



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes - Approved PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION

Tuesday, June 24, 2008

5:00 PM

Room LL110, Madison Municipal Building
215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
(After 6 pm, use Doty St. entrance.)

Items reported in the order listed on the agenda. [Items E. 1. and E.3. were taken up following item C.]

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Present: 7 -

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

Absent: 2 -

Judy Compton and Charles W. Strawser III

Excused: 2 -

Beth A. Whitaker and Mary P. Conroy

A. PUBLIC COMMENT - None

B. ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

B.1. Election of Chair and Vice Chair

Motion by Webber/Crandall to nominate Mark Shahan as Chair.

Following three calls for further nominations and no other nominations being made, there was a motion by Skidmore/Webber to close nominations, motion carried unanimously.

Motion to elect Mark Shahan as Chair carried unanimously.

Motion by Webber/Skidmore to nominate Cheryl Wittke as Vice-Chair.

Following three calls for further nominations and no other nominations being made, there was a motion by Skidmore/Webber to close nominations, motion carried unanimously.

Motion to elect Cheryl Wittke as Vice-Chair carried unanimously.

B.2. [10608](#)

Pedestrian/Bicycle/Motor Vehicle Commission Rules and Procedures

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

B.3. Reconfirm meeting time of fourth Tuesday at 5:00 p.m.

Motion by Webber/De Vos to reconfirm the meeting time, carried unanimously.

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

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

D. PRESENTATION

**D.1. [10992](#) Junction Road-Mineral Point Road Intersection Improvements Alternatives:
Review by Rob Phillips, Deputy City Engineer**

Rob Phillips, Deputy City Engineer, and Jack Bartman of HNTB were present. Tim Sobota from Madison Metro was also present. Although invited, a representative from Dane County was not present.

Phillips advised that this new alternative #4 was a hybrid of other alternatives. The presentation tonight is a preview of what will be presented at a public information meeting on July 27. The goal is to select an alternative for preliminary design that provides safe and convenient access for all users and accommodates future traffic volumes. Phillips noted that when the PBMVC previously reviewed the other alternatives, comments had included that the design needed better accommodations for bikes and peds. Concerns from others included the need to keep Commerce Drive open for businesses. Safety was also a big concern, and it was felt some of the earlier alternatives presented unfamiliar traffic patterns that might be confusing. The design also needs to coordinate with the adjacent intersections (Pleasant View and the Beltline).

Bartman reviewed Alternative #4.

- It is a modified jug handle design.
- Southbound Junction motorists will be grade-separated from Mineral Point Road, while northbound Junction motorists are at-grade. Southbound Junction will go over Mineral Point Road.
- Northbound motorists will drive the intersection as a basic four-legged intersection.
- Southbound Junction motorists will need to use the jug handle to turn either left or right. Southbound through traffic will not need to stop for Mineral Point Road traffic.
- Westbound Mineral Point Road traffic will need to stop for northbound Junction but will go under southbound Junction traffic. Basically, Mineral Point Road traffic will need to cross a one-way street rather than a two-way street.
- On Mineral Point, eastbound through and left turning traffic will operate as a normal intersection; right turns will use the jug handle.
- For westbound Mineral Point traffic, right turns will be a normal movement and left turns will use the jug handle.
- Commerce is open at Mineral Point Road and will have a half signal. By moving Commerce traffic out of the stream, the other left turns moving under Junction Road are more efficient because there are fewer of them.
- A wide multi-use path will go underneath the Beltline and hook up near

Tree Lane. At the other end, it would hook up to whatever future trail system happens in the development.

