



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

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

---

Tuesday, March 22, 2005

5:00 PM

215 MLKJ BLVD RM 260 (MMB)  
(After 6 pm, use Doty St. entrance.)

---

**A. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

*A quorum being present, Chair Shahan called the meeting to order at 5 p.m. (Ald. Compton arrived at 5:10.)*

**Present:** Ald. Judy Compton, Ald. Robbie Webber, Mark N. Shahan, Matthew A. Logan, Mary P. Conroy, Susan M. De Vos and Charles W. Strawser III

**Absent:** Austin W. King

**Excused:** Charles S. Thimmesch, Cheryl E. Wittke and Carl R. Kugler

*Others Present:*

*Dan McCormick, Acting Executive Secretary; Arthur Ross, Traffic Engineering; Larry Nelson, City Engineer and Tony Fernandez, City Engineering*

**B. PUBLIC COMMENT - None**

**C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - FEBRUARY 23, 2005**

A motion was made by Conroy, seconded by Logan, to Approve the Minutes Change made to note Thimmesch as absent. The motion passed by acclamation.

**D. MADISON POLICE DEPARTMENT REPORT ON TRAFFIC RELATED ISSUES**

1. Speeder's Hotline data

Since Police representatives could not attend, the item was not taken up and members were asked to hold their questions about the materials provided on the Speeder's Hotline for the next meeting.

**E. OLD BUSINESS ITEMS**

2. NTMP 2005 Traffic Calming Priority List

*Motion was made by Compton/Webber to approve the 2005 list of projects in the following order:*

*Collectors: Hammersley, Thompson, Manchester, S (Collector) & N (Local) Spooner combined into one project, East Pass and Winnebago.*

*Locals: Reetz, Jefferson, Pleasure, Fairfax and East Mifflin.*

*The Sommers project was to move to the top of the 2006 list if it did not proceed under a project for Dunning Street in 2005.*

*Winnebago Street was to move to the top of the 2006 list if it was not accomplished in 2005.*

*West Lawn was expected to be accomplished as part of the Monroe Commons  
Redevelopment Project.*

*Glenway was expected to be accomplished through a Peds for Arterial funding program  
due to its higher traffic volumes which had it qualifying for this funding source.*

A motion was made by Ald. Compton, seconded by Ald. Webber, to Approve with Amendment(s)

Persons appearing included:

Ald. Zach Brandon, District 7, appeared in support of the East Pass Collector project (#7), noting that it was 0.8 points from project #6-the last one recommended for implementation in 2005. He asked that if any of the projects do not move forward that East Pass be undertaken. He reviewed the conditions of the street, specifically the newer segment where traffic-calming measures have been put in place and the older section that was in need of such measures. He suggested that if the bike route system in this part of the City were updated, East Pass would qualify for the 5 points for a bike route thus putting it into a category of qualifying for a project in 2005. He did not believe the peripheral areas should be penalized when it came to considering points for bike routes because the City wasn't up-to-date in defining the bike route system in the peripheral area. He referred to the pedestrian generators and the efforts to encourage pedestrian and bicycle traffic in this neighborhood and provide a safe environment.

Richard Hammerstrom (5717 Hammersley) registered in support of the Hammersley project and wrote: "I very much support efforts to reduce the speed of traffic on Hammersley Road. I would prefer enforcement of the speed limit by law enforcement but applaud any effort."

Melissa O'Loughlin (5908 Hammersley) registered in support of the Hammersley project and did not speak.

Patrick O'Loughlin (5908 Hammersley) registered in support of the Hammersley project and addressed the serious problem they had with speeders.

George Hall (2724 Regent Street), representing the Regent Neighborhood Assn. Transportation Committee, registered in support of including North and South Spooner Streets in the NTMP priority list for 2005 and didn't speak.

Betsy Fleury (5901 Hammersley) registered in support of the Hammersley project and described conditions as a resident of the area for some 33 years and urged that something be done to curb speeding and unsafe conditions that exist.

