



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

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

Tuesday, October 25, 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

Present: Ald. Judy Compton, Ald. Robbie Webber, Ald. Paul E. Skidmore, Michael Forster Rothbart, Mark N. Shahan, Matthew A. Logan, Mary P. Conroy, Cheryl E. Wittke, Susan M. De Vos, Charles W. Strawser III and Carl R. Kugler

B JOINT MEETING WITH TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION

Transit and Parking Commission members present:

Carl Durocher, Chris Carlsen, Diane Paoni, Sharon McCabe, Amanda White, Tim Wong, Ken Streit, Ald. Noel Radomski, Ald. Jed Sanbord, Ald. Ken Golden

Staff: Dan McCormick, Traffic Engineering; Catherine Debo, Metro Transit General Manager; Dave Trowbridge, Transportation Planning, P&D; Larry Nelson, City Engineer, and Rob Phillips, Deputy City Engineer; Stephanie Bradley-Wilson, Stacy Vilas, and Cam McLay, Madison Police; Lisa Bullard Cawthorne MHD

B.1 [02207](#) Adopting and confirming the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan.

Sponsors: Mayor Cieslewicz

Attachments: Comprehensive Plan Transportation chapter.pdf, Comprehensive Plan Transportation maps.pdf, Exhibit A

Refer to the PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION

Purpose is to afford commissions an opportunity for questions/answer session with City Staff relative to the transportation elements of the Comprehensive Plan. Following this session, the item is to be referred to the November meeting when the full plan and legislation will be available. Action is requested at the November meeting.

Trowbridge highlighted the more substantial changes made as a result of comments received from prior reviews:

P3-10: Policy 4 appeared in both the bicycle section and objectives and policies for roads and was intended to give bicycles a status in terms of functional classification.

P3-13: Added new objective - Transportation Demand Management (TDM). Strawser asked if the reference to transportation allowances was another way of referring to parking cash outs. Trowbridge responded that as well as other incentives to lower costs.

P3-15: Added a Policy 8 to look at where there were disconnects due to cul-de-sacs and other non-traditional street designs as it related to pedestrian accommodations, such as providing a crossing for long blocks.

P3-21: Added Policy 5 related to bicycle parking facilities in both public and private areas.

P3-21: Clarified Policy 7 as it related to locating bicycle parking at ancillary developments and major transit stations.

P3-21: Policy 9 was revised to deal with the issues of cul-de-sacs and non-traditional street designs and need to provide crossings and linkages within neighborhoods.

P3-22: Policy 1 referred to the need to look into under-served trail networks, and he referred to the number of comments they had received from north side residents about the lack of bicycle facilities.

P3-26: Change in the objective for Air Transportation to include reference to increasing direct and non-stop flights out of Madison as an economic development goal.

P3-26: Policy 2 explored opportunities to provide a direct link with the Airport and the Interstate Highway system. He acknowledged this would be a challenge but pointed out successful airports found this to be critical to their success. This too was an economic development goal.

P3-31: Implementation Recommendations:

*Explore feasibility of a street utility as a way to cover some of the transportation costs. Paoni asked if this was similar to what was being done in Oconomowoc. Trowbridge was not familiar with what was being done in there.

*Trowbridge said they had received a lengthy letter of comments from the Tenney-Lapham neighborhood indicating a desire to look again at the street network in their area and the broader Isthmus area. An implementation element had been included to conduct an update of the Isthmus Traffic Redirection Study, initially completed in the late 70's and updated in the 80's.

Conroy referred to page 3-23 and the policies on parking and asked about accommodations for people with disabilities. Also, she referred to issues related to providing special accommodations in areas in which there would be a high density of elderly residents. Trowbridge said a reference to parking for people with disabilities could be incorporated. In terms of the latter comment, he sought

clarification if the goal was to increase pedestrian opportunities and Trowbridge believed that was included in the pedestrian section. Wittke said an example in point would be the area around Hilldale along Segoe Road. Trowbridge added there was a section dealing with barriers to pedestrian mobility and this might be where this issue was addressed.

Durocher referred to a section under Transportation Objectives and a map, which outlined proposed streetcars and he asked Trowbridge to expand on it in relation to the Comprehensive Plan. Trowbridge pointed out that in the comprehensive plan they attempted to not be specific about potential routes and had included the only documented recommendation for anything along these lines and it came from Transport 2020 commuter rail project (that is, included a recommendation to look into a street-running option). A concept in Transport 2020 was to link bus transfer points within the City and future expansions beyond that could follow. The first step was to link Metro's transit facilities and this is the reason for their inclusion in the comprehensive plan. He emphasized the number of other processes which are involved in transportation planning, including the need for involvement from stakeholders, more detailed planning efforts, etc.

Wittke asked how the comprehensive plan was expected to be used. Trowbridge said this was something that wasn't totally clear within the Planning unit. However, it was expected that it would be used to guide the planning processes. The Planning Unit was looking at issues, such as, would approval in the comprehensive plan require updating of existing, approved neighborhood plans? He said he didn't have a good answer and referred to the challenge as it would relate to transportation planning efforts led by regional and local entities. Wittke asked if PBMVC should use it to guide their recommendations and Trowbridge responded yes.

Golden offered some suggestions related to the plan:

P3-4: Under Policy 2, he suggested the word "coordination" in the context of the regional transportation plan be changed to "consistency".

P3-7: In relation to the comment under building placement and orientation, the issue of the location of parking in relation to the building is needed and should explicitly state that parking should be in the back or sides of the building and might reference some minimal, if any, parking in front.

P3-8: In the discussion relative to small block size, he noted that he had read that in Portland they had actually identified a number of feet for the optimum block size. He suggested some numerical standard as a goal.

P3-9: In the section about transit-oriented development, he suggested adding something about seeking expedited review and approval of those kinds of developments.

P3-11: In the section addressing capacity increases, he referred to the situation on East Washington in which street capacity was increased significantly without adding traffic lanes, and he thought this section should emphasize engineering as the best way to increase capacity-it did not need to be the only means but should be the means emphasized. Examples of how capacity had been increased on East Washington was restricting driveway access, eliminating cross roads and adding turn lanes.

P3-14: He suggested they incorporate explicit reference to the increased use of in-street yield to pedestrian signs in neighborhood business districts.

P3-15: He cited a mistake in Objective 9 as it related to "reduce the costs to provide transit" and said such outcome was remote; they might be able to reduce costs per trip so thought that clarification should be incorporated.

P3-23: He suggested adding discussion about street parking. There were many places in the City where roads were built with no parking at anytime and he suggested this created a suburban form. Rather they should be pursuing a more urban form with street parking as well as street parking near activity centers.

P3-24: He referred to areas such as the Research Park, which had no on street parking for no good reason. He suggested that if such parking were included in the planning consideration, less off-street parking might be required and could become infill sites for development.