- There are loop ramps to/from the bridge, similar to the new East Washington overpass. Using the path, bicyclists would only have to cross the northbound Junction traffic, then go under the bridge, up the loop, across the bridge in a dedicated lane, down the other loop, through a tunnel under the jug handle, and out. Webber noted path users would also have to cross the driveway to Target.
- Peds can use the same path.
- The shared use path is separated from Mineral Point Road. There will also be on-street bike lanes. There are also sidewalks, although in some locations the sidewalk has been replaced with the shared use path. The path is extra-wide to accommodate the shared use.
- Bartman pointed out the proposed bus stops. Bus cut-outs are provided at some locations.
- To get from Target to Menards, peds would use the regular sidewalks. De Vos noted that turning motorists would pose a problem. Phillips pointed out that peds would be dealing only with two right-turn movements and it should be easier than a standard intersection because at-grade Junction Road is only one-way.
- De Vos asked if there is a way for NEVs to get to the stores. Phillips was not sure. McCormick advised that Traffic Engineering staff is working with WisDOT on routes for NEVs. Mineral Point Road is currently 40 mph so NEVs would not be allowed, although it's likely TE staff will be looking at the speed limit in conjunction with reconstruction. Shahan pointed out NEVs would be prohibited from crossing without approval from WisDOT.
- Schulman asked about the rationale for both on-street bike lanes and a shared use path. Shahan indicated the different facilities accommodate different types of bicyclists. Webber noted that bike lanes allow bicyclists to travel faster without causing conflicts with peds on narrow paths.
- Bartman identified advantages of the modified jug handle design: better access for peds and bikes; better access to Commerce Drive businesses; fewer negative impacts for businesses (first jug handle design had wide retaining walls); and accommodates anticipated traffic volumes.
- Modified jug handle design does require that Steve's Liquor be relocated.
- Shahan mentioned a concern that back-ups on eastbound Mineral Point Road would block the jug handle. Bartman indicated this problem has not come up in the modeling. Phillips indicated the public information meeting will have a video clip of the model.
- On the east side of the intersection, all roadways are at present grade, which is a tremendous advantage in terms of aesthetics and viability of those parcels.
- The modified jug handle is the only alternative that provides for left turns into Commerce Drive.
- Peds and bikes will benefit by (1) no freeway style off-ramps; (2) separating the southbound Junction lanes reduces the crossing of Junction Road to a one-way street, and (3) the loops make it easier for westbound bicyclists to head southbound. There are "slip ramps" at the base of the loops so bicyclists can get on/off the bike lane.
- Commerce will function better than it does now, since left turns can enter while other traffic is leaving.

Webber asked if there have there been discussions with Dane County about

funding, or whether the County had any comments on the design proposal. Bartman indicated the County is aware of it but has not provided specific comments. Phillips advised that the City regularly requests funding from the County through their process for projects – the County sends out a request for projects, and this intersection has been in the process the last few years. He was not aware of any indication that they are willing to fund a portion of the project.

Webber remarked that generally side paths are a little risky. She requested that the path crossing of the driveway into Target and the crossing of Junction Road be done in something more than paint, perhaps a raised area, change in texture etc. It's important to have something other than white paint to alert motorists, especially right-turns, to the possible presence of peds and bicyclists moving in both directions on the path. The driveway is an especially hazardous point. Phillips noted that the same path will also cross the Beltline ramps.

Skidmore was very impressed with the new alternative. The design may not be there yet but it's getting very close to a preferred alternative. He mentioned his district has a new County supervisor. She advised Skidmore she met with the County Executive, who said the County fully intends to participate in this project, including funding. Skidmore felt County participation is extremely important given the regional nature of the traffic.

Skidmore indicated that westbound Mineral Point traffic turning into Commerce is very heavy. Northbound on Junction is also very heavy. This design provides a good solution. While it's not perfect, many of the details can be worked out. Skidmore wanted to know what happens after the public information meeting. Phillips responded that after the public information meeting, staff hope to be the position of introducing a resolution approving the geometric design to the Common Council for referral