Michael Barrett (2137 Sommers Avenue) registered in support of the Sommers Avenue (Division-Dunning) project and disclosed he was a member of the Urban Design Commission and active in the neighborhood association. He pointed out Winnebago Street was a major gateway to the new development at Union Corners and Schenks Corners and he emphasized the pedestrian orientation goals of the neighborhood. He noted the configuration of Dunning and Sommers and pointed out that although there were stop signs there, motorists often ran the stop signs and the location had a higher crash rate than other intersections in the area. He noted that Sommers had not received points for bike route and thought that Dunning was a bike route and suggested that if not it served in a de facto way and should have received points for that. Although no points were assigned for school route, he referred to the bus stop serving several children. Understanding that Dunning was to be reconstructed in 2006, he supported delaying a project until that construction project.

Susan Duane (5400 Hammersley) registered and spoke in support of the

Hammersley project, describing the unsafe conditions that exist for pedestrians along this corridor due to the speeding vehicles. Asked about the advisability of sidewalks, Duane said they would not address the speeding issue that was paramount and due to topography sidewalks were not a good alternative.

Elizabeth Kerwin (1 North Prospect) registered in support of traffic calming on North and South Spooner Street.

Ald. Judy Olson, District 6, spoke in support of the Sommers Avenue project although she, too, supported delaying it until the reconstruction project. Similarly she supported the Winnebago project (Linden-Fifth) which she pointed out was a wide residential street. She also supported staff's comments on the project; that is, project could be delayed due to schedule of the Union Corners redevelopment project but asked that the funding for the project be allocated in 2005 so that there was some flexibility in moving forward on a project if that was deemed appropriate.

Ald. Paul Skidmore, representing District 9, registered in support of the Westfield/Sawmill project. He pointed out the project had been listed as the 6th priority project in the list he saw in February and had just learned that it had dropped to #9 on the list. He asked why. He described the intersection with the park located on the northeast quadrant and role the street served as an alternate to the Beltline for persons traveling to Middleton. He saw it as a prime candidate for traffic calming and a location that had been identified by the neighborhood early in the NTMP process and continued to rate as one of their high priority areas of concern-next to Gammon and Tree. He expressed concern about learning about the change in priority and asked for an explanation. He urged support pointing out the continued support for the project which he believed was due for consideration.

McCormick explained that the priority list was developed over a three-month period and further refinements resulted in the change.

Asked about the number of projects to be funded, McCormick responded that typically they have been able to do about 10 projects and to date the commission has agreed to split the projects evenly between collector and local streets. He reminded members the program was initiated to address problems on local streets. He pointed to their efforts to identify other funding sources, such as this year to consider the Glenway project under an arterial pedestrian funding program. If they found as the year progressed that there were enough funds to do more projects, they would consider including those using the list as the basis for which project would be addressed next. For example, the two Spooner projects might be accomplished with less funds than would typically be assigned to two projects. McCormick asked if the Westfield project could be satisfied by addressing possibly just one location (e.g., at Sawmill) vs. more than one in the section identified. Skidmore referred to the speeds being experienced and any efforts that could be done to address the issues of safety for the area. He acknowledged that Sawmill was problematic but added there were probably some other areas of concern (e.g., Westfield and Farmington).

Mark Bergum (610 Division), representing the Schenk's Corner Project Management Team (PMT) registered in support of the Winnebago Street project, pointing out the project met the goals of the Business District Master Plan to

increase ease of access to the district while discouraging cut-through traffic.

Shahan referred to some of the items discussed at the last meeting and items presented: 1) Seek funding outside NTMP for Glenway. 2) Whether to combine Spooner into one project instead of a local and collector project. 3) Possibility of adding another project by delaying Sommers because of a pending construction project in the area. Webber asked if there was funding for Glenway outside of NTMP; McCormick responded there was.

Webber referred to West Lawn and the desire for it to be a part of the Monroe Commons conditions of approval. McCormick said he couldn't confirm that, but he would be surprised if it were omitted.

