



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

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

Tuesday, August 22, 2006

5:00 PM

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

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Present: Judy Compton, Robbie Webber, Paul E. Skidmore, Michael Forster Rothbart,
Matthew A. Logan, Mary P. Conroy and Susan M. De Vos

Absent: Cheryl E. Wittke and Carl R. Kugler

Excused: Mark N. Shahan and Charles W. Strawser III

Compton arrived at 5:10 p.m.

Staff present: Dan McCormick, Assistant City Traffic Engineer

A. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - 7/25/06

A motion was made by Conroy, seconded by Webber, to Approve. The motion passed by acclamation.

C. MADISON POLICE DEPARTMENT REPORT ON TRAFFIC RELATED ISSUES

None

D. SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS

D.1. [04372](#) Union Corners Redevelopment Project

Attachments: Union Corners Redevelopment_McGrath materials.pdf, Union Corners Redevelopment Transportation Analysis ag08.22.06.pdf

Logan noted that this item is on the agenda for the PBMVC to advise the Plan Commission on the ped/bike aspects of the proposal. McCormick pointed out that the General Development Plan (GDP) has been approved by the Plan Commission and the Common Council. The final plat has been approved and some of the street work has been approved by the Board of Public Works. The next stage is the submittal of the Specific Implementation Plan (SIP). Approval of the GDP included a condition that the developer bring the project to the PBMVC for comments prior to submittal of the SIP.

Lance McGrath, McGrath Associates, Inc. and John Lichtenheld, Schreiber/Anderson Associates, Inc. (SAA) gave the presentation.

· Work on the redevelopment project began over three years ago and involved extensive public input, including over 40 neighborhood meetings.

- Project area comprises 22 parcels on an approximately 15-acre site bordered by East Washington Avenue on the west, Farwell Street on the east, Milwaukee Street on the north, and the railroad corridor on the south.
- Major environmental remediation was done on the former Ray-o-vac site and demolition of existing buildings has begun (Kohl's grocery store, French Battery building).
- First phase involves construction of 5 buildings with commercial, retail/grocery, mixed use and condos, one level of below-grade parking.
- Using materials from demolished French Battery building to recreate the face of the building.
- Plan includes green space and sustainable design.
- As far as transportation issues, did not just focus on issues related to the project itself; worked with the City on some of the transportation issues related to the surrounding streets and neighborhoods.
- One challenge was to improve the transportation system but not to the detriment of the surrounding neighborhoods.
- Working with the City, looked at transportation issues on some of the other nearby corridors, such as Milwaukee Street.
- Cut-through traffic on Sixth Street is a concern.
- Winnebago Street is a big issue, not just in the area of the development.
- Looked at some of the opportunities to make bike connections and long-term rail connections.
- Is an existing extensive bus system on East Washington Avenue.
- Developed project site plan that focused on integrating itself with the neighborhood in terms of motor vehicles and alternative transportation modes. Site plan also integrated more of a grid street system to try and eliminate the existing "headache" where Winnebago Street enters East Washington at Milwaukee Street.
- Proposal calls for extending Sixth Street through the development to Winnebago Street and putting in a signal at Sixth-East Washington. Signal provides an opportunity for getting traffic in/out of the site and also provides a better ped crossing of East Washington.
- One concern of the neighborhood and development team is to avoid encouraging cut-through traffic.
- Included in the design is a roundabout at Sixth-Winnebago to slow down traffic.
- Winnebago Street would have on-street bike lanes and parking along with a varying street width.
- Introduced tabletop design, raised section in middle of the street to slow traffic.
- Connection of Sixth Street at Winnebago would be narrow and angled.
- From a motor vehicle standpoint, accomplished what they wanted to do. Internal streets will have an urban feel.
- The City is working on vacating Division Street but maintaining it as a ped/bike connection.
- Bike accommodations include construction of a bike path along the railroad corridor and extension of the bike path at Jackson Street to Farwell Street. The bike path is integrated into the design.
- Site will be well-served by transit.
- Reiterated there has been extensive public input and felt the neighborhood as a whole appreciates the project.

