

From: [Larson, Aidan](#)
To: [Larson, Aidan](#)
Subject: FW: RE: Follow-up on our conversation a few weeks back: Lakeside Street traffic-calming concerns
Date: Thursday, March 10, 2022 2:49:10 PM

From: [Ann Kovich](#)

Sent: Monday, March 7, 2022 3:39 PM

To: [Margaret Bergamini \(mobergamini@wisc.edu\)](#); [tlwilson1986@gmail.com](#)

Cc: [district15@cityofmadison.com](#); [Evers, Tag](#); [Lynch, Thomas](#); [Tao, Yang](#);

[TMohr@cityofmadison.com](#); [ReCallaway@cityofmadison.com](#); [Carrie Rothburd](#)

Subject: FW: RE: Follow-up on our conversation a few weeks back: Lakeside Street traffic-calming concerns

THIS IS INTENDED TO BE A ONE-WAY COMMUNICATION. PLEASE DO NOT REPLY TO ALL.

Hi, Margaret. Thanks for copying me on this email and for providing all the information and links in your response. I have researched the various motions and other discussions related to traffic calming on Lakeside Street. I thought it would be helpful if I provided you and Tom Wilson with the following summary (recognizing that you already know some of this information).

While there was a lot of discussion at the 3/10/21 TC meeting about traffic calming on Lakeside St., following was the motion which is reflected in the approved TC minutes posted in Legistar for the 3/10/21 meeting: "Foster moved to approval Staff recommendation with the addition of speed humps at either end of Lakeside Street near Park Street and John Nolen Drive, subject to MFD approval and to return to TC if MFD says no, and leaving speed boards in place, seconded by Bremer. After minimal discussion, the motion passed by voice vote/other." Motion required that staff bring the Lakeside traffic calming proposal back to TC for additional review and discussion if MFD said "No."

While there was a lot of discussion at the 4/28/21 TC meeting about Lakeside, following was the motion which is reflected in the approved TC minutes posted in Legistar for the 4/28/21 meeting: "Streit moved to approve moving the speed boards along with keeping in place the original approval of two speed humps and a traffic circle, seconded by Bremer. The motion passed by the following roll call vote: Ayes - 5 - Barbara Harrington-McKinney, Charles Myadze, William Bremer, Ken Streit, Brigit Brown Noes - 3 - Chris McCahill, Denise Jess, Harald Kliems. TC will refer MFD's position to not support speed humps in certain locations as a policy matter to the Transportation Policy and Planning Board." MPD made its position very clear in emails saved in Legistar, and answered Alder Foster's questions in those emails as well.

As I noted at the TC meetings regarding this topic, TC is the implementation body and TPPB creates and recommends transportation polices to the Common Council. Discussion of changing the standard practice of prioritizing MFD's position on speed humps should be addressed at TPPB, whether as a standalone item or through Vision Zero and/or Complete Green Streets, etc.

At the 6/9/21 TC meeting, the following item "Update on TC Feedback Report to TPPB" was on the agenda (regarding TC referral of MFD's position to not support speed humps in certain locations as a

policy matter to TPPB). Approved minutes for the 6/9/21 TC meeting reflect the following: “Kovich provided verbal reports and was available for questions.” At the 6/9/21 TC meeting, I indicated that the Joint TC and TPPB Traffic Calming Subcommittee (TCS) was discussing this issue. In addition, it appears that Vision Zero and Complete Green Streets are the best vehicles to address this issue. I said I would bring this back to a future meeting when appropriate. I did not bring this back to TC as a separate standalone agenda item, as this was fully addressed in the TCS Final Report, which was reviewed by TC on 7/28/21 and by TPPB on 8/2/21, with adoption recommended to the Common Council by both bodies.

As you mentioned in your email, the TCS Final Report was adopted by the Common Council on 8/3/21, and in that resolution the Common Council also approved: adopting all the Priority Recommendations included in the TCS Final Report, implementing the new Safe Streets Madison (SSM) program under the direction of the City Traffic Engineer, terminating the Neighborhood Traffic Management Program (NTMP), and consolidating the existing programs into SSM. TCS Final Report addresses the issues related to MFD declining to approve the speed humps in several sections. There were extensive discussions about every section of the Final Report at the TCS meetings, including the issue of MFD and speed humps. Agendas for all TCS Subcommittee meetings were posted, and all the meetings were open to the public.

At the 2/9/22 TC meeting, Safe Streets Madison was on the agenda. In response to a comment regarding the MFD/speed humps issue on Lakeside, Alder Foster indicated that the MFD/speed humps issue is on the list of TPPB future topics.

I have heard from Traffic Engineering that the two speed humps and traffic circle have been completed on Lakeside St., and the speed boards should be moved in the coming months.

Safe Streets Madison projects will be on the TC agenda again in the near future, likely at the 3/23/22 meeting.