Webber asked about allocating money for the Sommers project in 2005 as similarly suggested for Winnebago. McCormick responded it was the pleasure of the body. It could be allocated this year understanding that the project wouldn't likely be undertaken until 2006, the project could be carried over to the following year and again ranked on the priority list or they could just acknowledge that it was a 2005 qualifying project and therefore funds in 2006 should be used for the project.

Compton questioned the table's accuracy as it related to Fairfax. She was confident it had been on the list for at least three years. If that is the case, its points should be adjusted accordingly. McCormick said he would have to check it out.

Compton asked the cost of projects; McCormick said they allocated between \$15,000-\$20,000 for each project. Some projects such as Jefferson might not take the full amount and their intent would be to make full utilization of the budget to the extent possible.

Compton supported the idea of delaying a project if construction work in the area was programmed and would impact the location of the traffic-calming project. She did not support setting the money aside for such projects; rather they make full utilization of the funds within the year it is budgeted. The projects which may have been delayed because of a pending construction project could be placed at the top of the list for the following year rather than again independently ranked.

Strawser asked if dollars would be saved by combining the Spooner projects; McCormick responded he thought it would save some. He explained that once a program was approved a contract was let and they would need to see what prices came in for projects; possibly they would be able to do more than they anticipated rather than reverse. If they were to move to other projects on the list some guidance might be given as to whether staff continues to maintain the balance between collector and local projects. Compton commented she would want to maintain the balance.

Compton moved to accept for funding in 2005 Hammersley, South Thompson Drive, Manchester, Spooner and East Pass for Collector Street projects; Reetz, Jefferson, Pleasure, Fairfax and E Mifflin for Local; the local and collector projects for Spooner should be combined under Collector; Sommers and Winnebago should be placed at the top of the list for next year; and that West Lawn and Glenway proceed as indicated in the Other Notes on the staff report (or

basically outside NTMP funding program); Webber seconded the motion.

Webber suggested leaving Winnebago on the list and if it could not be completed in 2005 moving to another project. Shahan added that this had been done with the Glenway Circle north of Mineral Point Road. For that project they had had until June to decide before moving onto another project. Ald. Compton disagreed.

Webber asked about investigating having the Winnebago project paid for by the developer. Ald. Olson explained the segment of Winnebago identified in NTMP was not in the Union Corners project area but it could potentially be affected by that project. Accordingly, it might be included in the project and they wouldn't have an answer about this until probably June. Olson wanted there to be some flexibility to bring the Winnebago project back into the NTMP funded program if other opportunities fell through.

Compton believed her motion addressed Winnebago in that it would be placed at the top of the 2006 list if other opportunities fell through in 2005. McCormick said they could identify Winnebago as 6 on the list of collector projects for 2005, so if funds became available in 2005 it could proceed. Compton agreed.

Strawser wondered about allocating money for the top 6 collectors and only 4 locals. Compton didn't agree; she understood collectors are important but believed this was a program started for local streets and they needed to maintain at least a balance between collectors and locals. Strawser believed the section of Winnebago was residential and wasn't sure the broad generalizations of local and collector needed to be strictly applied. He pointed out Winnebago earned its position for funding in 2005 and that should be taken into account, whereas East Mifflin qualifies as one of the local street due to the shuffling done with the local projects.

Conroy asked about adding East Pass and not acknowledging the closeness of Sheridan Drive in the ratings between the two. Again McCormick said that if monies became available the intent would be to move down the list and bring in the next project. He referred to Ald. Brandon' comments that East Pass had not received 5 points for being a bike route and if that had occurred the gap between the two projects would be greater.

The motion passed by acclamation.

3. Report Relative to City's Speed Hump Policy

*Compton/DeVos moved support of Option C in the report: "Speed humps not allowed on any street classified as collectors to address Madison Fire Department concerns."*

*Webber/Strawser moved a substitute motion to support Option B in the report: "Include low volume collector streets for speed hump application consideration, by increasing the traffic volume limit for the use of speed humps on streets with traffic volumes between 3,000 to 5,000 vehicles per day on a case by case basis with consultation with Madison Metro and the Madison Fire Department."*

*Vote to support Option B carried on a 4 to 2 vote (voting no: Compton, De Vos).*

A motion was made by Ald. Compton, seconded by De Vos, to Approve

McCormick referred to the initial report and subsequent materials provided as it related to correspondence between Ald. Golden and the Fire Department about establishing fire response routes, which the Fire Department did not support.

