



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

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

---

Tuesday, August 28, 2007

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**

A quorum being present, Chair Shahan called the meeting to order at 5:07 p.m.

**Present:** Judy Compton, Robbie Webber, Paul E. Skidmore, Mark N. Shahan, Mary P. Conroy, Cheryl E. Wittke, Susan M. De Vos and Aaron S. P. Crandall

**Excused:** Brian W. Ohm, Charles W. Strawser III and Patricia A. Ball

Compton arrived at 5:15 p.m. Crandall arrived at 5:20 p.m.

**A. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Cheryl Elkinton, homeless:

- Traffic signals are geared toward motor vehicles. As a pedestrian, she would like to see automated WALK lights throughout the city.
- She would like the Square to be a vendor-only automobile area. The absence of motor vehicle traffic would make the Square more peaceful. The only motor vehicle traffic besides vendors should be people who work in the Capitol.
- She likes having buses routed to the Outer Ring, as they are currently detoured, and would like that to be permanent.
- She would like to have stop signs on West Mifflin Street at Henry Street, near the library and Overture Center.

**B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - 6/26/07 and 7/24/07**

Motion by Conroy/Skidmore to approve the 6/26 and 7/24 minutes.

Regarding the 6/26 minutes, De Vos noted a typographical correction on page 6, ninth bullet, the word "they" should be "there." On page 8, item E.3., De Vos indicated there was no mention of her statement that she had recalled that when the PBMVC had considered the Spring Harbor Neighborhood Plan, it was noted as being the first one for adoption following the City's adoption of the Comprehensive Plan. [The Recording Secretary subsequently checked the videotape of the meeting. There is no indication De Vos made any comments during discussion of this item. However, the minutes of the PBMVC 7/25/06 meeting when the Spring Harbor Plan was discussed contain a statement by City Planner Archie Nicolette that "The Spring Harbor Plan is the first one that had to follow the City's adopted Comprehensive Plan." An editorial note will be added to the 6/26/07 minutes to clarify that the Spring Harbor Plan, not the Tenney-Lapham Plan, was the first one under the Comprehensive Plan.]

Motion to approve the 6/26/07 minutes as amended and the 7/24/07 minutes, carried unanimously.

**C. MADISON POLICE DEPARTMENT REPORT ON TRAFFIC SAFETY RELATED ITEMS**

**C.1. [07328](#) Madison Police Department Traffic Enforcement Activity Report, 2nd Quarter 2007**

Lt. Stephanie Bradley-Wilson and Captain Cam McLay of the Madison Police Department were present on this item.

Lt. Bradley-Wilson gave an overview of the enforcement activity report.

- Enforcement has been fairly good and consistent.
- Over the last six months, the MPD has been involved in a variety of enforcement and education efforts regarding traffic safety.
- There have been some high profile traffic crashes with fatalities involving speed, alcohol or both. The MPD will continue to do what they think is the right thing to do regarding alcohol enforcement.
- The MPD did not receive any State funding this year for the Click It or Ticket program.
- Pedestrian enforcement has increased and is anticipated to continue through the rest of the year.
- The enforcement numbers include the efforts of the Community Policing Teams.
- The June calls to the Speeders Hotline were quite a bit lower than May and April, not sure why. Lt. Bradley-Wilson has not looked at the July and August numbers to see if the trend has continued. Shahan noted that in the past, calls pick up again in the fall when school starts.
- The Speeders Hotline averages about 7-10 calls a day. Some of the calls are from the same caller and/or regard a repeated problem area in a neighborhood.
- The TEST is still short one officer but it is anticipated the unit will be full strength in September.
- Orientation for adult school crossing guards will be tomorrow. There will be several new ASCGs this year.
- The MPD will distribute a news release reminding motorists to slow down in school zones.
- Will continue enforcement efforts utilizing TEST officers in the morning and parking enforcement. Would like to have Community Police Teams or patrol officers do the afternoon school zone areas but have had only limited success because school gets out during the middle of a shift change.
- Skidmore asked whether it's legal for a motorist to pass on a city street. Captain McLay indicated it depends on how the roadway is marked and signed. Also, a motorist cannot exceed the posted speed limit when passing. Skidmore commented that when he is on Old Sauk Road on the hill near the elementary school and is driving the speed limit, he is often passed. He found this to be very dangerous. The lane markings (dashed line) apparently give the impression it is legal to pass. McLay indicated this may be an issue for both the MPD (speed enforcement) and Traffic Engineering (pavement markings). He stated that the behavior described by Skidmore is illegal since the passing vehicle is exceeding the speed limit.
- Skidmore asked for specific information on city streets where it is legal to pass. Compton did not see a need for allowing passing on residential streets unless there is a stopped vehicle, and she indicated she would be willing to sponsor an ordinance. City Traffic Engineer Dryer stated he would check the current ordinances and compare them to State statutes.

