



# City of Madison

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

## Meeting Minutes - Approved PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION

---

Tuesday, November 25, 2008

5:00 PM

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

---

### CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

**Present:** 6 -

Aaron S. P. Crandall; Jason Schulman; Robbie Webber; Paul E. Skidmore;  
Mark N. Shahan and Susan M. De Vos

**Excused:** 5 -

Beth A. Whitaker; Judy Compton; Charles W. Strawser III; Mary P. Conroy  
and Cheryl E. Wittke

**Staff:** Arthur Ross, Traffic Engineering

A quorum being present, Chair Shahan called the meeting to order at 5:02 p.m.

### A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Skidmore, seconded by Webber, to Approve the Minutes . The motion passed by voice vote/other.

### B. PUBLIC COMMENT - None

### C. NEW BUSINESS

- C.1. [12792](#) Amending Sections 12.132(559) and 12.132(607) of the Madison General Ordinances to modify parking on East Wilson Street.

A motion was made by Skidmore, seconded by Webber, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER . The motion passed by voice vote/other.

- C.2. [12793](#) Creating Section 12.137(263) of the Madison General Ordinances to create two-hour parking on the north side of Wilson Street.

A motion was made by Skidmore, seconded by Webber, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER . The motion passed by voice vote/other.

DISCUSSION ON ITEMS C.1. AND C.2.

Shahan noted that items C.1. and C.2. are related.

Motion by Skidmore/Webber to recommend approval of both C.1. and C.2.

Ross advised that the area affected is from Ingersoll to Baldwin but does not

include the cul-de-sac west of Ingersoll. Item C.1 covers the 1100 block of E. Wilson and moves the Parking Prohibited at All Times restriction that is currently on the north side to the south side. Item C.2 makes the parking on the north side from Ingersoll to Baldwin a two-hour zone from 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. The two ordinances together will result in two-hour parking on the north side of E. Wilson from Ingersoll to Baldwin, and no parking at all on the south side from Ingersoll to Baldwin. Ross pointed out that these ordinances have been posted on a 90-day trial, which has now expired. The City needs to either make the changes permanent or return to the previous situation (where the No Parking zone switched between the north side and south side).

Webber clarified that residents would not be able to park for more than two hours during the day. Ross stated this is correct but noted that the district alder is working to rezone several properties in the 1100-1200 blocks of E. Wilson in order to create 50% residential zoning. This will then allow the residents to petition the Parking Utility to implement the Residential Parking Permit Program (RP3). Under RP3, residents can buy an annual permit that exempts them from the two-hour parking restriction and allows them to park for up to 48 hours without moving their vehicle. Ross emphasized that the ordinance amendments have the alder's support and he felt there is no reason not to go ahead with making the changes permanent. Ross noted that the two-hour parking is the on the Central Park side since there are no driveways and fewer conflicts. Shahan remarked that having parking on the same side for both blocks will make it easier for bicyclists.

Motion carried unanimously.

C.3. [12811](#)

Traffic Signal Priority List 2008, staff recommendations

Brian Smith, Traffic Signal Engineer, briefly reviewed the materials provided in the agenda packet. He advised that Traffic Engineering staff did studies at four locations already on the list. They also conducted counts at two new locations to add those intersections to the list: Bedford-Main is #54 and is 69% below the minimum warrant, and American Parkway-Buttonwood is #75 and is 93% below the minimum warrant. Smith advised that if an intersection in this area were to be signalized, it would be American Family Drive-American Parkway.

Smith then highlighted the findings related to the four locations that were studied.

**OLD SAUK ROAD-WESTFIELD ROAD**

- New counts were taken which showed the intersection to be 23% below the minimum warrant (previous count it was 25% below).
- If the intersection were signalized, the current geometry would not work. The eastbound and westbound Old Sauk approaches would need to be remarked to add left-turn lanes.
- Remarking would result in the elimination of the eastbound Bikes and Right Turns Only lane east of the intersection.
- Would also likely need to widen the east side of Old Sauk in order to maintain bike lanes. If space is not available, would need to remove the bike lane.

**COTTAGE GROVE-THOMPSON**

- Took counts twice since the first count was done while the Buckeye Road bridge was closed which meant many motorists were diverted to Cottage Grove Road.
- Intersection is 47% below minimum warrant [staff report incorrectly states 23%].

**MONONA-PANTHER-TOMPKINS**

- New counts show this intersection to be 62% below the minimum warrant (had been 52% below in previous count).
- As part of the Monona Drive reconstruction project in 2009, the City of Monona is planning to signalize the intersection of Monona-Owens. If that occurs, a signal at Monona-Panther/Tompkins would be too close to allow progression.
- Off-set geometry of this T-intersection pair would be a problem.

