



# City of Madison

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

## Master

**File Number: 24468**

**File ID:** 24468

**File Type:** Resolution

**Status:** Passed

**Version:** 2

**Reference:**

**Controlling Body:** PLAN  
COMMISSION

**Lead Referral:** PLAN COMMISSION

**Cost:**

**File Created Date :** 11/08/2011

**File Name:** Adopting Downtown Plan

**Final Action:** 07/17/2012

**Title:** A SUBSTITUTE Resolution Adopting the Downtown Plan as a Supplement to the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan.

### Notes:

### Code Sections:

**CC Agenda Date:** 07/17/2012

### Indexes:

**Agenda Number:**

**Sponsors:** Paul R. Soglin, Shiva Bidar-Sielaff, Lauren Cnare, Bridget R. Maniaci, Scott J. Resnick, Marsha A. Rummel, Brian L. Solomon, Michael E. Verveer and Steve King

**Effective Date:** 07/23/2012

**Attachments:** Downtown Plan DRAFT\_Nov 2011.pdf, Committee Action - PC Memo 6 - PC Summary.pdf, Request for Height Map Modification 042612.pdf, Version 1.pdf, CC Memo - Plan Commission's Final Recommendation 071712.pdf, registrations 7.18.2012 Common Council, Verveer amendments, Verveer amdmt 3 and 5 roll call, Verveer amdmt 6-7-8 roll call, Maniaci amendment, Maniaci amdmt roll call, Rummel amendment, Rummel amdmt roll call

**Enactment Number:** RES-12-00564

### Author:

**Hearing Date:**

**Entered by:** jcleveland@cityofmadison.com

**Published Date:**

## Approval History

Version	Date	Approver	Action
1	11/09/2011	Daniel Bohrod	Approve
2	07/11/2012	Daniel Bohrod	Approve

## History of Legislative File

Version:	Acting Body:	Date:	Action:	Sent To:	Due Date:	Return Date:	Result:

1	Department of Planning and Community and Economic Development	11/08/2011	Referred for Introduction		
	<b>Action Text:</b>	This Resolution was Referred for Introduction			
	<b>Notes:</b>	Plan Commission, Urban Design Commission, Landmarks Commission, Madison Arts Commission, Economic Development Committee, Board of Estimates, Downtown Coordinating Committee, Ped-Bike-Motor Vehicle Commission, Transit & Parking Commission, Long-Range Transportation Planning Committee, Board of Park Commissioners, Sustainable Design and Energy Committee, Committee on the Environment, Madison's Central Business Improvement District (BID) Board			
1	COMMON COUNCIL	11/15/2011	Referred	PLAN COMMISSION	06/18/2012
	<b>Action Text:</b>	This Resolution was Referred to the PLAN COMMISSION			
	<b>Notes:</b>	Additional referrals: Plan Commission, Urban Design Commission, Landmarks Commission, Madison Arts Commission, Economic Development Committee, Board of Estimates, Downtown Coordinating Committee, Ped-Bike-Motor Vehicle Commission, Transit & Parking Commission, Long-Range Transportation Planning Committee, Board of Park Commissioners, Sustainable Design and Energy Committee, Committee on the Environment, Madison's Central Business Improvement District (BID) Board			
1	PLAN COMMISSION	11/16/2011	Refer	URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	02/29/2012
	<b>Action Text:</b>	This Resolution was Refer to the URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION			
	<b>Notes:</b>				
1	PLAN COMMISSION	11/16/2011	Refer	LANDMARKS COMMISSION	11/21/2011
	<b>Action Text:</b>	This Resolution was Refer to the LANDMARKS COMMISSION			
	<b>Notes:</b>				
1	PLAN COMMISSION	11/16/2011	Refer	MADISON ARTS COMMISSION	12/13/2011
	<b>Action Text:</b>	This Resolution was Refer to the MADISON ARTS COMMISSION			
	<b>Notes:</b>				
1	PLAN COMMISSION	11/16/2011	Refer	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE	02/15/2012
	<b>Action Text:</b>	This Resolution was Refer to the ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE			
	<b>Notes:</b>				
1	PLAN COMMISSION	11/16/2011	Refer	BOARD OF ESTIMATES	02/20/2012
	<b>Action Text:</b>	This Resolution was Refer to the BOARD OF ESTIMATES			
	<b>Notes:</b>				
1	PLAN COMMISSION	11/16/2011	Refer	DOWNTOWN COORDINATING COMMITTEE	02/16/2012
	<b>Action Text:</b>	This Resolution was Refer to the DOWNTOWN COORDINATING COMMITTEE			
	<b>Notes:</b>				
1	PLAN COMMISSION	11/16/2011	Refer	PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION	02/29/2012
	<b>Action Text:</b>	This Resolution was Refer to the PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION			
	<b>Notes:</b>				
1	PLAN COMMISSION	11/16/2011	Refer	TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION	01/11/2012
	<b>Action Text:</b>	This Resolution was Refer to the TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION			
	<b>Notes:</b>				

1	PLAN COMMISSION	11/16/2011	Refer	LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATI ON PLANNING COMMITTEE		02/16/2012	
	<b>Action Text:</b>	This Resolution was Refer to the LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING COMMITTEE					
	<b>Notes:</b>						
1	PLAN COMMISSION	11/16/2011	Refer	BOARD OF PARK COMMISSIONER S		12/14/2011	
	<b>Action Text:</b>	This Resolution was Refer to the BOARD OF PARK COMMISSIONERS					
	<b>Notes:</b>						
1	PLAN COMMISSION	11/16/2011	Refer	SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE (ended 6/2012)		01/23/2012	
	<b>Action Text:</b>	This Resolution was Refer to the SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE					
	<b>Notes:</b>						
1	PLAN COMMISSION	11/16/2011	Refer	COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT		12/19/2011	
	<b>Action Text:</b>	This Resolution was Refer to the COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT					
	<b>Notes:</b>						
1	PLAN COMMISSION	11/16/2011	Refer	MADISON'S CENTRAL BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT (BID) BOARD		02/08/2012	
	<b>Action Text:</b>	This Resolution was Refer to the MADISON'S CENTRAL BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT (BID) BOARD					
	<b>Notes:</b>						
1	COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT	11/21/2011	Refer	COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT	12/19/2011	12/19/2011	Pass
	<b>Action Text:</b>	Bill Fruhling, City Planning, highlighted several projects outlined in the Downtown Plan, including Law Park, Lake Mendota path, and Brittingham Beach. Bill stressed that the specifics in the plan are in a conceptual phase, and that future work on any of these items would come before the COE for further review/comment. Committee members had some questions and concerns about the proposal to fill in part of Lake Monona at Law Park as well as the paved path along Lake Mendota since in some areas there would be a "hardening" of the shoreline where it is currently more natural. Members indicated they would like more time to review the plan before submitting their comments.					
	<b>Notes:</b>	A motion was made by Melton, seconded by Ald. Weier, to Refer to the COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT and should be returned by 12/19/2011. The motion passed by voice vote/other.					
1	LANDMARKS COMMISSION	11/21/2011	Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval	PLAN COMMISSION		06/18/2012	Pass
	<b>Action Text:</b>	A motion was made by Slattery, seconded by Taylor, to accept the resolution to adopt the Downtown Plan as presented with the recommended option for Mifflin instead of the alternate option. The motion passed by voice vote/other.					
	<b>Notes:</b>	Rebecca Cnare, City Planning Staff, presented the basic elements of the Downtown Plan with specific emphasis on the historic preservation issues. There was general discussion about the two options for the Mifflin area, potential local historic districts, potential National historic districts, strengthening the identity of local historic districts, creating National historic districts where local districts exist, the importance of the character of the buildings on the triangle blocks, and the need to partner with Building Inspection to assist in the maintenance of historic building stock.					
	<b>Notes:</b>	The Landmarks Commission voted to Return to Lead (the PLAN COMMISSION) with the Recommendation to accept the resolution to adopt the Downtown Plan as presented with the recommended option for Mifflin instead of					

the alternate option.

1	SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE (ended 6/2012)	12/12/2011					
1	MADISON ARTS COMMISSION	12/13/2011	Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval	PLAN COMMISSION		06/18/2012	Pass

**Action Text:** A motion was made by Madera, seconded by Elson, to Return to Lead with comments and the Recommendation for Approval to the PLAN COMMISSION. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

**Notes:** The Plans should recommend increasing the budget of the arts commission, for example, we should add some dollars to Objective 8.2.

- p. 3 - Add a reference to the arts in the last paragraph on page three.
- p. 6 - Add a reference to the Cultural Plan in the fifth Bullet
- p.7 - Add a reference to keeping up with technology advancements as a guiding principle, i.e. WIFI
- p. 14/15 -Regarding the potential infill of Law Park? The map should show the existing shoreline.
- p. 48 2nd ¶ add "cultural" to entertainment
- p. 49 - #56 cultural, entertainment etc
- p. 66? Low income housing for service employees which often include cultural arts workers and artists = affordable housing options
- p. 65 -Access to grocery, and food needed downtown
- p. 66 - artist/ service worker housing
- p. 67 - senior center should have a connection to the library - the temporary location isn't working for seniors
- p. 68 - RE: natural access control: art should be an option
- p. 81 - let people know how many parking stalls are in use at the city ramps
- p. 83 - B-cycle is a proprietary business, the plan should refer to bicycle sharing programs and not call out one in particular.
- Add pontoon rentals
- Key #8
- p. 99 - last ¶ fails to mention privately owner cultural resources. They should also be mentioned
- p. 103 - obj 8.2 this should mention creative initiative staff team for cultural plan?
- Orpheum/Bartell/Stage Door Theater could use a little help - grants; façade grants; targeted fund arts
- p. 115 - lead agency - reference to cultural plan - the city should adopt the cultural plan as an implementation step in the Downtown Plan.

1	TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION	12/14/2011	Re-refer	TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION		01/11/2012	Pass
---	--------------------------------	------------	----------	--------------------------------	--	------------	------

**Action Text:** Registrant Ledell Zellers, 510 N. Carroll, 53703, commented as follows.

- Both living and working downtown, she was very interested in what was in the Plan, which she thought generally a strong and good plan.
- Re: the study of Johnson & Gorham to consider converting it to a 2-way street, the study should go beyond Wisconsin Avenue to Broom and Bassett Streets also for study as 2-way streets, per the recommendation of the draft Mansion Hill Plan.
- A reference to car-sharing programs (like Community Car) should be included. Such programs helped reduce cars of downtown residents; and offered an option to downtown employers, whose employees took transit to work and might need access to a car for appointments, etc.
- Page 85 talked about a Langdon mid-block pedestrian path/walkway, which was a great idea. But, the picture on the page showed a vehicle. It should be made clear this was a ped pathway.
- Language should be included to address the acute problem of mo-ped parking on front lawns and terraces downtown.
- A recommendation should be included to investigate increasing the cost of residential permits. Right now, annual permits were virtually free, and didn't really pay for the cost of cars to be able to park on-street. It could also encourage people to give up their cars.
- Zellers thanked City staff for doing an admirable job on the Plan.

Michael Waidelich of the Planning Department made the following remarks about the Downtown Plan.

- Other downtown plans preceded this one: the Downtown 2000 Plan, prepared in 1989, and the Downtown Plan, prepared in 1970. Though this was the next comprehensive downtown plan, it did not start anew: To a large extent, it was based on recommendations that appeared first in the Comprehensive Plan, which itself was based on a study called "The Downtown Advisory Report" done two years earlier, with a lot of public input.
- It had been a long process putting the Plan together, which started in Spring 2008, and was delayed somewhat by other planning projects. In September 2010, a booklet of draft recommendations (without explanatory narrative and data) had been put out, which generated a lot of comment. Based on that, changes were made. One change in the organization of the Plan made it easier to follow, though it was still a fairly complicated document because all the sections of the Plan were inter-related and referred to one another.
- The Plan was organized around nine key ideas.
- "Celebrate the lakes": The #1 most popular idea, people recognized that the City needed to embrace its two lakefronts better than it had. Historically a lot of business activities were on the lakes that were no longer there, and we now had additional opportunities.
- "Strengthen the region's economic engine": Key to that was making the downtown an engaging place and creating the energy to attract the footloose, education-based worker and businesses that everyone wanted to grow locally. With a major university and medical center, the area had a lot going for it as an economic location. How might the downtown contribute to this by providing locations, infrastructure and amenities to make it more attractive?
- "Ensure a quality urban environment": The Plan contained recommendations for making the downtown even cooler.
- "Maintain strong neighborhoods and districts": The downtown was a quiltwork of different districts and neighborhoods with different characteristics. How might we enhance and strengthen them, even as they evolve, to maintain the sense that the downtown offered different places to go to with a little different feel?
- "Enhance liveability": Having had success over the past 10-15 years with new residents downtown and more housing development, how might we build on this?
- Other key ideas were: Increase transportation choices; build on historic resources (many of which were located in the downtown); expand recreational, cultural and entertainment offerings; and become a model of sustainability. Downtowns were inherently sustainable, being more compact with more transit and more walkability/bikeability; but how might we go beyond that to become more sustainable?
- Though focusing now on Key 6 (transportation choices), many transportation recommendations appeared in other parts of the Plan as well. Also, other plans dealt with large-scale transportation issues, such as the Comprehensive Plan, the Regional Transportation Plan and any number of more specific planning activities now. This Plan was not intended to preempt these other efforts, but to work with them and help create a vision for the downtown for the next 20 years.

Waidelich then discussed recommendations in Key 6, Increase Transportation Choices. The focus was to improve connections and transportation choices between downtown and near downtown activity centers (i.e., the Square, government, State Street, UW, Capital East district), and outlying communities; and to increase choices within the downtown itself to move around more easily.

To help do this, the Plan called for: high-quality ped, bike, streetscape amenities; compact,

interconnected, intensively developed blocks; multimodal travel opportunities; efficient street networks; excellent access to high frequency mass transit; on-street structures and underground parking to meet the needs that become apparent, and eventual redevelopment of large surface parking lots (with redevelopment opportunities, came the need to address what to do with parking).

Recommendations for "Connections to Other Cities" included:

- Continue to plan for high-speed rail service to downtown. Though this had been deferred, it was still an important goal for the downtown. Intercity rail service should be important as the nation developed a more energy-efficient and engaging future in which people could travel to nearby metro areas by train as well as car or bus.
- Locate the train station in the vicinity of Monona Terrace. Though the station could end up somewhere else, it was important to keep it on the agenda.
- Provide intermodal facilities located near the rail station so people could connect to buses traveling to/from other cities and to Metro buses within the city.
- Provide universal transit shuttle service between downtown and Dane County Airport.

Recommendations for "Transit Service" included:

- Expand transit options within the downtown and to other parts of the city. The isthmus focused transit corridors, which gave the downtown good transit access.
- Continue to support the creation of an RTA.
- Consider a commuter rail system, and other forms of express transit. Studies had shown that to really expand employment downtown, high-capacity transit was needed, which could include commuter rail, bus rapid transit, and express bus service. But we shouldn't lose track of the fact that a rail ran along the edge of the downtown, close to major employment centers.
- Encourage transit-oriented development near transit stations.
- Improve Metro, with additional passenger amenities like shelters, signage, scheduling.
- Develop a downtown circulator system. Though previous attempts had not been really successful, maybe we hadn't yet found the right way to do it. Beyond walking and cabs, we needed a way to move people among places downtown (for example, from a hotel to Overture and other places, and back).
- Utilize new transportation technology (using computers for traffic flow, real time signage for parking and buses).

Recommendations for "Complete Streets" included:

- Provide streets that accommodate vehicles, bikes, pedestrians, and transit vehicles (on transit routes).
- Consider converting some one-way streets to two-way. Visitors often commented how difficult it was to get around because of the one-way streets. Some things were facilitated by one-way streets as well. But the issue should be at least be reviewed, as would now occur as part of the Comprehensive Transportation Study.
- Improve safety and aesthetics at key intersections, esp. those that were gateways to the downtown and were not easy to use for bikes, peds, or vehicles (like Blair-Williamson-John Nolen).
- Restripe W. Washington to have bike lanes and one lane of traffic each way. Right now, it wasn't clear where the lanes were and where bikes were supposed to be.

Recommendations for "Parking" included:

- Provide a balanced approach to parking. Parking was a controversial issue, and parking studies often ended up with inconclusive results. Though a challenge, we should work to balance the need to find a place to park downtown, with the understandable desire that not everybody can drive downtown, and promote other modes--bus, bike, walking.
- Continue to evaluate the need for on-site parking on a project-by-project basis. Some additions to parking capacity have occurred as part of private projects. Continue to look at this as an opportunity to provide the parking the development needed, with a little extra to help others out, when appropriate.
- Address backyard parking. People were still parking illegally in backyards. This should be considered as redevelopment occurred, when this parking might be accommodated within the development.
- Study the City's role in providing parking in future. Over the years, there had been discussion about public vs. private, constraints on the Utility, what kind of parking, how their bonds were structured, etc. Public parking was an important part of the mix, but not the only thing that could be done.
- Try to encourage parking underground, eliminate surface lots, and align parking with something else, putting parking in the interior and storefronts on the sidewalk.

Recommendations for "Bicycle Facilities" included:

- Improve and expand bicycle facilities.
- Consider contraflow lanes on some one-way streets. Though this was not always a good idea, it

should be considered in certain situations. Bikers sometimes went a long way out of their way to get where they were going.

- Add bike lanes to East and West Washington, Broom and Bassett.
- Provide ample parking, convenient to where bikers are going.
- Continue to build and enhance bicycle infrastructure generally.
- Expand opportunities for visitor and intermittent use of bicycles, to be able to use a bike and leave it somewhere else (vs. returning it to where it was rented).

Recommendations for "Pedestrian Connections" included:

- Improve connections by creating and improving sidewalks and multi-use paths where we can.
- Enhance streetscapes, esp. on certain streets and ped routes, inc. those from certain parking ramps to popular destinations.
- Among other ped improvements, complete a path between James Madison Park and the Memorial Union, create the Langdon Mid-Block Path, and extend the East Campus Mall to Brittingham Park.