C.2. Red light running cameras

Captain McLay provided an update to the Commission.

- The MPD is identifying ways to impact the driving culture. The number of vehicles, the staffing level of the MPD, and the complexities of red light running enforcement make it difficult to be effective.
- They have researched the use of photo enforcement for red light running and looked at the lessons learned when the City considered this issue previously.
- There is nothing in the State statutes that expressly prohibits the use of photo enforcement for red light running (statutes do prohibit the use of cameras for speed enforcement). The only thing is the absence of a State statute that allows the issuance of citations to the registered owner of a vehicle.
- Currently, if the camera showed a red light violation occurred and the vehicle is identified by its license plates, the MPD would have to investigate to find out who the driver was. This would be almost impossible to do given staffing and time constraints. The MPD needs enabling legislation that would allow them to issue a ticket to the registered owner.
- Most communities that have adopted red light running cameras did it through enabling legislation that allows registered owner liability.
- The City of Milwaukee state representative has introduced legislation for red light running and enabling legislation for an owner liability statute.
- City of Madison is in favor of statewide enabling legislation. Representative Berceau, representing the Madison area, is supportive of the topic and the general principle.
- At the local level, some alders and City staff (City Attorney, Traffic Engineering and MPD) have researched how they would want the program to look in Madison.
- Up until now, efforts have stayed away from vendors to make sure that staff's assessment was independent. However, MPD and TE recently met with representatives of the company that has the most units in operation. Capt. McLay was very impressed with the company's background knowledge and information.
- If the City wants to move forward, it's time to work with a vendor and develop a Madison model.
- Capt. McLay had attended a meeting of the Public Safety Review Board (PSRB) to get their input. He discovered that people have a lot of questions that can only be answered by having an implementation plan. Capt. McLay stated that after the PSRB meeting, he decided he did not want any public meetings until an operation plan is in place; people need to know what they are reacting to. An inability to answer questions looks like the City has not thought it through or that there is a fatal flaw to the proposal.
- The next step should be a meeting of City stakeholders and have the vendor do a proposal. City policymakers could then be asked whether this is a tool they want the MPD and TE to explore. The City needs to be able to say "this is what we want." State legislative representatives want to know whether the City supports this in a formal way before a State representative will feel comfortable going forward with legislation.
- Skidmore wondered whether the PBMVC, rather than the PSRB, should be the sponsoring agency.
- Shahan clarified the issue as the City is trying to get enabling legislation but the State representatives want to know whether Madison supports it. Should the City put forth more effort if we don't have a statute yet? He was concerned about how much staff time will go into this and then it's deep-sixed at the State level.
- Capt. McLay remarked that there's enough trepidation about the details that if they can come up with a well-developed implementation plan, they can show that

there's no foundation to the concerns and that it's worth going forward. And if it's worth doing, it's worth putting a whole lot of work into it. He felt it would be worthwhile, if not this legislative session then the next one.

- Compton suggesting introducing a resolution for referral to the PBMVC and the PSRB. She felt it's important to point out to the Council that staff have stayed away from a vendor up until now and that staff have not been swayed by a vendor but have been swayed by the need for this initiative. The vendor can do a presentation for the Council. She asked whether a resolution stating that the City will enter into the discussion would give staff what they need.

- Capt. McLay was not sure of the sequence of events. He felt that the Council will want to ask the same detailed questions as the PSRB that can only be answered by having a proposed implementation plan. Compton noted the Council could have a presentation by the vendor and determine the Council's willingness to address it. McLay felt there's a good likelihood the Council will be disturbed hearing a presentation from the vendor without details specific to implementation in Madison.

- Compton preferred to introduce the concept via a resolution and see whether the Council gives the go-ahead and then have staff do a further investigation and have a presentation. Staff needs to know whether the Council supports this.