DeVos questioned the finding in the SAA report that the additional 150 residential

units will not increase traffic volumes above those projected in the December 2004 traffic impact analysis. Lichtenheld confirmed that is correct. He emphasized that this is a redevelopment project; when this area functioned as a viable community, it generated traffic. Traffic volumes on Milwaukee Street and Winnebago are currently less than when the buildings in this area were "in play." This is not a case where they are introducing traffic into a neighborhood that never had traffic. DeVos felt the a.m. peak hour trip generation for the 150 units seemed low. Lichtenheld stated the estimates are based on national averages. DeVos felt it would make more sense to do a demographic profile of who might live in the units and found that estimates based on these assumptions are too low to be credible. McCormick reiterated Lichtenheld's comment that these are industry standards, it is not an exact number. Compton pointed out that many of the residents will use transit or bike. McCormick confirmed that the estimate only relates to motor vehicle trips and does not take into account peak hour trips by transit, walking or biking.

In response to a question by Webber, Lichtenheld stated that when they estimated the trip generation, it was assumed that Winnebago Street went through to Milwaukee Street. Webber asked about turns from Winnebago onto Milwaukee. McCormick directed attention to Figures 6 and 7 showing peak hour turning movements, but Webber noted the maps do not show Winnebago going through. She indicated she was trying to determine how many motorists will use Winnebago as a cut-through and wanted to know the estimated average daily traffic for the new section of Winnebago. Lichtenheld replied 2,204. Webber asked for a breakdown of how many are leaving the development versus driving through, but Lichtenheld didn't have that estimate. Webber felt this would be important data to provide to the Plan Commission; it's a huge concern for the neighborhood and should be considered.

McCormick reminded members that the GDP has been approved. This project has been through a rigorous design process, and the street plans have been approved by the Common Council.

Lichtenheld advised they are trying to reduce the amount of through trips. However, they also want to maintain access and do want traffic in the development to go down to the end of the new section of Winnebago (Sixth Street).

Responding to a question, McCormick advised that the new section of Winnebago Street is 44 feet wide, with parking and bike lanes on both sides. They are trying to promote the street for biking. There are about 7,000 motor vehicle trips per day. Webber recalled that the SAA report estimated just over 2,000 vehicle trips per day, but McCormick indicated that the City Traffic Engineering estimates were higher than that, probably 5,000 motor vehicles per day on the section of Winnebago outlined in red on the aerial photo attached to Lance McGrath's memo. Webber wondered whether it's necessary to have marked bike lanes for that volume of motor vehicle traffic. McCormick reiterated that they are trying to promote bicycling for all levels of bicyclists. McGrath indicated that internally on the site, bicyclists are able to get from Union Green West to Union Green East, and Webber felt some bicyclists might use that route rather than Winnebago Street. She noted the bulb-outs on Union Green West and East at Winnebago, and Lichtenheld indicated Winnebago is 32 feet wide in this area (1' gutters, 5' bike lanes, and 10' traffic lanes).

There was a question regarding the earlier reference to a tabletop design, and McCormick indicated it's characteristic of a speed hump except it's about 4-6" high, basically a raised ped crosswalk.

McCormick advised that the proposed bike path is a City Engineering project and he did not have information about the funding. McGrath stated he has granted an easement to the City for the bike path and it is part of the second phase, although McCormick emphasized it's subject to City funding. Lichtenheld indicated that the City is doing the bike path because the developer doesn't have standing to work with the railroad. He indicated the process will start this fall and tie in with the Division Street vacation. Forster Rothbart felt that for this section of path to be useful, the section from Winnebago to Main is critical. Perhaps the PBMVC can push the City Engineer in that direction and make it part of this project. McCormick urged members to contact the Mayor and Common Council about capital budget funding requests.

Webber had concerns about the width and configuration of the roundabout since it appears too easy to travel at a high speed, but McCormick noted members need to see the engineering design. The lanes are about 20 feet wide because they need to accommodate multiple types of vehicles, including buses and trucks. But it is a single lane roundabout. He indicated he could come back with the roundabout design elements. Webber expressed concern that the vehicles will not slow down enough for peds and bicyclists

Webber stated she would have preferred for the PBMVC to have more ped and bike information. McCormick stated he could bring back more information if desired, but he reiterated that the street plans have been approved by the Plan Commission and the Board of Public Works. Also, the plan went through a vigorous review. Webber indicated she had read some of the neighborhood comments, one of which was that a number of things were brought up as conceptual rather than final design. If the citizens didn't have the final plans that went to the GDP, it make it difficult to comment. McGrath stated the plans were constantly changing and they kept the neighborhoods informed as best they could.