P3-24: He suggested adding something about coordinating parking rates and transit fares; in other words, when transit fares are raised, parking rates be increased as a way to mitigate transit ridership losses.

Webber commented on the following sections:

P3-8: In the section related to transit oriented developments (TOD) and parking, she suggested adding a reference to bicycle parking for areas that serve as multi-modal centers.

P3-10: In objective 5 about alleviating traffic congestion, she thought there could be some mention in the plan about the fact that alleviating traffic congestion should not degrade the safety of users of other modes of transportation moving along or across the corridor.

P3-11: She questioned the inclusion of the statement of considering the conversion of two-way streets to one-way streets. She referred to the pros and cons on either side of the issue. Trowbridge commented that the one-way operation allowed for tighter intersections and lessened crossing distances. There were some schools of thought that one-way streets were safer for pedestrians, while others believe that one-way streets created more speeding problems. He pointed out this was the reason for using "consider" in this statement.

P3-11: She referred to another opportunity to add a policy as it related to pedestrian and bicycle accommodations along and across roadways being modeled when undertaking roadway expansion to ensure that safety will not be compromised.

P3-15: Pedestrian accommodations, policy 7, addresses existing barriers to mobility and she thought it should be clear that this is true in new developments-not just retrofitted areas. She said she had some language that she would share with Trowbridge. She thought this might be where Golden's suggestion about block face size might be located, including if a block were longer than a certain distance there should be a mid-block cut-through/walkway to complete the grid for pedestrians. Trowbridge commented that he was in agreement with the concept but was a little concerned about putting numerical standards in the comprehensive plan; that there were other processes where this would come into play. Webber asked if there was a current, written policy; McCormick said it was likely identified in the subdivision regulations where it addressed blocks of "x" feet having a pedestrian walkway may or shall be provided. Webber thought that if this were in the subdivision ordinance, she didn't see a problem with including it in the comprehensive plan as well.

Shahan referred to the following:

P3-3: Shahan referred to the deleted paragraphs and asked for an explanation. Trowbridge said they were repeated in other chapters of the plan.

P3-5: At the top of the page he noted the revision to use the term "efficient" over "effective" and suggested that this change be carried out in the report; that there were other locations such as in the note under Policy 3 where "effective" was used and it might also be changed to "efficient".

P3-9: At the top of the page where the last sentence was deleted as it related to TOD density, he asked if this change was because it was too specific. Trowbridge responded that TODs vary in scale and size and it was felt the statement was too restrictive.

P3-10: He appreciated policy 4 on developing a hierarchy of bicycle corridors.

P3-13: He said there was a lot of TDM definition but wondered if some policies were needed. He wondered would TDM be wanted in all new developments or just some of them, should there be some kind of warrant system to determine when needed, etc.? How would this apply to redevelopments; would it be expected? Should there be some specific measurable goals and reference could be made to EPA program and tie it into transit oriented development and whether TOD would be required. It should be clear that the City would have a Demand Management Program for its employees, particularly since the City was expecting this of others. It should include an outreach to neighboring municipalities and County to get them on board to do something similar.

P3-14: He suggested the City's Pedestrian Plan should be referenced and identified by name in the comprehensive plan.

P3-21: He found Policy 5 under Bike Parking to be good.

P3-23: He referenced the section on encouraging short-term use for visitors and shoppers and said that if that concept were taken to an extreme without qualifying it, it could be interpreted as encouraging shopping trips to be made only by car. He wondered if there was a way to rework this since this was not a message he thought they should convey.

P3-26: Relative to the policy on Airport and access to the Interstate, he didn't understand how that could be accomplished nor did he like the idea. Trowbridge pointed out the policy was phrased as "explore" opportunities and it was an economic development goal.

Noting the reference to Isthmus Redirection, Shahan asked about the West Side Arterial Study and asked if it was currently happening. Golden thought the Pioneer Plan was based on it and TDM components.

In response to a question from Paoni, Trowbridge referred to page 3-33 in the implementation table, which dealt with amending the zoning and subdivision ordinances as a follow-up activity.

Paoni asked how the City's comprehensive plan compared with other cities; Trowbridge said he didn't have that information.

In response to a question, Trowbridge stated that the full ordinance on the Comprehensive Plan would be available for the next meeting, when each Commission would be asked to forward a recommendation, including specific comments to the Plan Commission.

Shahan noted the registration of Michael Barrett (2137 Sommers Av), who registered in opposition to the plan and did not wish to speak.

Logan referred to P3-21 and a change to Policy 4: Special attention should also be given to ensuring pedestrian and bicycle access to schools and that the City should encourage school design and financial incentives and other means set forth as safe and convenient use of non-motorized transportation for students. Logan said he would forward the wording to Trowbridge.

Forster Rothbart asked if the maps provided included changes that might have

been suggested; Trowbridge indicated they were being worked on this.

Wong commented as follows:

P3-10: Policy 4 - He referred to discussions in the mid-1990s when they were developing the bike map. They had talked about how they could produce a map that would be useful to a person unfamiliar with the area and one which showed the connectivity of the bike paths and routes. They had considered having a numbering route system similar to what's used for buses. He felt the idea of bicycle corridors was good but it could be augmented with a helpful map informing persons how to get from one location to another.

P3-11: Relating to Policy 3, he suggested it read like an open-ended invitation to traffic engineers to go crazy. In policy 4, in the transportation system management strategies, he did not like the word "improve traffic flow" - for example, when applied East Washington Crossings he saw an impossible situation. He suggested that when traffic flow is improved, one actually weighed the balance of transportation options toward the automobile. He, too, did not like the consideration of converting two-way streets to one way in policy 6-he believed it increased speed and in fact he supported recent discussions to convert existing one-way streets back to two-way streets.

P3-22: He did not consider mopeds as a pedestrian element. He said a problem with mopeds was they were using facilities designed for bicycles and riding on sidewalks. He urged that the laws be changed that now allow mopeds to park in bike racks. He referred to the polluting impacts of mopeds. Trowbridge commented about enforcing existing laws, including those that address driving responsibilities on the road and mopeds. The efforts of the UW in this area were mentioned. Wong suggested they work toward the redefinition of a moped to require them to have pedals, or else it would not meet the requirements for a moped and the laws associated with them.

P3-26: Relative to the Airport policies, he said as an Eastsider he had problems with anything that would improve air passenger service because of 1) noise, and 2) suggested that to move toward longer distance and non-stop service led to more flights and more pollution. Another concern was that when hopping on a flight was made easy, it was less likely that high-speed rail would be considered. He wanted to specifically see better transit service-not the once per hour bus to a transfer point. Instead they should have some kind of transit from the airport to downtown or UW or express rail. It was suggested that if he had some specific route ideas, he should forward the information to staff. He supported policy 2 for airport for obvious reasons.