Recommendations for "Wayfinding" included:

- Improve signage to help pedestrians get around downtown, and to designate historic districts.
- Look at signage for bikeways and major ped routes.

Recommendations for "TDM Plans" included:

- Encourage preparation of TDM plans by major downtown employers to manage how employees get to/from their business that deemphasize single-occupancy automobiles and promote alternatives, like transit, bicycling, car-pooling and walking.
- Require TDM plans for major developments as part of their approval process.
- Consider forming a Transportation Management Associations (TMA), for several enterprises or for businesses in a certain area to do a joint transportation plan which might offer opportunities that weren't available in a single entity.

With regard to the "Comprehensive Transportation Study":

- The Study would be city-wide and cover areas way beyond those covered by the Downtown Plan. The Downtown Plan didn't include some recommendations that it might have because their impact would have gone beyond the downtown area.
- The Study would be an opportunity to tie transportation modes together on a city-wide basis. How will the transit system, the street system, the location of parking ramps, all work together?

Waidelich said staff hoped the Commission would take some action, and pass the Plan along with comments and recommendations. Fourteen groups would be reviewing the Plan, and if there were referrals, the process would take a very long time.

Members appreciated the three years of hard work put into the Plan by staff and committee members, and thought it a good plan generally. However, members felt the Plan focused too much on the short term and lacked a long-term vision (how we wanted the Downtown to look in 40-50 years). Along with written comments submitted by members (attached), Commissioners raised questions and made comments and suggestions, as follows.

- Incorporate TMA's into the zoning code, to the extent it can be mandated to either property owners or larger business and office concerns. Leaving it as an option would not be workable.
- Related to the discussion of shuttles and visitors, emphasize downtown linkage to/from the Alliant Center more.
- Add a bus-time map if feasible, along with a drive-time map.
- Distinguish between regular visitors/commuters from neighboring communities, and infrequent visitors from further away. Their knowledge of the city was different, and Plan recommendations for such things as parking and way-finding should be sensitive to that.
- Linkage between Monona Terrace and the rest of the commercial/retail downtown was incomplete, and perhaps Pinckney Street should be added to the list of streets for enhanced pedestrian facilities/amenities.
- Be bold about de-emphasizing vehicular use downtown, esp. in light of limited right-of-way and discussions about street direction and bike facilities. For example, Strassbourg removed lanes from streets, built high-capacity light rail service, and placed parking facilities outside of the city-center. To go so far as to try to improve the environment for pedestrians and bikes and to have a shuttle, the Plan could be more visionary and could expressly state the goal of limiting vehicular use long-term, even if this is a few generations away. At the same time, access to any point in the downtown by means of high-capacity transit, shuttle service, biking facilities, etc. should be guaranteed.
- While the Plan contained many good recommendations, it lacked an overall vision or goal: In the end, what would transportation in and to/from downtown look like? The Plan needed an over-arching

- vision of where we eventually want to get to. To what end were the individual recommendations made?
- The Plan didn't address commuting issues. Suggestions contained in the Plan (such as adding bus/bike amenities) were good, and were likely offered by people who already used buses and bikes. But how do we get (new) people on the bus? Parts of the community didn't use the bus because they felt it wasn't an efficient ride for them (it took too long, the stop was too far from their house, etc.) Even with a Comprehensive Transportation study in the long-term, before the Downtown Plan was finalized, it should address the question: How do we help people better commute downtown, to add to a vibrant and thriving downtown?
  - The Plan lacked a vision of how younger generations would use transportation: What would their needs be in the next 10 or 20 years? The Plan was a wish-list for the short-term, but didn't look at the long-term re: how people would move in out of the downtown conveniently.
  - The Plan lacked a list of future legitimate modes of transportation, like bicycles. Bicycles seemed to just be thrown in here and there in the Plan; but it needed to be legitimized as a serious mode of transportation. The list should include bicycles, along with buses, automobiles, car-sharing, commuter cars, and B-Cycle.
  - On page 76, remove the statement that the RTA recommended commuter rail: The RTA plan for transit did not recommend commuter passenger rail. While commuter rail could be discussed in this Plan, it was not part of an RTA recommendation.
  - Alarming, 2000 census data showed that, even in dense, transit-friendly neighborhoods, the number of cars/household had gone up (to 1.7 cars/household), with only 2-3 persons in an average downtown household. With the trend was going the wrong way then, it would be good to know what 2010 data showed now. Word-of-mouth was that more and more students were bringing cars to campus, despite what had been done with transportation (inc. TDM, bikes and mopeds, etc.). Apparently, it was still hard to get around on Campus.
  - The Plan needed to focus more on Intelligent Transportation Systems specifically for mass transit, and include such things as traffic signal prioritization.
  - The Plan should include efficiencies for bus and pedestrians (i.e., narrowing streets), not only those for cars.
  - The Plan needed to get realistic about where to put a train and intercity buses, etc. Cramming all this at/around Gov East would not work: Too many tear-downs would have to occur, and too many diesel fumes would fill an area intended to be comfortable for people, esp. visitors.
  - A 24-hour bus system should be considered. Students would continue to bring cars to Campus until transit provided a way to get home safely from the library at 4-6 AM.
  - In preparing the Plan, staff and committee members were asked to put the cart before the horse: Without a robust Transportation Plan that addressed a lot of issues that had been raised and that set specific goals, priorities and a vision, it would be hard to develop that piece within the Downtown Plan. Without this, (naturally) the recommendations in the Plan seemed rather piecemeal. For example, what were our goals for reducing vehicle miles traveled?
  - The Plan should discuss marketing. The "Smart Trips" program (started in Portland) marketed existing transportation choices to neighborhoods, and saw a reduction in car trips of 9% per neighborhood, without adding any new infrastructure. Madison seemed to invest in infrastructure (for bikes and transit) without investing in marketing these assets.
  - The Plan should emphasize the use of technology to better promote bike, transit and parking systems.
  - The Plan should include a goal that 20% of trips in Madison be made by bike by 2020.
  - Though supportive of Plan recommendations for W. Washington (striping, buffered bike lanes, etc.), staff should check with Traffic Engineering about this since TE had previously indicated such changes were not feasible, due to space and parking issues.
  - The bicycle component of the Plan was lacking. European cities had 40-50% trips made by bike, by creating separate bicycling facilities. Buffered bike lanes between cars and bikes helped moms, kids, seniors feel more comfortable biking.
  - The Plan suggested amenities and improvements to the downtown to make it more liveable and attractive for residents, workers, and visitors. Did it discuss delivery vehicles (suppliers) and their impact?
  - The number cited for bus trips around the Outer Loop seemed low, and should be re-checked.
  - Because of our unusual street grid, it would be difficult for people to navigate the downtown whether streets were one-way or two-way. People would still get lost. At least, lack of familiarity made drivers slow down.
  - Re: the Outer Loop and other downtown streets: Narrow the streets, take a lane, make pedestrian rights-of-way broader, install street-side amenities, have dedicated bus lanes, install bus shelters; and deal with the key issue of delivery traffic, look at rail corridors (for freight), and how to work with this commercial network to make small storefront businesses viable, which was central to the Plan.
  - Instead of focusing only on efficiency for cars, consider the look and feel of the whole area for people in all modes.



- While all good, these suggestions, in isolation, would be hard to implement without an overall vision. Was the city really ready to adopt a strategy like Strassbourg, which abandoned automobiles in its central commercial district, in order to implement these?
- While worth aspiring to, some of these ideas would be hard to achieve. For example, 24-hour transit service was not financially sustainable; and removing parking and installing bike facilities had not historically been popular among businesses.
- In making a series of incremental changes like these, care was needed not to thoughtlessly support pro-transit and anti-parking measures that would strike fear into the business community. While some of this could be accomplished, a shared vision with the business community and more marketing and discussion with other segments was needed before going this route. It wouldn't be good for Madison to lose its competitive edge because businesses viewed some other community as friendlier to vehicles and more sustainable for them.
- Perhaps, identifying these changes as a vision for 2050 would allow the community to prepare.
- Though a Transportation Plan was needed, the Downtown Plan was not intended to be that. The Downtown Plan contained a lot of different pieces taken from a lot of different places, which was fine, because the place for transportation innovation was not in a Downtown Plan. That belonged in a different plan developed by other agencies and committees (MPO, TPC, etc.).
- Attitudes towards transportation and alternate modes had changed in the past 20 years, from simply thinking that more parking was needed to enlightened business owners who were providing commute cards and bike amenities, and promoting car- and ride-sharing.
- If attitudes could change like this so quickly over the past 15-20 years, what would they be 20 years from now?
- We were talking about something big when we talked about a Transportation Plan. And when we talked about transportation just within the downtown, it was different, calling for a little of this and that.

Planning staff responded as follows to questions/comments.

- The statistic that 3% of trips were made by bikes was based on 2000 census data, and specifically related to trips to work (located) downtown.
- Certain other info (such as average # of cars/household) from the 2010 census was not yet available.
- Recommendation #122 on page 74, generally stated: Utilize intelligent system technology (i.e., traveler info), and other wayfinding improvements. However, other specific intelligent transportation system enhancements should be added.
- The topic of how to bring things in/out of the downtown was discussed at a project level and in the zoning code. The issue was challenging because the downtown lacked alleys and suppliers now used big trucks. Though the issue was probably more site-specific than the Plan tended to address, it could be added to the Plan, esp. since the topic came up frequently on a practical level.
- The Plan contained many recommendations about the Outer Loop, mostly with regard to its relative unattractiveness compared to the Square (partly because it was used to divert transit and vehicular traffic from the Square), and its lack of amenities. The issue of improving the Outer Loop was challenged by the number of lanes there; and no one was saying that a lane should taken/used to create a wider terrace and bike path.
- The topic of changing the direction of the flow on the Outer Loop was not discussed. That was part of the bigger issue of reviewing the whole system of (one-way) streets and traffic flow. Visitors and bikes had a hard time getting around downtown, with its many one-way streets.

Referring to pages 80-81, Parking's Knobloch made the following remarks.

- He was happy to see the comment about TIF for public parking, because when TIF was provided only to the private sector, the Utility could not readily compete.
- The Plan said nothing about the Utility maintaining its current inventory of parking. If big money was not put into the current aging parking stock over the next 20 years, the Utility would eventually have to lock its doors. A keystone to the UW's transportation plan was to maintain its current inventory of 13,000 stalls, while having all the growth in other modes -- similar to what the City was trying to do.
- Some on-street parking was being lost for various reasons; but certain businesses around town (on Regent and Williamson) could benefit from better turnover on their streets with either 2-hour parking or more meters.

After staff and member comments concluded, Schmitz proposed that maybe the Transportation section of the Downtown Plan be set aside until the Comprehensive Transportation Plan was prepared, at which point a Transportation section for the Downtown Plan could be done, which fit into that.

Schmitz cited the RTA plan for transit, as an example of a bigger, more visionary statement: Create a transit system that allows autos, buses, bikes, trains, airport passengers, and pedestrians to function

compatibly, within a coordinated, modernized system. (And from this would eventually come specific items like better bus shelters.) This was what people should be looking at right now, and should be the mission of the City's Transportation Plan. Then, the Downtown Transportation section would slide into that.

Schmitz/Subeck made a motion to recommend that the Transportation section of the Downtown Plan be set aside until completion of the City's Transportation Plan. Bergamini offered a friendly amendment to the motion to say that the Transportation section of the Downtown Plan be "set aside and rewritten after the completion" of the City's Transportation Plan.

Poulson asked if the Commission had a recommendation for the overall Plan, apart from its recommendation for the Transportation section.

While in sympathy with the sentiment, Golden felt the Plan had to move on and that the Commission couldn't just redact the transportation elements of it and have it be a meaningful plan. Though an opinion not shared by everyone, Golden felt the authors of the Plan had done a good job of finding all the debris of transportation scattered among many different plans from the past 40 years and putting it into the Plan. What they didn't do was prepare the Transportation Plan (work, which should be done by the TPC and others).

Golden offered an alternate approach that the Commission approve the Plan subject to the comments made at the meeting, to be presented to Plan Commission for their consideration; and ask that the Plan be amended to specifically reference the future Transportation Plan, which recommendations when adopted, would be incorporated into the Downtown Plan by amendment. With this approach, if the completed Transportation Plan were substantially different from or went beyond what was now in the Downtown Plan, it would at that time become the way we would do transportation in the downtown. Perhaps this would get the Commission where it wanted to go, without redacting what had been done.

Schmidt agreed with Golden. On a practical level, this was an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan and would have a role in the Plan Commission deliberations; if the Transportation section were taken out of the Plan, there would be a time when those recommendations wouldn't have any force at all. Schmidt thought it safer to work on what was there, and use the language suggested by Golden. Either way, we would have to do an amendment to the Downtown Plan; procedurally later on, it would amount to the same thing. But in the interim (perhaps a couple years), if redacted, we would lack the benefit of some of the recommendations which would probably have a substantial impact on PUD's that would come along downtown.

Schmidt/Golden made an alternate motion that the Transportation section be retained, that the Commission's comments be forwarded to the bodies, and recommend that a statement be included to say the Plan should be amended upon completion of the city-wide Transportation Plan.

White noted that Golden's verbiage talked about amending the Plan to include a reference to the City Transportation Plan. She said the Downtown Plan already included a statement that it "would support the vision and goals" of such a city-wide Transportation Plan. Also, she felt it strange to support something that might well be null and void after the Transportation Plan was created; it was an odd timing situation.

Schmitz said she had numerous recommendations/comments on the Transportation section, and wondered what would happen to those. She said that if she agreed to the alternate motion, she wanted to see some changes in the Transportation section. Golden offered an amendment to Schmidt's alternate motion, that would add some of his original language, to approve the Plan "subject to the comments made at this meeting" and submitted at this meeting (having heard no disagreement about the comments that had been made). As to comments that had not yet been made, he had submitted written comments prior to the meeting, in order to avoid verbalizing all of them at the meeting. He suggested that Schmitz either make her comments now or submit them directly to the Plan Commission.

Schmidt restated his alternate motion (to the original motion), that the Commission recommend approval of the Downtown Plan, subject to the comments contained in the Minutes and additional materials provided by Commission members; and that the Transportation section should be revised and go through the amendment process once the city-wide Transportation Plan was completed. Without objection from the body, Schmitz withdrew her original motion.

Bergamini said that a number of points had been discussed, and there seemed to be pretty good

consensus about a lot of things. But she had no idea what Schmitz had in her comments not yet presented. She wondered if the Commission would consider those comments a sense of the whole group, as endorsed by the whole group or not. She wanted to hear the group speak as a Commission, to put everything together and be visionary.

Schmidt said that when resolutions were forwarded with comments, it was generally understood that individual comments were from the individual. However, the Commission could take the opportunity to continue talking, discuss individual comments, and highlight them in some fashion.

Tolmie wondered about gathering all the comments together and put them before the Commission, so they could defer the decision about the motion or the approval until the next meeting. That way, they could get all the comments together and speak as a Commission, vs. having random comments emailed in. White added that, along those lines, perhaps if the comments were given to the committee managing the Plan, then a new draft of the Transportation section could come back the TPC, based on those comments. The TPC would then have something to base their discussion around. Though it would draw out the 3-year process further, White was uncomfortable enough with the Transportation chapter, that spending more time on it was warranted.

A substitute motion was made by Golden, seconded by Schmitz, to Re-refer the resolution to the January meeting of the TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION to allow staff to prepare the Minutes with staff and member comment, and to allow members to submit additional written comments to staff by December 21, 2011, so that the entire package could be presented to the Commission for review. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

**Notes:**

1	BOARD OF PARK COMMISSIONERS	12/14/2011	Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval	PLAN COMMISSION	12/19/2011	06/18/2012
---	-----------------------------	------------	---	-----------------	------------	------------

**Action Text:** This Resolution was Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the PLAN COMMISSION due back on 12/19/2011

Bill Fruehling of the city's Planning Department presented the latest draft of the Downtown Plan that staff have been working on since 2008. There have been more than 125 meetings, attended by over 2200 people. Staff believe they have come up with a balanced plan that will provide the framework for decision making over the next 20 years. It covers employment, economic development, parks and housing. He noted that these are concepts that are to convey an overall vision and not specifics for any one location.

One of the consistent recommendations that was heard is that the Downtown has to get serious about how it engages the lakes and how residents can utilize them. The narrow strip of land along Lake Monona that comprises Law Park, there is a large surface parking lot and bike path but not much else. They believe this area would provide a major opportunity to create a signature downtown park along the lake and their draft incorporated a variation of a plan that was done a few decades ago. It recommends adding about 2 acres of fill to expand the park into the lake. The City got a permit from the Army Corps of Engineers in 1990 to add 4 acres of fill but that permit has expired. This plan includes open space so it can be flexible in the way it is used. The centerpiece is the Frank Lloyd Wright boathouse that would become more of a shelter/pavilion structure. There are not many opportunities for boaters to tie up who want to visit the downtown and this would include temporary boat docking. Additionally, in order to connect the park back into the downtown, staff recommends land bridges to extend the park vertically, thus creating a graceful and inviting way to get from the downtown to the park.

Another area along Lake Monona is the Broom Street gateway. They envision beautifying John Nolen Drive from the Beltline to the downtown along the Causeway. Currently what is seen is a dog park and tennis courts at the Broom Street intersection. It was suggested that features be added to the dog park since it is really well used as well as the adjacent tennis courts which are the most used in the city.

Brittingham Bay on the other side of the causeway from Lake Monona is less congested than either Lakes Monona or Mendota. There are not a lot of opportunities to use either the park shelter or the bay, and a rental facility for sail boats, kayaks or paddle boats would bring more people to that destination. Efforts are being made to improve the water quality in the bay.

Turning to Lake Mendota, there has been an idea for many years about a lakefront path along the lake. The concept would have the path begin in James Madison Park and then continue through the campus to Picnic Point for a total of approximately three miles. A good portion is already built and the city has easement covering much of the middle segment. Easements are still needed for the last segment. Diagrams of the path were presented and it was noted that it is not meant to be a place to hang out but just a path. There are streets that dead-end and go down to the lake that could enhance the sight lines to the lake.

