10:31  
To: Foster, Grant  
Cc: Mohr, Thomas; Evers, Tag; Price, Arthur; Davis, Steven  
Subject: RE: Lakeside Speed Humps

Grant and Tom:

Thanks for your patience as the MFD considered the additional traffic calming measures. The MFD maintains the additional speed humps will negatively impact patient care and does not support the additional speed humps.

Ed  
---

From: Foster, Grant  
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2021 11:21 AM  
To: Ruckriegel, Edwin  
Cc: Mohr, Thomas ; Evers, Tag ; Price, Arthur ; Davis, Steven ; [annelizabethkovich@gmail.com](mailto:annelizabethkovich@gmail.com); [tlwilson1986@gmail.com](mailto:tlwilson1986@gmail.com)  
Subject: Re: Lakeside Speed Humps

Thanks for the consideration, Ed. As I mentioned in our previous discussion, this is a really important policy point that has been raised by the Traffic Calming Subcommittee. As I know you're aware, high-speed motor-vehicle traffic also negatively impacts public safety and reduces access to safe and comfortable conditions for vulnerable people moving by foot and by bike on these streets. I expect we're going to need to dig in deeper on this question to be able to better weigh the competing pros/cons of traffic calming infrastructure.

I think for our follow up discussion at Transportation Commission on this particular proposal (Lakeside), it would be helpful to have some quantification of the expected negative impact on patient care. Is that something you'd be able to provide and speak to? I've copied TC Chair Kovich and TPPB and TCS Chair Wilson here as fyi. Thanks again for your support and collaboration as we try and find the right balance.

Grant Foster  
District 15 Alder  
Madison Common Council  
608-285-2519  
<https://www.cityofmadison.com/council/district15/blog/>

---

From: Ruckriegel, Edwin  
To: Foster, Grant  
Cc: Mohr, Thomas; Evers, Tag; Price, Arthur; Davis, Steven; [annelizabethkovich@gmail.com](mailto:annelizabethkovich@gmail.com); [tlwilson1986@gmail.com](mailto:tlwilson1986@gmail.com)  
Subject: RE: Lakeside Speed Humps  
Date: Monday, March 22, 2021 6:54:50 AM

Alder Foster: It is unfortunate the public safety goal has some conflicting and competing priorities. To some degree it defies logic. We all want the same thing, but getting there requires some tough decisions. The MFD supports efforts to improve pedestrian, bike, and vehicle safety. Equally, the MFD is charged with providing the best possible care for the sick and injured we care for. If all things are equal, the MFD will prioritize patient care.

It is not possible to quantify the patient care impacts associated with speed humps. We do not track the routes used for transports which means we cannot correlate the route to the medical outcome, length of hospital stay or degree of patient recovery. Anecdotally, we know patients experience pain spikes and express anxiety when the ambulances cross speed humps.

Ed

#### **E) Lakeside Neighbors Group Letter submitted for TC Meeting of April 28, 2021**

To: Transportation Commission  
From: Charlene Sweeney, Carrie Rothburd, Joe Koss, Janelle Munns of Lakeside Neighbors' Group  
Re: Traffic Calming on Lakeside  
Date: April 28, 2021

---

Thank you on behalf of the vast majority of Lakeside Street neighbors who support traffic calming on Lakeside Street. With close to 90% of us the votes in so far favoring both the speed humps and traffic circle, we have begun to look forward to their installation this summer. We appreciate your interest in initiating calming on Lakeside Street and wish to bring forward for your follow-up consideration a few questions left on the table at the March 10, 2021 meeting:

- 1) Requesting relocation of speed boards on Lakeside:  
We asked at the March 10, 2021 meeting to relocate the speed boards currently east and west of Franklin School to the 100 and 800 blocks of Lakeside if/when speed humps are installed near Franklin School. (The speed board east of Franklin is currently obscured by a tree and requires relocation.) At the March 10th meeting, Traffic Engineering

said this move is a possibility, and the Commission noted that this request “makes sense...and would help with speeding at either ends of street.” Given the overwhelmingly positive response to the traffic-calming survey, we ask now for the Commission’s approval to move the speed boards as soon as possible after installing the speed humps.

2) Requesting that MFD attend a TC meeting: Part of the motion approved at the March 10, 2021 meeting included inviting MFD to attend a TC meeting to talk through traffic calming on Lakeside in light of MFD’s rationale for denying speed humps on the 100 and 800 blocks of Lakeside Street. As MFD vehicles regularly traverse speed humps on routes throughout all of Madison, we believe it would be beneficial to explore the following questions with MFD:

- A) Regarding MFD’s statement that “it is not possible to quantify the patient care impacts associated with speed humps”:
- Would it be possible to direct EMS crews to collect the data needed to correlate trips over speed humps to medical outcomes in order to quantify the impact of speed humps on patient care? Would it be possible to focus a part of this study on Lakeside Street before and after the installation of the two speed humps for comparative data?
- B) Regarding resolving the conflict between residential on-street safety and the safe passage of EMS vehicles:
- Would it be possible for MFD to work with TE to modify the design of speed humps to reduce their potential negative impact on EMS vehicles?
  - Would it be possible to consider offset speed tables and/or speed cushions in lieu of speed humps on Lakeside and other collector streets in Madison to reduce speeding while minimizing or eliminating the potential negative impacts of traffic calming on EMS vehicles?

Offset Speed Table



Speed Cushion



Thank you again for your focus on Lakeside Street and your concern for safety on collector streets in general. We look forward to working further with TE and all of you on improving signage on Lakeside Street this year and hopefully to following up with additional traffic-calming on Lakeside Street next year.