Durocher reminded TPC members of their regular agenda so suggested they wrap up their questions so that they could recess for that purpose.

White thought there was a lack of reference to carpooling in the plan and promotion of this mode was an important transportation element. Perhaps it could be its own category or reflected under Demand Management element. She noted the City's commitment to the Rideshare program and thought reference to that would be appropriate.

Conroy asked about public hearings. Trowbridge said an official public hearing would be held later this year-the schedule was still being worked out. They were at the stage of getting comments from commissions and hoped to have them in the next month. Conroy asked about neighborhood involvement. Trowbridge said there had been eight or more meetings throughout the City and there had been considerable outreach with the comprehensive plan development.

Golden/Carlsen of the TPC moved to recess the TPC meeting and move to the third floor for the regular TPC meeting; carried unanimously.

REGULAR PBMVC AGENDA ITEMS

Regular meeting convened after joint meeting at 6:05 p.m.

C PUBLIC COMMENT -

None

D APPROVAL OF MINUTES - 9/28/05

A motion was made by Ald. Webber, seconded by Strawser III, to Approve the Minutes. The motion passed by acclamation.

E MADISON POLICE DEPARTMENT REPORT ON TRAFFIC RELATED ITEMS

Traffic Quarterly Report

Bradley Wilson and McLay reviewed the Third Quarter report, provided at the meeting along with an invitation to the 2005 Traffic Safety Summit, which she invited members to consider attending.

Bradley-Wilson noted that total citations in the third quarter were about 700 less than the previous quarter and of that 1662 were for non-hazardous violations. A comparison showed about 400 less for hazardous and 300 less for non-hazardous violations. The Police had been emphasizing the importance of traffic safety overall and were encouraging officers to write citations for hazardous violations along with seat belt violations. They had made some 336 traffic contract where verbal warnings were given. They were not satisfied with the results for the quarter and would make efforts to improve it. Speeder's hotline resulted in some 416 calls for the period with 47% resulting in a letter being sent. Information related to it was available in the PD common database for officers. In the traffic safety initiatives they had been involved in a number of activities and she reviewed the list enumerated in the handout and provided a status as it might relate to other factors, such as an increase in violent crime in the Allied Drive area, resulting in CPT not always having the resources for traffic safety.

McLay addressed his efforts working with Police Administration and the organization as a whole in an effort to address the larger culture change toward traffic safety. They planned to continue the course they are on to improve traffic safety awareness and a buy-in by officers with the goal of changing the community's perception of Policing efforts in the way of enforcement.

Skidmore asked for an estimate of how many of the 4695 citations were written by TEST. Bradley-Wilson responded that typically TEST writes about 30%. McLay said this figure might be somewhat optimistic since the number of officers comprising TEST has been reduced and some of the existing TEST officers were on light duty and although they were working in the traffic safety area, their efforts would not be reflected in the number of citations issued. Also due to other staffing shortages, there were occasions when TEST officers would be assigned to another area. Skidmore wondered about the number of traffic stops in which citations were not issued; Bradley-Wilson referred to the statistic of 336 traffic contacts. Lastly, Skidmore asked the percent of the time the SW CPT was not involved in Allied Drive. McLay said he wouldn't have a figure.

Logan asked in the fourth quarter where they would expect to see improvements. McLay said there are several categories that are common to an investigation of a motor vehicle accident, e.g., pass/turning movements, yield right-of-way, following too close, etc. He would expect a closer look at these when the crash was investigated and if there was probable cause that a causal violation occurred a citation was to be issued. This was not being followed and they expected to change this. For crashes they might investigate that were not reportable by WisDOT standards, officers completed a separate form to facilitate the drivers exchanging information. Currently, the policy doesn't require the officer to write a citation when there is probable cause that a violation may have occurred for these and there is support from the management team to change this so that anytime an officer is called to a motor vehicle crash and there is probable cause for causal violation, the officer is to issue a citation. Logan wondered about the impact on driver behavior. McLay didn't believe it would have a significant effect. He referred to the theory in law enforcement that people do their own cost-benefit

analysis and he didn't believe the community perceived a high probability of being cited. He acknowledged they had ownership of a certain part of that perception. He emphasized the value of organizations such as the Safe Community Coalition in helping with the larger community culture change.

McLay emphasized that the Chief's position was for the Police to focus on hazardous moving violations. He referred to the number of officers who believed that they would be appeased merely by numbers so that they would stop a motorist and write additional minor equipment violations. This created a disparate impact on persons of color and socio economics. Instead the focus for their law enforcement was to increase safety and therefore they wanted to see the emphasis on hazardous citations.

Forster Rothbart referred to the statistics for pedestrian-bicycle and the decline in numbers and wondered if it could be a result of improved behavior or less enforcement. McLay said some could be accounted to less of an enforcement effort although he noted the efforts recently undertaken. Bradley Wilson pointed out that a couple of years ago they received money from WisDOT for a bike enforcement initiative and at that time they also had a PM Test unit. In response to a question Bradley-Wilson indicated they had worked with UW police on some initiatives in the past.

Bradley-Wilson responded to a question on what constitutes a non-hazardous citation, e.g., equipment violations.

Shahan referred to prior comments from MPD on a problem-solving approach and wondered if there was an update on the status of that process. McLay reported that data from the State and Traffic Engineering had been sent to the district patrol lieutenants along with traffic complaints. How effectively this was used varied from district to district and he described his experience in the SW district using a traffic safety coordinator and dissemination of information to the officers. McLay indicated a difficulty would be in measuring success and they would be talking with Traffic Engineering on more timely feedback with respect to measuring variances in crashes.

Webber asked if UW enforcement was used in the campus area on City street and if there was coordination between the City and UW Police agencies, such as along the main corridors that run through the campus. Were tickets for motor vehicle violations being issued by UW? Bradley-Wilson said she didn't have any data relative to this. Webber felt this was a real opportunity if there could be such coordination.

Webber asked about the issue of enforcement in school zones in the afternoon, particularly as it related to shift changes occurring at a time that made it difficult to be able to conduct any enforcement efforts during this critical time. She noted that she had passed along her concern to the Mayor and Chief. She asked if there had been any problem solving to bridge the gap between shift changes and the need to have a presence after school dismissal times. Bradley-Wilson said that depended on the district. She thought in the west district they were relying on beat officers to supplement the effort but she acknowledged that it could be problematic since the beat officer might not be able to get on site until 3 p.m. They were working to assign patrol officers vs. CPT to an earlier time. MPD recognized the problem and was working toward resolution. McLay added that

part of the dynamics for the west district was the explosive problem with violent crimes and it was becoming harder to put traffic safety ahead of dealing with these issues. There was a commitment on the part of MPD to traffic safety, but the realities of other crimes in certain areas had to be taken into consideration.