- Wittke referenced the Safe Communities "Stop on Red" campaign that has been done the past five years. Typically, studies taken before, during and after the campaign show that red light running violations are reduced during the enforcement campaign but within a couple of days of the campaign ending, violations are back up. The campaign this year will be focused on the high crash intersections targeted by the MPD for increased enforcement. She suggested the campaign data be used in the resolution to show that current efforts aren't getting anywhere in addressing the problem. She also suggested using the experience of other communities that have used cameras and seen a sustainable reduction in violations. Safe Communities could do a presentation at the next PBMVC meeting.

- Webber commented that the implementation issues are not tied to the vendor; it's a matter of how staff wants to do things. McLay indicated that the vendor is necessary to help with the assurances that abuses won't occur. Webber commented that having a vendor presentation might not answer the type of questions the Council would have; their questions would be for City staff.

- Dryer remarked that staff hope the vendor would do much of the work. The vendor contemplated installing a system to record statistics on red light running just to give an idea of the number of violations and show the seriousness of the problem. But if the Council doesn't have any interest, this would be a waste of time.

- Compton noted the need for an implementation plan in order to get the information for final approval. But to get an implementation plan, staff needs to know if there's interest by the Council. Thus, there is a need for a resolution with referral to at least PBMVC and PSRB to see whether they can recommend moving forward with the implementation plan that staff will develop by working with the vendor. Basically it would be a resolution asking whether the alders support getting the information to develop an implementation plan. If the vendor needs to be present to explain the cameras, that's not a problem. Compton felt the place to start is with a resolution and refer it to the PSRB and the PBMVC.

- Shahan asked whether McLay wanted staff to get their act together first so they are comfortable explaining it. He wasn't sure a resolution was necessary for that. What he was hearing is that staff wants to get some information and get comfortable with it to use as a basis for a resolution. The resolution would be

introduced at the Council for referral to the PBMVC and PSRB, where the meat of the resolution will be worked out. Compton did not want to have staff spend more time on this issue if the Council doesn't support it. Skidmore agreed with Compton. The resolution should state there is a problem and this is how we think it should be solved. Shahan preferred to leave it up to staff: what did they want first, a resolution or more information?

- Dryer indicated that moving ahead with a resolution is okay. But he wanted to use the vendor as a resource because staff doesn't have the experience that the vendor does.

- Skidmore, Compton and Webber said they would sponsor a resolution.

Basically it would look for permission for staff to go to step 2. Include the data from the red light running campaigns that shows that violations drop but then go back up when the enforcement stops.

Motion by Skidmore/Compton to recommend a resolution that identifies the problem and empowers staff to talk to the vendor and bring back information to see if the City wants to move forward; carried unanimously.

McLay indicated that Police Chief Wray wants to know whether this is a tool the community wants the MPD to use. There needs to be public input that this is a problem, and they were happy to see the involvement by Safe Communities, with citizens gathering the data. The community and policymakers need to discuss it. Compton relayed that the number one complaint in her district is red light running at Buckeye Road and Stoughton Road. She felt there will be widespread community support.

Crandall wanted to know how many test cameras the vendor was suggesting. McLay said they discussed using 2 to 5 cameras. The test needs to be large enough so that the analysis is not subject to sampling error.

C.3. Delivery trucks parking in University Avenue contraflow bike lane, follow-up to 6/26/07 PBMVC discussion

- Lt. Bradley-Wilson stated that staff have made significant progress since this issue was discussed at the June PBMVC meeting. MPD met with Zoning Administrator Matt Tucker and Dan Dettmann of Traffic Engineering and came up with a plan of action.

- A letter was drafted for several of the property owners, letting them know the concern about what's happening in front of their property. The letter references each property's zoning approval and includes photos of the violations.

- TE will designate the east side of Frances Street as a Truck Loading Zone. The contraflow lane will be marked as No Stopping, Standing or Parking, which will make it very clear that no parking is allowed in this area, and parking enforcement officers will be able to enforce it.

- The letter will go out this week; the signs will go up soon; will then have enforcement action. This should reduce or eliminate the problem. The number of violations has been reduced already.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS ITEMS

D.1. [06761](#) Adopting the Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Plan as a supplement to the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan.

A motion was made by Webber, seconded by Skidmore, to Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s) to the PLAN COMMISSION Substitute motion to accept the Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Plan and recommend that a multi-modal transportation study be undertaken for the isthmus and downtown area; further, all recommendations contained in the TLNA Plan should be examined as part of the study and that specific Pedestrian/Bicycle/Motor Vehicle Commission comments, PB MVC meeting minutes (7/24/07 and 8/28/07), and the Traffic Engineering staff changes re: TLNA Plan-Revised Draft 8/22/07 be forwarded to Traffic Engineering, City Engineering, and/or Planning Division (whichever agency will be leading the study) for their consideration as part of the study.