Thanks,

Ann

Ann E. Kovich
(she/her/hers)
2605 Golden Gate Way
Madison, WI 53713
Email: annelizabethkovich@gmail.com
Mobile: 608-886-2556

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: sawney@charter.net
Sent: Friday, February 25, 2022 11:02 AM
To: annelizabethkovich@gmail.com

Subject: FW: RE: Follow-up on our conversation a few weeks back: Lakeside Street traffic-calming concerns

From: "Margaret Bergamini"
To: "crothburd@gmail.com"
Cc: "Thomas Wilson", "Ann Kovich"
Sent: Thursday February 24 2022 6:14:42PM
Subject: RE: Follow-up on our conversation a few weeks back: Lakeside Street traffic-calming concerns

Dear Carrie,

This is not my area of expertise, particularly at such a level of specificity.

In general, I can tell you that on August 3, 2021, the Common Council adopted

<https://madison.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=9675008&GUID=AE7FF658-0EEE-4DDF-98CF-82AC7290B4A0> and <https://madison.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=9675009&GUID=FBC73D1E-D045-40D5-B2D0-B59A437839C8>

These are the Safe Streets Report, and the Prioritization tool, respectively. These are the guidelines and the process that will be used going forward for a number of types of projects, with the thought that the city would be best served by evaluating and funding these improvements in a more holistic fashion.

I do not know where that leaves specific projects that were somewhere in the queue (or not) prior to this year. I assume they will be evaluated using this newer, more holistic process rather than somehow referring back to eligibility lists from previous years. The list of traffic calming project requests was very long and problematic for a variety of reasons, hence the revamp of the entire process. My working assumption would be that unless your project was specifically enumerated in the budget for this year, it would be subject to the current process, rather than any process used in prior years.

A motion being approved by a committee is not a guarantee that the actions suggested in that motion will come to pass, especially when it comes to an action which requires an allocation of monies, with some very rare exceptions. I am certain that traffic calming projects are not one of those rare exceptions.

For more information on how the process will be moving forward, I would refer you to <https://www.cityofmadison.com/trafficEngineering/SafeStreets.cfm> which among other things does include a list of recent and future meetings where the Safe Streets process and potential projects are being reviewed. This may also alert you to the most appropriate public opportunities to share your concerns about your particular project.

I was not in attendance at the 2/14 meeting of the TPPB where the consultants on this process presented their work to date, nor have I watched that meeting yet or reviewed the draft minutes, if they are even available yet. I suspect that would be a place to look for the most recent information on the progress of establishing the new process.

I also would refer you to the alder for the area in question, as alders are more likely to be tracking

projects like this within their districts.

I imagine this may not be the response you were hoping for, but it is the best one I have to offer at this time.

I am cc'ing the chair of the TPPB, Tom Wilson, and Ann Kovich, Chair of the TC, in case either have further comments or suggestions.

Sincerely,

Margaret Bergamini

From: crothburd@gmail.com <crothburd@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, February 23, 2022 8:38 PM

To: Margaret Bergamini <margaret.bergamini@wisc.edu>

Subject: Follow-up on our conversation a few weeks back: Lakeside Street traffic-calming concerns
Hello, Margaret,

I sincerely hope this email finds you in better spirits than the last time we spoke and that all turned out well with respect to the matter then at-hand.

I mentioned to you at that time that there was an issue I had hoped to talk with you about, and we agreed that I would send you information about it via email. I hope you have the time to consider this matter now or, if you do not, to refer me to someone who could. It is timely and time-sensitive.

Attached is the letter that Lakeside Neighbors Group submitted to the Transportation Commission on January 28, 2022 in follow-up to an unfinished conversation that took place regarding Lakeside Street at the TC on March 10 and April 28, 2021. The letter from April 28, 2021 is included in the attachments for this year's letter. Lakeside Street was the focus of a traffic-calming effort last year after being ranked among the top streets in Madison for speeding for more than two decades. During these two decades, speed humps were not considered an option for calming traffic because MFD disapproved of their installation on a collector street and alternate emergency transport route.

We have several questions that should become clear once you have read the rest of this email:

- 1) What is the city's policy wrt to overlooked or unfulfilled motions? Isn't a motion a binding decision?
- 2) Is it necessary for the TC to refer its decision about Lakeside Street to the TPPB or can it, as some members assumed last year, complete the decision-making on its own?
- 3) If, in fact, the TC does need to refer its decision about Lakeside to the TPPB and takes appropriate steps to make that referral, can the TPPB make a decision about the relative authority of the TC versus the MFD in the near future? Is the TPPB yet aware of the issues concerning Lakeside?

In the rest of this email, I lay out the discussions that preceded the ball being dropped unintentionally on Lakeside. I am concerned that neither the March 10, 2021 unanimously passed motion nor the motion passed by a vote of 5-3 on April 28, 2021 has been fulfilled. Instead a different and never discussed plan of action that involves referral to TPPB and delay for six more months is being implemented as if it had been discussed and approved by the TC.