Wittke asked if they had given thought to other ways than citations to evaluate the outcomes of the efforts being undertaken through other traffic safety initiatives. Bradley-Wilson referred to the training efforts of officers including pre-tests before receiving training and then conducting a post-test. They found this valuable in keeping officers up to date. Wittke asked if they wouldn't expect to see an increase in the number of citations; Bradley-Wilson thought yes.

Compton asked if video cameras might be useful in Police work, especially considering the staffing limitations in today's climate. McLay responded that in terms of making a substantive difference in the behavior of drivers, there was no doubt in his mind that if you increase the certainty of being caught, there would be a decrease in the number of violations. Where used elsewhere, it has been used successfully. However, in Wisconsin, State Statutes do not allow its use as an enforcement/citation issuing tool. He understood also that within the City there was mixed feeling about its use (i.e., big brother watching). However, it could be used as a tool to send notices and MPD was supportive of it, but one had to address the issue of having/funding the necessary technology. Often these kinds of costs were justified by the offsetting monies being collected through citations, which would not be the case if the technology were used only as a "warning mechanism". If they could find grant monies, they would certainly look into pursuing it. Compton supported further investigation into the idea.

There were no other questions.

School Traffic Safety Teams (Madison Public Health, Lisa Bullard-Cawthorne) and MPD, Stacy Vilas)

Stacy Vilas,(MPD) and Lisa Bullard-Cawthorne (Madison Health Dept) provided some background on the Madison School Traffic Committee. It was an interagency committee whose purpose is to review traffic issues around schools. Several years ago, Vilas had gone to several schools to address traffic safety issues. There was a lack of communication between the various agencies and the schools were unclear as to where to address their issues. The Team was formalized in early 2004 and it brought together the School District, Madison Public Health, Madison Police, Traffic Engineering and most recently a representative from the Council office (Robbie Webber). A handout was provided and it enumerated the participation and responsibilities of the School Traffic Safety Committee, Madison Municipal School District Administration and Individual Schools, Public Health, Madison Traffic Engineering, Madison Police Department and finally the Pedestrian-Bicycle-Motor Vehicle Commission; and Vilas and Bullard-Cawthorne summarized major points of this document.

Bullard-Cawthorne pointed out theirs was an informal committee and they hoped to be able to streamline the complaints that come in. They questioned the role and relationship the committee should have with the Commission, particularly as it might relate to traffic safety issues around schools. There is liaison between the Committee and Commission with the membership of Webber on both bodies. She asked the format the Commission would like to take as it related to the

liaison relationship with the two bodies. What level of communication was desired? Should scheduled reports be made? Should they bring specifics about the schools with issues and how they were and were planning to be addressed?

Shahan agreed there should be a continuing relationship and addressed the difficulties in addressing the education element, including parents. One of the areas they might like guidance from the Committee might be effective ways to encourage parents not to drive their children to school. So much of the issue involves changing behavior and he saw education playing a significant role.

Vilas referred to the difficulties with changing behaviors and noted the efforts on the safe walking routes. As a part of that, parents were asked why they drove their children to school and what would it take to encourage them to walk and bike or bus. They had undertaken efforts over the year to get at the reasons and try to promote the positives of alternative modes. Compton pointed out the concern of parents for children's safety from possible assault and thought perhaps more school busing should be promoted. It was reported that one of the issues cited by parents for transporting their children was convenience although fear also had been cited.

Shahan asked if there were other things PBMVC would like to see in terms of the relationship between the Committee and itself. Wittke liked the composition and of the committee and the issues being driven by parents and schools. She wondered about focusing on a couple of schools each year, in which a problem-solving effort was undertaken and reported out. She referred to expansion and completion of the safe walk route maps.

Webber referred to a grid that identified issues around schools and includes what had been done and it might be useful to PBMVC members in understanding the issues and how they have been resolved. Vilas referred to how often the issue was merely defining an appropriate drop-off area, particularly considering the layout of some of the existing schools. She noted with the current language for signing, it said "no parking" and that regulation isn't understood as a location in which a parent could stop his/her car and let their children out of the vehicle. Should there be changes to allow Traffic Engineering to clearly define a school drop-off area through signing? Vilas pointed out this was more a short-term issue and there was a desire to find also longer-term solutions, including the financial planning associated with it.

Logan said information that would be useful to him would be the percentage of parents who drive their children to school, the number of pedestrian, bicycle and bus trips made and this type of information might be provide on a yearly basis. Vilas said they had been addressing a few schools each year. They had surveyed the Franklin-Randall parents and got an idea how many parents were driving and those using other modes. Most of the schools did not know the breakdown of trip modes of their students. Logan said it would be good to have even qualitative reports-more this year vs. prior years, etc. Vilas said numbers available would be the number of children bused to Madison Schools and this would be available through the school district.

Logan said he would be interested in any recommendation from the Committee on any policy changes that might be pursued and then qualitative information on how things had changed from the last update.

Webbers pointed out the results of the survey were available through Bullard-Cawthorne and she could provide it. It would give a picture of the questions asked and the results. Webber thought the results might be useful to PBMVC. Eventually a web site would be available with the evaluation report appearing on the Public Health site. It was suggested the link be provided to members. (<<http://www.ci.madison.wi.us/health/pubnews/safeinjurpub.html>>

Shahan indicated that Traffic Engineering (Arthur Ross) would be presenting a perspective on this in December.

Bullard-Cawthorne asked how often they should expect to meet; Shahan responded at least yearly and if there were specific issues, they could have the item placed on the agenda. Webber wondered if a logical time for this update would be just before the school year begins or after a school year? Or should there be twice yearly reports? Vilas thought that placing an agenda item when they had issues would seem appropriate and if an annual update was desired, she would suggest it be in late Spring/early Summer.

Wittke thanked the committee on its initiative and leadership in forming and addressing issues; Shahan echoed the thanks on behalf of PBMVC.

F SPECIAL PRESENTATION

Hilldale Phase Two - Request for PBMVC to review and provide comments to Plan Commission

Dennis Harder, representing Freed and Associates, updated members on the developments with Hilldale-Phase Two. He identified the second SIP within the area bounded primarily by University Avenue; driveway into Hilldale off University Avenue, Frey Street to Segoe, portion of Sawyer Terrace and Segoe Road. He reviewed the plan, which included a 50,000 square ft. Whole Food Grocery with parking and a proposed new driveway access on University into the parking lot (right in/right out), and an 84-unit condo site adjacent to the one recently constructed on Frey Street. In this phase Sawyer Terrace would come down to Frey and extend to a cul-de-sac behind the existing Hilldale theater building and restaurant, which were to remain in this phase. Frey Street would be configured basically as it exists today. In the future, the configuration of Frey Street would change with the construction of a new roadway connecting through the Mall Phase 1 to Midvale and a portion of Sawyer would be vacated as a public right-of-way. He identified additional retail and residential sites. The pedestrian network was shown and would provide connections for all the sidewalks in the internal circulation system. The condos would be served with an access point off Sawyer and there would be consideration given to returning Sawyer to a two-way street. He identified bicycle path improvements and bicycle parking accommodations and streetscape improvements along University Avenue. Bicycle parking would be available in front and to the side of Whole Food.