**MARSHALL-RIDGE-UNIVERSITY**

- Updated the traffic volume data and crash history from the past reports.
- City staff have met with the Shorewood Hills engineer doing the Traffic Impact Analysis for the 800 University Bay Drive project.
- Shorewood Hills is considering a signalized solution to support the new development. The City conveyed its concerns about a fully signalized intersection (where both directions of University Avenue would be stopped at the same time). A fully signalized intersection would be detrimental to traffic progression and would increase crashes.
- Shorewood Hills engineer will relay Madison's concerns and discussions will continue to look at some type of signalized solution that will benefit Shorewood's development and help ped access. Smith did not want to get into the details of what was discussed since Shorewood Hills hasn't yet heard the suggestions.
- Some solutions may require restricting certain movements, e.g., left turn in/right turn out of both Ridge and Marshall.

Shahan suggested that at Ridge, restricted westbound left turns and U-turns might be an option. He pointed out that when you look at the gap analysis, it looks good but you have to look at the gap available to get across the entire street because the median is too narrow for bicyclists to wait and almost too narrow for peds. Increasing the size of the median to provide a true two-stage crossing and restricting left turns at Ridge would be a good interim solution. Smith indicated that Shahan's suggestion is a possibility, although it would be a hardship on some of the businesses in the southeast side of the intersection. Smith commented that it would need to be a political decision. He agreed that the median is not good as a ped refuge and would like to see it enhanced. However, he was not sure how soon the development is going to occur and how much the City would be willing to spend on a short-term fix.

Webber noted that University Avenue will be re-patched next year and asked whether anything can be done as part of that project. Ross pointed out that part of the University Avenue project will involve reconstruction while other segments will be joint repair. Shahan wondered whether the PBMVC should recommend the elimination of U-turns and westbound University Avenue left turns at Ridge and Marshall and then get a wider median. This would help tremendously. Webber mentioned that another issue is that for peds who are

looking westbound, the sight lines are very short. Sometimes a ped thinks they have a gap but a motorist comes over the hill. Having a refuge would be a big benefit. Smith advised that staff have measured how far you can see and it's within the safe parameters for sight distance. Webber responded that it depends on how fast the traffic is moving.

Shahan recalled that there has been talk about having an overpass at Farley-University Bay Drive but the problem is where the ramps would come down. Ridge might be a better location for an overpass. He suggested this be brought up in the discussions with Shorewood Hills, especially if there isn't a good signal option.

Discussion then turned to Old Sauk Road-Westfield Road. Smith confirmed that staff was recommending against a signal. He reiterated the lane changes that would be necessary and pointed out that those changes themselves might reduce some of the congestion. Webber asked why it would be necessary to remove the eastbound Bikes and Right Turn Only lane. Smith explained that the east leg of the intersection currently has two eastbound lanes, one for all vehicles and one for bikes and right turns. In order to provide a left turn lane, the right lane would need to serve through and right turn motorists. Webber recalled that the existing right lane is very wide and it seems like there is space to "play with" to accommodate traffic. Smith stated that Old Sauk Road is 40 feet wide east of Westfield and 54 feet wide west of Westfield. Webber thought the right lane currently has parking but no one parks there because there is off-street parking. Skidmore interjected that Webber was apparently recalling a different segment of Old Sauk.

Smith directed attention to items #5 and #6 on staff's report. These signals were not requested by the PBMC but are needed. Item #5 is the Aberg Avenue/Highway 30 ramp intersections with East Washington Avenue. The signals will be installed in 2009 as part of the last phase of the East Washington reconstruction project. The reconstructed interchange will allow full movements. Crandall asked whether a bike lane will be provided on East Washington across Highway 30, and Smith replied yes.

Referencing item #6 Brooks Street and Johnson Street, Smith explained that as part of the University Avenue repaving project, it is planned to close Park Street between University Avenue and Johnson Street. Traffic will be detoured to Brooks Street. Members were surprised to hear about the closing of this segment of Park Street. Smith was not sure how long it was planned to be closed. Smith noted that the Brooks signal will remain after Park Street is reopened and will provide gaps for all modes of traffic trying to cross or enter Johnson Street from Brooks Street.

Motion by Webber/De Vos to approve the staff recommendations with an additional recommendation that, if possible, an improved ped refuge at Marshall-Ridge-University be included as part of the University Avenue reconstruction project. Motion carried, with Skidmore voting no.

C.4. [12807](#)

Restructuring of bicycle registration and licensing program, 2009 operating budget directive

John Rider, Bicycle Registration Coordinator, was present. The 2009 operating budget contains a directive to increase revenues from the bike registration

program by \$30,000 to support bicycle programs. Ross explained that the PBMVC needs to decide how to restructure the program to create the additional revenues to be used to support recommendations in the Platinum Biking Report. In response to a question from Webber, Ross advised that this was put in the budget by the Mayor, not Traffic Engineering.