**DISCUSSION:**

The following persons was present on this item: Patrick McDowell, 441 N. Paterson Street, representing the Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Association, registered in support and was available to answer questions; Ald. Brenda Konkel, representing the Tenney-Lapham area; and Linda Horvath, City Planning.

Wittke mentioned that she is a member of the Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Board and voted in favor of the Plan.

- Shahan reminded members this had been referred from last month's meeting due to concerns.
- The Long Range Transportation Planning Commission moved to accept the Plan and made additional recommendations. Shahan felt this motion was a good starting point.
- Wittke asked for clarification of TE staff's comment that the Plan is inconsistent with the City's adopted Comprehensive Plan. Dryer stated that there is a fundamental difference in the belief that the Johnson-Gorham arterial corridor is destroying the neighborhood. TE is trying to make the Plan more objective. Dryer indicated TE also recommended expanding the "implementer" agencies for some of the goals. He stated that TE did not have a problem with the studying the listed items. Given the neighborhood's revised draft 8/22/07, Wittke asked if TE still felt the Plan was inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Dryer responded he would have to see it in the overall context to see how it all fits together. Skidmore agreed that there are inconsistencies with the neighborhood plan and the City's Comprehensive Plan.
- Ald. Konkel did not understand how TE saw inconsistencies with the Comprehensive Plan. Almost everything in this Plan is in the neighborhood's adopted 1995 Plan. She felt the neighborhood did a good job of revising the existing Plan. If this Plan is not adopted, the existing Plan will remain in force and in some ways it has harsher language than what is being proposed now.
- Konkel fully supported the comments made by McDowell at the July meeting. She did not think what the Plan proposes is so extreme or unusual that it requires the staff reaction it got. Staff has been looking at it for the past 16 months. She was not aware of anything in the Tenney-Lapham Plan that is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan.
- Skidmore pointed out that changing Johnson-Gorham to two-way traffic is a big issue. It's a recommendation that goes beyond a neighborhood plan and would affect the whole region. Konkel noted that this recommendation is in the current Plan. Skidmore was not necessarily opposed to looking at the idea but would want staff's reaction. Dryer stated that the idea of studying the proposal is fine.
- Dryer reiterated it comes down to the fact that TE staff does not buy the

fundamental belief in the Plan that arterial streets can't co-exist with neighborhoods. He supported replacing the first paragraph of the Transportation Vision Statement with the language proposed by TE staff. Wittke noted that the neighborhood's Vision Statement is consistent with the old Plan that was adopted.

- Wittke emphasized that Goal 1 says to study certain strategies; it does not say to implement them. The neighborhood doesn't want them taken off the table until they've been studied. The neighborhood wants all the strategies looked at together as one piece.
- Wittke urged the PBMC to adopt the Plan, not to merely accept it as the LRTPC did.

Motion by Wittke/De Vos to adopt the Plan as amended in the revised draft 8/22/07.

Webber noted the statement that recommendations 2-4 may be implemented independent of the Transportation Management Plan study, and she wondered how this jibed with Wittke's statement that the neighborhood did not want things done piecemeal. McDowell explained that some issues were not seen as major systemic issues and could be done without converting Johnson-Gorham to two-way traffic. Goals 2-4 are more local things that can be done in terms of traffic calming without the bigger scope changes. It doesn't make sense to delay these for a number of years when they could be done within the limited scope of a neighborhood plan. Goals 2-4 were adopted in the 1995 Plan but have not been done yet. They could be addressed on their own merit.

De Vos mentioned that the older neighborhoods in Madison (e.g., Tenney-Lapham, Dudgeon-Monroe) were built so that people could walk and bike to destinations without having to drive everywhere. But there is a transportation conflict in the central part of the city with motorists from outside the city using these neighborhood streets to get through Madison. The neighborhood streets were not constructed for this type of use, and it affects the quality of the neighborhood. She felt it was wrong to acquiesce to the mentality that these motorists need to be accommodated on neighborhood streets. It's important to see the advantage of having neighborhoods where people live near where they work and can walk, bike or bus to work. She supported the Tenney-Lapham Plan because it seems to address that.