Harder said the plans had been discussed with the community, including the Hill Farm Association and Sunset Village, with Alders. Gruber and Radomski, and with Traffic Engineering. There was some concern expressed by the Community about how the intersection of Frey and Segoe would function and his team had done some analyses and received a perspective from Traffic Engineering and they were willing to participate in further discussion. He indicated he could follow up with some graphic materials.

DeVos asked about the bus stop locations. Harder said there was a bus stop currently located at Segoe and University. They had talked with Transit staff and are in the process of integrating a facility into the design of the building and making sure there was a pedestrian connection to the front of the building. There was some discussion of putting the shelter on Segoe but the more desirable location was on University.

Webber asked about pedestrian-bicycle access at the corner of Midvale and University in the phase 1 section. Harder indicated their design included a ramp as well as a stairway so there would be such access. She stressed the importance of this access for people crossing University to the Mall complex.

Forster Rothbart addressed the pedestrian access limitations from University and Harder pointed out that some accommodation could be made at the drive entrance but there was really no pedestrian activity in that area of the service drive.

Shahan referred to the bike parking on University and wondered why most of it was occurring on the University side when he thought there were more using Frey Street. Harder outlined where they expected traffic to come from. Shahan thought there was more parking on University than there was on the other side and Harder said it was split 60:40 in favor of the front of the building. Shahan believed the front of the building would be the more logical place since most of the bicycle traffic would come from the south side of the building. Harder

addressed the significant grades associated with the site.

Shahan asked about the intersection of Segoe and Frey and the additional left turn lanes. Harder described the concept to create a lane reduction/direction feature for the left turns from Segoe onto Frey. As a result the outbound Frey left turn could be made to a basically southbound protected lane. Shahan pointed out that the sight lines looking down Segoe were bad and wondered if something could be done to improve it; currently from Frey it was difficult to see once one got to the median to make the left turn. It was suggested that the lane configuration would improve that by providing the left-turn only lane to Frey. Harder said they were prepared to work with Traffic Engineering to address the issues related to the intersection design. Tom Lynch, Strand Associates, elaborated on the operation of the intersection with lane reduction and the provision of basically a dedicated left-turn lane onto Frey. Other than that, he did not believe much could be done to improve the visibility without major reconstruction. Lynch said the design allowed for an easier two-stage entrance onto Segoe similar to what was used on Schroeder Road. McCormick added that with City Engineering they would work on a future profile and tried to match the redevelopment on the Hilldale side with any redevelopment that might occur on the State Building side, there might be opportunities to lower the roadway to flatten it out. Lynch pointed out that if Sawyer were made two-way, persons would have the option to exit from Sawyer onto Segoe instead of relying solely on Frey.

Shahan asked if there was room for Sawyer to be two way with parking; McCormick thought it might be a 32 or 36 ft. street with parking on both sides. In later phases of the Hilldale project, there might be more opportunities to modify Sawyer Street as a part of that redevelopment. Two-way movement would improve circulation for the area. They would also look into the signal at Sawyer and Segoe and consider its possible relocation to Sheboygan. McCormick added that a signal at Sheboygan would create more gaps in traffic at Frey for the northbound traffic. McCormick added that these were not changes being suggested at this time but were things under consideration.

Wittke pointed out the significant house for seniors and noted a meeting with a group in the Senior Center located at Sawyer and Segoe and she asked that they keep in mind the needs of persons with vision problems and their need to cross at that intersection.

Harder reviewed the pedestrian corridor from the Segoe and Sawyer area to the mall, for the present it basically remains. Harder added that as development opportunities are pursued, such as residential, they would have opportunity to consider other options.

Shahan asked as more specific plans were developed would PBMVC have an opportunity to review them. McCormick commented that the Whole Food and restaurant site were going through the SIP and the movie theater/restaurant and other projects would come back.

No action was required.

G OLD BUSINESS ITEMS (Items may require action)

Rerefer to the PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION

Erika Kluetmeier (116 N. Allen), representing the Regent Neighborhood Assn., appeared in support of changing the policy to allow speed humps on collectors with 5000 vpd. Their goal was to allow maximum flexibility to consider all of the available and appropriate traffic calming options on collector streets; and particularly those in their neighborhood. There are five north-south collectors and they were looking at using speed humps on one of the five. They agreed it might not be appropriate for every street but they believed it would work well for Allen Street. She pointed out that the existing policy would allow for exceptions. She referred to current concerns about Fire and ambulance vehicles and for Allen Street they did not see it as an emergency route. They hoped that the Safe Community Coalition would have success in changing driver behavior but they weren't confident that it would be successful without engineering options such as speed humps as a deterrent. She understood the transit issues and pointed out for Allen Street they were looking at a five block area and he didn't believe the addition of speed humps would have a huge impact.

DeVos asked if she had experienced riding in a bus over a speed hump; Kluetmeier said she had and again did not believe it would present much of a problem and suggested it would address some of the problems currently experienced with buses traveling too fast.

McCormick pointed out the current policy and procedures gives the City carte blanche on streets with speed humps and yet the new wording did not have this; it left it open for the Fire Department to veto any speed hump project-not just those on collectors. Staff was suggesting that if it were under a certain threshold, retaining the current policy was the intent. The intent was for the review by Fire and Metro for those collector streets with the higher volumes. McCormick said the change could probably be dealt with in the revision to the Policy document once this resolution was acted upon, assuming this was the intent.

Shahan read from the resolution as it related to McCormick's comment: "...to allow the use of speed humps on local or collector streets, specifically streets with 5,000 vpd or less, following review by the Fire department and Madison Metro." Webber pointed out this stated "following review" and not "subject to". McCormick added that under the current policy there was no question that for local street or streets with 3,000 or less, the agency would proceed without review by Fire; it is only for collector streets above 3000 where they had concerns.

Strawser wondered about substituting the language from the original. Or Shahan suggested "use of speed humps on all local streets or collector streets with 5000 vehicles per day or less." McCormick said the language probably did not need to be changed today, rather they would make the intent clear in the policy when it was revised. Shahan felt instead that they should make it clear in the resolution as well.

Compton/Skidmore moved to refer the resolution to the next meeting.