The map illustrated on page 102 shows the areas that represent a quarter mile radius, about a 5 minute walk, from the downtown's major open spaces. It also shows the area currently underserved by parkland. Most of the recent development on the west end of downtown has been tall student residence buildings. Because they are on parcels that are redeveloped there is no vacant space available for a park. Currently the vacant lot on the corner of Gorham/University is used as parkland but it is not very safe because of all the traffic going past. Planning has proposed that a new park be established that would be a safe, attractive well designed open space that could be used however the users want.

Fruehling noted those were the park related concepts in the plan and the recommendations would require more involved planning. The Plan was introduced to the Common Council on November 15 and then referred to 14 Boards, Commissions and Committees. This document sets the concepts in a broader context and after approval by all of the Boards, Commissions and Committees as well as approval by the Common Council, hopefully soon after the first of the year, the Planning Department will move toward implementation. Additionally, there are other plans that are dependent on this plan's adoption, i.e. the Zoning Code will incorporate recommendations regarding height.

The Law Park proposal will be controversial because of adding fill in the lake and will be politically challenging so they will take it a step at a time. It is envisioned that the really large projects would have steering committees appointed.

Cnare added that they are looking at a connection between the lakes through the University and also want to connect missing sidewalks in the area.

Commission members noted that the John Nolen Centennial Committee is looking at John Nolen Drive from the Beltline to Downtown and asked how that meshed with the Downtown Plan. The two plans will come together on the Causeway but will need time and money to make them happen.

They applauded the land bridges at Law Park. They felt it was a beautiful plan but did express concerns about filling in two acres into Lake Monona to increase the size of Law Park and asked whether there would need to be some mitigation efforts. Planning indicated that the concept stays within the dock lines that had been previously established and that the new plan calls for less fill than the permit had previously allowed.

Members also commented about scale in the artist's rendering throughout the plan and hoped that the infrastructure was more along the scale of the new Tenney Pavilion so the emphasis is on the lakes and open spaces and not the buildings. It was noted that a different portion of the Plan discussed canopy and streetscapes and that different streets have different functions. When street construction/reconstruction is planned the urban tree canopy is taken into consideration.

The Plan's timeframes contain short-, mid- and long term recommendations. The short term recommendations are immediate, the mid-term recommendations are two to five years out and the long term recommendations cover the time beyond that. The mid-term portion covers the next planning phase of the plan.

They were impressed with the concept of a lakefront path along Lake Mendota. It was suggested that people would want to bike from the Union to Picnic Point or come back through James Madison Park, they hoped that the path would be wide enough to accommodate walkers and bikers.

In response to questions about the proposed new park off of Gorham, it would be approximately 1.5 to 2 acres, near the Doubletree Hotel.

Members indicated that they were glad to see the focus on the lakes and asked that planners keep scale in mind when approving development to allow people to enjoy the lakes. Ald. Clear interjected that a way to mitigate expenses for the expansion of Law Park and the path along Lake Mendota would be through development, which in turn could generate money for park improvements.

Superintendent Briski then reported that staff recommends approval with the comments noted above.

A motion was made by Ragland/Leopold to approve Resolution ID#24468 Resolution Adopting the Downtown Plan as a Supplement to the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan incorporating the items discussed tonight. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**Notes:**

1 DOWNTOWN 12/15/2011  
COORDINATING  
COMMITTEE

**Action Text:** Downtown Plan Update

Fruehling stated this was his tenth visit to DCC as the Downtown Plan was being developed. His first presentation was when the Planning Department was first putting together the planning process back in 2007. The booklet with draft recommendations was presented last time and the current document refined those recommendations based on input from the various boards, commissions and public meetings.

The biggest difference is the way the current document is organized. It's easier to read and use. It has all the discussion, data, maps, and the discussion rationale for recommendations contained in the plan. This Plan was introduced to the Common Council on November 15, 2011 and was referred to 14 boards, commissions and committees. The Plan Commission is the lead agency and all recommendations are to be forwarded to them for compilation. Planning hopes to have the Plan adopted at the second Common Council meeting in February or March. The recommendations have been pretty static since September 2010 with only minor changes.

One of the reasons for working towards adoption of the Downtown Plan is so that the new Zoning Code can incorporate those recommendations relating to zoning. The recommendations in the Plan will be implemented through inclusion in the Zoning Ordinance.

Members asked what commissions have already taken action and what were their recommendations? They also wondered what format they should use to be most helpful. They were told that comments should come from the committee collectively instead of individuals. The Landmarks Commission approved it but then reconsidered their vote so they will again review it next Monday. The Arts Commission recommended adoption. The Park Commission commented on John Nolen Drive and questioned how it would mesh with the John Nolen Centennial Committee that is looking at John Nolen Drive from the Beltline to Downtown. They applauded the land bridges at Law Park. They felt it was a beautiful plan but did express concerns about filling in two acres into Lake Monona to increase the size of Law Park and asked whether there would need to be some mitigation efforts. Members also commented about scale in the artist's rendering throughout the plan and hoped that the infrastructure was more along the scale of the new Tenney Pavilion so the emphasis is on the lakes and not the buildings. They were impressed with the concept of a lakefront path along Lake Mendota. They wondered about the proposed new park off of Gorham. Overall, members indicated that they were glad to see the focus on the lakes and asked that planners keep scale in mind when approving development to allow people to enjoy the lakes. They recommended approval of the Plan incorporating the above items. The Transit and Parking Commission will take action at their next meeting.

It is anticipated that the Zoning Code would be adopted about two months following adoption of the Downtown Plan. The group working on the Zoning Code can work on the zoning maps while waiting for adoption of the Downtown Plan.

In response to a question about the John Nolen Drive Centennial Committee, Fruehling reported he is one of the city's staff people serving on that committee. That group's focus is really from the Causeway to the Beltline and the area around Olin-Turville Park and the Alliant Energy Center. The Downtown Plan focuses on the Causeway to Downtown.

The city is interested in pursuing the fill into Lake Monona at Law Park and it will be a huge project. Planning wants to get policy direction from the city before undertaking staff time and investing resources. Prior to 1990, there was a similar proposal for Law Park that recommended 4 acres of fill. That plan had received a permit from the Army Corps of Engineers but the city did not pursue it because they were also working on Monona Terrace. This plan cuts it back to about 2 acres. They hope this scaled down version will be approved by the Army Corps of Engineers in light of their previous approval for a larger area of fill. The Commission on the Environment has referred the Plan due to concerns about the proposal to add fill to the lake. It also had concerns about hardening the edge of the Lake Mendota shoreline for the path.

Metro has been involved in the plan and wordsmithed the final recommendations related to it. The citywide transportation plan which is being developed has broader impacts on the transportation system beyond the downtown area. Once the citywide transportation plan is complete, if there are recommendations for items that come out of that plan that aren't consistent with the Downtown plan, changes may be recommended.

Appendix D, found on page 132, contains benchmarks not goals. They identify the current conditions and project forward for 10- and 20-year benchmarks. These are not projections as much as

reasonable expectations of what could happen in the downtown and the numbers could be revisited in a decade.

The Call to Action beginning on page 109 provides a matrix that identifies each of the major recommendations and what steps are necessary to implement the recommendations. Some of the recommendations will take time and items are not prioritized but rather identified as short-, mid- and long-term time frames.

Members felt this was a unique challenge since the mission of the committee covers the boundaries of the downtown plan. They thought the plan was well balanced. While there were some differences of opinion with some pieces related to land use and height limits, they felt overall that it was a good plan. Discussion turned to process. It was suggested that subcommittees be appointed. A document identifying the different proposed areas of study and breaking the information into three separate subcommittees was distributed. Planning staff will not attend those meetings. It was also noted that Parks will not staff those meetings but would prepare the required public notices for the meetings. DCC members would need to provide Parks staff with the date, time and location for those meetings.

A motion was made by Crabb/Zellers to adopt the Downtown Plan areas of study and that the various subcommittees would present a report on the status of each subcommittee at the January 2012 DCC meeting. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

A brief discussion ensued regarding the Mifflin alternative. There have been meetings covering just this issue and an alternative was developed that could achieve a number of things. It gets rid of the mid-block urban lane and concentrates on building around smaller clusters of buildings.

There are old plans, including neighborhood plans, located on the Downtown website, that can be reviewed for additional information.

**Notes:**

1	COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT	12/19/2011	Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s)	PLAN COMMISSION	06/18/2012	Pass
---	------------------------------	------------	---	-----------------	------------	------

**Action Text:** Bill Fruhling, City Planning, was present to answer any further questions about the Downtown Plan. He reminded the commissioners that the intention of the plan is general concept, and that any specifics would be discussed in much greater detail when the city decides to move forward on any of the recommendations.

Commissioners indicated their continued concern about recommending any fill at Law Park on Lake Monona. Other concerns included the existing dog park near John Nolen/Broom, the lack of a natural resources inventory (other than trees), and the discussion of parking issues and how to encourage downtown visitors to use other methods of transportation. The question was raised as to whether there is an urban "environment" or if it is in fact human-engineered. Lasky noted that she was impressed with the planning process associated with creating the plan, and that there was thorough citizen input.

A motion was made by Lasky, seconded by Weier, to Return to Lead with the Following Recommendations to the PLAN COMMISSION, to approve the plan in its entirety with the following notes: (1) The recommendation to fill in any amount at Law Park goes against the mission of the COE and should not be included, (2) There is concern about the proximity of a dog park to Lake Monona and any associated environmental impacts, (3) There should be a natural resources inventory included in the plan, (4) The environmental capacity for downtown parking and the effects on air quality should be included. The motion failed by the following vote:

Excused: 2 -  
Weide, Vedder  
Ayes: 2 -  
Lasky, Weier  
Noes: 4 -  
Fix, Melton, Bannerman, Bennett  
Abstentions: 1 -  
Grant

A motion was made by Melton, seconded by Fix, to Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s) to the PLAN COMMISSION, to remove the first Recommendation as listed in the November 2011 Downtown Plan pertaining to filling along the Lake Monona shoreline at Law Park), and to include the other three notes indicated in the first motion (proximity of dog park to the lake and other associated environmental impacts, lack of natural resources inventory, suggestion to estimate environmental capacity for parking downtown and its effects on air quality). The motion passed by the following vote:

**Notes:**

Ayes: 5 Anita Weier; Steven M. Fix; Dan Melton; Roger T. Bannerman and James P. Bennett  
Noes: 1 Patricia A. Lasky  
Abstentions: 1 Lori O. Grant  
Excused: 2 Reginald N. Weide and Kathryn Vedder

1	LANDMARKS COMMISSION	12/19/2011	Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s)	PLAN COMMISSION	06/18/2012	Pass
---	----------------------	------------	---	-----------------	------------	------

**Action Text:** A motion was made by Rosenblum, seconded by Slattery, to Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s) to the PLAN COMMISSION. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

**Notes:** A motion was made by Gehrig, seconded by Rummel, to remove bonus area G (Lamp House) from the Downtown Plan. The motion was passed on a voice vote/other. Rosenblum voted No. Levitan No vote.

A second motion was made by Rosenblum, seconded by Rummel, to use stronger language to address branding of historic districts in section of Downtown Plan that addresses branding. The motion was passed on a voice vote/other.

A third motion was made by Rummel, seconded by Slattery, to add a recommendation to Page 57 to urge update of Mansion Hill Plan. The motion was passed on a voice vote/other.

Levitan discussion. He asked if the removal word "local" on Page 127 would disallow bonus stories in D/E/F. Cnare said that it might confuse the issue, but that staff can look at language to make it more clear.



Gehrig recommended boundaries of local be expanded to be conterminous. Cnare explains that Page 95 #171 is what this means. Creating and/or modifying national and historic district boundaries to be coterminous by working with State Historical Society. Bill Fruhling said that they will try to clarify that language to make it more understandable.

A final motion was made by Rosenblum, seconded by Slattery, to recommend the adoption of the Downtown Plan with recommendations by Landmarks Commission. The motion was passed on a voice vote/other.

1	URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	12/21/2011	Refer	URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	02/29/2012	Pass
	<b>Action Text:</b>	A motion was made by Huggins, seconded by Rummel, to Refer to the URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION special meeting of January 25, 2012. The motion passed by voice vote/other.				
	<b>Notes:</b>					
1	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE	12/21/2011				
	<b>Notes:</b>					
1	TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION	01/11/2012	Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s)	PLAN COMMISSION	06/18/2012	Pass

**Action Text:** Golden made a suggestion regarding process to help expedite Commission review of the Plan, bearing in mind that the Plan was subject to adoption of the Plan Commission, not the TPC. Two options were available: The group could all agree on what was sent back to the Lead. Or the group could let the Plan Commission sift and winnow through the comments made by TPC members, with their transportation experience and perspective, recognizing the possibility of staff comments being made on such things as financial feasibility, etc. Apart from removing something completely objectionable, Golden didn't think much would be gained by debating the merit of each comment. In reading over the comments, he found them interesting; and though he didn't agree with all of them, he didn't disagree with any one of them strongly enough to bring it up. He recommended that after a constructive discussion, the TPC make a recommendation to accept the resolution and to send all the comments to the Plan Commission with the idea that they and Planning staff would go through them and do the right thing by them.

Maniaci disagreed with this suggestion; though the easy thing to do, it was a cop out. The TPC was the transportation committee, and she didn't think the Plan Commission would nuance through a list of comments sent by the TPC. She thought this was the time and place and the body to have the debate about the transportation portion of the Plan. She proposed listing the comments on a white board, looking at where ideas agreed, and sending the Plan Commission what the TPC as a body agreed to, and what the TPC as a whole didn't agree to. Items that everyone uniformly agreed should be added in, and could be taken up; other items could be put on the record noting that consensus wasn't reached on them.

Schmitz discussed a motion at the December meeting that recommended making comments now, as well as revisiting the Downtown Plan after the Transportation Plan was completed. She thought that this earlier motion put things in context. Recording Secretary Anne Benishek-Clark read portions of the December meeting minutes to refresh everyone's memories about the previous discussion and sequence of motions, which led up to the final (substitute) motion: To wait until the January meeting to take action on the Plan and make recommendations, after members had time to review all the comments inc. those made at the December meeting as well as any additional comments members wished to submit by December 21st.

Bergamini said that the group had had a very comprehensive discussion about this, and when she looked at the additional comments that were submitted after the December meeting (including those from Golden, Schmitz, UDC, other committees and the public), there seemed to be a broad consensus that transportation was missing and should be added into the Plan in greater detail. Where there seemed to be a lack of consensus (mostly in other committees) was the level of detail that a Plan like this should go into. Some committees talked about lane width and height of railings, while others talked about the broad vision; and Bergamini wasn't sure where to draw that line. She thought the TPC could go back to a motion to submit its comments, and also appreciate the work of the other committees which noted that details of transportation planning were lacking and needed to be revisited, which was properly the scope of the transportation study (plan); and that the Downtown Plan as a whole should be looked at and potentially revised with the benefit of that transportation study having been done.

White agreed with Bergamini, and thought the group had had a great discussion at the last meeting, with a lot of comments made and further comments submitted. She wasn't sure what further discussion would do to help, when really what they needed was the transportation plan. She thought it premature to approve this chapter, because it was like putting the cart before the horse without the overall transportation plan. At the same time, she supported a motion to amend and revisit the chapter after the transportation plan was finished, as Bergamini had proposed. Bergamini added that individuals (representing themselves) could also contact Planning to explain their comments, if they wished.

Subeck agreed with Bergamini and White, saying that she didn't think it would be helpful to rehash all the comments without having the Transportation Plan first. She preferred forwarding the comments along, with a motion to recommend that the chapter be revisited as was suggested at the December meeting. Golden talked about reviewing the many different member and staff comments, inc. those that seemed at variance with each other, and found that he didn't really disagree with any of them. Assuming that members had read the December minutes and pertinent parts of the Downtown Plan, he suggested that for the sake of time members could bring up issues that were not done to their liking, issues with which they disagreed, and issues that were missing (vs. discussing things with which they all agreed).

Benishek-Clark clarified with members which portions of the December minutes that they wished

forwarded to the Plan Commission: Bulleted comments made by members, starting at the bottom of Page 6 and running to mid-page on Page 9, and by Parking staff, at the bottom of Page 9 and the top of Page 10.

Golden discussed the recommendation he submitted on December 21st in advance of the January meeting (attached). He wanted the City to have a longer-term vision without being specific, and look to a time when (probably for environmental reasons more than oil issues) the city will need to be nimble enough to convert to a very different way of getting around. For example, certain streets in Madison could very easily be adapted to a European style of moving around. Certain other streets might have to be completely re-done. As streets and systems were being (re) designed, they should be done in a way that anticipated that kind of conversion. In addition to the physical things, public education was needed to promote transit, to call people out for how inconsistent their behavior was with their values, and to educate them to the probability that at some point there would be a conversion and we should be prepared for it. Such things as housing policies, commercial policies, food distribution would be need to be restructured when that time came. His statement was an attempt to say this from a transportation perspective.

Subeck felt that along with environmental costs, there were financial and social justice costs to relying on automobiles: roads were costlier than transit; and the more reliant we were on cars, the less accessible transportation was for those with less. She suggested adding two words to the first sentence in Golden's statement to read: "The city should recognize the environmental, economic and social costs of continuing to rely on automobiles long term...."

Maniaci added the following to member comments and recommendations for the Plan.

- A direct bus between the airport and Downtown was needed.
- Since the city was on an isthmus, we should begin discussion about lobbying for congestion pricing ability.
- Her neighborhood had long discussed a Park & Ride at First Street. Transportation issues weren't confined to the boundaries of the Downtown Plan.
- Why have Recommendation #137 to add bike lanes on E. Washington from Blair to Pinckney, which would mirror the Bike Boulevard on Mifflin Street?
- The Residential Parking Permit program should be overhauled. The current program incentivized people to bring their cars downtown, and create the expectation that people could pay \$22/year to park in front of their residences.
- Recommendation #129 re: aesthetics and backyard parking could be left out. A committee had gone through all the issues about backyard parking. A good look was needed at how the discussion had evolved in terms of the Zoning Code rewrite and usable open space requirements. Since it was really a zoning issue, perhaps a clarification was needed. The reality was that we can't get rid of backyard parking and push everyone out on the street, esp. with too many people trying to park on the street already. The broad-brush approach to this issue was not satisfactory.
- A small business parking permit program should be considered, in terms of economic development and land use conflicts downtown and based on comments from small retail business owners. An update of the 1978 Transportation Plan was needed.
- Re: expanding parking ramp capacity where able and the recommendations on page 81 for more underground parking: Her neighborhood had discussed Cap Sq North, in which they preferred having the ramp built out to create higher capacity (vs. residential parking there), which would provide better use for the neighborhood, for winter snow parking, etc. In general, no mention was made in the Plan of spending money to increase available ramp parking.
- More bike parking was needed (beyond commercial areas) in residential areas downtown, where people were tripping over bikes and bikes were being chained to trees and poles.