Forster Rothbart suggested some minor ped improvements. (1) On Winnebago Street where the bike lanes begin, there's no curb cut from the bike path to the street. Lichtenheld noted the drawing was not a true representation. (2) It would seem useful to have a sidewalk connection at Anzinger. McGrath stated they envisioned Anzinger connecting to Milwaukee Street. (3) He recalled an earlier version that showed a second railroad crossing. Lichtenheld was not sure they had two crossings, possibly the drawing showed a couple of options as to where the crossing should be. The crossing selected was more centrally located. Forster Rothbart suggested having two crossings if all possible. (4) Bike parking is not shown in the middle of the block of Union Main and west of Building G2. Logan wanted to know what process was used to locate the bike parking, i.e., what factors were taken into account. Lichtenheld stated they worked with the architect for each of the buildings. Logan believed a fair number of bicyclists will try to cross at Sixth Street; given this assumption, most bicyclists will look for parking in a straight line from the building door. You can put bike parking anywhere, but bicyclists will use what is closest. Lichtenheld commented that the proposal is a work in progress and he assured the PBMVC that they want to

put the bike parking in the most appropriate location. McGrath noted that each building will have covered bike parking for the building tenants.

Members then heard from the registrants.

Peter Wolff, 945 Jenifer Street, representing the Marquette Neighborhood Association:

- The Marquette Neighborhood Association is working with the Atwood Neighborhood Association to preserve neighborhood streets. The neighborhood associations want to avoid the Williamson-Winnebago pair becoming a new arterial or shortcut to East Washington Avenue. They don't want Winnebago to become a commuter route.
- He distributed a copy of the Williamson-Atwood-Winnebago Street Plan developed by the Marquette and Atwood Traffic Committees.
- Main concern is that Winnebago not be made attractive for cut-through traffic. The roundabout at Sixth Street is a good idea, but then the City decided to make Winnebago 44 feet wide. This is wider than the existing section of Winnebago. There's no way that a street that wide won't encourage through traffic.
- Uncomfortable with bicyclists traveling through where there's diagonal parking inside the site.

Compton pointed out that with two 5-foot bike lanes and two 8-foot parking lanes, the driving lanes will only be 10 feet wide. If the street was made narrower, what would he give up? Wolff stated he is a bicyclist and didn't think it was necessary to have marked bike lanes on this street. He hoped that bicyclists would use Winnebago and motorists would use East Washington Avenue. Wolff indicated the neighborhood did not want bike lanes on neighborhood streets like Winnebago.

Mike Barrett, 2137 Sommers Avenue, Madison:

- Supported the town center concept of the development.
- He is worried about cut-through traffic on Winnebago.
- The neighborhoods have tried to work on traffic calming devices that will address the issue of providing good access to the development but not through the development.
- Had concerns about the way Winnebago is laid out in the development; it is very wide. He suggested narrowing it to avoid it becoming an attractive cut-through.
- Felt the roundabout is problematic in that it allows motorists to maintain their speed, which is dangerous for peds.

Skidmore wanted to know what the PBMVC was supposed to be making recommendations on. McCormick advised that the street is already platted and the street width has been approved by the Common Council. Comments on the internal connections are probably the most appropriate, e.g., bike parking, sidewalk connections, etc. Skidmore asked whether the bike and ped paths have been set, and McCormick stated no.

Motion by Compton/Skidmore to approve the project as presented.

Webber was disappointed that once again, there was no discussion about the traffic patterns until it's too late. This problem has been discussed at LRTPC - there needs to be some review of all modes of transportation early in the

development process. She had concerns about the width of Winnebago. There are many streets with higher volumes that don't have marked bike lanes.

Webber offered several amendments that were accepted as friendly:

- (1) Include the indicated bike path as part of the development and include it in the SIP. Wants to make sure it's included since there's some question about when it will be built.
- (2) Traffic Engineering should include a realistic average daily traffic for that section of Winnebago when it's presented to the Plan Commission.
- (3) Provide clear detailed drawings of the roundabout so the Plan Commission can see the speed. If there's an opportunity for sharpening up the corners, have Traffic Engineering provide those options to the Plan Commission.
- (4) Make it clear as to where and how many bike parking spots there are.