Webber referred members to the July minutes which include recommendations for additions to the Plan to facilitate an increase in the ped/bike modal split and a corresponding reduction in single occupancy vehicle trips. The recommended additions would strengthen the Plan and actually point out ways to get the modal split that is desired. Shahan read the recommendations he had suggested at the July meeting. Webber understood the neighborhood's desire to reduce speed and volume of motor vehicles but felt that there's too much focus on reducing cars going through the neighborhood and too little on beefing up other modes to encourage a mode shift. She felt there were a number of questions that have not been addressed yet and thus was uncomfortable with adopting the Plan as it stands. Shahan suggested the PBMC could make the same motion as the LRTPC and include the recommendations in the PBMC's minutes.

Shahan pointed out two areas that need to be addressed: the desire to capture other comments/recommendations to strengthen the Plan to better achieve a multi-modal split; and a reaction to the comments made by Traffic Engineering

related to the neighborhood's revised draft dated 8/22/07. Wittke asked whether the recommendations would be part of a larger transportation plan or included in a neighborhood plan. Webber responded that if the neighborhood wants to make recommendations as to what should be studied in the transportation plan, then the suggestions made by Shahan at the July meeting should be included. She reiterated the need to beef up the language regarding transit, bike and ped modes if you want to reduce the number of single occupancy vehicle trips through the neighborhood; you need to figure out other ways to get through the neighborhood. It would be very difficult if not impossible to funnel more motor vehicle traffic to East Washington. The transportation study needs to look at all modes, not just motor vehicles.

Crandall wanted to know the best way to ensure that staff's comments and the comments made tonight are incorporated into the Plan. He would like to see more emphasis on other modes of travel.

Substitute motion by Webber/Skidmore to accept the Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Plan and recommend that a multi-modal transportation study be undertaken for the isthmus and downtown area; further, all recommendations contained in the TLNA Plan should be examined as part of the study and that specific PBMVC comments and PBMVC meeting minutes be forwarded to Traffic Engineering, City Engineering, and/or Planning Division (whichever agency will be leading the study) for their consideration as part of the study.

Webber felt that trying to amend the Plan so that members felt comfortable adopting it would take a long time. The Plan Commission is the lead agency and will make the recommendation to the Common Council. The motion allows enough time for the neighborhood and staff to make the amendments to the Plan if they so desire and then forward that to the Plan Commission. Konkol noted that there is already an adopted Plan on file; if the new Plan is accepted, which one rules? If the PBMVC wants additional comments in the Plan, it should recommend amendments to the Plan. She felt accepting this Plan would serve no purpose and basically leave the status quo, where the previously adopted Plan remains in force. Webber pointed out that the Common Council will make the final decision on the Plan. The PBMVC's recommendation to the Plan Commission is to consider the PBMVC comments outlined in the minutes. Konkol felt that if the PBMVC wants its comments heard, they need to be incorporated in the Plan. The Plan Commission will have lots of information before them and she was not sure the PBMVC concerns will be adequately heard at that point. Webber remarked that both the LRTPC and the PBMVC had concerns about the current form of the Plan and she assumed the Plan Commission will read the recommendations of the other referral committees.

Skidmore and Compton supported the substitute motion. The PBMVC is asking the Plan Commission to approve the recommendations suggested by the PBMVC and the LRTPC. Wittke pointed out that the Plan language says "to study" all the options, and options emphasizing other modes of travel can be added. Changing the Johnson-Gorham corridor to two-way traffic appears to be a flashpoint, but the Plan merely asks for a study; it does not say "do this." Whether the PBMVC accepts or adopts the Plan, all it is doing is agreeing with the Plan recommendation for a study. Skidmore noted that the Johnson-Gorham recommendation affects the whole region and needs to be looked at in a larger sense. Crandall asked the impact of adopting the Plan without making any amendments. Shahan advised that the Plan goes to the Plan Commission. The



critical issue is, what does the PBMVC want forwarded to the Plan Commission? For the PBMVC to work through all the issues would take too long; instead, the motion is to forward the PBMVC's recommendations regarding additional things that should be studied as well as other comments/concerns. For instance, there had been disagreement about a park-and-ride lot. Rather than try to come up with a location, the recommendation is that it be studied. Shahan's comments at the July meeting were intentionally about general areas that needed to be beefed up without too much specificity.

Linda Horvath, City Planning, felt adoption of the Plan, rather than acceptance, would send a stronger message to the Plan Commission. The PBMVC's recommendations and comments could still be included with a motion to adopt.