Golden appreciated Maniaci's comments about backyard parking and the residential permit program. He had worked on the backyard parking committee, which basically concluded that the problem would eventually be resolved because backyard parking would be eliminated if the downtown residences and redevelopments occurred as they should. As for the permit program, it was originally designed for University Heights, and it made no sense anywhere else it was being used. He felt it was up to the downtown alders to take the issue on, where there were 300 spaces and 700 parkers. The permit was supposed to be cost-based. Maniaci noted that the current permit fee paid for processing the permits, but did not include the costs of street-sweeping, ticket enforcement, and other costs that were not being captured in the permit program. She understood the political ramifications. Downtown constituents wouldn't like paying more for a permit and making it harder to get one. It was interesting asking people what they would do. Golden talked about the issue of parking in neighborhoods around West High, which was resolved by opening up parking along Speedway. Maniaci reiterated her recommendation (above) that the permit program needed to be evaluated and updated.

Schmitz strongly endorsed Golden's vision statement (of 12/21st). She said the Downtown Plan was a plan, not an implementation document; and Golden's statement set the stage for the plan. It also helped inform Key 2 which identified the downtown as the region's economic engine. As an economic engine, the downtown needed a critical mass of people and increased housing options, and it needed to be more condensed, a place where people could live, work, shop and play. Transportation worked directly into this. She felt we needed to start thinking differently. The community had high sustainability values and downtowns were inherently more sustainable if they were built that way. She said she would be glad if Golden's statement came from the group. Golden said the statement was taken from the city of Strasbourg, which had similarities to Madison (an island rather than an isthmus). Schmitz said this was what Portland and Amsterdam did, to look long-term. Golden mentioned how Strasbourg priced parking out of downtown, improved light rail, and moved parking to the periphery of the downtown. Schmitz added her support to the Golden's earlier comment re: Page 74, about creating a representative RTA.

Members wondered how their comments should be sent back to the Lead. During discussion, staff suggested extracting the bulleted comments of members and staff from both meetings and adding any comments submitted by members in writing, and inserting them into the motion.

A motion was made by Bergamini, seconded by Maniaci, to Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s). The Transit and Parking Commission recommends that the resolution be approved with the recommendation that the following statement and subsequent (bulleted) comments be incorporated into the Downtown Plan, recognizing that the Downtown Plan will not be complete until it includes a complete Transportation Plan that speaks specifically to the long-term environmental, economic and social costs mentioned in the vision statement. The Commission appreciates the comments of other committees and commissions, which have also raised concerns about the lack of vital transportation planning in this document, and further suggests that its lists of comments and questions be used to help frame both the Transportation Plan and the Zoning Code Rewrite. While the Commission didn't have perfect consensus along all these points, everyone agreed that all these points should be considered. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

Under Key 6 on page 71, at the beginning of the Transportation section, insert the statement: The city should recognize the environmental, economic and social costs of continuing to rely on automobiles long term and seek the in cooperation and support of our County, State and Federal partners for a long range strategy that envisions a downtown Madison where motorized vehicles are significantly deemphasized as the primary means of getting to and circulating around the downtown. This vision must include multi-year efforts to educate the public and policy makers about the types of infrastructural changes needed to make this vision possible. While the Transit and Parking Commission recognizes the current and likely continuing role of individually owned motor vehicles for use in reaching and circulating between downtown destinations for years to come, this recommendation is intended to begin a strategy that, at minimum, moves motor vehicles to the edge of the downtown or even the edge of the city to remote parking facilities. This must be coupled with the creation of high(er) frequency, high capacity transit service options for movement of people to and around the downtown.

Following are member comments from the Commission's December and January meetings as well as those submitted by members in writing, for Plan Commission consideration:

- Incorporate TMA's into the zoning code, to the extent it can be mandated to either property owners or larger business and office concerns. Leaving it as an option would not be workable.
- Related to the discussion of shuttles and visitors, emphasize downtown linkage to/from the Alliant Center more.
- Add a bus-time map if feasible, along with a drive-time map.
- Distinguish between regular visitors/commuters from neighboring communities, and infrequent visitors from further away. Their knowledge of the city was different, and Plan recommendations for such things as parking and way-finding should be sensitive to that.
- Linkage between Monona Terrace and the rest of the commercial/retail downtown was incomplete, and perhaps Pinckney Street should be added to the list of streets for enhanced pedestrian facilities/amenities.
- Be bold about de-emphasizing vehicular use downtown, esp. in light of limited right-of-way and discussions about street direction and bike facilities. For example, Strasbourg removed lanes from streets, built high-capacity light rail service, and placed parking facilities outside of the city-center. To go so far as to try to improve the environment for pedestrians and bikes and to have a shuttle, the Plan could be more visionary and could expressly state the goal of limiting vehicular use long-term, even if this is a few generations away. At the same time, access to any point in the downtown by means of

high-capacity transit, shuttle service, biking facilities, etc. should be guaranteed.

- While the Plan contained many good recommendations, it lacked an overall vision or goal: In the end, what would transportation in and to/from downtown look like? The Plan needed an over-arching vision of where we eventually want to get to. To what end were the individual recommendations made?
- The Plan didn't address commuting issues. Suggestions contained in the Plan (such as adding bus/bike amenities) were good, and were likely offered by people who already used buses and bikes. But how do we get (new) people on the bus? Parts of the community didn't use the bus because they felt it wasn't an efficient ride for them (it took too long, the stop was too far from their house, etc.) Even with a Comprehensive Transportation study in the long-term, before the Downtown Plan was finalized, it should address the question: How do we help people better commute downtown, to add to a vibrant and thriving downtown?
- The Plan lacked a vision of how younger generations would use transportation: What would their needs be in the next 10 or 20 years? The Plan was a wish-list for the short-term, but didn't look at the long-term re: how people would move in and out of the downtown conveniently.
- The Plan lacked a list of future legitimate modes of transportation, like bicycles. Bicycles seemed to just be thrown in here and there in the Plan; but it needed to be legitimized as a serious mode of transportation. The list should include bicycles, along with buses, automobiles, car-sharing, commuter cars, and B-Cycle.
- On page 76, remove the statement that the RTA recommended commuter rail: The RTA plan for transit did not recommend commuter passenger rail. While commuter rail could be discussed in the Plan, it was not part of an RTA recommendation.
- Alarming, 2000 census data showed that, even in dense, transit-friendly neighborhoods, the number of cars/household had gone up (to 1.7 cars/household), with only 2-3 persons in an average downtown household. With the trend was going the wrong way then, it would be good to know what 2010 data showed now. Word-of-mouth was that more and more students were bringing a car to campus, despite what had been done with transportation (inc. TDM, bikes and mopeds, etc.). Apparently, it was still hard to get around on Campus.
- The Plan needed to focus more on Intelligent Transportation Systems specifically for mass transit, and include such things as traffic signal prioritization.
- The Plan should include efficiencies for bus and pedestrians (i.e., narrowing streets), not only for cars.
- The Plan needed to get realistic about where to put a train and intercity buses, etc. Cramming all this at/around Gov East would not work: Too many tear-downs would have to occur, and too many diesel fumes would fill an area intended to be comfortable for people, esp. visitors.
- A 24-hour bus system should be considered. Students would continue to bring cars to Campus until transit provided a way to get home safely from the library at 4-6 AM.
- In preparing the Plan, staff and committee members were asked to put the cart before the horse: Without a robust Transportation Plan that addressed a lot of issues that had been raised and that set specific goals, priorities and a vision, it would be hard to develop that piece within the Downtown Plan. Without this, (naturally) the recommendations in the Plan seemed rather piecemeal. For example, what were our goals for reducing vehicle miles traveled?
- The Plan should discuss marketing. The "Smart Trips" program (started in Portland) marketed existing transportation choices to neighborhoods, and saw a reduction in car trips of 9% per neighborhood, without adding any new infrastructure. Madison seemed to invest in infrastructure (for bikes and transit) without investing in marketing these assets.
- The Plan should emphasize the use of technology to better promote bike, transit and parking systems.
- The Plan should include a goal that 20% of trips in Madison be made by bike by 2020.
- Though supportive of Plan recommendations for W. Washington (striping, buffered bike lanes, etc.), staff should check with Traffic Engineering about this since TE had previously indicated such changes were not feasible, due to space and parking issues.
- The bicycle component of the Plan was lacking. European cities had 40-50% trips made by bike, by creating separate bicycling facilities. Buffered bike lanes between cars and bikes helped moms, kids, seniors feel more comfortable biking.
- The Plan suggested amenities and improvements to the downtown to make it more liveable and attractive for residents, workers, and visitors. Did it discuss delivery vehicles (suppliers) and their impact?
- The number cited for bus trips around the Outer Loop seemed low, and should be re-checked.
- Because of our unusual street grid, it would be difficult for people to navigate the downtown whether streets were one-way or two-way. People would still get lost. At least, lack of familiarity made drivers slow down.
- Re: the Outer Loop and other downtown streets: Narrow the streets, take a lane, make pedestrian rights-of-way broader, install street-side amenities, have dedicated bus lanes, install bus shelters; and deal with the key issue of delivery traffic, look at rail corridors (for freight), and how to work with this

commercial network to make small storefront businesses viable, which was central to the Plan.

- Instead of focusing only on efficiency for cars, consider the look and feel of the whole area for people in all modes.
- While all good, these suggestions, in isolation, would be hard to implement without an overall vision. Was the city really ready to adopt a strategy like Strassbourg, which abandoned automobiles in its central commercial district, in order to implement these?
- While worth aspiring to, some of these ideas would be hard to achieve. For example, 24-hour transit service was not financially sustainable; and removing parking and installing bike facilities had not historically been popular among businesses.
- In making a series of incremental changes like these, care was needed not to thoughtlessly support pro-transit and anti-parking measures that would strike fear into the business community. While some of this could be accomplished, a shared vision with the business community and more marketing and discussion with other segments was needed before going this route. It wouldn't be good for Madison to lose its competitive edge because businesses viewed some other community as friendlier to vehicles and more sustainable for them.
- Perhaps, identifying these changes as a vision for 2050 would allow the community to prepare.
- Though a Transportation Plan was needed, the Downtown Plan was not intended to be that. The Downtown Plan contained a lot of different pieces taken from a lot of different places, which was fine, because the place for transportation innovation was not in a Downtown Plan. That belonged in a different plan developed by other agencies and committees (MPO, TPC, etc.).
- Attitudes towards transportation and alternate modes had changed in the past 20 years, from simply thinking that more parking was needed to enlightened business owners who were providing commute cards and bike amenities, and promoting car- and ride-sharing.
- If attitudes could change like this so quickly over the past 15-20 years, what would they be 20 years from now?
- We were talking about something big when we talked about a Transportation Plan. And when we talked about transportation just within the downtown, it was different, calling for a little of this and that.
- A direct bus between the airport and Downtown was needed.
- Since the city was on an isthmus, we should begin discussion about lobbying for congestion pricing ability.
- Her neighborhood had long discussed a Park & Ride at First Street. Transportation issues weren't confined to the boundaries of the Downtown Plan.
- Why have Recommendation #137 to add bike lanes on E. Washington from Blair to Pinckney, which would mirror the Bike Boulevard on Mifflin Street?
- The Residential Parking Permit program should be overhauled. The current program incentivized people to bring their cars downtown, and create the expectation that people could pay \$22/year to park in front of their residences.
- Recommendation #129 re: aesthetics and backyard parking could be left out. A committee had gone through all the issues about backyard parking. A good look was needed at how the discussion had evolved in terms of the Zoning Code rewrite and usable open space requirements. Since it was really a zoning issue, perhaps a clarification was needed. The reality was that we can't get rid of backyard parking and push everyone out on the street, esp. with too many people trying to park on the street already. The broad-brush approach to this issue was not satisfactory.
- A small business parking permit program should be considered, in terms of economic development and land use conflicts downtown and based on comments from small retail business owners. An update of the 1978 Transportation Plan was needed.
- Re: expanding parking ramp capacity where able and the recommendations on page 81 for more underground parking: Her neighborhood had discussed Cap Sq North, in which they preferred having the ramp built out to create higher capacity (vs. residential parking there), which would provide better use for the neighborhood, for winter snow parking, etc. In general, no mention was made of spending money to increase available ramp parking.
- More bike parking was needed (beyond commercial areas) in residential areas downtown, where people were tripping over bikes and bikes were being chained to trees and poles.
- Page 5 - In addition to attracting and retaining businesses, we should do the same for all levels of government. The IRS, some state agencies and now even the CARPC are considering moving from the downtown or have done so.
- Page 5 - Use of the term Commercial does not distinguish between office and retail uses. These generate different kinds of parking demands so should be discussed and planned for separately.
- Key # 6 needs to separately discuss visitors from the city or county from visitors from outside the region. Their needs are very different.
- Page 21 - Government employment is no longer stable for reasons that should be obvious -- work at home and contracting, not to mention deficit reduction need to be mentioned.
- Page 27 - Consider varying heights on individual blocks to avoid the walled in look.
- Page 31 - Consider filling in retail gaps like first block of Pinckney ST from Monona Terrace.

- Page 32 - Drive time map is OK- Add a bike time map too, and even a ped time map.
- New idea: Mention the need for connection the Alliant center, a major activity center near the downtown that could help retail and reduce parking demand by providing a transit link.
- Page 73 - Create an airport shuttle in collaboration with the county.
- Page 73 - Add recommendation to study adding dedicated bus lanes on downtown streets and on key connecting routes to speed up bus service.
- Page 74 on RTA: Create a representative RTA that grows out of the TPSC and Metro so existing expertise can be tapped. CSOC was intended as a seed for a future RTA getting other communities experience in transit governance.
- Somewhere in the P. 70s: Add a recommendation to study creating a circulator for all large Kohl center events so that buses can get people to city and UW parking ramps. Tie in with season ticket holder mailings.
- Pages 77-80 - Consider reducing the downtown as a destination for cars by building all new ramps on the edge of the downtown and adding high frequency circulators to the mix. Create multimodal transportation hubs. See Strasbourg France's model.
- Madison lacks real time information on where parking is available when people encounter full ramps. Some sort of signage and way finding should be considered.
- Parking recommendation: Area parking need studies like the one done 10 years ago on west Wash corridor (Bauman administration) should be done when shortages (or surpluses) are observed in the utilities facilities.
- Mandate TMAs to the extent possible in the zoning code.

Under Key 6:

- Create a Vision for what a true Multi-Modal system would look like and how it would function in a seamless manner.
- Not clear what the adopted "Regional Transportation Plan" is referring to. Is this the RTA Plan for Transit?
- A statement needs to be made in this section that recognizes bicycle commuting as a legitimate mode of transportation.
- Commuting and visitors need to be mentioned in this section—possibly a "Park Once" concept.
- When talking about parking, bicycle parking needs to be mentioned.
- Bicycles and bicycle routes need to be mentioned under "Connections to other Cities".
- Remember to include Taxi/Cab service when talking about modes/connections.

Transit Service and Recommendations:

- "Connecting the bicycle network" needs to be added along with the goal of separated bicycle lanes.
- Our bus service is not "excellent" at this time because of a lack of appropriate funding. Metro is not able to connect to the outlying areas of the city.
- Changes at the State level (to provide for RTA legislation) need to be a goal

Commuter Rail/Bus Rapid Transit Service:

- The RTA "Plan for Transit" did not recommend commuter rail—remove that language (they referenced it for the future).
- Accommodations for bicycles need to be added

Circulator Transit Service:

- This needs a different approach because it has not worked in the past. Take a look at B-Cycle to get our hands around how people get around in the DT because on B-Cycle, they can define their own route. B-Cycle needs to be part of this conversation.

- Accommodate bicycles on one-way streets.

Bicycle Facilities:

- Recommendation # 137 should be for ALL STREETS including segregated lanes on busier streets.
- Reference 20 by 2020 as a goal for bicycle commuting
- Separate bicycle lights.
- Talk about visitors, B-Cycle and bike rentals
- Reference partnerships with the Cycling companies that are located in the area and how they can help us build a multi-modal system—Trek, Saris, Pacific Cycle, B-Cycle, Planet Bike.

Wayfinding:

- The use of technology is key to the future of wayfinding

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plans:

- There is too much passive language in this section. Is this part of the vision or not?
- Recommendation #158 is good: Add "Use data gathered from B-Cycle for the DT Circulator discussion along with data from our other partners".

Following are the comments from Parking staff.

- The Plan recommendation about TIF for public parking was good, because when TIF was provided only to the private sector, the Utility could not readily compete.
- The Plan said nothing about the Utility maintaining its current inventory of parking. If big money was

not put into the current aging parking stock over the next 20 years, the Utility would eventually have to lock its doors. A keystone to the UW's transportation plan was to maintain its current inventory of 13,000 stalls, while having all the growth in other modes -- similar to what the City was trying to do.

- Some on-street parking was being lost for various reasons; but certain businesses around town (on Regent and Williamson) could benefit from better turnover on their streets with either 2-hour parking or more meters.

Golden asked that when the motion were drafted, it be sent out to members for review. If needed, they could send any concerns to Poulson who could mediate. Maniaci asked Michael Waidlich of Planning how Planning staff would handle these comments/suggestions. He said that they would probably go through the comments from all the committees, inc. the TPC, and prepare a document that somehow factored the comments for the Plan Commission.

