



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

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

Tuesday, August 23, 2005

5:00 PM

215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
Room 260 (Madison Municipal Building)
(After 6 pm, use Doty St. entrance.)

A CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Meeting called to order at 5:03 by Chair Shahan.

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

Excused: Ald. Robbie Webber, Cheryl E. Wittke and Carl R. Kugler

One Vacancy - Plan Commission representative
Compton arrived 5:10 p.m

B PUBLIC COMMENT - None

C APPROVAL OF MINUTES - July 26, 2005

As revised to clarify items under E1:

Page 7, under Old Middleton Road, insert "on uphill sections" on the sentence defining the approved street standard.

Page 8, under Arbor Hills Bike Trail, in the first sentence insert "Leopold" in front of "School".

A motion was made by Conroy, seconded by Logan, to Approve the Minutes.
The motion passed by acclamation.

D OLD BUSINESS

- D.1** [01191](#) Revising the Neighborhood Traffic Management Program (NTMP) to allow for the use of speed humps on local or collector streets with volumes of 5000 vpd or less.

Attachments: Neighborhood Traffic Mgmt Program Report.pdf

Referred to September meeting.

Refer to the PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION

Ross reviewed the action taken by other referral committees noting that TPC had approved the recommendation as included in the resolution allowing for speed humps on streets with 5000 vpd following review by the Fire Department and Madison Metro. Public Safety had recommended no change to the current policy (Option A). Skidmore added that Public Safety Review felt very strongly about this issue.

Referring to the PBMVC recommendation for a joint meeting, Shahan asked if Public Safety had not felt this was necessary-apparently so. Skidmore pointed out that he had subsequently requested that Public Safety Review Board notice the PBMVC meeting in the event a quorum attended to address their issues, but he was the only member of that body present.

Motion was made by Logan/Skidmore to refer the item to the next meeting.

Logan pointed out his motion for referral was so that Webber could be present since she had expressed considerable interest in the measure and Skidmore added that he supported referral so that it might give an opportunity for some of the Public Safety Review Board members to attend to share their positions.

DeVos indicated she had some prepared comments and wanted to share them rather than wait for the next meeting. She read from a statement indicating her opposition to expanding roads eligible for speed humps. A main reason was that it would jeopardize bus travel. When she joined PBMVC she had expected to share many of her beliefs and those of others as it related to promoting modes other than the automobile. Although her major transportation was a bus, she was a pedestrian advocate and wanted to encourage other transportation modes other than the automobile. She thought people oriented toward traffic calming would want to encourage alternative transportation modes as well. Yet a year later, she was less sanguine about such assumptions and in fact was more skeptical about people's motives. Using the speed hump issue as an example, she said that if the goal is to increase bus ridership, it is not logical to make riding the bus less comfortable. Testimony from bus company representatives had indicated that speed humps would do just that. She asked how many people in favor of speed humps actually rode the bus. What she saw was that people who didn't want speeding on their street, ended up using their car for everything else and probably were speeders themselves. She had not seen a concern for encouraging people to use alternative modes of transportation. Another example she suggested was restoring parking on the Capitol Square. A result of this proposal was to eliminate a number of bus stops and she asked does this encourage bus riding? She suggested the proposal did not encourage bike riding either. She referred to examples where traffic islands were recommended and referred to one constructed in her neighborhood, which didn't allow for a motorist to pass a bicyclist. Yet another island is being planned and at a neighborhood forum no other alternatives were presented-only the engineer's pre-planned scheme. She referred to an experience on the bus near the recently completed Badger stadium; the bus driver had to go into left lane to avoid hitting a bicyclist because of a traffic island on Breese Terrace near Regent-there wasn't sufficient room for a bus to pass a bicyclist. She asked would it take a serious accident before these designs draw the attention they should. Weren't the traffic calming measures actually motivating people to get in cars rather than other modes, e.g., bicycles? If she wanted to encourage car travel rather than bus and bicycle

travel, she said she would follow the course being taken by the City. So she asked, what is the goal of traffic calming-to sour people on the whole idea or to encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation?

Motion to refer carried unanimously.