Ross commented that the only way to increase revenues by this amount is to increase compliance. The fee could be raised and the registration term could be shortened, but these steps would not be enough to double the program revenues, which is what the budget requires.

Webber referenced the Mission portion of the staff report and asked how often the various elements are actually used, e.g., if a bicyclist were injured, who would an EMT call to check the bicyclist's registration information (name, address)? Rider noted this information would be available only during the hours someone is staffing the Police Department property room. Ross stated it's a 911 issue. City IT, which maintains the registration database, has tried to get it into the County system but there's always some problem with making it happen. But the intent is to have the registration information available through the 911 Center. Webber felt that if the information is not available to emergency responders, or available only in limited situations, it was misleading to include it in the report. The report needs to be accurate about the benefits of registration.

Webber commented that the MPD does not always pick up abandoned/stolen bikes quickly. Rider reported that the Police Department has a part-time employee for this task and there is a regular timeframe for picking up bikes. He felt that recovery of bicycles has improved within the last year. Webber asked if bikes in the MPD property room are checked for registrations. Rider advised that the MPD immediately checks for bike registration and if none, then checks the serial number to see if the bike was reported stolen. Also, when a stolen bike report is received at the MPD, it is checked against bikes in the property room.

Webber asked Rider why he thought registrations have declined every year since 1998. Rider attributed it to a lack of promotion and high turnover of staff in the bike shops and department stores. He goes to the stores to talk about what is required by dealers. There needs to be more buy-in from the store managers and employees. Rider acknowledged that while the program has never had a promotion budget, the City did have bike monitors. Ross noted that the requirement that dealers sell a registration with each bike sale was enacted in 1991. There was a lot of publicity at that time which resulted in good compliance for a few years. But there is not a lot of support for it. Saying that program revenues will be used for bike programs might get more publicity and improve the perception of the program among dealers, thus resulting in better compliance.

Webber asked about the cost of the suggested actions to improve the rate of compliance. Specifically, she wondered if the cost would equal or exceed the revenues raised. Rider did not have cost figures with him for the publicity campaign. Ross noted that the directive is to more than double current revenues, which will be difficult. An ad in Isthmus costs about \$250, and to be effective the message has to get out over and over on a consistent basis.

Crandall inquired about the penalty for an unregistered bike. Rider replied that while the ordinance includes a fine, ticketing unregistered bikes is not a priority. The lack of a consequence is another factor for the low compliance. Crandall asked whether the MPD would potentially issue a ticket for non-registration if the bicyclist was stopped for some other reason. Ross clarified that even when the City had bike monitors, registration was not a primary enforcement. If the bicyclist was cited for something else, a ticket could be issued for non-registration but would be voided if the bike was subsequently registered. Schulman could see why people don't buy a registration if it's not enforced and even if they do get a ticket, they can avoid having to pay it by getting the bike registered. He also advised that when he purchased a bike, nothing was said about the need to register it. Rider pointed out that there are different penalties for dealers.

Ray Harmon, Mayoral Assistant, was present. When the Mayor's office looked at the registration program, one thing they noticed is that the registration is good for four years whereas other City fees/licenses are issued on an annual basis. He suggested that having an annual registration might help bicyclists remember the need to register. Crandall wondered whether an annual registration would increase administrative costs. Shahan agreed and felt an annual program would be expensive. Rider indicated that the decals cost about \$2,000 every four years, so that cost would go up significantly with yearly registration.

Shahan wanted to know what will happen if the program doesn't generate the extra \$30,000. Ross advised that the money can't be spent on Platinum recommendations until it's generated. Shahan asked if a fine increase is being considered. Rider indicated no decisions have been made yet.

Schulman asked if consideration has been given to funding bike projects through other fees, like motor vehicle registration fees. Webber pointed out that the City doesn't get any money from motor vehicle registrations. Schulman suggested perhaps increasing parking rates and using the increased revenues for bike projects. Webber noted that the Mayor could have put \$30,000 in the budget for bike projects without linking it to increasing bike registration revenues. She had not realized this language was in the budget. She did not see why bike projects should be delayed because dealers won't comply with the ordinance. Webber thought it unrealistic to expect program revenues to double in a year.

Members then heard from the registered speaker.

Mary Rouse, 1934 Rowley Avenue, co-chair of the former Platinum Bicycling Committee:

- In terms of bike infrastructure, we need a much larger amount of money than \$30,000. The next opportunity will be the Transportation Improvement Program, a five-year allocation process.
- If more bikeways are built, more people will bike.
- She's willing to pay a tax or registration fee if she knows the revenues are going directly to her interests. If bike dealers knew that registration fees would be going toward implementation of recommendations in the Platinum Biking Plan or Bicycle Transportation Plan, they might be more willing to push

registration.