Ann Gullickson, Metro Transit, spoke in opposition to broadening the categories of streets eligible for speed humps. She believed the current policy worked well and acknowledged that there were a few routes with speed humps in which City buses had to travel. Currently they would review requests and offer their comments. Their primary concern is the safety of the passengers and secondarily the safety of their drivers. Collector streets are the best streets for bus routes and they do their best to minimize the use of local streets. Streets with speed humps require the bus to slow down significantly lower than the speed limit (in the neighborhood of 10-15 mph) so as not to give a passenger/driver an unexpected jolt or even cause injury. Metro saw significant liability with speed humps and therefore they urged the policy not be changed. She suggested that Metro might need to look to changes in routes with the addition of speed humps, which might mean moving to local streets and it was not something they wanted to do

George Hall, representing the Regent Neighborhood Association Transportation Committee indicated he was available to answer questions and indicated a preference for "Option B as a way of building consensus (whatever can be obtained) for responsive City policies. Option B offers case-by-case review, which may meet consensus of those affected."

Elizabeth Kerwin (1 North Prospect) registered in support of speed humps on Allen Street and reacted to comments by Metro staff about the disadvantages of adding speed humps on collector streets. She suggested Metro drivers contributed to the problem and she had no problem with having such drivers reduce their speeds to 10-15 mph.

McCormick reviewed the options outlined in the report: A) No change, B) Include low volume collectors (3000-5000 vpd) for speed hump consideration after consultation with Madison Metro and Madison Fire Department. C) Restrict speed humps from any collector street.

Compton/DeVos moved support of Option C (no speed humps on collector streets).

Compton said they needed to pay attention to the concerns addressed by Fire and Metro and suggested other traffic calming devices could be used on collector streets.

Webber/Strawser moved a substitute motion to recommend Option B (allow speed humps on low volume collector streets - volume 3000-5000 - on a case-by-case basis).

Webber pointed out that option C was more restrictive than current conditions and saw no need to move in that direction. She believed the case-by-case review by Fire and Metro provided an opportunity to be apprised of the ramifications of requests for speed humps on certain low volume collector streets.

Shahan noted a concern with supporting option C vs. A or B, namely, with Option

C would we remove Yuma's speed humps if passed because Yuma is a collector? If not, we should should go with A or B. DeVos believed that the concerns expressed about impacts on emergency and Metro vehicles were reasons to support the option. Compton restated her reason that they needed to listen to staff and there were opportunities to use other traffic calming measures to address speeding issues.

Webber pointed out the reason speed humps were desired over other traffic calming measures were that they were found to lower speeds more effectively than traffic islands and they didn't impact a street's parking supply as much as islands would. She repeated that any speed hump on a lower volume collector street required prior consideration/comment by Fire and Metro. She emphasized that Option C was more severe than current conditions and urged support for either her option B or at a minimum A.

DeVos commented she did not believe speed humps would be appropriate for Allen Street since it was a bus route. Logan commented by making the change as proposed in Option B would not mean that a street falling within in this volume range would get speed humps, rather the option provided for review and comment by the affected bodies. Conroy too supported the flexibility afforded in option B. Compton contended that if there was a truly "special" case it could be taken up even under her proposal for option C. She emphasized the need to listen to staff on an issue such as this, since they affect safety of customers and employees. Strawser contended that this opportunity to deviate from C was not there; rather what Compton was addressing was option A. Compton didn't agree.

McCormick pointed out that if a change were made to the policy, a resolution would be prepared and submitted to the Council for their approval.