Asked by Compton about the difference between tabletops and speed humps, Ross explained that the design for speed humps used by the City was sometimes called a speed table. There is a 22 ft. hump with 10 ft. flat top section and 6 foot ramps on either side. Basically, the terms could be used interchangeably.

D.2 Status Report on NTMP 2005 Program, including results of Sawmill and Westfield Ballot

Ross was not familiar with the results so Skidmore explained what he understood from a prior conversation with David Dryer that the ballot resulted in a 3 to 1 approval rate for the traffic claming circle at the intersection that was presently controlled with stop signs on the Sawmill approach. He said he had spoken with the neighborhood association president who also was aware of the results. Skidmore added that some of the residents were advocating for speed humps.

E NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

E.1 [01690](#) SCHEDULE FOR TRAFFIC SIGNAL PRIORITY LIST 2005 CONSIDERATION

Attachments: 2004 Traffic Signal Priority List.xls, CRITERIA FOR TRAFFIC SIGNALS.doc, 2005 signalpriorityletter.doc

Smith explained that at the last meeting the schedule had been presented and a copy of an initial edition of the proposed priority list was provided. He reminded members the public hearing was scheduled for the next meeting - September 28. Since it would take a couple of months to collect any additional data, the final action on the list was not expected until the November 22 meeting. Prior to then, staff was looking to the Commission to identify any locations in which additional information or counts might be desired. Smith offered to go over the criteria used in formulating the list, but thought possibly that most members were familiar with the process.

Compton asked if the list might identify locations where coordination with other governmental or private groups was needed; for example, between County or State. She referred to Cottage Grove, which is a County Road, and she wondered if this would be a project undertaken by the City and County. Smith commented that the City planned to take over maintenance responsibilities for Cottage Grove at the USH 51 intersection and then would coordinate it with some of the adjacent intersections to improve traffic flow. He added that when there was shared jurisdiction with the State, their approval would be required, and it was one of the reasons they conducted the studies to see if the location met the standards identified in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, since the State would typically not approve a signal to be installed unless it did meet the warrants. With the County, however, there had been times when a signal might be approved but then the County would not contribute to any costs until such time as the location met the warrants.

Compton thought it would be valuable information to show the jurisdictions involved when there are State and County roads and if there were any coordination considerations (including private development). Smith said when he did a revision he could show the County/State highway designations. Shahan added that he was hearing that Compton also wanted to know about any financial splits for a location and if there were any to identify them. He wondered if that information would be available at this time or would this be something that would be determined after a location was approved. Smith reminded members that funding had not been a consideration in the past in terms of the priority list itself; rather the list was based on whether the location met the criteria or to what extent it met the criteria. Compton continued to believe that the information would be useful. Smith referred to the priority list and comment "D - Part of cost could be assessed to benefiting property owners" and where it was known the letter "D" was shown in the comment column. They did not have a letter identifier for whether a location was shared with a governmental jurisdiction and this might be the way to indicate this in the table.

DeVos asked about Warrants 1A and 1B, and Smith referred to the handout from the last meeting which provided a paraphrased explanation. The more lengthy explanation could be found in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, which could be found on the Web through a Google search on MUTCD. Smith said that if there were any individual requests for additional information, the member should contact him and he would see what he could provide.

Smith referred to a couple additions in the 2005 list compared to 2004: Sam's Club Driveways with Watts Road (listed on one line although they had count information for both driveways) and he referred to the crash information which

would likely improve with a signal and pointed out the location would be assessed. Another location was Cottage Grove Road and Thompson Drive. Smith pointed out the list had been updated with crash information but still needs to incorporate some traffic volume information. The numbering of the all-way stop locations had been corrected.

Shahan referred to some of the discussion at TPC when there was a hearing on increasing bus fares and there had been reference to possibly cutting traffic calming dollars and a suggestion had been made that rather than that possibly signal installations could be delayed. He asked if the cost per signal was in the neighborhood of \$100,000 per intersection; Smith responded that typically it was in the \$50-60,000 range and could be lower if conduit were already installed.

Shahan reminded members the public hearing would be next month on September 28.

F REPORTS OF OTHER COMMITTEES - SUMMARY OF ACTIVITY

F.1 Plan Commission

None since there is no representative from the Plan Commission at this time.

