



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes - Approved PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION

This meeting can be viewed LIVE on Madison City Channel at www.madisoncitychannel.tv

Monday, December 10, 2012

5:00 PM

210 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
City-County Building
Room 201 (Council Chambers)

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 5:05 p.m.

Present: 6 -

Michael W. Rewey; Robbie Webber; Aaron S. P. Crandall; Ronald B. Steinhof; Lydia S. Maurer and Susan M. De Vos

Absent: 2 -

Bridget R. Maniaci and Jill Johnson

Excused: 1 -

Lisa Subeck

A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - October 23, 2012

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

B. PUBLIC COMMENT

Bob Klebba, 704 East Gorham Street, spoke to the commission to request that they look at options to increase compliance on E. Gorham for vehicles to yield to pedestrians at unmarked crossings. Klebba stated that there is a bus stop at the corner of Blount Street and Gorham Street near his residence. There are about 80 to 100 people who take the bus each morning at this location, and have to cross E. Gorham Street during morning rush hour to get to the bus stop. Klebba stated that he would like to see signage installed at this unmarked crossing to reinforce to vehicle drivers that they must yield to pedestrians. Klebba suggested that speed boards could be installed as well.

Webber suggested that Klebba also follow up with his alder to address this issue.

C. DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS - None

D. NEW BUSINESS

Maniaci and Johnson arrived at 5:15 p.m. during item D.1. A new roll call is shown to reflect this.

Present: 8 -
Bridget R. Maniaci; Jill Johnson; Michael W. Rewey; Robbie Webber;
Aaron S. P. Crandall; Ronald B. Steinhofer; Lydia S. Maurer and Susan M.
De Vos

Excused: 1 -
Lisa Subeck

D.1 [28101](#)

Approving plans and specifications for public improvements necessary for the project known as Southwest Path Lighting. (5th, 10th, 11th, and 13th AD)

Alder Brian Solomon said that he has heard from people for years that they want to use the path more, but are concerned about safety. The concerns regarding safety that he has heard are not related to crime, but about being able to see the path when it is dark. He started working with Traffic Engineering staff on this project years ago, and after developing a plan for the lighting project, it was presented at a neighborhood meeting. Approximately 100 people attended the meeting, and there was both strong support and strong opposition to the project. People who are opposed to the project identified concerns about the color and brightness of the lights, light spillover, and hours of operation. Staff worked to address each of these concerns and developed the current proposal. Solomon stated that he believes that the current proposed plan is a good compromise that takes into consideration the needs and concerns of the residents along the path and also meets the needs of path users. A second public hearing was held on the new proposal, and opinions on the project remained mostly the same, with both strong support and opposition. Solomon stated that, although it is a difficult decision to make with many people having strong opinions on both sides, that the decision should be made based on what is in the best interest of the City. Solomon supports moving forward with the project and thinks that it is in the best interest of the City to light the path.

Registrants:

Mark Shahan, 607 Piper, Madison, registered and spoke in support.

Steve Hiniker, 118 Bascom Pl, Madison, registered and spoke in opposition.

Sandy Stark, 2720 Gregory St, Madison, registered and spoke in opposition.

Rachel Holloway, 1118 E Dayton St., Madison, WI registered in support.

William Holloway, 1118 E Dayton St., Madison, WI registered in support.

De Vos stated that it sounds like the people who spoke in opposition seem to be in support of lighting, but not the particular proposed lighting. De Vos asked if other lighting options could be considered. Dryer responded that this particular specification of lighting was selected to meet the needs of the path, and that other types of lighting, such as bollards would not be recommended by staff, regardless of whether there was funding for the additional cost to install bollards. There are significant maintenance issues with bollards and they also need to be placed close to the path to be effective. Due to the steep grades on this path, the bollards would have to be placed four to five feet from the path and would not effectively light it. Lighting with bollards also requires a greater number of light fixtures in order to provide continuous lighting. Using bollard style fixtures would require 670 fixtures to light the path, compared to the current proposal of 68 fixtures. Bollard lighting would use significantly

more energy than the proposed fixtures.

Maniaci stated that 3 of 4 alders who represent the area do not support the plan, and would like to see more support from the residents in the area before she can support it. She feels that there are other issues that have not been addressed and that more work can be done on the plan.

Rewey supports the project. This is a regional transportation corridor. One stretch of Gregory Street has 12 streetlights on it, and no one has spoken out in opposition to these. The same stretch on the bike path, which sees more traffic than Gregory Street has 1 test light. Biking and walking should not be relegated to second class transportation and should be given the same importance as motor vehicle transportation.

Webber stated that this path has more users than many of the collector streets in the city and is a major transportation corridor. If all of the streetlights, porch lights, and garage lights in a neighborhood were turned off, people would probably feel uneasy; this is how cyclists feel when they are on the unlit path. Webber asked that commission members vote to light the path, the same way other roads in the city are lit.

A motion was made by Webber, seconded by Johnson, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS. The motion passed by the following vote:

Ayes: 6 -

Jill Johnson; Michael W. Rewey; Robbie Webber; Ronald B. Steinhofner;
Lydia S. Maurer and Susan M. De Vos

Noes: 1 -

Bridget R. Maniaci

Excused: 1 -

Lisa Subeck

Non Voting: 1 -

Aaron S. P. Crandall

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Rewey, seconded by Webber, to Adjourn. The motion passed by voice vote/other. The meeting adjourned at 5:39 p.m.