**Notes:** A motion was made by Bergamini, seconded by Maniaci, to Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s). The Transit and Parking Commission recommends that the resolution be approved with the recommendation that the following statement and subsequent (bulleted) comments be incorporated into the Downtown Plan, recognizing that the Downtown Plan will not be complete until it includes a complete Transportation Plan that speaks specifically to the long-term environmental, economic and social costs mentioned in the vision statement. The Commission appreciates the comments of other committees and commissions, which have also raised concerns about the lack of vital transportation planning in this document, and further suggests that its lists of comments and questions be used to help frame both the Transportation Plan and the Zoning Code Rewrite. While the Commission didn't have perfect consensus along all these points, everyone agreed that all these points should be considered. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

Under Key 6 on page 71, at the beginning of the Transportation section, insert the statement: The city should recognize the environmental, economic and social costs of continuing to rely on automobiles long term and seek the in cooperation and support of our County, State and Federal partners for a long range strategy that envisions a downtown Madison where motorized vehicles are significantly deemphasized as the primary means of getting to and circulating around the downtown. This vision must include multi-year efforts to educate the public and policy makers about the types of infrastructural changes needed to make this vision possible. While the Transit and Parking Commission recognizes the current and likely continuing role of individually owned motor vehicles for use in reaching and circulating between downtown destinations for years to come, this recommendation is intended to begin a strategy that, at minimum, moves motor vehicles to the edge of the downtown or even the edge of the city to remote parking facilities. This must be coupled with the creation of high(er) frequency, high capacity transit service options for movement of people to and around the downtown.

Following are member comments from the Commission's December and January meetings as well as those submitted by members in writing, for Plan Commission consideration:

- Incorporate TMA's into the zoning code, to the extent it can be mandated to either property owners or larger business and office concerns. Leaving it as an option would not be workable.
- Related to the discussion of shuttles and visitors, emphasize downtown linkage to/from the Alliant Center more.
- Add a bus-time map if feasible, along with a drive-time map.
- Distinguish between regular visitors/commuters from neighboring communities, and infrequent visitors from further away. Their knowledge of the city was different, and Plan recommendations for such things as parking and way-finding should be sensitive to that.
- Linkage between Monona Terrace and the rest of the commercial/retail downtown was incomplete, and perhaps Pinckney Street should be added to the list of streets for enhanced pedestrian facilities/amenities.
- Be bold about de-emphasizing vehicular use downtown, esp. in light of limited right-of-way and discussions about street direction and bike facilities. For example, Strassbourg removed lanes from streets, built high-capacity light rail service, and placed parking facilities outside of the city-center. To go so far as to try to improve the environment for pedestrians and bikes and to have a shuttle, the Plan could be more visionary and could expressly state the goal of limiting vehicular use long-term, even if this is a few generations away. At the same time, access to any point in the downtown by means of high-capacity transit, shuttle service, biking facilities, etc. should be guaranteed.
- While the Plan contained many good recommendations, it lacked an overall vision or goal: In the end, what would transportation in and to/from downtown look like? The Plan needed an over-arching vision of where we eventually want to get to. To what end were the individual recommendations made?
- The Plan didn't address commuting issues. Suggestions contained in the Plan (such as adding bus/bike amenities) were good, and were likely offered by people who already used buses and bikes. But how do we get (new) people on the bus? Parts of the community didn't use the bus because they felt it wasn't an efficient ride for them (it took too long, the stop was too far from their house, etc.) Even with a Comprehensive Transportation study in the long-term, before the Downtown Plan was finalized, it should address the question: How do we help people better commute downtown, to add to a vibrant and thriving downtown?
- The Plan lacked a vision of how younger generations would use transportation: What would their needs be in the next 10 or 20 years? The Plan was a wish-list for the short-term, but didn't look at the long-term re: how people would move in out of the downtown conveniently.
- The Plan lacked a list of future legitimate modes of transportation, like bicycles. Bicycles seemed to just be thrown in here and there in the Plan; but it needed to be legitimized as a serious mode of transportation. The list should include bicycles, along with buses, automobiles, car-sharing, commuter cars, and B-Cycle.
- On page 76, remove the statement that the RTA recommended commuter rail: The RTA plan for transit did not recommend commuter passenger rail. While commuter rail could be discussed in the Plan, it was not part of an RTA recommendation.



- Alarmingly, 2000 census data showed that, even in dense, transit-friendly neighborhoods, the number of cars/household had gone up (to 1.7 cars/household), with only 2-3 persons in an average downtown household. With the trend was going the wrong way then, it would be good to know what 2010 data showed now. Word-of-mouth was that more and more students were bringing a car to campus, despite what had been done with transportation (inc. TDM, bikes and mopeds, etc.). Apparently, it was still hard to get around on Campus.
- The Plan needed to focus more on Intelligent Transportation Systems specifically for mass transit, and include such things as traffic signal prioritization.
- The Plan should include efficiencies for bus and pedestrians (i.e., narrowing streets), not only for cars.
- The Plan needed to get realistic about where to put a train and intercity buses, etc. Cramming all this at/around Gov East would not work: Too many tear-downs would have to occur, and too many diesel fumes would fill an area intended to be comfortable for people, esp. visitors.
- A 24-hour bus system should be considered. Students would continue to bring cars to Campus until transit provided a way to get home safely from the library at 4-6 AM.
- In preparing the Plan, staff and committee members were asked to put the cart before the horse: Without a robust Transportation Plan that addressed a lot of issues that had been raised and that set specific goals, priorities and a vision, it would be hard to develop that piece within the Downtown Plan. Without this, (naturally) the recommendations in the Plan seemed rather piecemeal. For example, what were our goals for reducing vehicle miles traveled?
- The Plan should discuss marketing. The "Smart Trips" program (started in Portland) marketed existing transportation choices to neighborhoods, and saw a reduction in car trips of 9% per neighborhood, without adding any new infrastructure. Madison seemed to invest in infrastructure (for bikes and transit) without investing in marketing these assets.
- The Plan should emphasize the use of technology to better promote bike, transit and parking systems.
- The Plan should include a goal that 20% of trips in Madison be made by bike by 2020.
- Though supportive of Plan recommendations for W. Washington (striping, buffered bike lanes, etc.), staff should check with Traffic Engineering about this since TE had previously indicated such changes were not feasible, due to space and parking issues.
- The bicycle component of the Plan was lacking. European cities had 40-50% trips made by bike, by creating separate bicycling facilities. Buffered bike lanes between cars and bikes helped moms, kids, seniors feel more comfortable biking.
- The Plan suggested amenities and improvements to the downtown to make it more liveable and attractive for residents, workers, and visitors. Did it discuss delivery vehicles (suppliers) and their impact?
- The number cited for bus trips around the Outer Loop seemed low, and should be re-checked.
- Because of our unusual street grid, it would be difficult for people to navigate the downtown whether streets were one-way or two-way. People would still get lost. At least, lack of familiarity made drivers slow down.
- Re: the Outer Loop and other downtown streets: Narrow the streets, take a lane, make pedestrian rights-of-way broader, install street-side amenities, have dedicated bus lanes, install bus shelters; and deal with the key issue of delivery traffic, look at rail corridors (for freight), and how to work with this commercial network to make small storefront businesses viable, which was central to the Plan.
- Instead of focusing only on efficiency for cars, consider the look and feel of the whole area for people in all modes.
- While all good, these suggestions, in isolation, would be hard to implement without an overall vision. Was the city really ready to adopt a strategy like Strassbourg, which abandoned automobiles in its central commercial district, in order to implement these?
- While worth aspiring to, some of these ideas would be hard to achieve. For example, 24-hour transit service was not financially sustainable; and removing parking and installing bike facilities had not historically been popular among businesses.
- In making a series of incremental changes like these, care was needed not to thoughtlessly support pro-transit and anti-parking measures that would strike fear into the business community. While some of this could be accomplished, a shared vision with the business community and more marketing and discussion with other segments was needed before going this route. It wouldn't be good for Madison to lose its competitive edge because businesses viewed some other community as friendlier to vehicles and more sustainable for them.
- Perhaps, identifying these changes as a vision for 2050 would allow the community to prepare.
- Though a Transportation Plan was needed, the Downtown Plan was not intended to be that. The Downtown Plan contained a lot of different pieces taken from a lot of different places, which was fine, because the place for transportation innovation was not in a Downtown Plan. That belonged in a different plan developed by other agencies and committees (MPO, TPC, etc.).
- Attitudes towards transportation and alternate modes had changed in the past 20 years, from simply thinking that more parking was needed to enlightened business owners who were providing commute cards and bike amenities, and promoting car- and ride-sharing.
- If attitudes could change like this so quickly over the past 15-20 years, what would they be 20 years from now?
- We were talking about something big when we talked about a Transportation Plan. And when we talked about transportation just within the downtown, it was different, calling for a little of this and that.
- A direct bus between the airport and Downtown was needed.
- Since the city was on an isthmus, we should begin discussion about lobbying for congestion pricing ability.
- Her neighborhood had long discussed a Park & Ride at First Street. Transportation issues weren't confined to the boundaries of the Downtown Plan.
- Why have Recommendation #137 to add bike lanes on E. Washington from Blair to Pinckney, which would mirror the Bike Boulevard on Mifflin Street?
- The Residential Parking Permit program should be overhauled. The current program incentivized people to bring their cars downtown, and create the expectation that people could pay \$22/year to park in front of their residences.

- Recommendation #129 re: aesthetics and backyard parking could be left out. A committee had gone through all the issues about backyard parking. A good look was needed at how the discussion had evolved in terms of the Zoning Code rewrite and usable open space requirements. Since it was really a zoning issue, perhaps a clarification was needed. The reality was that we can't get rid of backyard parking and push everyone out on the street, esp. with too many people trying to park on the street already. The broad-brush approach to this issue was not satisfactory.
  - A small business parking permit program should be considered, in terms of economic development and land use conflicts downtown and based on comments from small retail business owners. An update of the 1978 Transportation Plan was needed.
  - Re: expanding parking ramp capacity where able and the recommendations on page 81 for more underground parking: Her neighborhood had discussed Cap Sq North, in which they preferred having the ramp built out to create higher capacity (vs. residential parking there), which would provide better use for the neighborhood, for winter snow parking, etc. In general, no mention was made of spending money to increase available ramp parking.
  - More bike parking was needed (beyond commercial areas) in residential areas downtown, where people were tripping over bikes and bikes were being chained to trees and poles.
  - Page 5 - In addition to attracting and retaining businesses, we should do the same for all levels of government. The IRS, some state agencies and now even the CARPC are considering moving from the downtown or have done so.
  - Page 5 - Use of the term Commercial does not distinguish between office and retail uses. These generate different kinds of parking demands so should be discussed and planned for separately.
  - Key # 6 needs to separately discuss visitors from the city or county from visitors from outside the region. Their needs are very different.
  - Page 21 - Government employment is no longer stable for reasons that should be obvious -- work at home and contracting, not to mention deficit reduction need to be mentioned.
  - Page 27 - Consider varying heights on individual blocks to avoid the walled in look.
  - Page 31 - Consider filling in retail gaps like first block of Pinckney ST from Monona Terrace.
  - Page 32 - Drive time map is OK- Add a bike time map too, and even a ped time map.
  - New idea: Mention the need for connection the Alliant center, a major activity center near the downtown that could help retail and reduce parking demand by providing a transit link.
  - Page 73 - Create an airport shuttle in collaboration with the county.
  - Page 73 - Add recommendation to study adding dedicated bus lanes on downtown streets and on key connecting routes to speed up bus service.
  - Page 74 on RTA: Create a representative RTA that grows out of the TPSC and Metro so existing expertise can be tapped. CSOC was intended as a seed for a future RTA getting other communities experience in transit governance.
  - Somewhere in the P. 70s: Add a recommendation to study creating a circulator for all large Kohl center events so that buses can get people to city and UW parking ramps. Tie in with season ticket holder mailings.
  - Pages 77-80 - Consider reducing the downtown as a destination for cars by building all new ramps on the edge of the downtown and adding high frequency circulators to the mix. Create multimodal transportation hubs. See Strasbourg France's model.
  - Madison lacks real time information on where parking is available when people encounter full ramps. Some sort of signage and way finding should be considered.
  - Parking recommendation: Area parking need studies like the one done 10 years ago on west Wash corridor (Bauman administration) should be done when shortages (or surpluses) are observed in the utilities facilities.
  - Mandate TMAs to the extent possible in the zoning code.
- Under Key 6:
- Create a Vision for what a true Multi-Modal system would look like and how it would function in a seamless manner.
  - Not clear what the adopted "Regional Transportation Plan" is referring to. Is this the RTA Plan for Transit?
  - A statement needs to be made in this section that recognizes bicycle commuting as a legitimate mode of transportation.
  - Commuting and visitors need to be mentioned in this section-possibly a "Park Once" concept.
  - When talking about parking, bicycle parking needs to be mentioned.
  - Bicycles and bicycle routes need to be mentioned under "Connections to other Cities".
  - Remember to include Taxi/Cab service when talking about modes/connections.
- Transit Service and Recommendations:
- "Connecting the bicycle network" needs to be added along with the goal of separated bicycle lanes.
  - Our bus service is not "excellent" at this time because of a lack of appropriate funding. Metro is not able to connect to the outlying areas of the city.
  - Changes at the State level (to provide for RTA legislation) need to be a goal
- Commuter Rail/Bus Rapid Transit Service:
- The RTA "Plan for Transit" did not recommend commuter rail-remove that language (they referenced it for the future).
  - Accommodations for bicycles need to be added
- Circulator Transit Service:
- This needs a different approach because it has not worked in the past. Take a look at B-Cycle to get our hands around how people get around in the DT because on B-Cycle, they can define their own route. B-Cycle needs to be part of this conversation.
  - Accommodate bicycles on one-way streets.
- Bicycle Facilities:
- Recommendation # 137 should be for ALL STREETS including segregated lanes on busier streets.

- Reference 20 by 2020 as a goal for bicycle commuting
- Separate bicycle lights.
- Talk about visitors, B-Cycle and bike rentals
- Reference partnerships with the Cycling companies that are located in the area and how they can help us build a multi-modal system-Trek, Saris, Pacific Cycle, B-Cycle, Planet Bike.

Wayfinding:

- The use of technology is key to the future of wayfinding

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plans:

- There is too much passive language in this section. Is this part of the vision or not?
- Recommendation #158 is good: Add "Use data gathered from B-Cycle for the DT Circulator discussion along with data from our other partners".

Following are the comments from Parking staff.

- The Plan recommendation about TIF for public parking was good, because when TIF was provided only to the private sector, the Utility could not readily compete.
- The Plan said nothing about the Utility maintaining its current inventory of parking. If big money was not put into the current aging parking stock over the next 20 years, the Utility would eventually have to lock its doors. A keystone to the UW's transportation plan was to maintain its current inventory of 13,000 stalls, while having all the growth in other modes -- similar to what the City was trying to do.
- Some on-street parking was being lost for various reasons; but certain businesses around town (on Regent and Williamson) could benefit from better turnover on their streets with either 2-hour parking or more meters.

1	LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING COMMITTEE	01/19/2012	Refer	LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATI ON PLANNING COMMITTEE	02/16/2012	Pass
---	--	------------	-------	--	------------	------

**Action Text:** Mark Shahan/Ald. Bridget Maniaci submitted a motion to "refer Resolution ID 24468 to the February 16th meeting, with the intent that LRTPC create a memorandum thereafter (from LRTPC to Plan Commission) summarizing key transportation recommendations for the Plan Commission to consider, and for LRTPC to consider a recommended alternative vision statement for Key 6: Increasing Transportation Choices".

That motion passed unanimously.

**Notes:** Mark Shahan/Ald. Bridget Maniaci submitted a motion to "refer Resolution ID 24468 to the February 16th meeting, with the intent that LRTPC create a memorandum thereafter (from LRTPC to Plan Commission) summarizing key transportation recommendations for the Plan Commission to consider, and for LRTPC to consider a recommended alternative vision statement for Key 6: Increasing Transportation Choices".

That motion passed unanimously.

1	DOWNTOWN COORDINATING COMMITTEE	01/19/2012	Refer	DOWNTOWN COORDINATING COMMITTEE	02/16/2012	02/16/2012
---	---------------------------------------	------------	-------	---------------------------------------	------------	------------

Action Text: Downtown Plan Update

REGISTERED SPEAKERS:

John T. Ribolzi, Support  
Peter Ostlind, Support,  
Michael Bridgeman Support,

Chair Zellers provided an overview of the structure of the three subcommittees and their area of responsibility. Zellers stated that given some of the members of the committee need to leave early, the first report would be on subcommittee #3, which was chaired by Reiter.

Reiter gave an overview of the report of subcommittee #3, which is focused on Keys #2, #3, and #8. The overview followed the report of the subcommittee #3 to the DCC and included committee discussion and staff clarification on specific items referenced in the subcommittee report. Upon Reiter's departure at 6:20 pm, Carbine presented the through the end of Key #3 of the subcommittee's report. Alder Resnick introduced the idea of working on keys #2 and #3 first to come to some consensus on these items. The committee discussed how the zoning code rewrite fits into the downtown plan. Fruhling indicated that the Downtown Plan is structured in a way to fit into the Zoning Code. The committee focused on the proposed changes from subcommittee #3's report for changes recommended to Keys #2 and #3 in an attempt to find general consensus on specific items. The committee discussed what they envisioned their final product to the plan commission would be.

The committee found general consensus on the following elements of the report of subcommittee #3:

1. Recommendation #15 needs to be clarified further by staff.
2. Objective 2.1 should include language including Creative Industries in addition to high tech industries as desired targets for recruitment efforts.
3. Recommendation #16 should include a more positive approach to the wording. Focusing on wording such as "incentivize and guide development."
4. Recommendation #30 should include language focusing on having a mix of executive housing and affordable workforce housing.
5. Objective 2.7 should include and incorporate CVB's Destination 2020 strategic plans.
6. Support for Objective 3.1 recognizing the value of the viewshed to the Downtown and that it impacts visitor's perspectives.
7. Recommendation #36 should recognize not only are the tops of buildings important, but the street level facades also contribute to the positive experience.
8. Objective 3.2 should read "Provide a dynamic and flexible mix of land uses and densities that enables ample opportunities..."
9. Supporting Objective 3.3 that acknowledges that buildings fit into the greater fabric of downtown.
10. Supporting Objective 3.4 and its recommendations.
11. Recommendations #52 and #54 – include as a concept the idea of placement as a part of street tree requirements.