F.2 Long Range Transportation Planning Commission

Shahan reported that the Commission discussed the Wingra Creek development and he shared the discussion PBMVC had previously had on the matter. LRTPC largely agreed with PBMVC and added a few more comments. For example, for Beld and Cedar Street, they suggested Beld Street connect with Cedar coming in at a T-intersection. In the northern section, they suggested making Olin connect more directly to Midland and keep South Street on a straighter alignment with a traffic circle included in the design.

Elections were held and Shahan was re-elected as Chair with Logan being elected as Vice Chair.

F.3 Joint West Area Campus Committee

No meeting in August so nothing to report.

F.4 Joint SE Campus Area Committee

No quorum so no meeting held in August.

G REPORTS OF OFFICERS AND/OR MEMBERS FOR INFORMATION/DISCUSSION

G.1 Executive Secretary Report

Ross pointed out that the joint meeting with TPC and Downtown Coordinating Committee for the follow-up report on Restoring Parking to the Capitol Square was scheduled for 9/28-tentatively at 5 p.m. with the signal public hearing at 6 p.m. Members felt it might be more appropriate to schedule the signal public hearing at 5 p.m. and the joint meeting at 6 p.m. so that the joint meeting was not confined to an hour time limit.

G.2 Items by Chair

Shahan said that as they start the NTMP process he would like to take another look at the traffic island on Glen Drive and referred to some rather nasty personal experiences he and his wife had.

G.3 Items for Referral and/or Announcements

Compton referred to a meeting with the Department of Natural Resources and DOT and asked Ross to summarize the outcome. Ross explained the issue was the missing piece of the Capital City Trail between Madison and Cottage Grove. This piece was primarily under the jurisdiction of the DNR (basically from the City limits to the East) and they had pretty much given up on any negotiations with the railroad (Union Pacific/Wisconsin Southern). Accordingly, they were working with willing landowners who were adjacent to the corridor to come up with an alternative to the rail corridor. The City was planning to complete an extension east from Dempsey Road to Cottage Grove in 2005 and from Buckeye Road next year and then they would need to wait for DNR to move forward. There weren't a lot of landowners that the DNR needed to negotiate with, rather some major owners with significant property holdings. DNR wanted to work only with willing landowners vs. condemnation. Basically completion of the link was on hold until DNR was successful with its negotiations with the landowners. The intent was to use lands on the north side of the rail corridor and consideration was being given to whether or not the lands where a sewer main was located could be used, but he pointed a corridor somewhat wider than the sewer corridor would likely be needed. Compton came away from the meeting very optimistic that the project would proceed in a timely fashion.

Compton referred to the inter-connectors north and south and for them to be viable, they would need to get people from the Sprecher neighborhood to the path. She pointed out DNR hadn't been aware that there was a sewer line running north-south from Cottage Grove down to Buckeye and on toward Femrite or that from Siggelkow Road there was a connector across at Marsh and there were some good potential for connecting through the agricultural and dairy centers.

Ross indicated that the County had been working on a series of connections running north-south and had been acquiring land in that corridor (e.g., Blooming Grove natural resource area) and they were interested in placing a pathway in that corridor running north-south to the Glacier Drumlin trail and were interested in seeing east-west connections. Compton referred to other developments in the Door Creek/Sprecher areas and lands dedicated by Hovde.

Shahan referred to the study to be undertaken by Planning about the pedestrian-bicycle facilities on the east side of the Interstate and how it would relate to this.

Compton referred to the discussion at the last meeting about Cottage Grove Road bridge reconstruction; that is, it was to be delayed and replaced with potentially Buckeye Road by the State. Compton said this project hadn't been "delayed" by the State, rather it was removed-instead the money was being used elsewhere in the State (in Columbus). She and others would be meeting with State officials on the 30th and they were doing all they could to get the monies restored and she encouraged actions to be undertaken to convince the State to restore these dollars. Studies for the bridge indicate it as functionally obsolete.

H ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Ald. Skidmore, seconded by Ald. Compton, to Adjourn at 5:50 p.m. The motion passed by acclamation.

*Presented by
Evelyn Fahrback, Recording Secretary*