Skidmore referenced the discussions about how much land is necessary. Phillips stated the City has met with the owners of Steve's Liquor. Bartman stated the estimated construction costs for this alternative are about a million dollars less than the original jug handle design. The bridge was reduced from 5-6 lanes to 3, and the retaining walls were reduced by a third. Shahan recalled that at the April PBMVC meeting, there was discussion about the Pioneer Neighborhood Plan that showed a dedicated transit route to it. Is it feasible and what would it hook up to? Also, the neighborhood was supposed to have transit go in before development occurred. Tim Sobota indicated the proposal for a high capacity transit corridor probably came from the Transport 2020 planning process. When that was originally started, there were two western corridors under consideration: existing freight corridor in the University Avenue area and a second alternative that would branch off from the rail corridor at Whitney Way down to Mineral Point Road. It was Sobota's understanding that the Pioneer Neighborhood Plan picked up on that alternative and instead of ending at West Towne Mall or Target, it would be extended into Research Park. However, he believed the Transport 2020 preferred alternative is to use the existing rail corridor. As it stands currently, there is nothing on the table for a fixed guideway to the Pioneer Neighborhood.

As far as transit service in general, Sobota reported that in 2004 when the Pioneer Neighborhood Plan was being developed, Metro made a presentation to Transit & Parking Commission. Metro identified that, with new funding, they could implement a bus route from the West Transfer Point to the Pioneer Neighborhood and back. It would be overlapping existing service so the new service could be an express (limited stop) route. Sobota stated the jug handle does allow for transit stops at the intersection, including some stop locations they're not able to serve now because of the existing geometry. He noted that Metro does have service on Watts Road including the intersection with CTH M, across from Research Park. Sobota emphasized that in order to provide a route that goes into the neighborhood, additional operating funds would be necessary. Shahan asked whether Metro would be able to follow rather soon once roads start going in and development occurs, and Sobota reiterated that it depends whether funding is available. .

Webber remarked that there have been a couple of developments that included a requirement for a Transportation Demand Management plan. She wanted to know which agency is responsible to make sure it happens. Sobota wasn't sure, and Phillips thought it probably would be in Traffic Engineering's area. Webber recalled that approval of advertising in the parking ramps was to pay for a TDM coordinator.

Schulman wanted to know the percentage increase in traffic volumes that is expected in 10 years, and Bartman replied about 30%. Skidmore pointed out the intersection is already over capacity. Schulman commented that when outlying intersections are built to freeway-like designs, it tends to encourage sprawl. Phillips advised that once it's determined that an at-grade intersection does not meet capacity, the next logical step is to look at some type of freeway design. He emphasized the City did not want to go in that direction with this project and the design calls for both Mineral Point Road and Junction Road to continue to function as urban arterial streets.

Shahan asked whether Sobota saw problem areas for transit service, either getting out there, dropping off passengers at or near the intersection, making bus stops accessible, etc. Sobota replied that at the Mineral Point-Junction intersection, he sees improvements. Sidewalk is being put in, some bus stop cut-outs are being provided, and new construction allows for accessible boarding pads. He felt the project will improve bus ability to get in/out of the bus stops. Anything that improves the flow of the intersection for motor vehicles will help buses as well.

Shahan encouraged members to forward concerns/comments to City Engineering or Metro. De Vos liked the design. Shahan felt it was much better than the first jug handle design. De Vos commented that NEVs will become more popular and feels they should be accommodated.

E. NEW BUSINESS

- E.1. [10870](#) Amending Section 12.1339(1) entitled "Street Sweeping Parking Restrictions" of the Madison General Ordinances to include the eleventh aldermanic district.
- A motion was made by Skidmore, seconded by De Vos, to **RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER** . The motion passed by voice vote/other.

Webber wanted to know why only the 11th district, and not the 5th and 8th districts, was being proposed for street sweeping. She said she would have proposed her district but was told it would be very expensive. Al Schumacher, Streets Superintendent, advised that Ald. Gruber had requested to add one street in the 11th district, Caromar Drive from Tokay to Keating Terrace. When the City Attorney's office drafted the ordinance amendment, the language referred to the entire district, as is the case for the other districts that have street sweeping. Schumacher stated that Caromar has parking on only one side of the street, so it is exempt from alternate side parking and thus it is difficult to plow and sweep. The 90-day trial went well. Schumacher stated that the Streets Division would not object if other streets were added since the street sweeping parking restrictions aid in other Streets tasks such as refuse collection. The ordinance covers the entire 11th district but so far the intent is to include only Caromar, which is why the fiscal note indicates that no appropriation is necessary since it can be accomplished with existing resources.