The committee then discussed other portions of the report from the subcommittee that generated less consensus in the earlier discussion. The committee generally agreed to lay aside the thematic language on height and conservation restrictions from the subcommittee. The committee also discussed but Objective 2.3. The change originally mentioned in the subcommittee's report on Recommendation #17 was discussed and generally considered to be not a priority of the full committee. The committee generally agreed to remove the comment on Recommendation #21 from the subcommittee's report. The subcommittee's report on Recommendation #20 was to reduce the restrictions on height. Discussion focused on the fact that the Downtown Plan Recommendation #20 allowed an exception to the maximum heights in certain redevelopment projects. Fruhling pointed out that this recommendation was focused on incentivizing redevelopment of some of the less than stellar architectural structures in the downtown. The committee felt that Recommendation #20 should more clearly be tied to the "out of scale" buildings mentioned on page 29 of the plan. After further debate and multiple alternatives, Alder Resnick proposed that the committee to stick to the current language of the plan.

Recommendation #23 was discussed with no clear final consensus. Carbine indicated that the subcommittee had significant concerns on this item. The committee discussed waiting to see what happens from the BID's meeting on the downtown plan related to this item. It was determined to bring this specific issue back to the DCC as a part of the continued review of the Downtown Plan in February. This completed the review of the subcommittee's report for Keys #2 and #3.

A motion was made by Frank/Verveer to refer this review of the Downtown Plan to the 2/16 meeting,  
MOTION CARRIED.

**Notes:**

1	SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE (ended 6/2012)	01/23/2012	Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s)	PLAN COMMISSION	06/18/2012
---	---	------------	---	--------------------	------------

**Action Text:** Rebecca Cnare – 14 City Committees will be reviewing the Downtown Plan. The Downtown Plan will be also be doing working sessions with the Plan Commission.

This is not the Sustainability Plan or the Comprehensive Plan so we are not going to be a replacement to these documents.

Key 9: Become a Model of Sustainability is the chapter where you look to see what we can do in the downtown for sustainability

Key 1: Celebrate the Lakes – connect with the lakes. This is a controversial issue.

There was also a plan for a new path along Lake Mendota.

Last 20 years of development in the downtown, the plan is saying let's continue this by more than doubling living units in the downtown in the next 20-30 years.

The rest of the keys look at quality of life in the downtown through neighborhoods, affordability and transportation.

Walking – better connections – East Campus Mall, North Shore Drive – James Madison Park, and Langdon Street.

Biking – Capital Square, more routes in and around downtown.

Streets/Parking – two-way streets where there are one-way streets are now. This is a start to the large transportation plan that the city is working on.

Transit – look again at a circulator, commuter rail, and high-speed rail.

Historic – adaptive reuse, historic district are protected – and redevelopment where appropriate.

Parks – site new park – Mifflin/Johnson Street Bend area.

Key 9 – Capitalizing on the Sustainability of many of the other keys. Use the Downtown as a place where you can try new ideas.

David – increase density... how to you make such densities – live-able?

Rebecca – street treatments, sidewalk treatments, set-backs when you have buildings over 5 stories. Looking at different types of streets – with different treatments...

David – noise is a big issue and cars make a lot of noise...

Rebecca – good suggestion.

Lance – Lots of sustainability in the plan. Green Streets is a good principals – storm water looking at pilot projects.... In parks... storm water/renewable... these things should not be only in parks.

Transportation – good to see RTA/TDM mentions. More robust goal (30% don't drive cars) look to increase this percentage. Bikes – way finding. Transit – increasing services and circulator. More directly look at the transportation plan. End of the plan – chart – with recommendations and who would work on them – not really filled in. Why?

Rebecca – The ones that we don't have in the chart – are policies. We do want these types of sustainability ideas that will pilot these ideas so we differently want to make sure that this is public and private.

Satya – The chart... I think that all of recommendations should be in the chart and have the Common Council – or have a separate list so the council knows what they are responsible for.

Lakes – Don't think that filling in the lake is sustainable – from an environmental perspective. We should look at a plan that looks at covering John Nolan Drive... and using the existing space better. (send Satya – the Seattle idea).

Activating the street – the height isn't as much of an issue – but want is happening on the ground floor

– how much sidewalk there is... (setback for larger sidewalk space). Cities – other cities that are doing other gathering spacing – parallel park, micro parks. Plan should provide additional ideas in this area. Other areas for public space – not just private space but public space.

Noise is an issue but is also speed – they are inter-connected. This should be looked at regarding where pedestrians walk and where bikes go.

Rebecca – looking at outer-loop – one-ways to two-ways... as a way to address this.

Satya – how can we increase density here and in just outside the downtown can increase – so we don't just have lots of high-rises.

Rebecca – This is a downtown plan so we focus here but we do mention this issue – we also talk about the transportation so that folks can easily get into the downtown.

Satya – Good regarding - urban forest – There is a need for urban agriculture.... This is tough – but it is a desire. We need to look at developing a soil standard for street trees so that they are more protected. Edible landscaping – fruit/nut trees – this should be in the plan. Storm water management – goal for downtown – as much storm water management as possible in the downtown – because of the lakes.

Marc – audience...

Rebecca – Implementation section will be internal but the document should be for the public. City has talked with many people...

Marc – Looking at the different between runners/bikers and walking. Law Park how do you expand it?

Rebecca – we are thinking about the entire John Nolan Drive... The plan adds about 2-acres – the DNR did give permission for about 4 acres... we would need to get a new permit. The bridges are big - 30 feet across.

Marc – we here at SDE had a discussion regarding tolls – have you have any discussion about that?

Rebecca – you can already get better rates – we need to advertise this more.

Marc – the Matrix – 108-116... the call to action – many considering putting that at the beginning of the documents.

Rebecca – could be a separate piece.

General discuss about using this as a way to navigate – and link to the document.

Lucas – I think we need more density and jobs in the downtown – we need to increase beyond what we are doing now.

Rebecca – The goals might be light. (doubles what we did just did in the last 20 years)... so more commercial and residential – goals might be light but we are trying to accelerate this rate.

Lucas – I think we need to increase the areas that are possible for redevelopment. This is all artificial shoreline, this not a huge fill project – of course this is a big issue that needs to be studied.

I think you should so some of the more of the non-park open space – such as kohl's center space...

David – lighting standards for street lighting – consider some dark-sky should considered. Also urban animals also needs to be addressed.

Lou – these are not natural shoreline – creating an edge – that work for people – this is not a big deal for me. I think this can really be a great way to connect the city to the lake.

Downtown Design Professionals – what did you think of it – what was incorporated – why/why not?

Rebecca – Some departures regarding Law Park – Didn't want to cut off Willy, there are issue with access with burying John Nolan...

Lou – How much were the downtown neighborhoods involved in the plan –

Rebecca - DMI group and the NA's – capital – Tenney... etc... very interested in heights, peds, etc. some of the NA's plans have lower building heights – and the downtown plan should push the heights....

Lou – Can some of these ideas be pushed – to other parts of the city.

Rebecca – There is a planner on all of the resource teams – so help push some of these ideas to other areas.

Satya – where is the planning department going next with NA – plans? Is there a plan? How old...greatest need?

Lance – at the Sasya NA – His goal in 2012 – plan for planning... template for helping the neighborhood association – helping them get ready to write a plan.

Chris – affordable housing and schools. The plan needs more in the plan – more specifics – should look at not only public schools and private schools.

Chris – Approval of Downtown Plan with consideration of SDE comments.

Marc – Second Unanimously Approved.

Return to Plan Commission with the following recommendations:

Consider noise and speed of cars in the downtown plan when dealing with residential density as it is a big issue...cars make a lot of noise.

Consider robust storm water management goals because of the downtown's close proximity to the lakes - consider pilot projects in the downtown in more areas that just parks

Consider a more robust goal for transportation and look for ways to increase percentage using alternative modes such as bikes and better way-finding, transit and increased service and downtown circulator.

Consider a more directly mention of the transportation plan.

At the end of the plan – there should be a more complete summary or chart listing all recommendations and who would work on them – consider listing the Common Council of the recommendation requires a policy adoption.

Consider not have a recommendation to fill in the lake and a more robust recommendation to cover parts of John Nolan Drive and use the existing space on Monona Terrace better!

Consider more ways to activate the street such as, sidewalk width, parallel park and micro parks.

Consider vehicular speed in the downtown as it is a barrier to pedestrians and bikes.

Consider looking at residential densities for not just the downtown but also just outside of the downtown.

Consider developing a soil standard for street trees so that they are more protected.

Consider edible landscaping such as fruit/nut trees.

Consider pages 108-116 putting that at the beginning of the document or as a separate piece.

Consider more density and jobs downtown.

Consider noting green space in the plan that is not part space such as space in front of Kohl Center Urban animals needs to be addressed.

Noted that much of the lake shore in Madison is not natural and if we can make the space better for people- this can really be a great way to connect the city to the lake.

There needs to more in the plan regarding affordable housing and schools. The plan needs more in the plan – more specifics – about schools and this should include public and private schools.

**Notes:**

1	PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/ MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION	01/24/2012	Refer	PEDESTRIAN/BIC YCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION	02/29/2012	Pass
---	--	------------	-------	---	------------	------



**Action Text:** Mike Waidelich from City Planning presented information on transportation related issues in the Downtown Plan including recommendations on rail, intermodal facilities, transit oriented development, parking needs, bicycle facilities, and wayfinding. PBMVC discussed various recommendations on the plan and how to present comments and recommendations to the Plan Commission. Members stated that a long list of comments and meeting notes will not clearly convey important recommendations, and rather, a list of clear and concise recommendations should be provided. PBMVC members will prepare comments and specific recommendations to bring to the February PBMVC meeting. PBMVC will discuss those comments and recommendations and compile a list of recommendations to forward to the Plan Commission.

A motion was made by Maniaci, seconded by Holloway, to Refer to the PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION to the February meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

**Notes:**

1 URBAN DESIGN 01/25/2012  
COMMISSION

**Action Text:** Further discussion to be continued.

**Notes:**

1 MADISON'S CENTRAL 02/02/2012 Return to Lead with PLAN 06/18/2012 Pass  
BUSINESS the Following COMMISSION  
IMPROVEMENT Recommendation(s)  
DISTRICT (BID) BOARD

**Action Text:** This Resolution was Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s) to the PLAN COMMISSION

**Notes:** The motion to Return to Lead with the following Recommendation(s) of approval with amendments passed by the following vote: 13-0  
[AYE: Riechers, Springman, Nemeth, Sullivan, Amundson, Broderick, Frank, Mehl, Miller, Milsted, Norman, Petri, Werhane; ABSTAIN: Lichte].

1 URBAN DESIGN 02/08/2012  
COMMISSION

**Action Text:** Continued discussion.

**Notes:**

1 ECONOMIC 02/15/2012 Return to Lead with PLAN 06/18/2012 Pass  
DEVELOPMENT the Following COMMISSION  
COMMITTEE Recommendation(s)

**Action Text:** A motion was made by Alder Clear, seconded by Mr. Zimmerman, to Return to the Plan Commission with the following recommendations: to recommend approval of the Downtown Plan and accept the Subcommittees motions and other changes made at this meeting.

The motion passed by voice vote.

**Notes:**

1 ECONOMIC 02/15/2012  
DEVELOPMENT  
COMMITTEE

**Notes:**

1 LONG RANGE 02/16/2012 Return to Lead with PLAN 06/18/2012 Pass  
TRANSPORTATION the COMMISSION  
PLANNING COMMITTEE Recommendation for  
Approval

**Action Text:** A motion was made by Shahan, seconded by Schmidt, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the PLAN COMMISSION,. The motion passed by the following vote:

**Notes:** David Trowbridge reminded Committee members that (at the January 19th meeting) it had asked to refer ID 24468 to this evening's meeting, with the intent to develop a list of items to be considered by the Plan Commission. He said that he would put together a memorandum (from LRTPC to Plan Commission) summarizing the comments.

Chair Webber asked for any initial comments or questions. Eric Sundquist noted that he does not support filling the lake for additional parkland. Robbie Webber

wished to express the need for a complete and detailed survey of existing bicycle parking in the central business district. Mark Shahan said that the Downtown Plan references three separate intermodal/transit stations or hubs - noting that this should be refined to one, or at most two. Shahan also noted that mode split data should be more refined to reflect just downtown-oriented trips. Eric Sundquist said that intelligent transportation system (ITS) technologies should be referenced strongly in the Transportation section (as a mechanism to assist with parking pricing policies and to assist with way finding efforts).

Chair Robbie Webber asked for specific comments to be included in the memorandum. She also asked Committee members to speak up if they disagreed with any of the suggested changes.

The Committee asked that the following "Vision" statement be added to the Downtown Plan (integrated into Key 6: Increase Transportation Choices):

"The city should recognize the environmental, economic and social costs of continuing to rely on the automobile long term and seek the cooperation and support of our County, State and Federal partners for a long range strategy that envisions a downtown Madison where motorized vehicles are significantly deemphasized as the primary means of getting to and circulating around the downtown. This vision must include multi-year efforts to educate the public and policy makers about the types of land use and infrastructural changes needed to make this vision possible. This vision must also include high capacity transit service improvements and improvements to non-motorized forms of transportation - in order to provide high-quality transportation options for people moving to, through and around the downtown".

The Committee recommended the following insertion into the Transportation Section or a separate section on measuring success of the Downtown Plan: Measures for safety, accessibility and mode split.

The mode split data on page 72 needs to be updated (year 2000 data is not relevant) and expanded beyond work trips, if possible. In addition, mode split should be further refined to better reflect trips to and from the central business district.

The Committee recommended including a specific improvement to improve pedestrian connections at the John Nolen Drive/Williamson Street intersection, before improvements to the lakeshore are implemented.

Mark Shahan/Ald. Chris Schmidt submitted a motion to recommend adoption of Resolution ID 24668, and forward LRTPC comments (via memorandum) to the Plan Commission for their consideration. That motion passed 5-1 (Margaret Bergamini voted "no").

Ayes: 5 Eric W. Sundquist; Lucas K. Dailey; Steve King; Chris Schmidt and Mark N. Shahan

Noes: 1 Margaret Bergamini

Excused: 3 Susan M. Schmitz; Marsha A. Rummel and Charles A. Erickson

Non Voting: 1 Robbie Webber

1	DOWNTOWN COORDINATING COMMITTEE	02/16/2012	Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval	PLAN COMMISSION	06/18/2012	Pass
---	---------------------------------------	------------	--	--------------------	------------	------

**Action Text:** This Resolution was Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval with the following recommendations for revisions, clarifications and/or changes to the document before it is finalized.

**KEY 1 – CELEBRATE THE LAKES**

We support Objective 1.1 and its six recommendations

We would suggest that water sports other than boating, such as kayaking, fishing, paragliding, etc. should also be encouraged on the lakefront,

**KEY 2 – STRENGTHEN THE REGION'S ECONOMIC ENGINE**

**Employment**

Objective 2.1 emphasizes the focus on tech-based businesses. The objective and supporting recommendations should also point out the target of Creative Industries as being desired in the recruitment efforts.

**Room to Grow**

Objective 2.3 -- We are supportive of the objective but do not see connections in the plan that will provide the actions required to achieve these goals.

The call for predictability in process, but flexibility in opportunity is important to the sectors of the market who will be responsible for the innovation and creating in investing in the type of buildings and supporting infrastructure needed in achieving the vision of the plan. Also, there should be acknowledgement that the downtown area is the place in Madison where density should be encouraged.

Recommendation 16 – should read “Guide and Incentivize development to locations recommended in this Plan.”

**Retail**

The Plan must recognize that the downtown is a regional attraction and visitor destination, and that the City and its partners must work to maintain this unique position. The current objective should be stronger in its vision, but based on retail realities.

**Objective 2.5**

Recommendation 23 – Provide more convenient access to retail goods and services through business clustering and placement strategies to build critical mass of contiguous retail, encourage cross-shopping opportunities, avoid potential commercial conflicts, and reduce business turnover.

**Vibrant, Engaging Downtown Environment**

**Objective 2.6**

Recommendation 30 – add a mix of executive housing and affordable workforce housing.

**Visitor and Tourist Information**

**Objective 2.7**

This objective is weak. It should incorporate the strategic plans that have been defined in the CVB's Destination 2020 documents.

**KEY #3: ENSURE A QUALITY URBAN ENVIRONMENT**

Support the key's vision of creating a “sense of place” in the downtown, and that this place should be an experience destination that is responsive to the mix of users in the downtown area.

**Views**

**Objective 3.1**

We support this objective recognizing that the view shed contributes to the visitor perspective and that views are one of our many assets.

Recommendation 35: Recommend flexibility in implementation to achieve the objective and remove the blanket requirement of setbacks and stepbacks so that implementation will balance innovation with the maintenance of the viewshed.

Recommendation 36: Recognize that not only are the tops of buildings important, but the street level facades also contribute to the positive experience and are important.

Mix of Land Uses

Objective 3.2 should read "Provide a dynamic and flexible mix of land uses and densities that enable ample opportunities..."

Recommendation 41 - Flexibility should be stated rather than assumed.

Building Scale

Objective 3.3: Support the objective's acknowledgement that buildings fit into the greater fabric of the downtown.

Recommendation #45: Staff should further clarify areas where setbacks, stepbacks and/or built-to line requirements are intended

Recommendation #46: Remove and incorporate into recommendation #45.

Urban Forest

Objective 3.5

Recommendation 52 and 54 - Add retail signage considerations as a factor influencing placement of street trees.

KEY 4- MAINTAIN STRONG NEIGHBORHOODS AND DISTRICTS

West Rail Corridor

Recommendation 75: add the word "mixed-use " in the text to be consistent with the language in the recommendation.

KEY 6 – INCREASE TRANSPORTATION CHOICES

The introductions should clearly state that implementation of the Complete Streets principles and practices in the Downtown is a fundamental component of the transportation vision embodied in this plan.