The motion passed by the following vote:

**Absent:** King  
**Excused:** Thimmesch, Wittke and Kugler  
**Aye:** Webber, Logan, Conroy and Strawser III  
**No:** Compton and De Vos  
**Non Voting:** Shahan

4. Bicycle Parking on State Street, including 200 Block (request of Ald. Webber)



Webber provided a copy of data from a manual count she took of bicycles parked east of Lake Street on State Street on 10/14/2004 and pointed out it was a cold and damp day. Webber referred to the discussion and requests for information from the December and January meetings, including a needs assessment of the land use and commercial uses so that they could come up with a general idea of the bike parking needs. Also requested was a survey of actual bike parking usage on the street. From there, she expected them to develop a plan to accommodate bikes in the area. She referred to and reviewed some of her count data and pointed out that in the 600 block alone there was a usage of 112 bikes, which documented the shortage of bicycle parking. Although she still intended to introduce a resolution to address the issue, she was hoping PBMC could move toward some kind of plan to accommodate bicycle parking. She asked the status of their request related to land uses and number of bicycle parking spaces that would be required under the ordinance if this were a private development under review, as well as the result of a bicycle count.

Compton asked if there was a cost breakdown on the cost of bike racks and maintenance. Ross said he didn't have it and he could try to obtain the information. He didn't believe it was a line item in agency budgets so that the data would not be easily retrievable. Compton believed the information was important for them to receive. Strawser agreed and suggested that when it is available it be discussed in context with the cost per space in a structured parking ramp, e.g., Mid-State Street ramp.

Shahan referred to some of the earlier discussion about directing people to available bike parking since some of it was underutilized-this might be especially true if bike parking accommodations were made in the parking ramps. Possibly this would need to be done through some kind of wayfinding program.

Webber asked if the information requested from the prior meeting was available. McCormick responded that he was unaware of the timetable and nothing was available.

Webber threw out some ideas; the City is considering building an \$11M parking ramp with the individual parking spaces costing \$34,000 per space but because of the mix between some private and public spaces, the public spaces were identified as costing \$24,000. Since the ramp was not using taxable bonds, she suggested looking into using some of the money to pay for bike parking facilities. She believed there should be bike parking facilities in all ramps; there should be signage; and if it was necessary to acquire land for bicycle parking, that should be considered. Considering the amount spent on car parking, she believed it appropriate and advisable to spend a fraction of it on a mode of transportation that was not clogging the streets or contributing to poor air quality. She summarized that they needed to quantify the existing number of parked bicycles and number of bike racks and then develop a parking plan for both long term and short-term parking. If it required the user to pay for the parking, she was open to the suggestion and arguments for it. She referred to the upcoming redesign undertaken for the 300-600 blocks of State Street and said she did not want to see a rehash of what occurred in the 200 block where inadequate bike parking facilities were provided. Although she was willing to assist where she could, she believed some City agencies needed to provide the data being requested.

Shahan asked the timeframe in which they could pull together the type of

information they had provided for the 100-200 blocks for the remaining blocks of State Street. Ross indicated that he could get the material for the 300 block by the next meeting.

Logan asked if they had an idea of the percentage of bikes parking on State Street that was long-term student/residential parking, including abandoned bikes. Ross commented that they did not have a way of knowing this without devoting staff resources to regular checking/inventorying of parked bicycles. Webber said that since there were long-term parking needs, they would need to develop some kind of a tagging system if they were going to be able to identify abandoned bicycles vs. ones parked for a long period (for example residents in the area). Ideally long-term parking could be accommodated in, for example, bicycle lockers.

Ross pointed out enforcement would be under the Police Dept. and he did not believe it was a high priority. He pointed out a City ordinance had been approved some years ago and it paralleled car regulations-e.g., bicycles couldn't be parked in one location longer than 48 hours. Also there was an ordinance that applied only to the defined State Street pedestrian mall areas and specified that a bicycle could only be parked in bicycle racks in these areas.