- E.2. [10682](#) Authorizing the City to enter into an agreement to accept funds from Dane County to continue the Pedestrian-Bicycle Coordinator Program in the Traffic Engineering Division.

A motion was made by Webber, seconded by Skidmore, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the BOARD OF ESTIMATES. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

This is an annual resolution to accept funding from Dane County to be used for the City Pedestrian/Bicycle Coordinator program. Wittke asked whether Ped/Bike Coordinator Arthur Ross work outside the City, and McCormick advised that Ross does dedicate some of his time to Dane County activities.

- E.3. [10674](#) Approving plans and specifications and authorizing the Board of Public Works to conduct a 120-day pilot for the testing of two-way traffic on the 400 block of West Gilman Street including traffic signal changes at the intersection of University Avenue and Gilman and Frances Street. (4th AD)

A motion was made by Skidmore, seconded by Webber, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation to Place on File to the BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- [11014](#) Pedestrian/bicycle capital projects, including 2008 public hearing comments

Traffic Engineering staff had provided compilation of the 2008 public hearing comments, and members also had the list of capital projects previously compiled by Shahan that was now updated with comments by City Engineering and Traffic Engineering.

Item T.1.1. – Webber noted that the CE and TE comments appear to be at odds. McCormick stated that the project needs to get into the construction queue. It will be necessary to get easements from the UW Research Park. There have been some meetings this year. He was not sure if City Engineering has this as a dedicated project or plans to accomplish it through available funds for

general bike path projects. McCormick indicated the right-of-way is an issue but he did not have any more specifics. Since it's a Tier 1 project, Webber would like more information as to its status. Shahan stated he works at Research Park and Director Mark Bugher had talked to him about the difficulty bicyclists have heading east from the site. Shahan talked to Ross last year and thought something was in the works. He would like to see something scheduled and encouraged CE to work on it.

Item T.1.2. – Webber asked whether the TE comment that “Facility Management will address” means it will happen in the next year. Does it mean that getting the appropriate racks has been worked out? McCormick understood that the City Architect and Facility Management (in Engineering) would try to incorporate racks. He understood that each individual City agency had to fund the racks through their own budgets. McCormick said he could get more information from Arthur Ross. Webber requested that staff do so since this is another Tier 1 project.

Skidmore referenced the notation that new racks are needed at Olbrich Park and assumed they would have to come through the Parks budget. With this project, is the PBMVC giving other agencies an unfunded mandate? Or is it a suggestion?

Shahan noted the racks could be done piecemeal, department by department. But departments may order the wrong kind, put them in the wrong location, etc. He brought up the idea of a bicycle utility rather than having each agency have responsibility. Shahan preferred TE oversight of the program, including allocation of the funds. There are a lot of racks that need to be replaced and the agencies don't know what to do.

Skidmore referenced Shahan's comment about a bike utility and noted that the Parks Division has a dog enterprise fund which uses money from fees to pay for improvements to the dog parks. Was Shahan envisioning something similar where bike license fees would be used to purchase racks and other improvements? Shahan responded it could be something similar. There's a certain amount of money used each year to purchase racks, and that fund could be used to fix racks on City property. For now, he would like to see the money that is spent on racks should be under TE and let TE buy and place the racks. Skidmore wondered if it should be limited to just racks; maybe it should be used for striping, etc. Shahan said that as this point he would limit it to racks. Pavement markings seem to get done on a regular basis, but there is no central authority for racks. It's up to each agency that has a building. Shahan clarified that he was recommending that all responsibility for bicycle racks on City property be under TE. He noted that the UW has an inventory of all their racks and tracks each year how many need to be replaced or added.