- To be effective, the program will need publicity, education and enforcement. But the big question is what it will cost. Is spending money on trying to increase the revenue stream from the registration program the best use of limited City funds for biking?
- Increasing bike registration revenues has potential but it will take work, and she would like to see some cost numbers for the proposed recommendations.

Shahan agreed that before making any decisions, the PBMVC needs more information about the cost of implementing the proposed recommendations and the anticipated revenues. He suggested this item be referred to the next meeting. Crandall stated he would also like information showing how many registered bikes that were lost/stolen were subsequently returned to their owners, i.e., is registration successful in accomplishing this part of its mission.

Motion by Crandall/Webber to refer this item to the next meeting and have staff provide cost estimates (expenses and anticipated revenues) for the proposals in the staff report as well as data regarding return of stolen/lost bicycles.

De Vos questioned why it costs money to ride a bike—why isn't it free? Shahan explained that part of the reason for a registration fee is to enable return of stolen bicycles. It's not a fee to ride a bike, it's a fee to support the bike program. Many cities have a bike registration program. Webber didn't have a problem with registering a bike for a minimal amount. She noted that bike theft, especially on campus, is a huge problem. However, she would not support raising the fee to \$10 per year.

Ross suggested there's another piece of information that the PBMVC should try and get a handle on, and that's what bicyclists and dealers think about the registration program. The PBMVC could have a public hearing or just invite dealers to a meeting to get their input. Webber agreed that this is very important. Shahan noted that December would not be a good month for a public hearing and suggested the PBMVC move ahead with getting the additional information at the next meeting and then decide how to proceed with getting input.

Motion carried unanimously.

## D. REPORTS

### D.1. [10610](#)

REPORTS OF OTHER COMMITTEES/COMMISSIONS (verbal reports for information only)

Plan Commission

Long Range Transportation Planning Commission

Joint West Campus Area Committee

Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee

School Traffic Safety Committee

**Plan Commission: No report due to Whitaker's absence.**

**L RTPC: Shahan reported that at the 11/18/08 Council meeting, the multi-modal**

transportation design plan resolution (ID 11560) was placed on file. However, the intent of the resolution will likely come back in another form.

Most of the LRTPC's meeting focused on air quality considerations in transportation and development decision-making processes. Dane County is at risk of becoming non-attainment for particulate matter. The LRTPC heard about approaches being used and some possible policies the City might want to consider. Shahan noted that the non-attainment standard for particulate matter is a three-year average of measurements.

Joint West Campus Area: The next meeting will be December 3.

Joint Southeast Campus Area: No report due to Strawser's absence.

School Traffic Safety Committee: Webber reported the committee is working with Lincoln Elementary. Ald. Bruer will be introducing an ordinance amendment to change the parking on Sequoia to provide a better pick up/drop off area at the school. Webber stated the committee is also working at Marquette Elementary/O'Keefe Middle Schools. The neighborhood has a huge amount of ped and bike traffic. There have been complaints about adult bicyclists not yielding to peds. They are talking with the school about having someone come in and talk about bike safety.

#### **E. REPORTS OF OFFICERS AND MEMBERS FOR INFORMATION/DISCUSSION**

##### **E.1. Executive Secretary Report**

###### **a. Update on Pedestrian Arterial Program**

Ross gave a brief report on the Pedestrian Arterial Program. Over the past few years, ped islands were installed on Odana Road, Schroeder Road, Fair Oaks Avenue, Nakoma Road, Milwaukee Street, Hammersley Road and Manchester Road. The intent of the program is to address issues as they come up where the NTMP doesn't apply or where there are other ped safety issues. There is no outstanding list of projects like there is for the NTMP. Program funding is in the City Engineering budget.

##### **E.2. Items by Chair**

###### **a. December PBmvc meeting - none currently scheduled**

Shahan noted that there will be at least one referral from the 12/2/08 Council meeting that will need PBmvc action in December. Members agreed with his suggested meeting date of Tuesday, December 16.

##### **E.3. Member requests for future agenda items and/or announcements**

Shahan asked for a report about the Southwest Bike Path and motorists parking along the path off of Breese Terrace on football Saturdays. People park in the backyards of houses and there needs to be a better plan for dealing with it. He would like Engineering staff to give an update and suggestions.

Webber requested two items: (1) a report on ped/bike issues related to the Old Middleton Road reconstruction project for 2009; and (2) a report by Engineering on the University Avenue reconstruction project for 2009, including what is planned, the time line, will Park Street be closed (as mentioned earlier in the



meeting), etc. She is particularly interested in the segment from Gorham Street to Breese Terrace (campus portion).

#### ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Skidmore, seconded by Webber, to Adjourn . The motion passed by voice vote/other. The meeting adjourned at 6:25 p.m.