Wittke commented that action on this Plan affects the other east isthmus neighborhoods in partnership with Tenney-Lapham. This Plan has been a collaboration with other neighborhoods; it is not just Tenney-Lapham looking out for itself.

Webber urged acceptance of the Plan versus adoption. She did not feel comfortable with some of the recommendations for study items, for example, the specifics of the park-and-ride lot were not run by the neighborhood where the lot would be located, and there are concerns about the impact for ped crossings of double turn lanes. The Plan is a little too incomplete to adopt. Webber preferred to see more work done on it and was comfortable having the LRTPC's and PBMVC's recommendations forwarded to the Plan Commission. Compton agreed and did not want to spend time now going through all the recommendations, nor did she want verbiage from the PBMVC saying that they adopted them all. She wants them to be studied to see if they are workable. Skidmore felt it was beyond the scope of a neighborhood plan to make recommendations that impact other neighborhoods. Some of the proposals may have merit, but he would want to have them studied.

Shahan reminded members they still needed to deal with TE staff comments.

Friendly amendment by Webber/Skidmore to also forward TE staff comments.

Substitute motion as amended carried on a 5-2 vote. The motion passed by the following vote:

**Excused:** Ohm, Strawser III and Ball  
**Aye:** Compton, Webber, Skidmore, Conroy and Crandall  
**No:** Wittke and De Vos  
**Non Voting:** Shahan

**D.2.** [07327](#) Pedestrian/Bicycle/Motor Vehicle Commission Rules and Procedures, proposed revisions

Shahan pointed out that the language specifying the format of the staff report cover sheet is no longer applicable since the City began using the Legistar legislative software. He proposed deleting this language and retaining the language requiring that some type of information be provided, e.g., staff report, resolution, Legistar cover sheet, or ordinance.

Motion by Conroy/Compton to approve the Rules and Procedures as amended, carried unanimously. (Skidmore was out of the room at the time of the vote.)

**E. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS**

- E.1. Pedestrian and bicycle improvement projects, PBMVC follow-up discussion to 5/22/07 public hearing

Arthur Ross, Pedestrian-Bicycle Coordinator, was not at the meeting.

Motion by Webber/Compton to refer to the September meeting, carried unanimously.

**F. REPORTS OF OTHER COMMITTEES - SUMMARY OF ACTIVITY**

- F.1. Plan Commission

No report, Plan Commission rep (Ohm) was not present.

- F.2. Long Range Transportation Planning Commission - 8/16/07 minutes encl.

Shahan indicated that most of the August meeting was taken up with discussion of the Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Plan.

- F.3. Joint West Campus Area Committee

Webber reported they talked about the Wisconsin Institute for Discovery. The first phase (west half of block) will be bid this fall. Project is bordered by University Avenue, Johnson Street, Randall and Charter. The UW Physical Plant will be moved. The committee also talked about the expansion of the Medical School building. The first phase of the Campus Drive ped/bike path (University Bay Drive to Walnut) will be finished by fall. This will be great for bicyclists trying to go north of the railroad tracks and will provide a connection that has been missing.

- F.4. Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee

No report, committee rep (Strawser) was not present.

- F.5. School Traffic Safety Committee

No report, committee has not met recently.

- F.6. Platinum Biking City Planning Committee

No report, rep (Ross) not present. It was noted the draft report has been released for input, comments being accepted until September 15. The report is available on-line or a hard copy can be requested.

**G. REPORTS OF OFFICERS AND MEMBERS FOR INFORMATION/DISCUSSION**

- G.1. Executive Secretary Report

Dryer stated that the Board of Public Works approved the majority of the 2007

traffic calming projects and construction will start shortly.

G.2. Items by Chair - None

G.3. Items for referral and/or announcements

Webber announced that the Metropolitan Planning Organization will be taking public comments on the 2008-2012 Transportation Improvement Program on September 5. The TIP will be acted on at the MPO's October meeting.

Wittke reported that Thursday at 10:30 a.m., at the intersection of Regent-West Washington, will be the unveiling of Traffic Engineering's response to the walking audits conducted as part of the Older Adult Pedestrian project . Wittke also advised that next week Safe Communities will be doing their Stop on Red campaign. Pre-campaign observational studies are being conducted now. The first week of October will be the Walk Your Kids to School campaign.

## ADJOURNMENT

Upon a motion by Compton/Crandall, the meeting adjourned at 6:48 p.m.