McCormick indicated there are racks both in the public right-of-way and at public buildings. TE would like to stretch the money by having each building be responsible. The \$15,000 that Ald. Clear added to the budget was to help with existing conditions. TE would like to give Facilities Management specifications for new City buildings as to number and location of racks; this would be included in the City Architect's plans for the building. By making each site responsible, it extends the pot of money available for racks. Webber

advised that the \$15,000 was to be for commercial areas constructed before the zoning code required bike racks. The racks would need to be installed on the public ROW. Since 1988, both public and private buildings are to meet zoning code requirements for bike racks. But there are public buildings, including a number of libraries and parks, that were built before 1988. For new buildings, racks should be included in the development plan since it's a requirement. McCormick advised that perhaps the PBMVC could provide prioritization of locations. Webber commented that businesses were supposed to request the \$15,000 but there's been no outreach so they don't know to request the money. Shahan clarified that his intent for T.1.2. is to retrofit existing buildings. He did not think the individual agencies know how/what to do as far as racks. He was looking for a way to get the experts (Traffic Engineering or City Engineering) to deal with this for existing facilities. Skidmore asked that staff come up with a recommendation for a 2009 budget amount and a plan.

T.1.3. – Shahan indicated there are several things involved beyond getting across the river. Bicyclists also need to get across railroad tracks and get a connection to Mifflin Street and the shopping center. There is a “desire path” but there needs to be an official path, including easements that may require real estate purchases.

Item T.1.6. – Webber wanted to know why it isn't programmed. Is it not practical? McCormick felt this project, like many on the list, are a case of budgeting. Some many require earmarks in the CE budget. He noted that during deliberation of the 2008 budget, Ald. Clear included \$15,000 for a bike rack program. In response to Webber's question, McCormick said he'd have to check with Ross as to an update on how that program is going. Webber felt T.1.6. was a fairly simple fix and not a huge capital project. She felt the comment “not programmed” usually referred to big capital projects. She would like more information as to the hold-up or whether TE feels it's not a good idea. Shahan thought there was something being worked on. He believed it involved directing the path a little differently and put the curb cut in a different spot.

Webber requested that staff come up with fiscal notes for the top priorities. Skidmore emphasized the information will be needed by the July meeting since the budget is being developed.

Wittke wondered how these priorities align with TE priorities. McCormick indicated that some may overlap, some may be separate. He pointed out that TE has been asked to submit a budget that is 3% less than the current year. Some projects will remain on the list until they can be dovetailed with a reconstruction project. Some may require dedicated funding. McCormick also noted there are priority recommendations from the Platinum Biking report. Wittke referenced the budget restraints and the increasing demands for service throughout the city. She hoped that TE would see the PBMVC as being able to help advocate for additional resources in order to accomplish some of these projects. She would like the PBMVC to talk about ways to inform both alders and citizens about transportation issues. McCormick reiterated it will be a tough budget year and supplemental budget requests are usually for basic services. Last year, Ald. Kerr added money for additional crosswalk markings around schools. Steps like that are helpful to get things done. It's up to the

Common Council and the community to say what they want to spend money on.

Wittke would like to see a proposal from TE on how these projects can be addressed and what is needed in terms of staff and resources, such as an additional sign crew. Shahan said there is a continuing need for maintenance of streets, paths, sidewalks, etc. and a little bit of money each year should be devoted to these things. He would like an estimate of what TE needs for these things, which would allow the PBMVC to help lobby for it with the Council and Mayor. Wittke referenced the need to get out information to the public about routine operating costs (e.g., electricity) and how this affects TE's ability to undertake some of the requested projects; each year the agency is asked to submit a reduced budget yet costs keep going up. McCormick indicated it's up to City Traffic Engineer Dryer how he wants to proceed but TE can come back with options.

Webber pointed out that some of the projects likely fall under City Engineering and their budget seems very healthy considering the number of streets put in each year. This should not necessarily land in the lap of TE, some are City Engineering priorities/issues and should be in their budget. Webber commented that it's hard for a lot of people who are asking for relatively small (in City budget terms) cost items to see the amount of money spent on accommodating motor vehicle traffic but then be told there's no money for bike racks. Metro ridership probably feels the same. The budget seems to have almost unlimited money to accommodate motorists, what about people who don't drive?