This information can also be gleaned from the recordings of the meetings that took place on March 10, 2021, April 28, 2021, and February 9, 2022. I have written out a transcript of the relevant portions of the first two meetings so that you can see what was said, if you wish. I attempted to type verbatim, omitting only those words necessary to make the spoken sentences readable.

On March 10, the TC considered the proposal worked out by TE and neighbors for 2 speed humps and a traffic circle and also reviewed a more holistic, full-street calming plan put

together by neighbors. After listening to neighbors' testimony about the situation on Lakeside, the TC approved a motion to install 4 speed humps on the street, 2 more than the 2 that TE had finally negotiated with MFD. The commissioners agreed that, if MFD denied the 2 additional humps to be added on the 100 and 800 blocks--the source of the problem--the TC would ask MFD to attend its next meeting to explain its rationale the veto. The TC would then evaluate MFD's reasoning and decide whether or not to uphold its decision for 4 speed humps.

On 4/28, neighbors were present at the TC meeting to speak out in favor of overriding the veto. MFD was not. The TC again concluded that it wanted MFD to come to a TC meeting to discuss its rejection of speed humps on Lakeside so that the TC could decide what to do next. The commissioners did not ever question the need for additional calming on Lakeside. They did question whether they could decide on their own in favor of the 4 speed humps or whether they needed to ask the TPPB to weigh in on the policy of vetoing an MFD veto. In the interim, the TC approved an intermediate motion to move the then and now-redundant speed boards to the 100 and 800 blocks from in front of the school where the 2 speed humps were to be installed.

It should be noted that at the 4/28 meeting, Chris McCahill spoke in favor of the TC overriding MFD's veto in favor of TC's unanimous decision to install 4 speed humps on Lakeside, while also acknowledging the possibility of the need to let TPPB weigh in on it right to override. Harald Kliems said that in his opinion the TC was in charge of where to place traffic-calming measures and not MFD and spoke about the urgency of moving forward on Lakeside specifically. So did Grant Foster, no longer part of the TC, who had first proposed hearing from MFD so that the TC could evaluate and accept or reject MFD's reason for MFD's veto. Only Anne Kovich suggested making the referral to the TPPB. But no motion for such a referral was made. Instead the TC approved an intermediate calming measure: moving the then and now-redundant speed boards to the 100 and 800 blocks from in front of the school where the 2 speed humps were to be installed.(The speed boards remain in place in front of the school.)

This year, Lakeside neighbors contacted TE and the TC as the two turned their attention again to traffic calming. Our request was not to add Lakeside to the streets to be considered for traffic calming this year, but to ask the TC to conclude its discussion of Lakeside Street from last year--first talking with MFD, then deciding whether it wished to overrule MFD's veto and seeking the approval of TPPB about its position, if need be. We asked that the TC apply the guidelines for implementing traffic-calming in existence last year when the Lakeside project was undertaken--and should, had all gone to plan, been completed. If either or both the TC or TPPB decided that MFD's veto should not be overridden, then we asked the TC to instruct TE, working with MFD, to come up with a workable alternative solution, such as split or cushion speed humps.

Urgency was the order of the day last year. And yet this year in response to Lakeside neighbors request to finish the job on Lakeside, we have been told by the TC that we must be patient, that there is nothing that TC can do since the matter has been referred to TPPB's hands now. (I believe the implication or statement at this year's February 9 meeting is that this referral was by motion; I have listened to the recording of the meeting three times now and can find no such motion.)

We've been further told that in light of the fact that Transportation staff involved on Lakeside (oddly not Tom Mohr, but someone we have never met) is working two department jobs and cannot attend to this matter now and also because there will soon be a new MFD chief that we will likely have to wait another half year before anyone discusses Lakeside Street again. Last year the chief had nothing to do with discussing Lakeside. Fire Marshall Ruckreigel was involved.

It seems to us that the first order of business now should be to fulfill the motion of March 10, 2021:

MFD should be invited to attend the next TC meeting so the commissioners can hear and evaluate MFD's rationale for vetoing the 2 additional speed humps on Lakeside. The TC would then pass a motion and vote about whether to stand by its former decision on Lakeside and move forward with the 2 additional speed humps or to come up with a suitable alternative calming measure. It seems likely based on the April 28, 2021 TC discussion that the TC would likely want to confer with TPPB about Lakeside in particular and about overriding MFD in general, but that is not clear.

What is critical here is that Lakeside's predicament not get lost nor the urgency of the need for traffic calming on Lakeside ignored. Lakeside got the green light for calming in 2021 with the promise of a holistic solution to come. The criteria for calming measures changed between 2021 and 2022, and we may never see that full solution. However the TC's approval of 4 humps in 2021 should not be ignored and either 4 humps should be installed in 2022 (albeit a year late) or some other solution arrived at that will prove as effective.

One of our Lakeside Neighbors Group and I have also been in touch with Chris McCahill about resuming the discussion about Lakeside Street ASAP. Thanks for your attention to this.

Thanks,

Carrie Rothburd, Lakeside Neighbors Group

█ W Lakeside Street

608-█