Shahan summarized what he was hearing: 1) They needed to get the data on the land uses so they would know the target number they were looking at. 2) They needed an inventory existing parking facilities in the area. 3) They needed to address the issue of long-term parkers and resident uses so that spaces available on State Street weren't being used for this long-term (abandoned bike) parking. 4) With providing bike parking in ramps, they needed to have a way to inform the public of this fact (wayfinding). 5) How would they plan to pay for parking that would be provided, e.g., long term parking? He believed they should start with the survey.

DeVos asked about providing bicycle parking in the Mid-State ramp, and Webber commented it had been mentioned but they had not seen the plan to see what the accommodations would be. Shahan added that he had brought the request to the attention of the Mayor's office following conversations with Susan Schmitz, DMI. Asked if this was a condition in the proposals; Webber said it was not.

Compton suggested they look into bicyclists paying for the parking provided, e.g., metered bike parking. Webber said this could be a part of the plan. Webber added a consideration could be the Parking Utility taking on bicycle parking and incorporating it within its system. She said she was open to ideas and assumed that in any consideration they would need to do a cost-benefit analysis on the feasibility of bicyclists paying for bicycle parking. Shahan added that they could try some things on a trial and referred to what was done in Europe and that assessing a fee for bike parking appeared to work better for long-term parking. Compton addressed her position that similar to motorists having to seek out sites to park and pay for parking, so should a bicyclist. Webber suggested they look into technology and costs associated with providing it and enforcing it-e.g., cost-benefit analysis.

McCormick asked if they were looking for a short-term goal of dealing with the redesign of the State Street so that bicycle parking is given consideration and adequate bicycle parking designed so as to meet the demand. Also, was an

overall bicycle parking plan being requested?

Besides the direction given above, members expected to receive bicycle inventory and land use information on the 300 block of State Street with the remaining blocks to follow shortly thereafter.

## F. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

5. Directing City Staff to Install Traffic Control Devices in Accordance with MGO 3.51(d) in order to Eliminate Commuter Traffic on Local Streets in the Lake Edge Neighborhood  
*Members conditioned approval on the device being installed allowing for pedestrian and bicycle access.*

A motion was made by Ald. Compton, seconded by Strawser III, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER

McCormick referred to the materials provided, including the email from Ald. Markle.

Item was tabled on motion by Webber/Logan so that Nelson could look for some materials he had brought; carried unanimously.

After taking the item off the table, Nelson explained that the issue dated back to the mid-1960's and involved use of a local street north of Monona Grove High School, which was used as a commuter route for access between the high school to the two County Highways to the north-Cottage Grove and Buckeye Road. The area north and to the east of Monona Grove HS was annexed and developed by the City of Madison and most of the neighborhood is served by unimproved streets without sidewalks. At the north end of Jerome and Buckeye, there is an elementary school located. The whole issue involves traffic through the neighborhood, some tennis courts which were subject to litigation in the late 1960s with some standing orders with regard to them; improvements to Coldspring Avenue, three houses purchased in the City of Madison by the Monona Grove HS for potential expansion and at one time a request to remove a parking lot which was not approved by the City of Madison. Currently before the Plan Commission is a request to revise the tennis courts. As part of the overall package, the City installed a traffic splitter at the intersection of Coldspring and Jerome as a test. The test resulted in some Madison residents being inconvenienced because they could not gain access to the signal at Coldspring and Monona Drive. The traffic splitter was basically a barrier across the street so traffic from Coldspring between Bainbridge and Jerome was diverted onto Jerome Street. Coldspring Avenue at the intersection is half in the City of Monona and half in the City of Madison. As a result of the test there was a neighborhood meeting on 1/21/05 and there was unanimous support with one abstention for a permanent traffic splitter and it was to be accomplished with the improvements scheduled for Coldspring. However, the Monona Grove School District and the City of Monona determined that the splitter had not met their needs and Monona requested that the splitter be removed on 3/9/05. Additionally the Board of Education and City of Monona took testimony that during a time when both a basketball game and band concert were scheduled, an ambulance dispatched to the high school was slowed in reaching the school due to congestion. Dryer met recently with the Mayor of Monona and his staff and understood that Monona would be agreeable to the installation of this traffic control device if there was some kind of emergency access through it provided-possibly a gate. They were not certain that this was a position that would receive full support of Monona or Monona Grove HS. An alternative was to test a different location (one to the east on Jerome) that would presumably duplicate the effectiveness of the one previously tried. The details had yet to be worked out and he acknowledged the preference was for the traffic control device to be located at Coldspring and Jerome. The resolution would allow for an extended testing period.