Webber suggested that language be changed to reflect the intent and wondered about possibly inserting "extend to collector streets."

As an aside, Shahan said that as an engineering feature, they should have some flexibility in the design, including the height of the hump, the ramps, etc. and they could be designed for different speeds. Compton cautioned that one had to consider the vehicles using these and the damage and liability that could result. McCormick said that they were receiving more feedback as they add to the number; in fact, in the 2800 Regent Street, there was concern-yet the design was the same as used for all other concrete speed humps. The construction varies somewhat, but what they were finding was residents wanted the highest hump but then to accommodate the larger vehicles (Fire and emergency) there had to be some flattening out considerations. Shahan said that as they have more experience and data from other communities where they are in use, they should have an opportunity to change the design to meet the conditions of a specific location. He suggested this might be an item for future discussion.

DeVos asked about a comparison between the speed hump on 2800 Regent with the one installed by the University on Highland; McCormick replied that the City was not involved in that project and it was a different design.

Motion to refer carried unanimously.

H NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

- H.1 [01866](#) Consideration of a conditional use for a new credit union building with drive-thru service located at 1433 Monroe Street. 5th Ald. Dist.
- Attachments:** Maps&Plans.pdf, Comments.pdf, Comments110705.pdf, Approval Letter 110905.pdf
- Approved with addition that a curb cut be provided at the best possible location as determined by the Alder and/or Traffic Engineering.*

A motion was made by Ald. Compton, seconded by Ald. Webber, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the PLAN COMMISSION

Bill Rattunde (838 Woodrow), agent for Architect, Planning Design Build, and Brad McClain, UW Credit Union, registered in support and available for questions.

Rattunde pointed out the project is a subdivision of an existing property owned by the UW Credit Union and would provide for a branch bank expansion to the east of the existing Credit Union building. He outlined the site plan, which made use of the existing driveway, and provided for drive-up teller and ATM service on the backside of the building. There were about 75 parking stalls on the existing Credit Union site and efforts were made to optimize the parking supply under the redevelopment. When the project was presented to the Plan Commission, they requested referral to PBMVC and Urban Design. A recommendation was made that the building be located closer to Monroe Street to make it more pedestrian and bicycle friendly. He reviewed the drive-up facility and the traffic flow associated with it, parking accommodations with eight employee parking stalls and 12 patron stalls. Working with the UW they were able to accommodate an extension of the bike path to Monroe Street and incorporated a bike plaza/parking area at Monroe Street and relocated the walk-up ATM to the east side of the building.

DeVos asked about an entrance to the building on the west side of the lot where the bike parking was shown; Rattunde pointed out that space and circulation considerations prohibited them from doing that.

Forster Rothbart sought clarification on the bike path/parking design and Rattunde reviewed the detail and referred to the materials provided. He emphasized that the bike parking areas would be under cover. The bike racks would be accessible from the sidewalk or sidewalk.

Skidmore referred to the route that would be used by people using the driveway through and the point in which motorists would cross incoming traffic and wondered if that wouldn't be a conflict. Shahan commented that Rattunde had pointed this out when he had met separately and issues that were raised were the need to provide driver side access to the drive-up and night deposit box, loss of green space if the flow were reversed, and safety concerns in the turning maneuvers in relationship to the building. McCormick said staff considered the drive-up use on the site such that the configuration shown was reasonable.

Webber asked about an entrance off the path to the backside parking lot and drive-up area. In other words, would a bicyclists desiring to use the drive-up need to use the path to Monroe, make a left onto Monroe and ride on the sidewalk to the driveway, and then make a left turn into the parking lot drive/lot. She believed there should be a "driveway" off the path. She suggested that path users would find a way to enter that way, so it behooved them to provide the access and thus protect the landscaping. She added that it would serve people in wheelchairs and pedestrians coming off the path. Rattunde said there had been discussion about it. About 7% of their client base came via bike and it was expected that this would grow with better accommodations. They projected that about one-third of their clients used the drive-through and there were some safety concerns they had considered. He said they could look at it as an option.

Webber said she was pleased with the change in building orientation make the

site more accessible to its customer base.

Motion by Webber/Logan to suspend the rules to meet past 8 p.m. carried unanimously.

Compton was somewhat concerned about the congestion with the redesign with the various conflicts associated with the drive-through and parked vehicles.

The location of the street side ATM was clarified; there had been one shown on the west side of the building, but the walk-up ATM had been moved to the east side. Understanding that Forster Rothbart said he supported comments made by Webber about providing more direct access to bicyclists and pedestrians. Compton wondered about restoring an ATM at the east corner of the building; would it diminish the need for a curb cut off the bike lane. Rattunde pointed out the costs associated (\$45,000 capital investment) as a reason for not planning for two sites.

Kugler wondered about where the access would be taken and Rattunde referred to grades that needed to be taken into consideration in so locating this access.

Strawser indicated his wholehearted support for the curb cut suggestion, pointing out the efforts undertaken to provide service for those coming to the facility by car. He did not feel safety would be an issue and suggested they needed to provide the service in the beginning rather than waiting.

Shahan disclosed he was a member of this credit union and did his business by bicycle. Shahan asked the walk-up percentage; McClain indicated that between walk-up and bicyclists they projected 35%. Shahan supported the redesign and would support a curb cut. Shahan asked about the hours of operation, specifically when the drive-up would be available whereas access to the building facilities would not.

Strawser added that the type of landscaping or shrubbery not impede sight lines to the bike path.

Webber pointed out her original concept was to provide access from the path to the site and the developers had taken it a step further by siting the bicycle path extension from the existing path, to Monroe Street.

Compton/Webber moved approval with the addition of the curb cut with the best possible location to be determined by the Alder or Traffic Engineer; carried unanimously. The motion passed by acclamation.

H.2 [02190](#)

Providing for a change on the Official Map of the City of Madison, which will add a proposed public street reservation for the widening of North and South Broom Street on platted lands, located in part of the Northeast 1/4 of Section 23, Town 07 North, Range 09 East, City of Madison, Dane County, Wisconsin. 4th Ald. Dist.

Sponsors: Michael E. Verveer

Attachments: broom street reservation.pdf

Item referred to its next meeting.

Refer to the PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION

H.3 [02151](#)

Approving Plans and Specifications, and authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute a State/Municipal Agreement for a Highway Improvement Project to serve the Todd Drive Beltline Highway Interchange including the addition of traffic signals, the resurfacing of the Beltline Highway Frontage Road, and the installation of bike and pedestrian facilities to serve the area. (14th AD)

Sponsors: Tim Bruer and Mayor Cieslewicz

Motion to approve the resolution 02151 understanding that there would be a change as it related to sidewalk dedication and to express displeasure with the way enhancement funds were being used in this particular case which they did not consider appropriate failed to carry on a 1 to 7 vote.