Regarding the large cap project list, Webber advised that the MPO did not submit the Sherman Flyer as a project because of problems with the railroad. However, there is an alternative (the Huxley cut-off). The alternative would mostly utilize local streets. It will be necessary to acquire easements from Oscar Mayer and the Hartmeyer Ice Arena.

Webber reported that completion of the Badger State Trail has a good chance of being funded by the State.

T.3.1. – In response to Webber's question, Shahan clarified the problem he was trying to address.

Wittke said she has received calls about ped crossings of Ridge-University. Webber advised that half of the street is in the Village of Shorewood Hills, and Village officials would like to put in a signal. Shahan said the biggest problem is the phasing because of the other nearby signalized intersections.

Wittke left at 6:55 p.m.

Shahan indicated he would try to update the capital project list with comments from this year's public hearing. For the large capital projects, he emphasized the need to identify other funding sources.

Item T.3.4. – In response to Webber's question, McCormick stated that crosswalk striping on State roads is generally a WisDOT responsibility.

Members requested that for the July meeting, staff come back with fiscal notes for Tier 1 and the Platinum Biking top 9 recommendations. Webber noted that some may not be TE responsibility. McCormick said he would forward the request to Dryer.

G. REPORTS

G.1. [10610](#)

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

Plan Commission

Long Range Transportation Planning Commission

Joint West Campus Area Committee

Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee

School Traffic Safety Committee

Plan Commission - No report

Long Range Transportation Planning Commission - Did not meet

Joint West - Shahan reported they discussed the new office building on University Bay Drive for medical faculty at UW Hospital. Will be a tight fit.

Webber advised that the Village of Shorewood Hills is doing a redevelopment plan for Marshall Court and also doing a traffic plan. What they do can affect City streets.

Joint Southeast - No report

School Traffic Safety Committee - Webber reported they went to the City-MMSD Liaison Committee because they have been looking at general transportation issues. The STSC talked to them about starting a joint City/School District safe routes to school program. There is a need to make it easier for students to bike and walk, which could reduce the number of students being bused. The STSC is also working with a number of schools on their traffic plans. Skidmore asked for an update at the next meeting on what is being done at each specific school.

H. REPORTS OF OFFICERS AND MEMBERS FOR INFORMATION/DISCUSSION

H.1. Executive Secretary Report

a. Signing/markings changes at Blair Street-John Nolen Drive-Machinery Row

b. Ribbon cutting for the Starkweather Creek Path overpass of East Washington Avenue, June 30 at 11 a.m.

a. McCormick handed out a map of the area. TE recently made changes to the driveway (one-way in) and marked crosswalks where the bike path crosses the driveways. However, the driveway change garnered a strong negative reaction from Machinery Row tenants and Law Park parkers. Motorists couldn't get onto John Nolen Drive and had conflicts with path users. TE will reverse the driveway to two-way and post warnings along both the bike path and the roadway. Webber agreed that it's a difficult location. One option would be to make it accessible only from the parking lot, but this would mean that motorists would have to be on John Nolen Drive; if a motorist were on Williamson Street, they wouldn't be able to enter Machinery Row. McCormick said other options were another driveway across John Nolen or to pull back the bike path to allow more room between the path and motorists trying to get onto John Nolen. It may be necessary to do some physical changes.

Other changes to the intersection area included marked bike lanes on Wilson and Williamson and installed bike boxes.

Webber noted that bicyclists eastbound on Wilson who want to turn left onto the bike path do not trip the loop detector and won't get a green unless a car is present.

H.2. Items by Chair (verbal report and/or announcements)

Shahan referenced the request by De Vos for discussion of winter maintenance at ped islands. Locations already mentioned were Midvale-University, Sherman-Northport and Farley-Unviarsity. He asked members to contact him with other specific locations.

H.3. Member requests for future agenda items and/or announcements - None

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Webber, seconded by Crandall, to Adjourn . The motion passed by voice vote/other. The meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.