Webber felt it's an excellent project.

Compton preferred to have marked lanes on Winnebago Street to encourage bicycling by as many people as possible, including those who may not be highly skilled. She also felt the marked lanes slow down traffic by providing a visual clue. She did not think the design of Winnebago with 10-foot traffic lanes will invite cut-through traffic.

Forster Rothbart offered several amendments, accepted as friendly:

- (1) Provide a curb cut from the bike trail to Winnebago Street at the most appropriate location.
- (2) Provide a sidewalk connection to Anzinger Court.
- (3) Have improved sidewalk or pavement markings to improve the pedestrian connection from Winnebago Street to Building A.
- (4) Additional bike parking spots as appropriate, including west of Building G and in the middle of Union Main. Locate the bike parking where bicyclists would expect parking to be (easily visible from the direction they would be traveling).
- (5) Recommend to City Engineering that when the bike path is built, it be continued out to Main Street as part of the same construction phase..

Skidmore liked the idea of a roundabout on Winnebago at Sixth Street but shared the concern about it being too friendly for motorists to maintain their speed. His major concern with the development is to keep traffic slow.

Forster Rothbart remarked that it seems ideal to have a second crossing of the railroad between Ohio and Farwell. He asked whether it's advisable to try and get a second crossing or is it better for the City to fight for what's most important and have one crossing. McCormick noted that the City will be lucky to get a new crossing so should pick the best location. Vacating Division Street helps to minimize exposure to trains.

Forster Rothbart suggested another amendment to request an additional crossing between Ohio and Farwell. Compton thought this should be subject to neighborhood feedback. McCormick noted that there's a fiscal impact associated with railroad crossings.

Friendly amendment that if possible and if supported by the neighborhood, the PBMVC recommends an additional crossing of the railroad between Ohio and Farwell.

Motion as amended carried unanimously.

E. OLD BUSINESS ITEMS

E.1. [04199](#)

Pedestrian and bicycle improvement projects, Ped/Bike/Motor Vehicle Commission follow-up discussion to 6/27/06 public hearing

Attachments: pbmvc mn06.26.06_public hearing written testimony.pdf, ped bike improvement work program 2006_2010.pdf

Logan relayed a comment from absent member Shahan that his priorities were improving connections to exit routes out of the city, specifically projects 1, 7b, 12, 25a, 25e, 27 and add the Perry Street overpass project. Shahan was also interested in a couple smaller projects, numbers 9 and 13, and some maintenance issues that are not on the list: repaving the Military Ridge connector in the vicinity of the frontage road, install a connector between West Shore Drive and the cul-de-sac, reduce the crossings of the Capital City Trail at CTH MM to one, and give peds an advance signal at the Capital City Trail at CTH PD. He noted that Shahan also mentioned a proposed overpass of Fish Hatchery Road, which Shahan felt would be in the City of Madison, not Fitchburg.

In response to Forster Rothbart's question, Logan explained that the purpose of going through the list was to provide guidance to Traffic Engineering on projects that should receive priority.

Compton requested that project 1 be added as a priority.

Webber felt the list should go the MPO and also through the budget process. These things need to be done and they need funding (Fed, state or local) the same way that roads are budgeted. Compton noted that project #1 (Sherman Flyer) had been ranked #1 by the MPO. Webber noted it will receive funding as long as there is enough enhancement money, but this project has to compete with other projects on a statewide basis for the enhancement money. The question remains whether the City will build it if it doesn't receive enhancement funding. Compton suggested the PBMVC confirm that they want to see this project happen. Webber noted that most of the projects on the PBMVC list probably don't qualify for enhancement funding. McCormick noted these projects don't fall on any one agency's shoulders. He wasn't sure how the Commission wanted to frame the issue - basically, they need to create an active list and lobby the different funding sources.

Motion by Forster Rothbart/Compton that the PBMVC feels that all the listed projects are important and support that all are built and the most urgent ones are those that provide escape routes of the city and then identify those projects.

Members were not sure to whom this should be relayed. McCormick indicated that TE staff could draft a letter for the PBMVC Chair's signature.

Friendly amendment by Webber that any listed projects that are adjacent to or cross a project that is funded by the State or Federal should be included as part of that State/Federal project.