A motion was made by Ald. Skidmore, seconded by Strawser III, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Denial to the BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS

Larry Nelson, City Engineer, and Rob Phillips, Deputy City Engineer were present on the item.

Nelson explained that the resolution before the body was the plans for Todd Drive interchange with the Beltline, which will be done under State/Municipal agreement. In 2004 the Council provided funds for the redevelopment of the interchange of Todd Drive and the Beltline Highway. The concept was to redevelop this portion of the Beltline Highway frontage road from Todd Drive to the west toward Grandview Boulevard. The business communities in the area interested in redevelopment were at a competitive disadvantage with developing areas on the perimeter of the City. They needed the ability to get people to the interchange by means of signalization and provide sidewalks and access to bus lanes on the street to serve the new development and employees occupying this new development. The Council made approximately \$1.2M available for the project. Construction was to be undertaken in 2006 along with parallel redevelopment. Using graphics he identified the area under consideration including annexations that had occurred or would occur. In order for the signal improvement to be effective, it was necessary that metered ramps be installed on the north side of the Beltline. A left-turn movement needed to be provided from the eastbound frontage road turning left. To serve the area, sidewalks along the frontage road would be extended to Landmark Place with the intent of eventually extending the sidewalk to Grandview. Efforts were being made to use available right-of-way; they could expand to the south but to do so would encroach on lands being redeveloped. In working with WisDOT, the idea was to take necessary land from Beltline and remove the large embankments and install retaining walls.

For the last 1.5-2 years, the City has been in negotiation with WisDOT on identifying funding sources. Besides the \$1.2M of City monies there was a "TEA" grant that had been approved by the Council. Part of the project WisDOT will be undertaking is the removal of the existing rail crossing, resurfacing of the Beltline highway, redecking of bridges and participation in the construction of the off ramp reconstruction, and providing more room along the Beltline Highway for cars to move off the Beltline Highway. Nelson said the City was not participating in the latter mentioned project but rather a subset project identified as part of the Verona/Beltline Highway which included the intersection immediately to the east of Seminole Highway. Meetings had been held with Arbor Hills neighborhood and he understood the NA is in strong support of the project and redevelopment. He referred to the material he provided and the funding source information included therein, pointing out that it was somewhat more complicated. Included was a Town of Madison enhancement project for \$160,000; there was a WisDOT separate enhancement project, there was State TEA funding capped at \$1M, there was an HES project capped at \$675,000. Total cost of the project including the resurfacing of the Beltline highway, removal of the railroad crossing, etc. was \$9.2M; Madison's current share is \$908,000, which included the City's responsibility for half of the TEA grant. He referred to pages 6-7, which provided a detailed draft maintenance plan that had not been a part of previous agreements. The Council had approved the TEA grant and they hoped to have contracts signed by the City in early-middle November. The project would then go out for bids and expect to begin construction in March 2006.

Webber asked what the City would be getting for the enhancement dollars (\$828,000) they would be using. Nelson said that \$160,000 was for bike paths, sidewalks and in addition the State had included enhancement funds for the project as it related to retaining walls. She asked if this would cost \$700,000; Nelson responded that he hoped it would cost no more than \$950,000 because that was the amount it was capped at. He was hopeful they could bring the project in but it was still an unknown at this time.

Webber said that it appeared that they were using money generally earmarked for pedestrian and bicycle enhancements; normally, these projects were not on an existing roadways, but rather the addition of a path or bridge, underpass, etc., and she wondered what the City would be getting in pedestrian and bicycle facilities that would cost that much. Nelson said this had been discussed before; and clarified that the term "we are using enhancements" was better stated as the "WisDOT was using enhancements." These would be State funds and it was a decision made by the State. If these funds were not used for the Todd Drive project, the State would determine where else to apply them.

Webber pursued the issue of whether pedestrian-bicycle enhancements for this project would result in enhancements for that amount; and if not, why are these enhancement funds being used for something that would not be a pedestrian-bicycle enhancement. Nelson said that if the enhancement funds were not used, the project would not go forward; and as a result, there would be no pedestrian, bicycle and transit enhancements for this neighborhood, there wouldn't be the redevelopment of the area, etc. Webber asked if enhancement funds were used for redevelopment. Nelson responded they were for enhancements; but added that if they were going to put together a project for the redevelopment of the area, these funds were needed.

Webber asked if these enhancement funds would be used based on the same 12 categories defined by the Federal enhancement monies; Nelson said he didn't know. He reiterated that it was the State's choice to use them. Webber referred to the City's 20% match and Nelson said that would be a part of this funding package. The City would be matching 20% of the smaller enhancement or \$75,950 against the \$950,000 larger enhancement project. The City would be putting in about half of the TEA grant.

Webber stated that she did not think the enhancement fund was being used for the purpose it was intended; that is, pedestrian-bicycle enhancements and not redevelopment districts, not additions to roadways. She was greatly concerned about this because this fund is very scarce and if it is tapped for normal roadway projects, there won't be any future pedestrian and bicycle enhancements and she was concerned about such a precedent. She pointed out she had argued for it at the MPO; she did not think it was appropriate to be used in this way and would therefore be opposed to it.

Shahan relinquished Chair responsibilities to Logan for the remainder of the discussion of this item.

Forster Rothbart asked about the sidewalk plans for the project; was the area between Todd Drive and Grandview Boulevard to have sidewalks? Nelson said the sidewalk would be on one side of Todd Drive to about the location where the apartments exist; ultimately it would extend to Grandview Boulevard. Forster Rothbart asked about the section from Grandview to Seminole Highway. Nelson

said there weren't plans for sidewalks, however, there were bike lanes on the frontage road. Forster Rothbart asked how pedestrians would have access across the Beltline; there would be sidewalks and ramps, including sidewalks across from Johannsen's corner for crossings to the west. The bus stop would be extended and improved.

Shahan said this has been a topic at LRTPC and pointed out the issue was the \$700,000 Type 1 grant, which he claimed came from another facility that was a true enhancement project-Perry Street overpass. At LRTPC they considered the Perry Street project a higher priority and believed it should have been included in the improvement plan. They did not learn it was removed until recently; he learned in August and had made a recommendation at LRTPC that it be included in the recommendations to MPO. The Perry Street project was in the South Neighborhood Plan and Fitchburg. A public hearing had been held and there hadn't been much interest but he suggested that was not unusual for the people affected. He suggested there was a large pool of people on the north side of the Beltline who are transit dependent and on the south side had a fairly large employment area. He believed there was a real need for the connection; yet at the public hearing two businesses appeared in opposition to it and he believed it was a reason for pulling out support for the project and transferring it to the Todd Drive project. He asked what the City was getting with the Todd Drive project compared to what it would have gotten with the overpass, something he considered a higher priority and one that would serve more people in more need. He asked what the cost of the overpass would have been. Nelson said the cost of bridges has risen by as much as 40% in the last couple of years. He believed the State had \$1M available for the Perry Street overpass and had spent a couple hundred thousand in design work. They were over budget on the project and had conflicts with existing billboards in the area and this could run one-quarter of a million dollars for buy out. They had complaints from hotels in the area. Residents and even the Planning and Development Department believed the project premature since there wasn't a comprehensive plan. In answer to the question, he thought with the design work in place, they perhaps could have gotten the bridge for \$1.5M depending on the final design and what happened with the billboard issue. Nelson referred to the funding constraints faced at the State level and his concern about losing the Todd Drive project.