Motion was made by Compton/Strawser to approve. Webber asked for a friendly amendment to request that any device that is installed allow bicycle and pedestrian traffic to pass through the device. Compton considered the amendment friendly. The motion passed by acclamation.

6. Repealing Section 12.128(2) and creating Section 12.82 of the Madison General Ordinances to establish new regulations for advertising on vehicles or other mobile objects when operating or parked on the highway, and amending Section 1.08(3)(a) of the Madison General Ordinances to establish a bail deposit amount for violations of new Section 12.81.

**A motion was made by De Vos, seconded by Strawser III, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION**

**Ald. Steve Holtzman appeared in support of the item and noted that it was something he had been working with the City Attorney's office for some 3.5 years. Research was done on what occurs in other parts of the country. He referred to Madison's tradition of regulating advertising including billboard bans (or limitation on advertising) that occurred in the late 1980s and 1990s. His concerns were not only related to aesthetics but the congestion such vehicle cause, e.g., on football Saturdays. His intent was to address the issue before it became more widespread.**

**Strawser asked about a situation with a VW "bug" painted with a local ice cream shop logo; was that type of advertising addressed one way or another in this ordinance change? Holtzman pointed out that they were finding more and more vehicles parked on arterial streets with an advertising sign in the window and they wanted to be able to address this situation. However, he said the intent was not to limit normal graphics with wraps on cars.**

**Conroy said from her reading she thought it was more inclusive than what was being described, e.g., the definition of "over more than 75% on the exterior". Holtzman said he was sorry the City Attorney couldn't be present to discuss some of the specifics and pointed out this is an issue dating back to 10/18/02 and there had been substantial research on what has been enacted in other jurisdictions. He wanted to curb the proliferation of any more of the trailers with graphics on them.**

**The motion passed by acclamation.**

7. Authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to provide a Statement of Willingness to Assume Financial Responsibility to the Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation in connection with a rails-to-trails conversion of the Union Pacific Railroad line between County Highway PD (McKee Road) and USH 18/151 (Beltline Highway).

*Item was referred to the April meeting so that staff could seek clarification on a number of issues.*

A motion was made by Ald. Webber, seconded by De Vos, to Refer to the PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION, due back on April 26, 2005

Tony Fernandez, City Engineering, identified the rail corridor in the vicinity of the Beltline Highway and Arbor Hills neighborhood. The State had approached the City with the possibility of maintaining and operating a bike path corridor under the rails-to-trails program. Abandonment of the rail operation was imminent and therefore there was an opportunity for the City to create a bicycle link between the residential neighborhoods crossing the Beltline and connecting in with the bike network. As part of the process, if the railroad requests abandonment there is a 20-day window of opportunity for any public agency to take over the corridor under the rail-to-trails. If the railroad agrees to negotiate on this basis and an agreement is reached, the rail corridor is not abandoned but moves into an interim trail use. The resolution before the body would provide a statement of willingness on the part of the City. Implications of such action would be for the agency to enter into negotiations with the railroad, including acquisition. The corridor involved multi-jurisdictions (City of Madison, Fitchburg, and conceivably the DNR and UW as it relates to the Arboretum properties).

Larry Nelson, City Engineering, said that when the resolution was drafted the City understood that since WisDOT apprised the City of this opportunity that the State was proceeding to acquire the corridor. But the City has since learned that is not the case. Therefore, they were requesting referral until staff had an opportunity to sort out some of the legal issues.

The motion passed by acclamation.

8. Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute an agreement with the State of Wisconsin Department of Transportation for Maintenance of the South Dutch Mill Road to Collins Bicycle/Pedestrian Path

A motion was made by Ald. Compton, seconded by Conroy, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS Motion by Compton/Conroy was to approve. The motion passed by acclamation.

9. Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute an agreement with the State of Wisconsin Department of Transportation for Maintenance of the Nelson Road to Terra Court Bicycle/Pedestrian Path

*Motion to approve was with the understanding that some changes needed to be made to the agreement. For example in item 3, the paragraph number references needed to be updated and item 15 was to be rechecked as to whether it was necessary since it seemed to be covered under item 3.*

A motion was made by Ald. Compton, seconded by De Vos, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS

Shahan referred to some changes he thought were needed in the Agreement. For example under item 3 some paragraph references needed to be updated due to some revisions to paragraph numbers in this agreement over the one just passed under item 8. Also Shahan questioned the need for paragraph 15 since it appeared to duplicate #3. Fernandez indicated staff would again review the agreements for accuracy before processing.

The motion passed by acclamation.

10. Routine Trial Period Ordinances (recommend approval)

10.a. Repealing Subsection (106) of Section 12.1334 entitled "Parking Prohibited Except Temporarily While Attended by Operator" of the Madison General Ordinances, portions Harrison Street.  
A motion was made by Conroy, seconded by Ald. Compton, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by acclamation.

10.b. Amending Subsection (158) of Section 12.132 entitled "Parking Prohibited At All Times" of the Madison General Ordinances, portions Harrison Street.  
A motion was made by Conroy, seconded by Ald. Compton, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by acclamation.

## G. REPORTS OF OTHER COMMITTEES -- SUMMARY OF ACTIVITY

11. Plan Commission - None

12. LRTPC

Minutes were provided and Shahan noted they had spent time discussing the land use map in for the Comprehensive Plan and desire to map transit corridors. Additionally they began to look into establishing rules of procedure for the body.

13. Joint West Area Campus Committee - None, had not met since last meeting.

*None; had not met since the last meeting.*

14. Joint SE Campus Area Committee

*None; had not met since the last meeting.*

## H. REPORTS OF OFFICERS AND/OR MEMBERS FOR INFORMATION/DISCUSSION

15. Executive Secretary - None

16. Items by Chair - None

17. Items for referral and/or announcements

DeVos asked what the procedure was for dealing with designating bicycle routes on the periphery as had been mentioned by Ald. Brandon when considering the NTMP item.

Ross noted that although a bike route network was identified, the goal was to provide for streets in the city to be accessible for bicycles. A bicycle route network was designed to indicated through routes from one part of an area to another, for example, to provide guidance to persons new to the City to help them get around. DeVos referred to the comments by Brandon as it related to an area not receiving points in the NTMP process since it wasn't a designated bicycle route, yet it probably would be if the City were up-to-date in making such designations and how this impacted these neighborhoods. Ross stated that they didn't have a specific process for updating newer parts of the City. When updating the bike map, they would be looking into the newly developed areas, but they hadn't done this for a couple of years-the bike route network was done some 5-6 years ago.

Webber added that as part of the comprehensive plan, she requested that the Transportation Planner in Planning Department include planning for a hierarchy of bicycle routes similar to plans done for a hierarchy of streets. She pointed out an arterial street would unlikely be a preferred route for bicyclists and pedestrians and often these represented the only through routes. Therefore, she saw a need to plan for a network of through routes for bicyclists and pedestrians. On top of that, the MPO and County bicycle plan designate certain routes as escape routes in/out of the City. A problem was that some of the escape routes were so dangerous that bicyclists do not want to use them even though they are designated as routes by the MPO and there wasn't a plan for maintaining them. She was hoping that these issues would be addressed in the comprehensive plan.

Compton asked how long it would take staff to update the bike routes for the City; Ross responded a month or two. Once done, members asked that it be brought back to them.

**ADJOURNMENT on motion by Webber/Compton at 7:30 p.m.**

Informational Enclosures - none

Prepared by Ev Fahrback, Recording Secretary