Webber explained that she had heard that a number of the ped/bike amenities that

are recommended as part of the Highway 51 (Stoughton Road) project were described by the State as the City's responsibility since they were in the City's plan. She felt that any ped/bike amenities that are part of the Stoughton Road right-of-way (e.g., overpasses) should be included in the State's project. McCormick noted that the letter could include a PBMVC policy that the Common Council not approve plans and specifications or enter into cost agreements unless these issues are addressed. Webber restated her amendment as "if a major road project is being built and the City has already identified ped/bike facilities that need to be built in that area, then it is the City's expectation that those facilities will be included and funded as part of the project." Compton accepted this as friendly.

Members accepted Forster Rothbart's suggestion to add project 24b to the list suggested by Shahan.

Motion restated as the PBMVC recommends that all projects on the list be completed at some point but priority is on the projects identified above, and TE staff will draft a letter for the PBMVC Chair's signature to send to the relevant bodies including the Metropolitan Planning Organization, the State, City agencies and other bodies as appropriate; carried unanimously.

Forster Rothbart wondered if there's a set amount of money in the City budget each year to cover general maintenance projects. McCormick advised that some projects are earmarked and some are on a candidate list as part of the capital budget. If desired, the PBMVC could have an annual review by City Engineering of these projects. Forster Rothbart thought that would be useful for things like a short section of sidewalk repair, a curb cut, etc. McCormick noted that some things are done as part of annual programs, like sidewalk repair (two aldermanic districts done each year). He commented that after the letter is sent, the PBMVC could invite the various agencies to a meeting to talk about the projects on the list.

E.2. [04201](#) Pedestrian/Bicycle/Motor Vehicle Commission pending list

Attachments: PBMVC pending list 08.17.06.pdf

Webber noted that some items have been on the list for a long time. Members requested an updated status report on each item before discussing the list.

Motion by Compton/Conroy to refer to a future meeting with a request that staff provide a written update on the listed items.

McCormick indicated it might be two to three months before staff is able to come back with the status report.

Motion carried unanimously.

F. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

F.1. [04371](#) Schedule for Traffic Signal Priority List 2006 consideration

Attachments: Traffic Signal Priority List 2006 ag08.22.06.pdf

McCormick noted that the public hearing will be part of the September meeting. If

members have intersections they wish to add to the list, please contact TE staff. Following the public hearing, he suggested the Commission identify the top five locations for further study with a report back at the November meeting.

F.2. [04373](#)

Update on Interim Redesign Options for the Intersection of Blair Street-John Nolen Drive-Williamson Street

Attachments: Interim Redesign Options_Blair John Nolen Williamson ag08.22.06.pdf

McCormick wanted to bring the members up to date. There have been numerous complaints about the intersection. The desire to fix the intersection before any development projects go forward is holding up development. TE is currently doing a count of ped, bikes and motor vehicles. McCormick offered to bring back design options at the next meeting. They are looking at interim solutions for this quadrant, including increasing the storage space for bicyclists at the Gateway corner, improving the bike crossing of the railroad tracks, adding a bike lane, closing a driveway, removing the free-flow right turn lane, etc. TE is working with Engineering on what can be done (funded) in the near term.

Webber felt the crash report for bicyclists is extremely incomplete. The data only includes crashes between bikes and motor vehicles involving at least \$1,000 in damage and/or injury. The vast majority of bike crashes involve falling on the railroad tracks but these are not included. There are also a lot of bike/motor vehicle crashes that are not reported. One of the biggest dangers for bicyclists is the angle of the tracks. Webber asked that a parenthetical be added to the crash data indicating that these are MV4000 crashes only. If you're talking about the safety record of this intersection, the crash statistics do not represent a vast majority of the crashes. Conroy asked if statistics for 2005 are available and McCormick replied yes, noting they're similar to 2004. DeVos felt that crash statistics are not a very good representation of the situation since some people won't even try using the intersection because it's too intimidating. McCormick indicated that the crash data is just one element of it.