Comprehensive Transportation Study

Objective 6.9 with its single recommendation 158 - "Prepare a comprehensive multi-modal transportation and parking strategy..." - is the over-arching recommendation of Key 6 and should be listed first. All other objectives and recommendations in Key 6 should be considered components or inputs to the comprehensive transportation and parking study proposed in the City's 2012 budget.

The area of study for the comprehensive transportation and parking strategy should conform to the expanded sense of "downtown" (including Capitol East, West Rail Employment, Park Street Health, and UW Campus areas) discussed in opening text of the whole plan and of Key 6. Moving Objective 6.9 up to the beginning provides a better segue from the opening statements of Key 6 and sets the context for the presentation of the subsequent transportation objectives. In addition to what is listed on page 90, important topics for the comprehensive transportation and parking strategy should include:

- Identify a specific location for a downtown inter-city bus terminal.
- Reevaluate the viability of Doyle Square as the site of a transportation hub. The site was hastily identified in 2010 by Governor Doyle as the location for the Amtrak Passenger Rail station. It's feasibility as multi-modal transit hub was not thoroughly studied. Now that the Midwest Regional Rail Initiative has decided it will by-pass Madison in the Milwaukee-to-Twin Cities route, the likelihood of this location serving as an Amtrak station in the next 20 years, if ever, is miniscule. The site should be considered for a local commuter rail station as part of future service between Middleton, the airport and/or Sun Prairie. Lastly, Doyle Square has limited Madison Metro connectivity compared to other potential sites. (Also see Recommendation 60 under Objective 4.1)
- Evaluate converting the entire downtown one-way network to two-way operation to reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), improve navigation for out-of-town visitors, improve visibility and access for downtown businesses, and enable successful achievement of the complete streets principles for the downtown environment.
- Identify physical strategies that would support a downtown two-way conversion such as establishment of closer-to-downtown park-and-shuttle locations (e.g. East Washington & First Street, South Park Street & the Beltline, and University & Segoe). Such perimeter sites to downtown will lend themselves to Transit Oriented Development in addition to relieving the pressure of the single-occupant vehicle on the core.

- Identify incentive strategies that would support a downtown two-way conversion such as expanded Transportation Demand Management programs with local employers.

#### Connections to Other Cities

Remove the assumption that the Monona Terrace site will be the future location of the Amtrak Passenger Rail Station. Leave the option open for other potential sites to be evaluated as discussed above in Objective 6.9 and below in Recommendation 112.

#### Objective 6.1

Recommendation 112 – Change this recommendation to: “Explore potential sites for a future inter-city passenger rail station. Madison may someday connect with the Midwest Regional Rail system and the station will likely need to be located on the main line route that links Madison via Watertown to the east and Portage to the north. Potential sites could be Union Corners, First Street & East Washington, or the Dane County Regional Airport, among other possibilities.”

Recommendations 113 and 115 – Combine these recommendations into one: “Locate an inter-city bus terminal downtown. Integrate the bus terminal with or provide close proximity to a variety of intermodal connections such as a bike station, multiple Madison Metro Bus routes, commuter rail, downtown circulator (streetcar) service, car sharing service and motor vehicle parking to facilitate the first or final leg of an inter-city trip.”

Recommendation 114 – Add: “In the future, airport connectivity should be part of a larger commuter rail service with metropolitan and suburban connectivity in addition to downtown.”

#### Transit Service

Make a stronger statement about the vision for transit. For example: “The goal for downtown is that for more and more people (consumers), places (destinations) and purposes (employment, recreation, tourism, etc.), transit will be the travel option of choice because it is attractive, convenient and efficient.”

#### Objective 6.2

Recommendation 116 – add: “A regional transit entity should have a dedicated funding source such as a sales tax, wheel tax or other mechanism. Absent reinstatement of RTA’s by the legislature, Dane County and the City of Madison should work together to explore and establish a greater metropolitan area transit system on their own authority. Such a system would implement the transit services discussed in this section throughout Madison and the rest of Dane County.”

Recommendation 123 - Add to the final sentence: “and to downtown perimeter park-and-shuttle facilities located at downtown-edge sites, for example East Washington and First Street, South Park and the Beltline, and University and Segoe.” (Also see Objective 2.2, recommendations 13 and 14.)

#### Complete Streets

The Downtown Plan should acknowledge that the one-way traffic system, implemented in the mid-20th century in Madison and many other cities, has had a long-term negative impact on the downtown environment and economy.

#### Objective 6.3

Recommendation 124 – Change to: “Review and evaluate the benefits and costs of converting the one-way network back to two-way in the greater downtown area between Breese Terrace on the west and Baldwin Street on the east.”

Add a new Recommendation (between 126 and 127): “Study establishing W. Mifflin between the Square (Philosophers’ Grove) and the Kohl Center as an intensive, complete street. Consider the concept of “woonerf” (as described by the Downtown Design Professionals) - a curbless, free-form esplanade used equally by all modes. This five block experiment could be the catalyst for reinventing the West Mifflin area as a unique urban place with a dynamic variety of mixed uses and building styles like nowhere else in the City. This recommendation is valid for both Mifflin neighborhood alternatives presented for Objective 4.3 in this Plan.

#### Parking

The idea of “park once” should include the concept that the parking location not be all the way downtown. There is evidence that commuting drivers into Madison are willing to shift modes to transit, bicycle or walking for the last “mile or so” of their trip.

The overbuilding of parking capacity downtown will never allow a transition away from Automobile-Oriented-Development in the urban core. City parking policy and practices must be part of an overall strategy of active Transportation Demand Management in the downtown, and not simply respond to demand related to one mode. Parking demand management needs to be part of the comprehensive multi-modal solution. (Also see Objective 2.1, recommendation 12.)

Objective 6.4

Recommendation 131 – Please add: “In addition, the consultant should examine the fundamental land use problem of devoting high-cost downtown land to automobile parking (all day storage) instead of using lower-cost land on the perimeter.”

Recommendation 132 – Add the following: “Dedicate stalls in Madison Parking Utility facilities for use by car sharing services.”

Add a new recommendation: “Address the problem of moped parking on front lawns and terraces in downtown neighborhoods.”

Add a new recommendation: “Evaluate the policies for on-street parking in downtown and adjoining neighborhoods. Include an evaluation of the costs associated with on-street parking permits to ensure that the price for annual permits reflects the full cost to the City.”

Bicycle Facilities

Objective 6.5

Recommendation 139 – Conduct more consumer market research to determine desirable locations for bike stations.

Recommendation 140 – Add: “Provide more bicycle parking in all existing Madison Parking Utility facilities downtown.”

Pedestrian Connections

Objective 6.6

Recommendation 146 – Clarify the extent to which the Langdon mid-block walk way is intended for motor vehicles and specify measures to separate pedestrian and bicycle flow.

Wayfinding

The wayfinding problems of visitors described on page 88 should be identified as one of the enduring negative impacts upon the Downtown environment and economy resulting from the introduction of the one-way network of streets in the mid-20th Century.

Objective 6.7

We support the wayfinding recommendations under objective 6.7.

Transportation Demand Management

A robust set of Transportation Demand Management strategies is an essential part of diversifying travel demand across more modes of transportation and away from dependence on the single occupant vehicle (SOV). Such diversification will be essential to the successful conversion of the downtown street system from one-way to two-way. This section presents a rather passive role for the City in this area. There should more the City can actively do to increase the adoption and implementation of TDM programs.

Objective 6.8

Add a new recommendation: “The City will support expansion of car sharing services in the Downtown including providing at least one car sharing vehicle in all Madison Parking Utility facilities.”

KEY 7: BUILD ON HISTORIC RESOURCES

Recommendations 163 – In the text define the nomination process for potential landmarks.

KEY 8 – EXPAND RECREATIONAL, CULTURAL AND ENTERTAINMENT OFFERINGS

The key should incorporate the city’s tools of using policy and recommendations that will encourage developing downtown as an experience destination that allows the private sector entertainment facilities to develop and for innovative business opportunities to come to fruition. It is known that arts and culture will develop organically, and the city’s role is to provide the infrastructure necessary to support and encourage this growth.

Arts Cultural and Entertainment Venues

Objective 8.3

Recommendation 187 – Add “Develop flexible land use and massing policies to allow for a wide range of urban multi-place entertainment venues, given market demands” to existing language

Recommendation 189 – Add “Position the district as a regional visitor destination by providing high standard as clean, safe, visitor friendly.” to the existing language

Recommendation 191: - Promote the arts, culture and entertainment by supporting collaboration between or among ...

KEY 9 – BECOME A MODEL OF SUSTAINABILITY

Objective 9.1

Add a new recommendation: “Green roofs will be installed on City buildings wherever possible and on new construction to improve energy efficiency and reduce the heat island effect. City buildings and new construction on land sold by the City for development should be models of sustainability.

CALL TO ACTION

The vision laid out in the narrative of the Downtown Plan clearly identifies the downtown as the economic and cultural center of our region. To achieve this, the key will be a thriving economic base that continues to grow, adapt and flex to meet the changing needs of the population that lives, works and plays within the downtown. The balance between “idea and action” in the current Downtown Plan is unclear. The success of the implementation of the plan is contingent on the Public and Private sectors working together.

To emphasize this, it is recommended that:

1. The Call to Action incorporate every recommendation in the Plan, and that each action item identify the City AND private sector resources/partners needed to achieve success.
2. Incorporate a full set of the City’s tools that it has at its disposal to achieve success. More emphasis on the City’s use of incentives, funding opportunities and encouragement tools should be incorporated throughout the plan narrative and the Call to Action as these tools will support the elements that will ultimately be implemented by the private sector and will be necessary to achieve success.

Notes:

1	BOARD OF ESTIMATES	02/20/2012	Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval	PLAN COMMISSION	06/18/2012	Pass
---	--------------------	------------	---	-----------------	------------	------

**Action Text:** A motion was made by Verveer, seconded by Clausius, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the PLAN COMMISSION. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

Notes:

1	PLAN COMMISSION	02/23/2012	Re-refer	PLAN COMMISSION	06/18/2012	
---	-----------------	------------	----------	-----------------	------------	--

**Action Text:** This Resolution was Re-referred to the PLAN COMMISSION

Notes:

1	URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	02/29/2012	Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval	Department of Planning and Community and Economic Development		Pass
---	-------------------------	------------	---	---	--	------

**Action Text:** A motion was made by Huggins, seconded by Slayton, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the Department of Planning and Community and Economic Development. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

Notes:

1	PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION	02/29/2012	Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s)	PLAN COMMISSION	06/18/2012	Pass
---	---	------------	---	-----------------	------------	------



**Action Text:** A motion was made by Maniaci, seconded by Crandall, to Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s) to the PLAN COMMISSION.

- Remove the path on East Dayton shown on page 87 from the plan.
- Add to recommendation 149 on page 86: "Consult with Triangle Neighborhood on East Campus Mall connections."
- The city should recognize the environmental costs of continuing to rely on automobiles long term, and should seek the cooperation and support of our County, State and Federal partners for a long range strategy that envisions a downtown Madison where motorized vehicles are significantly deemphasized as the primary means of getting to and circulating around the downtown. This vision must include multi-year efforts to educate the public and policy makers about the types of land use and infrastructural changes needed to make this vision possible. This vision must also include the creation of high(er) frequency, high capacity transit service and improved non-motorized transportation options for the movement of people to and around the downtown with the goal of a modal breakdown for all trips to the downtown area of 20% ridesharing, 20% biking, 20% walking, 30% riding transit, and 10% driving single occupant vehicles.
- In addition to, and separate from recommendation 140, add a recommendation that the City should invest in public bicycle parking infrastructure targeted toward older downtown residential districts.
- Install color coded wayfinding markers in the Capitol Square area including the inner and outer loop
- City should fund a TDM or Smart Trips program for downtown businesses, residents, and events.
- Lower transit fees for low income residents.
- Have a core bus system running 24/7 that can accommodate 2nd and 3rd shift workers, as well as 1st shift workers.

The motion passed by voice vote/other.

**Notes:** A motion was made by Maniaci, seconded by Crandall, to Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s) to the PLAN COMMISSION:

- Remove the path on East Dayton shown on page 87 from the plan.
- Add to recommendation 149 on page 86: "Consult with Triangle Neighborhood on East Campus Mall connections."
- The city should recognize the environmental costs of continuing to rely on automobiles long term, and should seek the cooperation and support of our County, State and Federal partners for a long range strategy that envisions a downtown Madison where motorized vehicles are significantly deemphasized as the primary means of getting to and circulating around the downtown. This vision must include multi-year efforts to educate the public and policy makers about the types of land use and infrastructural changes needed to make this vision possible. This vision must also include the creation of high(er) frequency, high capacity transit service and improved non-motorized transportation options for the movement of people to and around the downtown with the goal of a modal breakdown for all trips to the downtown area of 20% ridesharing, 20% biking, 20% walking, 30% riding transit, and 10% driving single occupant vehicles.
- In addition to, and separate from recommendation 140, add a recommendation that the City should invest in public bicycle parking infrastructure targeted toward older downtown residential districts.
- Install color coded wayfinding markers in the Capitol Square area including the inner and outer loop
- City should fund a TDM or Smart Trips program for downtown businesses, residents, and events.
- Lower transit fees for low income residents.
- Have a core bus system running 24/7 that can accommodate 2nd and 3rd shift workers, as well as 1st shift workers.

The motion passed by voice vote/other.

1	PLAN COMMISSION	03/08/2012	Re-refer	PLAN COMMISSION	06/18/2012
	<b>Action Text:</b>	This Resolution was Re-referred to the PLAN COMMISSION			
	<b>Notes:</b>				
1	PLAN COMMISSION	03/13/2012	Re-refer	PLAN COMMISSION	06/18/2012
	<b>Action Text:</b>	This Resolution was Re-referred to the PLAN COMMISSION			
	<b>Notes:</b>				
1	PLAN COMMISSION	03/22/2012	Re-refer	PLAN COMMISSION	06/18/2012
	<b>Action Text:</b>	This Resolution was Re-referred to the PLAN COMMISSION			
	<b>Notes:</b>				
1	PLAN COMMISSION	03/29/2012			
	<b>Notes:</b>	A. <u>Key 3: Ensure a Quality Urban Environment</u>			

A motion was made by Schmidt, seconded by King, to approve Key 3 with the staff recommendations and consideration of the following changes/comments:

- a) page 35- Obj. 3.1 (memorandum page 2, row 3)- The Commission discussed clarifying where the views are to and from for the priority viewsheds, but did not take specific action on this or the recommended change and decided to revisit it after the discussions on height and the West Washington Ave. corridor.
- b) page 36- The southern "priority viewshed" on the Views and Vistas Map should be revised pursuant to staff's recommendation that it be narrowed somewhat.
- c) page 36- Consider adding a recommendation that projects in a viewshed should have to prepare a viewshed study.
- d) page 38- Obj. 3.2 (memorandum page 2, row 6)- There should be a definition of "density" somewhere in this section.
- e) page 40- Move the Downtown 2000 Land Use Map and associated text to Appendix A, and also add the 1970 Land Use Map to Appendix A.
- f) page 41- Obj. 3.3 (memorandum page 3, row 3)- Clarify that if an area is planned for change, a new project would need to be compatible with that vision.
- g) page 41- Rec. 44 (memorandum page 3, row 5 and page 4 row 1)- Support using the PDD process to exceed the height limit based on standards that will be developed as part of the Downtown Zoning Districts. Also support for using the Conditional Use process to grant up to two bonus stories in bonus areas where height is the only bulk requirement proposed to be altered, with any request above that having to go through the PDD process.
- h) page 41- Say in the text that the current Downtown Design Zones are proposed to be eliminated.
- i) page 41- Rec. 47- Clarify that this refers to a digital model and not a physical one.
- j) page 41- last paragraph- Look at measuring height from the highest existing grade on the site.
- k) page 42- first paragraph, last sentence- Change "might be taller" to "could be taller".
- l) page 42 - second paragraph- Consider allowing some small enclosure on rooftops.
- m) page 44- The Streetscape Design Map should differentiate between the treatment of the outer loop and John Nolen Drive.
- n) page 44- Consider adding a reference in the text that talks about the civic node at the West Mifflin St. / Fairchild St. intersection.
- o) page 45 - Rec. 55 (memorandum page 4, row 10)- Add devoting more space and high-quality soils to support canopy trees in the terrace.
- p) page 45 (memorandum page 5, row 1)- Add developing a tree preservation ordinance.
- q) (memorandum page 5, row 2)- Support adding the BID's recommendation.
- r) In general, do not list references to specific page numbers for maps, but instead list the name of the map.

B. Appendix C: Maximum Building Heights - Bonus Story Criteria

A motion was made by Schmidt, seconded by King, to approve Appendix C with the staff recommendations and consideration of the following changes/comments:

- a) page 127 (memorandum page 5, row 4)- Clarify that if bonus areas D, E, or F become local historic districts that the bonus story provisions will need to be revisited.
- b) Bonus area B should be extended east on the 400 block of East Wilson St. to the viewshed line.
- c) Remove all references to "potential landmarks" in this section.
- d) The criteria should be more general and generic, and not have different criteria for specific sites.
- e) Need to clarify what is meant by "restoration".

C. Key 4: Maintain Strong Neighborhoods and Districts

The Commission referred discussion on this section until the next meeting.

D. A Call to Action

A motion was made by King, seconded by Cantrell, to approve this section of the plan without change except what may be necessary to reflect the Plan Commission's revisions to earlier sections. Approved by voice vote/other.

