



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes - Approved SUSTAINABLE MADISON TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (Madison in Motion)

Thursday, March 19, 2015

5:00 PM

Room 300, Madison Municipal Building
215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard

1 CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Chair Gary Poulson called the 3-19-15 meeting of the Madison in Motion (Transportation Master Plan) Oversight Committee to order.

Present: 8 - Maurice S. Cheeks; Chris Schmidt; John Strasser; Denise DeMarb; Rob Kennedy; Gary L. Poulson; Lynn K. Hobbie and Jay B. Ferm

Excused: 3 - Ken Golden; Craig P. Stanley and Michael W. Rewey

2 APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM DECEMBER 18, 2014 MEETING

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

3 PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no members of the public wishing to speak in regard to future Committee agendas.

4 DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

There were no disclosures or recusals reported by Committee members.

NEW BUSINESS

- 5 [37359](#) Dissolving the Ad Hoc Parking Strategic Plan Committee and directing actions to fulfill its charge.

This Resolution was Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION

Concerns were raised by some Committee members that replacing this committee with the Oversight Committee may not leave this issue focused enough. David Trowbridge discussed about how Capitol East District is looking at a new tool that

can evaluate mode choice options and future development options, and its related impacts on parking.

Lynn Hobbie would like to see discussion somewhere about how much parking is required for specific development types and how this drives public investment. David responded that it is doubtful that they could get into this level of detail at the TMP process, but that these deliberations are taking place in other work efforts (largely led by the Transit and Parking Commission). Chairman Gary Poulson stated that although the Madison in Motion committee is not looking at Capitol East, we'd like to have a check in from them as it will influence things that we are looking at.

The Committee then unanimously recommended adoption of Resolution ID 37359, on a motion submitted by Ald. Chris Schmidt/Rob Kennedy.

6 REVIEW OF BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN SYSTEM PLANNING AND EVALUATION

Bicycle

David Trowbridge introduced this topic and stated that Toole Design Group (TDG) has been doing a lot of work with staff on bike and pedestrian recommendations and is probably 80% complete with the task. Tom Huber and Kevin Luecke here to provide an update. Tom Huber started with the existing bicycle system map - this is the network that is in existence today. Since members did not have individual maps of the three different layers of bikeway facilities, Tom and Kevin suggested they simply look at the composite map that was part of their packet.

Toole Design Group is also working on a Beltline planning project looking at bicycle and pedestrian access - this is a major barrier in the region. Tom indicated that since this is such a major barrier, when planning routes, you need to think about good crossings a few blocks away from the Beltline so that you can get your network to mate with the good crossings or vice versa. Map also displays possible future crossings - these will provide a good opportunity for improving bike/pedestrian crossings; some of these will be non-interchange street crossings, some may be independent bike/pedestrian crossings.

The next map that Tom showed had a series of recommendations for **local street**

facilities. Local streets are minor streets often referred to as neighborhood streets. Some of these are from the current MPO/County bicycle plan or have been identified through this planning process. Since these are low volume, local streets they can be supported with the following bikeway types - bike boulevards, shared lane markings, perhaps bike lanes, and wayfinding (a more comprehensive form of bicycle routing).

Tom reviewed the proposed additions for bikeways for **major streets**. These are likely to be more visible as facilities - bike lanes, separated bike lanes, perhaps sidepaths. Additions as shown are things that can happen in the near term - up to 5-7 years from now. There are some arterials or higher volume collectors that are not shown because they are beyond that timeframe, although may be some collectors or arterials at the edge of the city which could have a medium to long-range timeframe for implementation and are shown.

Ald. Denise DeMarb asked about the Lower Yahara Trail and why the indirect routing as shown? Kevin responded that it would have been more direct and advantageous to follow the rail line, but the cost and coordination with the railroad seemed to outweigh the benefits, especially since there was a viable, but less direct option of tying it into the Capital City Trail.

Rob Kennedy asked about where the mapped future trails came from and if these were all new. Tom and Kevin responded that there was a combination of sources for these trails: the current MPO/County bicycle plan, trails added by the Madison planning office as new/proposed for subdivisions or in undeveloped areas at the edges of the city, and several new trails added by the TDG team.

Jay Ferm asked about the origin of "Level of Service" (LOS) used in the assessment of roadways and also wanted to know how the recommendations factored this in so as to reduce stress for long trips? Kevin responded that the TDG team looked at routing opportunities consistent with the bicycle functional classification scheme developed earlier in the planning process. Primary routes that are along lower speed and lower volume streets, as well as paths along arterials, will have higher LOS values (lower stress values). Tom stated that LOS is part of the Highway Capacity Manual and is based on user preferences which came directly from surveyed bicyclists (they heavily favored conditions that improved

safety). Jay asked what percent of the recommendations are at the different levels, which neither Tom or Kevin could answer, but could be estimated later.

David Trowbridge indicated that the next step was to bring together a focus group of bicyclists to review the recommendations. Jay suggested meeting with just several area bikeway experts in advance of that meeting. David indicated that he will set that up.

Pedestrian

Kevin Luecke reviewed the underpinnings of the two tier sidewalk priority approach applied to the Madison sidewalk system. Kevin indicated how this can be useful in implementation: city policy is that sidewalks be on both sides of the street when constructed new or when the street is reconstructed. The priority map or Tier 1 recommendations suggest if you don't wait for reconstruction, then these new sidewalks are most important to start with. Kevin acknowledged that the identification of unbuilt sidewalks as links to schools was really difficult to conduct. The TDG Team felt uncomfortable making recommendations for priority sidewalks leading to schools without some earlier study to help base the recommendations.

Jay Ferm asked why is there such resistance to getting new sidewalks in place in already developed areas? Ald. Denise DeMarb answered that there are two main issues - cost of the initial facilities and maintenance which is especially difficult for people who are elderly and who are on fixed incomes and have limited means to do clear snow from sidewalks. To make it more palatable Denise was instrumental in getting funding for a pilot program which will pay for 50% of the costs for new sidewalks as part of a project. Several members suggested giving some thought for area or district assessments as another approach. Ald. Maurice Cheeks commented that often the supporters and potential users for proposed sidewalks are not living on the street where the sidewalks are proposed leading to discord among neighbors.

Jay Ferm asked for a definition and examples of collectors and arterials since Tier 1 recommendations were tied directly to these streets. Jay followed up with a question - what would be the process involved in simply putting in a sidewalk where there was an obvious need based on a path worn in grass? Chris Petykowski from City Engineering responded that people should let the Department

of Public Works know where these gaps are and often small gaps can be added to nearby projects.

David Trowbridge explained one additional map that was in the committee's packet which had potential new interstate crossings being considered as part of another study. New crossings are often difficult to be added because of the built up nature of the neighborhoods on both sides of the Interstate.

7 ADJOURNMENT

The Committee adjourned its meeting at 6:35 p.m.