In response to a question, McCormick stated that if members have specific ideas or recommendations they should email him or David Dryer. He reiterated that these should be things that could be done fairly easily. Logan mentioned that there appears to be a lack of storage space for bicyclists trying to cross Williamson Street (near Machinery Row). The waiting bicyclist partially extends into the bike path. McCormick stated he will brief the Commission on the design next month. He urged members to send their top 3 suggestions for areas to be worked on. McCormick indicated the proposed redesign options could be put on the City's website so people can start talking about them and identify their top priorities. Things the City are considering include expanding the bike storage space at the Gateway corner, perhaps be cutting back the garden a little, and adding a bike lane on the other side of Williamson up to Jenifer.

F.3. Update on installation of pedestrian count-down timers

McCormick handed out a list of the countdown ped signals planned for installation in 2006 as well as those installed in 2005. He indicated that TE tries to install the countdown signals at the more complex intersections and also in new projects, e.g., along the East Washington Avenue reconstruction project. TE is working on the University Avenue locations identified in the May 18, 2006 memo to the PBMVC. Field crews may not be able to get to all locations on the list in

2006.

DeVos noted the 5/18/06 memo references what she described as a rigid and unnecessary policy for audible signals, and she was dissatisfied with that.

Webber asked that the intersection of University-University Bay-Farley be added, but McCormick noted it's already on the list.

F.4. Update on 2006 construction of traffic calming projects

McCormick handed out a list of projects approved in 2005 and a chart showing the revised construction schedule for 2006. The projects that have completed the ballot stage are shown on the construction schedule. The projects are developed by TE and constructed through City Engineering. He noted it's getting late in the season and he hoped all the projects could be finished. He pointed out that completion of the projects is subject to the contractor hired by City Engineering. The contractor did not start work until August. For 2007, they will request City Engineering to have the contractor start earlier. For those projects for which the ballot has not been done yet, McCormick advised the money has been earmarked, the funding is not in jeopardy. The contract includes all 22 projects on the list.

Webber advised that the Spooner ballots have been approved and the street should be added to the construction list. McCormick commented that the construction season typically ends October 15 and it's questionable whether the contractor will be able to finish the projects already on the schedule.

G. REPORTS OF OTHER COMMITTEES - SUMMARY OF ACTIVITY

G.1. Plan Commission

Forster Rothbart reported that he has been reappointed as the Plan Commission's representative to the PBMVC. The Plan Commission will review the westside bike plan at its September 11 meeting. Compton noted that when the MPO was discussing potential projects, the west side had its own map while other areas of the city were shown together on a different map. Compton asked that when the Plan Commission looks at the west side map, they pay attention to balancing/dispersing evenly throughout the city. Forster Rothbart said he would forward this comment.

G.2. LRTPC - 7/20/06 minutes encl.

Logan reported that in August they reviewed the Stoughton Road options, and one issue that came up was whether they felt comfortable with the traffic projections, i.e., more traffic was being predicted than what they would like to see in this area. Compton pointed out that the information has been gathered over the years and does not take into account Sprecher Road or the North Beltline. Also, there are other roads being designed to take traffic off Highway 51 to some degree. She expected to see a balancing out as Sprecher, Highway 12 and the North Beltline take away some of the traffic that currently has no choice but to use Highway 51. Forster Rothbart asked if Logan was comfortable with the ped/bike elements of the project, and Logan replied that some real improvements are included. Webber felt the question is whether the ped/bike facilities will be built as part of the State project. Compton indicated that the Stoughton Road Advisory Committee is looking at the frontage roads and will be making a

presentation to WisDOT. That will be a good time to include ped/bike accommodations, and she encouraged Webber to forward suggestions to her.

Webber referenced item 4 on the July 20 LRTPC minutes regarding referral of development projects for review of transit, bike and ped impacts. This is tied in with her frustration with the Union Corners presentation tonight re: many decisions having already been approved by the Common Council. There is no single committee that reviews all transportation elements of major development projects.

G.3. Joint West Campus Area Committee

Logan forwarded a report from Shahan that the committee heard neighborhood reports.

G.4. Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee

No report

G.5. School Traffic Safety Committee

No report

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

H.1. Executive Secretary Report

McCormick mentioned that Madison will be hosting the national Pro Walk/Pro Bike conference the first week of September.

H.2. Items by Chair

None

H.3. Items for Referral and/or Announcements

Forster Rothbart asked that a future agenda include discussion whether the PBMVC wants to annually review small, lower cost maintenance projects in terms of priority and give input on priority. Webber felt this was more of an individual aldermanic issue.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon a motion by Compton/Conroy, the meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.