1 PLAN COMMISSION 04/11/2012

**Notes:** A. Key 4: Maintain Strong Neighborhoods and Districts

A motion was made by King, seconded by Sundquist, to approve Key 4 with the staff recommendations and consideration of the following changes/comments:

- a) page 48- The Simeon Mills Historic District should be on the map.
- b) page 48- The Brayton Lot should be on the map or have block numbers in parenthesis in the text.
- c) page 49- Rec. 56 (memorandum page 6, row 3)- Add the 100 blocks of E. and W. Mifflin St.
- d) page 49- Rec. 62 (memorandum page 6, row 7)- Change to: "Preserve and rehabilitate landmarks

- and encourage the adaptive reuse of heritage resources.”
- e) page 50- Clarify the text that a State Street historic district was proposed, and was determined to be eligible, but was not supported.
  - f) page 50- Obj. 4.2 (memorandum page 8, row 1)- Change to: “As a premier destination, the State Street district should continue to encourage a vibrant, diverse, dynamic mix of uses and users, a human scale and unique sense of place, and evolution as a shopping, dining, entertainment and cultural destination. The existing character should be supported, and ground floor spaces should be reserved for retail and eating/drinking establishments while additional office uses on upper floors should be considered. Many of the buildings are historic or architecturally significant and should be retained.” The objective should include that a balance needs to be struck between physical scale and business needs.
  - g) page 50- Consider adding a recommendation that some redevelopment opportunities may occur to create more functional retail space.
  - h) page 50- In the text reference the need to accommodate a mix of store sizes.
  - i) page 50- Rec. 64 (memorandum page 8, row 3)- Change to: “Support the retention, expansion, and establishment of a mix of locally owned businesses while allowing a mix of national and international businesses; with a flexible range of business sizes including destination retail.”
  - j) page 50- Rec. 65 (memorandum page 8, row 4)- Include looking at existing TIF policies to provide assistance to help improve older commercial structures. Also, make a reference to this in Key 7 and change Rec. 62 if necessary to be consistent.
  - k) page 51- Mifflin (excluding the 400-500 blocks of W. Washington Ave.)- Allow a mix of uses including research, employment, residential (both student and non-student), and neighborhood-serving retail in some areas (not generally mid-block). Establish a maximum building height of 6-stories. Promote the following characteristics: No preference towards preservation of the house-like form, ground floors should be designed for commercial uses but that could accommodate residential uses, wide tree terraces with larger trees, and urban open spaces, but not “useable open space” as defined by the Zoning Code.
  - l) page 51- 400-500 blocks of W. Washington Ave. - Allow a mix of uses, but primarily residential. Establish a maximum building height of 4-stories + 2 bonus stories. Promote the following characteristics: No preference towards preservation of the house-like form, ground floor commercial use is OK, but upper floors should emphasize residential uses, consistent setbacks as described in the Letter of Transmittal alternative, preserve the wide terraces, and don’t create a boulevard (median).
  - m) page 56- In the text add a reference to “Student Co-op Row” with the reference to “Greek Row.”
  - n) page 57- Obj. 4.9 (memorandum page 11, row 3)- Delete: “for executives, families, and students.”
  - o) page 58- first paragraph, last sentence- The private drive connecting Wisconsin Ave. and Pinckney St. also needs to be shown on a transportation map.
  - p) page 58- Obj. 4.10- Add a reference to workforce housing.
  - q) page 59- Rec. 86- Add a reference to workforce housing and note that the existing housing stock includes many larger units that are family supportive.

There was a consensus of the Commission that a recommendation should be added to page 35 that states: “Viewshed studies may be used to demonstrate that a proposed development has no negative impacts on priority viewsheds.”

1	PLAN COMMISSION	06/11/2012	Refer	PLAN COMMISSION	
	<b>Action Text:</b>	This Item was Referred to the PLAN COMMISSION			
2	PLAN COMMISSION	06/18/2012	RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT WITH CONDITIONS - REPORT OF OFFICER		Pass
	<b>Action Text:</b>	A motion was made by King, seconded by Rewey, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT WITH CONDITIONS - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by the following vote:			
	<b>Notes:</b>	<i>The Plan Commission recommended approval of the Downtown Plan subject to the comments and revisions recommended in Staff Memorandum 6 (Memo 6)(dated June 18, 2012), including the additional staff-recommended resolved clause in the alternate or substitute resolution, and the following revisions:</i>			

- That “as soon as possible” be added to the end of the first sentence of Recommendation 76 on page 37 of Memo 6, which would now read: “Prepare a detailed development concept plan, design standards, and a comprehensive implementation strategy to guide future redevelopment as soon as

possible. Recommendations may include building form as well as streetscape design standards to help create a distinctive urban character and sense of place."

- That the second to last sentence of the second full paragraph on page 36 of Memo 6 regarding W. Washington Avenue be revised to now read: "Of particular importance to this character is the grand appearance created by the consistent building setbacks, wide terraces and large canopy trees, and these features should be maintained as public amenities and not allow private use as redevelopment occurs."

- That the word "initiated" be removed from the last sentence of the last paragraph of the State Street section on page 33 of Memo 6. That sentence would now read: "However, in light of past efforts, this should only be considered if supported by a majority of the property owners."

- That the recommendations for the 400- and 500-blocks of W. Washington Avenue be separated out in the narrative.

- A motion by Ald. Rummel, seconded by Rewey to have staff prepare a map that better reflects the goals and character of the new West Washington Avenue District (per the previous recommendation regarding the 400- and 500-blocks) and revise the Mifflin District graphics as necessary passed 7-1 on the following vote: AYE: Ald. King, Ald. Rummel, Ald. Schmidt, Andrzejewski, Hamilton-Nisbet, Rewey, Sundquist; NAY: Cantrell; NON-VOTING: Fey; EXCUSED: Finnemore, Heifetz.

- A motion by Ald. Rummel, seconded by Rewey to revise Recommendation 73 on page 36 be revised to now read: "Establish a minimum two-story and maximum four-story building height in the Mifflin District, with up to two bonus additional stories allowed if stepped back" failed 3-5 on the following vote: AYE: Ald. Rummel, Andrzejewski, Rewey; NAY: Ald. King, Ald. Schmidt, Cantrell, Hamilton-Nisbet, Sundquist; NON-VOTING: Fey; EXCUSED: Finnemore, Heifetz.

- A motion by Ald. Rummel, seconded by Andrzejewski, to revise the second recommendation on page 10 of Memo 6 to add "However, PDD's to exceed building heights should be extremely rare." failed 2-6 on the following vote: AYE: Ald. Rummel, Andrzejewski; NAY: Ald. King, Ald. Schmidt, Cantrell, Hamilton-Nisbet, Rewey, Sundquist; NON-VOTING: Fey; EXCUSED: Finnemore, Heifetz.

Ayes: 6 Steve King; Chris Schmidt; Michael W. Rewey; Bradley A. Cantrell; Anna Andrzejewski and Tonya L. Hamilton-Nisbet

Noes: 2 Marsha A. Rummel and Eric W. Sundquist

Excused: 1 Michael G. Heifetz and John L. Finnemore

Non Voting: 1 Nan Fey

1	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE	06/20/2012		
2	COMMON COUNCIL	07/17/2012		
2	COMMON COUNCIL	07/17/2012	Adopt the following Amendment(s) to the Substitute	Pass

**Action Text:** A motion was made by Verveer, seconded by Bidar-Sielaff, to Adopt the following Amendment(s) to the Substitute. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

The amendments to the substitute were:

1) Planning Division Staff Memorandum to Mayor Soglin and Members of the Common Council (dated July 17, 2012)- page 2, paragraph 3- add a new sentence 4:

"However, the Mifflin area should not be considered as a campus expansion opportunity for the University."

4) Planning Division Staff Memorandum to Mayor Soglin and Members of the Common Council (dated July 17, 2012)- page 5, paragraph 3, sentence 2 - change to read:

"Of particular importance to this character is the grand appearance created by the consistent building setbacks, wide terraces and large canopy trees, and these features should be maintained as public amenities as redevelopment occurs. Driveway openings along this frontage should be minimized and use of the terrace for vehicle pull-outs or other private activities should not be allowed."

2 COMMON COUNCIL 07/17/2012 Adopt the following Amendment(s) to the Substitute Pass

**Action Text:** A motion was made by Verveer, seconded by Bidar-Sielaff, to Adopt the following Amendment(s) to the Substitute. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

The amendment to the substitute was:

2) Planning Division Staff Memorandum to Mayor Soglin and Members of the Common Council (dated July 17, 2012)- page 3, paragraph 2, sentence 4- change to read:

"Successful transformation of the Mifflin district into a truly engaging mixed-use neighborhood will depend heavily on the quality of design, and it is recommended that detailed planning for the future of this area include development of specific design standards addressing, at a minimum, setbacks and stepbacks."

2 COMMON COUNCIL 07/17/2012 Adopt the following Amendment(s) to the Substitute Pass

**Action Text:** A motion was made by Verveer, seconded by Bidar-Sielaff, to Adopt the following Amendment(s) to the Substitute. The motion passed by the following vote: 11-10.

The amendment to the substitute was:

3) Planning Division Staff Memorandum to Mayor Soglin and Members of the Common Council (dated July 17, 2012)- page 5, paragraph 2, sentence 5- change to read:

"Buildings up to four stories in height are recommended along both sides of West Washington Avenue, with the potential for two additional stories if there is a noticeable setback."

Ayes: 11 Bridget R. Maniaci; Lauren Cnare; Michael E. Verveer; Shiva Bidar-Sielaff; Marsha A. Rummel; Scott J. Resnick; Paul E. Skidmore; Brian L. Solomon; Satya V. Rhodes-Conway; Jill Johnson and Paul R. Soglin

Noes: 10 Lisa Subeck; Steve King; Chris Schmidt; Sue Ellingson; Tim Bruer; Larry Palm; Joseph R. Clausius; Anita Weier; Mark Clear and Matthew J. Phair

2 COMMON COUNCIL 07/17/2012 Adopt the following Amendment(s) to the Substitute Pass

**Action Text:** A motion was made by Verveer, seconded by Bidar-Sielaff, to Adopt the following Amendment(s) to the Substitute. The motion passed by the following vote: 11-10

The amendment to the substitute was:

5) Planning Division Staff Memorandum to Mayor Soglin and Members of the Common Council (dated July 17, 2012) page 5, Recommendation 78 - change to read:

"Recommendation 78: Establish a minimum two-story and maximum four-story building height on the West Washington Avenue frontage, with up to two additional stories allowed if there is a noticeable stepback."

Ayes: 11 Bridget R. Maniaci; Lauren Cnare; Michael E. Verveer; Shiva Bidar-Sielaff; Marsha A. Rummel; Scott J. Resnick; Paul E. Skidmore; Brian L. Solomon; Satya V. Rhodes-Conway; Jill Johnson and Paul R. Soglin

Noes: 10 Steve King; Chris Schmidt; Sue Ellingson; Tim Bruer; Larry Palm; Joseph R. Clausius; Anita Weier; Mark Clear; Matthew J. Phair and Lisa Subeck

2 COMMON COUNCIL 07/17/2012 Adopt the following Amendment(s) to the Substitute Fail

**Action Text:** A motion was made by Verveer, seconded by Bidar-Sielaff, to Adopt the following Amendment(s) to the Substitute. The motion failed by the following vote: 10-11

The amendments to the substitute were:

6) Planning Division Staff Memorandum 6 to the Plan Commission (dated June 18, 2012) - page 10, row 1 - change to read:

"Recommendation 44: Establish maximum building heights as shown on the Maximum Building Heights Map and incorporate them into the Zoning Ordinance to provide variety and reflect and enhance the varied topography of the Downtown. Maximum building heights may be exceeded through the planned development process. In bonus areas, the conditional use process may be used to approve uUp to two additional stories may be allowed in areas designated in Appendix C if approved by the Common Council. The processes and standards for exceeding the heights designated on the Maximum Building Heights Map will be developed as part of the Downtown Zoning Districts."

7) The proposed change to Recommendation 44 will require that Appendix C, as proposed in Memorandum 6, be revised to remove specific references to the conditional use process.

Ayes: 10 Lauren Cnare; Michael E. Verveer; Shiva Bidar-Sielaff; Marsha A. Rummel; Scott J. Resnick; Brian L. Solomon; Satya V. Rhodes-Conway; Sue Ellingson; Jill Johnson and Bridget R. Maniaci

Noes: 11 Steve King; Paul E. Skidmore; Chris Schmidt; Tim Bruer; Larry Palm; Joseph R. Clausius; Anita Weier; Mark Clear; Matthew J. Phair; Lisa Subeck and Paul R. Soglin

2 COMMON COUNCIL 07/17/2012 Adopt the following Amendment(s) to the Substitute Fail

**Action Text:** A motion was made by Verveer, seconded by Bidar-Sielaff, to Adopt the following Amendment(s) to the Substitute. The motion failed by the following vote: 10-10

The amendment to the substitute was:

8) Planning Division Staff Memorandum 6 to the Plan Commission (dated June 18, 2012)- page 10, row 2- add the following paragraph:

"The ability to propose buildings taller than shown on the Maximum Building Heights Map should be used as a tool to encourage buildings of truly exceptional design that respond to the specific context of their location and accomplish specific objectives defined for the area. It is intended to provide additional design flexibility to address unique circumstances and to create an incentive for projects that go beyond what is otherwise required to help achieve other objectives of this plan."

Ayes: 10 Michael E. Verveer; Shiva Bidar-Sielaff; Marsha A. Rummel; Brian L. Solomon; Satya V. Rhodes-Conway; Sue Ellingson; Larry Palm; Jill Johnson; Lauren Cnare and Bridget R. Maniaci

Noes: 10 Steve King; Scott J. Resnick; Paul E. Skidmore; Chris Schmidt; Tim Bruer; Joseph R. Clausius; Anita Weier; Mark Clear; Matthew J. Phair and Lisa Subeck  
Abstentions: 1 Paul R. Soglin

2 COMMON COUNCIL 07/17/2012 Adopt the following Amendment(s) to the Substitute Pass

**Action Text:** A motion was made by Maniaci, seconded by Cnare, to Adopt the following Amendment(s) to the Substitute. The motion passed by the following vote: 13-6

The amendment to the substitute was:

Remove Recommendation 150 from the Downtown Plan and corresponding map.

Ayes: 13 Shiva Bidar-Sielaff; Marsha A. Rummel; Paul E. Skidmore; Brian L. Solomon; Chris Schmidt; Sue Ellingson; Tim Bruer; Joseph R. Clausius; Anita Weier; Mark Clear; Lauren Cnare; Michael E. Verveer and Bridget R. Maniaci  
Noes: 6 Steve King; Satya V. Rhodes-Conway; Larry Palm; Jill Johnson; Matthew J. Phair and Lisa Subeck  
Abstentions: 1 Scott J. Resnick  
Non Voting: 1 Paul R. Soglin

2 COMMON COUNCIL 07/17/2012 Adopt the following Amendment(s) to the Substitute Pass

**Action Text:** A motion was made by Rummel, seconded by Weier, to Adopt the following Amendment(s) to the Substitute. The motion passed by the following vote:

The amendment to the substitute was:

1. In recommendation 1 (p.13), delete the phrase "including limited funding to expand the shoreline"
2. Delete paragraph 2 of Lane Park text on pp.14-15 and assorted diagrams and remove references to lake fill elsewhere in the plan. Replace paragraph 2 with the text:

"Lane Park should undergo a master plan process which would address the need to connect downtown to Lake Monona, and such planning should be done in conjunction with redesign of the John Nolen/Blair/Williamson St. intersection."

Ayes: 12 Marsha A. Rummel; Scott J. Resnick; Brian L. Solomon; Chris Schmidt; Satya V. Rhodes-Conway; Sue Ellingson; Larry Palm; Joseph R. Clausius; Anita Weier; Lisa Subeck; Lauren Cnare and Shiva Bidar-Sielaff  
Noes: 8 Steve King; Paul E. Skidmore; Tim Bruer; Jill Johnson; Mark Clear; Matthew J. Phair; Bridget R. Maniaci and Michael E. Verveer  
Non Voting: 1 Paul R. Soglin

2 COMMON COUNCIL 07/17/2012 Adopt Substitute As Amended Pass

**Action Text:** A motion was made by Bidar-Sielaff, seconded by Schmidt, to Adopt Substitute As Amended. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

Ayes: 21 Steve King; Scott J. Resnick; Paul E. Skidmore; Brian L. Solomon; Chris Schmidt; Satya V. Rhodes-Conway; Sue Ellingson; Tim Bruer; Larry Palm; Jill Johnson; Joseph R. Clausius; Anita Weier; Mark Clear; Matthew J. Phair; Lisa Subeck; Paul R. Soglin; Lauren Cnare; Bridget R. Maniaci; Michael E. Verveer; Shiva Bidar-Sielaff and Marsha A. Rummel

---

## Text of Legislative File 24468

### Fiscal Note

There is no fiscal impact associated with the adoption of the plan. Implementing recommendations within the plan may require the inclusion of expenditures in future capital and operating budgets, subject to Common Council approval at that time.

**Title**

A SUBSTITUTE Resolution Adopting the Downtown Plan as a Supplement to the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan.

**Body**

WHEREAS in early 2008 the City embarked on a process to create a new plan for the future of downtown Madison; and

WHEREAS the process to prepare the new plan included an extensive participation process which started with the review and affirmation of the Downtown Advisory Report prepared in 2004, as well as recommendations for the downtown contained in the City's 2006 Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS the planning process included a series of public workshops, large-scale public meetings, the development and evaluation of general approaches to address issues and opportunities, the identification and refinement of preliminary concepts, and finally the issuance of draft recommendations in September 2010; and

WHEREAS since the draft recommendations were released, staff have continued to meet with policy makers, City agencies and the general public to receive comments and to finalize the recommendations included in the Downtown Plan; and

WHEREAS the plan for downtown Madison describes the desired vision for the future of downtown and provides recommendations to guide land use and investment decisions over time to ensure that the vision for downtown is achieved.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Madison Common Council hereby adopts the Downtown Plan as a supplement to the City's Comprehensive Plan to be used as a guide in making land use, development and investment decisions within the downtown.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the recommendations shall be used by the Department of Planning and Community and Economic Development to finalize the draft zoning districts for the downtown to be included in the City's new zoning code.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the adopted Downtown Plan includes the Plan Commission's final report and recommendations, and that Planning Division staff is authorized to incorporate these changes and make non-substantive editorial changes to improve clarity, consistency, and readability, including the supporting graphics, in developing the final plan document.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that the Department of Planning and Community and Economic Development shall monitor the implementation status of recommendations included in the plan and shall work to update the plan within 10 years.