Shahan restated the sentiment that LRTPC felt it was a very needed project; and there was concern that they were not receiving enough for a pedestrian-bicycle project.

Webber said a second element of her concern was that both the State Pedestrian Plan and State Bicycle Plan state that when the State is building a road, they are to put bicycle and pedestrian facilities in as part of the costs of the project without using enhancement funds. Generally pedestrian and bicycle facilities along a road being rebuilt is inexpensive compared to the other costs of the project and it was why she questioned the use of scarce enhancement funding-instead the scarce funding is to be used for separate projects, e.g., under/over passes. She restated her concern about a precedent of State DOT using enhancement funds for roadway where normally it would be funded as a part of the total project costs. That was why she asked what the cost of the pedestrian-bicycle facilities were and was that what they would be getting for the \$700,000? Or are they just using the \$700,000 for a roadway improvement project. Why is the State DOT using enhancement monies when in their own plans they say projects are not to be funded in that way? She did not consider the use of the

funding for this project as appropriate, even though she understood the difficulties the City had in dealing with WisDOT on it.

DeVos commented she did not like to see a \$9M project for road construction and resurfacing and yet there wasn't \$500,000 to keep Metro running an adequate level of service. She would vote against it because she believed the money could be better spent to reduce traffic and put people on alternative modes of transportation.

Nelson said that if they wanted the area redeveloped, they needed to assemble the funds to do it. If the enhancement funds were not used, the City would need to come forward and make up the difference and the State would proceed and find another project for the enhancement monies they have available. He said they were trying to leverage a project, and if it could not be accomplished, there would be no redevelopment of the area unless the City was going to come forward with significant cash infusion into the project.

Forster Rothbart asked if the project would go forward without the TEA money from the State. Nelson responded he did not believe it would unless the City wanted to replace the dollars in kind, which is not in any City budget. Nelson said the City committed \$1.2M for the project and the City was also trying to put in TIF monies as well which had to go toward private improvements. Forster Rothbart asked if this was a high priority project in Nelson's mind; Nelson said in 2004 the Mayor and Council made several millions of dollars available to redo the area and Park Street area; it was identified by subsequent redevelopment districts, tax increment finance districts, etc. He believed the documentation was there to support it and he was hopeful that they would be able to bring the neighborhood back to what it was.

Forster Rothbart asked Nelson if he knew what would happen if the City rejected the enhancement monies, what was the likelihood that the enhancement monies would be slotted for another City project or would it go elsewhere in the State? Nelson said they were negotiating across the table, and he believed the Mayor, Ald. Bruer, and businessmen in the area got State cooperation at the highest level to make this project a reality.

Shahan said that although he was supportive of the Todd Drive project, he questioned what the State had done and if there was any leverage to get the money back for intended purposes. He was hearing that this was unlikely, which added to his frustration since he believed this Perry Street overpass was needed.

Skidmore agreed with what Shahan said as well as what Nelson had said; but he fully realized that there were two projects competing for a set amount of dollars and if the Todd Drive project were voted down the monies might go to somewhere other than Madison. He, therefore, would support the project so as to leverage the amount of money they could get to do a project that is needed.

Shahan pointed out PBMVC would be advisory to Council but the lead agency was BPW. Nelson added that it would also be reported to BOE.

Skidmore/Strawser moved approval of the plans and specifications and to authorize the Mayor and City Clerk execute a State/Municipal Agreement for the Highway Improvement Project as noted in item H3 on the agenda.

McCormick pointed out that Engineering was asking for additional language to authorize the execution of agreements for land acquisition for the sidewalk. The language had been provided in an email from Christy Bachman and provided to members. It would allow the City to accept the dedication from the developer for the sidewalk. Skidmore said that was acceptable to him.

Webber agreed that it was a good redevelopment project, but she could not approve funding for the project when she knew it was not being appropriately used. This was the reason for her vote against the motion.

Shahan offered an amendment to express PBMVC's displeasure to the Council, Board of Public Works and Board of Estimates in how the enhancement money is working. This was accepted as friendly.

Strawser agreed that it was a good project. He considered the discussion about declining the enhancement money and it then going somewhere else as somewhat parochial. If WisDOT uses the money in some other community for its intended purpose wouldn't it be better than using it inappropriately in Madison? Forster Rothbart said he wasn't confident that WisDOT would use the enhancement money appropriately elsewhere. He was unclear on the impact of separating out the approval of the project and the funding issue.

Shahan understood the motion as approving the agreement and forwarding the recommendation with the statement about the commission's displeasure with the way the enhancement monies are being used in this case; it was not appropriate.

Forster Rothbart wondered about the impact of the expression of displeasure; would it have any bearing? Webber said it would be forward to the BOE-the fiscal board of the City and Board of Public Works. She suggested that regardless of what PBMVC did, she believed the project would proceed.

Skidmore believed they were saying that the Todd Drive project was a good project, and not that Perry Street wasn't a good project, but this is where the funds are coming from and a statement is being added about the appropriate use of enhancement funds.

Motion failed with Skidmore being the only one supporting it. The motion failed by the following vote:

Absent: Compton, Conroy and Wittke

Aye: Skidmore

No: Webber, Forster Rothbart, Shahan, De Vos, Strawser III and Kugler

Non Voting: Logan

I REPORTS OF OTHER COMMITTEES - SUMMARY OF ACTIVITY

Motion was made by Skidmore/Strawser to refer the remainder of the agenda.

Webber pointed out a memo she had on Parking on the Square, which would be on the next agenda along with the Traffic Signal Priority List. Members agreed that a December meeting should be scheduled.

- I.1 Plan Commission
- I.2 LRTPC
- I.3 Joint West Area Campus Committee
- I.4 Joint SE Campus Area Committee

J REPORTS OF OFFICERS AND/OR MEMBERS FOR INFORMATIONAL DISCUSSION

- J.1 Executive Secretary - Schedule a December meeting? None is on the calendar at this time.
- J.2 Items by the Chair
- J.3 Items for Referral and/or Announcements

K ADJOURNMENT

Informational Enclosures