



Department of Planning & Community & Economic Development
Planning Division

Website: www.cityofmadison.com

Madison Municipal Building, Suite LL100
215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard
P.O. Box 2985
Madison, Wisconsin 53701-2985
FAX 608 267-8739
PH 608 266-4635

MEMORANDUM 3

TO: Plan Commission

FROM: Planning Division Staff

DATE: March 13, 2012

SUBJECT: **Committee and Commission Recommendations on the City of Madison draft Downtown Plan (Legistar # 24468).**

[Key 6: Increase Transportation Choices]

The purpose of this memorandum is to convey revisions to the draft *Downtown Plan* recommended by the City boards, commission, and committees to which it was referred (see table below). In an effort to facilitate the Plan Commission's discussion, this memorandum only includes changes to the *Plan* that were recommended by these bodies related to Key 6: Increase Transportation Choices, as listed on the Plan Commission's agenda for this meeting. It does not include general discussion or background information. For instance, the BID Board approved a 13-page report on the *Downtown Plan*, that is available in Legistar, but only those portions with actual recommendations are included in this memo. Complete minutes of each of the referral bodies' meetings are available on Legistar.

BOARD/COMMISSION/COMMITTEE	DATE OF FINAL ACTION
Madison Arts Commission [ARTS]	DEC. 13, 2011
Board of Park Commissioners [PARKS]	DEC. 14, 2011
Landmarks Commission [LANDMARKS]	DEC. 19, 2011
Committee on the Environment [ENVIR]	DEC. 19, 2011
Transit + Parking Commission [TPC]	JAN. 11, 2012
Sustainable Design + Energy Committee [SUSTAIN]	JAN. 23, 2012
Madison Central Business Improvement District (BID) Board [BID]	FEB. 02, 2012
Economic Development Committee [EDC]	FEB. 15, 2012
Downtown Coordinating Committee [DCC]	FEB. 16, 2012
Long Range Transportation Planning Committee [LRTPC]	FEB. 16, 2012
Board of Estimates [BOE]	FEB. 20, 2012
Urban Design Commission [UDC]	FEB. 29, 2012
Pedestrian-Bicycle-Motor Vehicle Commission [PBMVC]	FEB. 29, 2012

It should be noted that the City is beginning the process of developing a city-wide transportation master plan. If any amendments to this section of the Downtown Plan are necessary as a result of that effort, they will be made after adoption of the transportation plan. It should also be noted that there are numerous recommendations in various sections of this chapter that are related to expanding the use of alternative modes of transportation and

de-emphasizing the use of private passenger automobiles in the long term. These recommendations are flagged

with a “*” in the page number box to further facilitate the Plan Commission’s discussion.

Recommendations with a **heavy outline** around that row in a table indicates that staff agrees with and supports that particular recommendation.

KEY 6: INCREASE TRANSPORTATION CHOICES (pages 71-90)

PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
71	The introduction should clearly state that implementation of the complete streets principles and practices in the Downtown is a fundamental component of the transportation vision embodied in this plan. [DCC]	NO CHANGE – Staff feel that this is adequately covered in the complete streets section of the plan.
71 *	At the beginning of the Transportation section, insert the statement: <u>The city should recognize the environmental, economic and social costs of continuing to rely on automobiles long term and seek the in cooperation and support of our County, State and Federal partners for a long range strategy that envisions a downtown Madison where motorized vehicles are significantly deemphasized as the primary means of getting to and circulating around the downtown. This vision must include multi-year efforts to educate the public and policy makers about the types of infrastructural changes needed to make this vision possible. While the Transit and Parking Commission recognizes the current and likely continuing role of individually owned motor vehicles for use in reaching and circulating between downtown destinations for years to come, this recommendation is intended to begin a strategy that, at minimum, moves motor vehicles to the edge of the downtown or even the edge of the city to remote parking facilities. This must be coupled with the creation of high(er) frequency, high capacity transit service options for movement of people to and around the downtown.</u> [TPC]	NO CHANGE – Staff believe that the plan offers a balanced approach to the future of transportation Downtown that seeks to enhance all modes. Developing alternative forms of transportation will offer additional choices and less reliance on private passenger automobiles.

PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
73	Rec. 112: Change this recommendation to: "Explore potential sites for a future inter-city passenger rail station. Madison may someday connect with the Midwest Regional Rail system and the station will likely need to be located on the main line route that links Madison via Watertown to the east and Portage to the north. Potential sites could be Union Corners, First Street & East Washington, or the Dane County Regional Airport, among other possibilities." [DCC]	SUPPORT IN PART – See the recommendation in the row above.
72	The mode split data needs to be updated (year 2000 data is not relevant) and expanded beyond work trips, if possible. In addition, mode split should be further refined to better reflect trips to and from the central business district. [LRTPC]	SUPPORT IN PART - This data is not available, but when it is, this would be appropriate to include in the benchmarks effort.
73	A direct bus between the airport and Downtown was needed. [TPC]	SUPPORT – NO CHANGE – This is covered in Rec. 114.
73	Create an airport shuttle in collaboration with the county. [TPC]	SUPPORT – Note that Dane County is one of many groups that the City would need to coordinate with.
73	Recs. 113 + 115: Combine these recommendations into one: "Locate an inter-city bus terminal downtown. Integrate the bus terminal with or provide close proximity to a variety of intermodal connections such as a bike station, multiple Madison Metro Bus routes, commuter rail, downtown circulator (streetcar) service, car sharing service and motor vehicle parking to facilitate the first or final leg of an inter-city trip." [DCC]	SUPPORT IN PART – Staff recommend keeping Rec. 113 to emphasize its importance, and amending Rec. 115 to state that inter-city bus service should be located in close proximity to a variety of inter-modal connections.
73	Rec. 114 : Add "In the future, airport connectivity should be part of a larger commuter rail service with metropolitan and suburban connectivity in addition to downtown." [DCC]	NO CHANGE – Staff support connections to the airport as stated in the plan, but feel this specific recommendation is too limiting as the airport may not be located on a future commuter rail line.
TRANSIT SERVICE		
74	The Plan should emphasize the use of technology to better promote bike, transit and parking systems. [TPC]	SUPPORT - NO CHANGE – This is addressed in Recs. 122, 151 + 154
74 *	Make a stronger statement about the vision for transit. For example: "The goal for downtown is that for more and more people (consumers), places (destinations) and purposes (employment, recreation, tourism, etc.), transit will be the travel option of choice because it is attractive, convenient and efficient." [DCC]	SUPPORT IN PART – Staff agree that the plan could include stronger statements about encouraging alternative modes of transportation.

PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
74	Create a representative RTA that grows out of the TPSC and Metro so existing expertise can be tapped. CSOC was intended as a seed for a future RTA getting other communities experience in transit governance. <i>[TPC]</i>	NO CHANGE – Staff feel that this is too specific as the governance of an RTA is beyond the scope of the Downtown, and of this plan.
74	Rec. 116: “A regional transit entity should have a dedicated funding source such as a sales tax, wheel tax or other mechanism. Absent reinstatement of RTA’s by the legislature, Dane County and the City of Madison should work together to explore and establish a greater metropolitan area transit system on their own authority. Such a system would implement the transit services discussed in this section throughout Madison and the rest of Dane County.” <i>[DCC]</i>	NO CHANGE – Staff feel that this is too specific and that the recommendation in the plan adequately addresses this matter.
74	Changes at the State level (to provide for RTA legislation) need to be a goal Commuter Rail/Bus Rapid Transit Service: <i>[TPC]</i>	NO CHANGE – This is an implementation recommendation that is too specific and beyond the scope of the Downtown, and of this plan.
74	Rec. 123: Add to the final sentence: “and to downtown perimeter park-and-shuttle facilities located at downtown-edge sites, for example East Washington and First Street, South Park and the Beltline, and University and Segoe.” (Also see Objective 2.2, recommendations 13 and 14.) <i>[DCC]</i>	NO CHANGE – The circulator is envisioned to operate within the Downtown and adjacent areas and staff feel that this recommendation would extend the system beyond the limits of what could be supported.
74	The RTA “Plan for Transit” did not recommend commuter rail—remove that language (they referenced it for the future). <i>[TPC]</i>	NO CHANGE – The plan does not say that the RTA recommended commuter rail.
74	Related to the discussion of shuttles and visitors, emphasize downtown linkage to/from the Alliant Center more. <i>[TPC]</i>	SUPPORT
74	Mention the need for connection to the Alliant center, a major activity center near the downtown that could help retail and reduce parking demand by providing a transit link. <i>[TPC]</i>	NO CHANGE – This is addressed in the row above.
74	Lower transit fees for low income residents. <i>[PBMVC]</i>	NO CHANGE – Staff feel this is an issue that extends beyond the Downtown and should be addressed on a community-wide scale.
74	“Connecting the bicycle network” needs to be added along with the goal of separated bicycle lanes. <i>[TPC]</i>	SUPPORT IN PART – Staff support connecting the bicycle network to transit, but separated bicycle lanes are more appropriately addressed in bicycle facilities planning.

PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
74	Accommodations for bicycles need to be added [TPC]	SUPPORT
74	Need to focus more on Intelligent Transportation Systems specifically for mass transit, and include such things as traffic signal prioritization. [TPC]	SUPPORT - NO CHANGE - Rec. 122 covers this.
74	Rec. 123: Develop a Downtown circulator transit system to connect major destinations within the Downtown, and to connect Downtown locations to adjacent activity and employment centers. <u>Look closely at providing a free ride zone to the circulator transit system to see if it is economically feasible.</u> [EDC]	NO CHANGE – Staff feel that this is too specific and more appropriately addressed as part of the detailed planning and implementation.
75	Regarding the concept of a potential circulator, ensure that the route will be determined after appropriate study of population density and user origin/destination. It is important to the BID that any circulator connect the central downtown with customers. The map on p. 75 shows a potential circulator route that bypasses areas of residential population density, i.e., the north side of the Isthmus, Langdon, Mansion Hill, Johnson & Gorham corridors. [BID]	SUPPORT IN PART – Staff support the first sentence, but feel that the remainder be considered as part of an implementation study.
75	Add recommendation to study adding dedicated bus lanes on downtown streets and on key connecting routes to speed up bus service. [TPC]	SUPPORT – NO CHANGE – This should be considered as part of the upcoming city-wide transportation master plan.
75	Our bus service is not “excellent” at this time because of a lack of appropriate funding. Metro is not able to connect to the outlying areas of the city. [TPC]	NO CHANGE – As stated in the plan, enhancements can be made, but staff believe that current service operates at a very high level.
75	Have a core bus system running 24/7 that can accommodate 2 nd and 3 rd shift workers, as well as 1 st shift workers. [PBMVC]	NO CHANGE – Staff feel this is an issue that extends beyond the Downtown and should be addressed on a community-wide scale.
75	A 24-hour bus system should be considered. Students would continue to bring cars to Campus until transit provided a way to get home safely from the library at 4-6 AM. [TPC]	NO CHANGE – Staff feel this is an issue that extends beyond the Downtown and should be addressed on a community-wide scale.
75	Add a bus-time map if feasible, along with a drive-time map. [TPC]	NO CHANGE – The drive time map was taken from the 2007 <i>Downtown Market Analysis</i> and is included in Key 2: Strengthen the Region’s Economic Engine (p.32) as a reference to that study and is not a transportation map. Note that on March 8, the Plan Commission recommended that the drive time map be removed from the plan.

PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
76	Remove the statement that the RTA recommended commuter rail: The RTA plan for transit did not recommend commuter passenger rail. While commuter rail could be discussed in the Plan, it was not part of an RTA recommendation. [TPC]	NO CHANGE – The plan says: “... a commuter passenger rail system (or a similar bus rapid transit system)...”.
77 *	Consider reducing the downtown as a destination for cars by building all new ramps on the edge of the downtown and adding high frequency circulators to the mix. Create multimodal transportation hubs. See Strasbourg France's model. [TPC]	NO CHANGE – This would represent a major policy shift that would be most appropriately considered as part of the upcoming city-wide transportation master plan.
77	This needs a different approach because it has not worked in the past. Take a look at B-Cycle to get our hands around how people get around in the DT because on B-Cycle, they can define their own route. B-Cycle needs to be part of this conversation. [TPC]	SUPPORT – NO CHANGE – The plan narrative acknowledges that past efforts were not successful. B-Cycle data should not be included in the plan since it is only one of many data sources to be evaluated.
COMPLETE STREETS		
78	Accommodate bicycles on one-way streets. [TPC]	SUPPORT – NO CHANGE
78	Rec. 124: Fund a study to Review and evaluate the impacts benefits and costs of converting the following streets from one-way network back to two-way in the greater downtown area between Breese Terrace on the west and Baldwin Street on the east...” [DCC]	NO CHANGE – This is beyond the geographic scope of the plan, but could be considered as part of the upcoming city-wide transportation master plan.
78	Rec. 126: Though supportive of Plan recommendations for W. Washington (striping, buffered bike lanes, etc.), staff should check with Traffic Engineering about this since TE had previously indicated such changes were not feasible, due to space and parking issues. [TPC]	SUPPORT - NO CHANGE – Staff did consult with Traffic Engineering when developing this plan and were assured this was possible. Traffic Engineering will be very involved if this concept moves forward.
78	Add a new Rec. (between 126+127): Study establishing W. Mifflin between the Square (Philosophers’ Grove) and the Kohl Center as an intensive, complete street. Consider the concept of “woonerf” (as described by the Downtown Design Professionals) - a curbless, free-form esplanade used equally by all modes. This five block experiment could be the catalyst for reinventing the W. Mifflin area as a unique urban place with a dynamic variety of mixed uses and building styles like nowhere else in the City. This recommendation is valid for both Mifflin neighborhood alternatives presented for Obj. 4.3 in this Plan. [DCC]	NO CHANGE – The approach to the street segment for the 400-500 blocks of West Mifflin St. should be considered as part of the recommended comprehensive study of the Mifflin area (p. 51). The appropriateness of the approach connecting to the Capitol Square should be considered after the treatment for the 400-500 blocks is determined.

PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
PARKING		
80 *	The idea of “park once” should include the concept that the parking location not be all the way downtown. There is evidence that commuting drivers into Madison are willing to shift modes to transit, bicycle or walking for the last “mile or so” of their trip. <i>[DCC]</i>	SUPPORT IN PART – The “park once” concept is specifically mentioned in Obj. 6.4., but the location of parking facilities outside of the Downtown should be considered as part of the upcoming city-wide transportation master plan.
80 *	Commuting and visitors need to be mentioned in this section—possibly a “Park Once” concept. <i>[TPC]</i>	SUPPORT – NO CHANGE – See the recommendation in the row above.
80 *	The overbuilding of parking capacity downtown will never allow a transition away from Automobile-Oriented-Development in the urban core. City parking policy and practices must be part of an overall strategy of active Transportation Demand Management in the downtown, and not simply respond to demand related to one mode. Parking demand management needs to be part of the comprehensive multi-modal solution. (Also see Objective 2.1, recommendation 12.) <i>[DCC]</i>	SUPPORT – NO CHANGE – This is a comment and not a specific recommendation, and TDMs are discussed on page 89.
80	The environmental capacity for downtown parking and the effects on air quality should be included. <i>[ENVIR]</i>	SUPPORT – NO CHANGE – This is a comment and not a specific recommendation.
80	Additional a new Rec.: <u>Improve key elements of the downtown parking customer experience: Enhance and modernize city parking wayfinding (i.e., “trailblazing”) signage; develop and market an integrated city parking validation system for downtown businesses (beyond the current coupon system); explore implementation of tiered parking ticket rates (more forgiving to first-time offenders, higher penalties for repeat offenders) as recommended in the Carl Walker report “Best Practices’ for Marketing & Managing Downtown Parking” presented to Madison in 2005; identify ways to improve cleanliness, lighting and safety of parking garages and lots.</u> <i>[BID]</i>	SUPPORT IN PART – Staff support the first portion (ending at “...(i.e., “trailblazing”) signage”), and the last portion (starting at “identify ways...”), but feel that the rest of the recommendation is too specific.

PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
80	Area parking need studies like the one done 10 years ago on west Wash corridor (Bauman administration) should be done when shortages (or surpluses) are observed in the utilities facilities. <i>[TPC]</i>	NO CHANGE – Staff feel that this is too specific.
80	The Residential Parking Permit program should be overhauled. The current program incentivized people to bring their cars downtown, and create the expectation that people could pay \$22/year to park in front of their residences. <i>[TPC]</i>	SUPPORT IN PART – Staff feel that a recommendation could be made to review the residential parking permit program to ensure its goals and operations balance the need of all Downtown street parking users.
80	A small business parking permit program should be considered, in terms of economic development and land use conflicts downtown and based on comments from small retail business owners. An update of the 1978 Transportation Plan was needed. <i>[TPC]</i>	SUPPORT IN PART – See the recommendation in the row above.
80	Add a new Rec.: “Evaluate the policies for on-street parking in downtown and adjoining neighborhoods. Include an evaluation of the costs associated with on-street parking permits to ensure that the price for annual permits reflects the full cost to the City.” <i>[DCC]</i>	SUPPORT
80	Rec. 129: Aesthetics and backyard parking could be left out. A committee had gone through all the issues about backyard parking. A good look was needed at how the discussion had evolved in terms of the Zoning Code rewrite and usable open space requirements. Since it was really a zoning issue, perhaps a clarification was needed. The reality was that we can't get rid of backyard parking and push everyone out on the street, esp. with too many people trying to park on the street already. The broad-brush approach to this issue was not satisfactory. <i>[TPC]</i>	NO CHANGE – Staff believe that there are aesthetic and land use issues associated with Downtown parking that should be addressed as opportunities arise.
81	Let people know how many parking stalls are in use at the city ramps. <i>[ARTS]</i>	SUPPORT - NO CHANGE – This is covered in Rec. 154. Also, real-time availability in public parking ramps is now available on-line (including on PDAs and cell phones).
81	Re: expanding parking ramp capacity where able and the recs. on p. 81 for more underground parking: Her neighborhood had discussed Cap Sq North, in which they preferred having the ramp built out to create higher capacity (vs. residential parking there), which would provide better use for the neighborhood, for winter snow parking, etc. In general, no mention was made of spending money to increase available ramp parking. <i>[TPC]</i>	NO CHANGE – Suggested change is unclear.

PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
81	Rec. 132: Add the following: "Dedicate stalls in Madison Parking Utility facilities for use by car sharing services." [DCC]	SUPPORT
81	Add a new Rec.: "Address the problem of moped parking on front lawns and terraces in downtown neighborhoods." [DCC]	SUPPORT
81 *	Add a new Rec.: Consider potential sites for close park-n-ride options. Ones that either do not require a transfer to get Downtown or may have an express bus option. [EDC]	NO CHANGE - The location of parking facilities outside of the Downtown should be considered as part of the upcoming city-wide transportation master plan.
81 *	Rec. 131: Add: "In addition, the consultant should examine the fundamental land use problem of devoting high-cost downtown land to automobile parking (all day storage) instead of using lower-cost land on the perimeter." [DCC]	NO CHANGE – This recommendation is focused on the operational aspects of the parking utility, not the land use issues associated with parking. The location of parking facilities outside of the Downtown should be considered as part of the upcoming city-wide transportation master plan.
BICYCLE FACILITIES		
82	Obj. 6.5: Improve and expand bicycle facilities through the creation and enhancement of bike routes, paths, <u>parking</u> and amenities as described in the Platinum Bicycle Committee report and the Bicycle transportation Plan for Madison Urban Area and Dane County. [EDC]	SUPPORT
82	Why have Recommendation #137 to add bike lanes on E. Washington from Blair to Pinckney, which would mirror the Bike Boulevard on Mifflin Street? [TPC]	NO CHANGE – The plan seeks to improve bicycle facilities on all transportation corridors and many people ride their bikes on this segment. Bike lanes also provide direct access to uses and activities on E. Washington Ave.
82 *	The Plan should include a goal that 20% of trips in Madison be made by bike by 2020. [TPC]	NO CHANGE – This is already a city-wide goal. Also, this could be part of the benchmarks effort.
82 *	The bicycle component of the Plan was lacking. European cities had 40-50% trips made by bike, by creating separate bicycling facilities. Buffered bike lanes between cars and bikes helped moms, kids, seniors feel more comfortable biking. [TPC]	NO CHANGE - This could be part of the benchmarks effort.

PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
82	More bike parking was needed (beyond commercial areas) in residential areas downtown, where people were tripping over bikes and bikes were being chained to trees and poles. <i>[TPC]</i>	SUPPORT
82 *	A statement needs to be made in this section that recognizes bicycle commuting as a legitimate mode of transportation. <i>[TPC]</i>	SUPPORT – NO CHANGE – This is referenced in the second sentence of this section.
82	When talking about parking, bicycle parking needs to be mentioned. <i>[TPC]</i>	SUPPORT – NO CHANGE – Rec. 140 addresses this.
82	Rec. 137 should be for ALL STREETS including segregated lanes on busier streets. <i>[TPC]</i>	NO CHANGE – This is part of the “complete streets approach on page 78.
82	Separate bicycle lights. <i>[TPC]</i>	SUPPORT - NO CHANGE – Bike stoplights are specifically mentioned in Rec. 141.
82	Talk about visitors, B-Cycle and bike rentals <i>[TPC]</i>	SUPPORT – NO CHANGE – The last paragraph on the page specifically mentions the B-Cycle rental program as being attractive to visitors.
82	Reference partnerships with the Cycling companies that are located in the area and how they can help us build a multi-modal system—Trek, Saris, Pacific Cycle, B-Cycle, Planet Bike. <i>[TPC]</i>	NO CHANGE – This is an implementation recommendation that is too specific.
83	B-cycle is a proprietary business, the plan should refer to bicycle sharing programs and not call out one in particular. <i>[ARTS]</i>	SUPPORT IN PART – Staff recommend that the “B-Cycle” reference be removed from Rec. 142 in favor of a more generic bicycle sharing/rental program statement, but that the reference in the text not be changed.
83	In addition to, and separate from rec. 140, add a recommendation that the City should invest in public bicycle parking infrastructure targeted toward older downtown residential districts. <i>[PBMVC]</i>	SUPPORT IN PART – Staff recommend that the City take the initiative in addressing this issue, but there may be other solutions that would not require the City to pay for it.
83	Rec. 139: Conduct more consumer market research to determine desirable locations for bike stations. <i>[DCC]</i>	SUPPORT
83	Rec. 140: Add: “Provide more bicycle parking in all existing Madison Parking Utility facilities downtown.” <i>[DCC]</i>	SUPPORT

PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
PEDESTRIAN CONNECTIONS		
84	Linkage between Monona Terrace and the rest of the commercial/retail downtown was incomplete, and perhaps Pinckney Street should be added to the list of streets for enhanced pedestrian facilities/amenities. <i>[TPC]</i>	SUPPORT – NO CHANGE – Pinckney Street is shown as a “pedestrian connection” on the Streetscape Design Map on page 44.
84	The Committee recommended including a specific (recommendation) to improve pedestrian connections at the John Nolen Drive/Williamson Street intersection, before improvements to the lakeshore are implemented. <i>[LRTPC]</i>	SUPPORT – Staff recommend that the entire intersection be considered and not just the pedestrian connections.
85	Rec. 146 – Clarify the extent to which the Langdon mid-block walk way is intended for motor vehicles and specify measures to separate pedestrian and bicycle flow. <i>[DCC]</i>	SUPPORT
86	Add to Rec. 149: “Consult with Triangle Neighborhood on East Campus Mall connections.” <i>[PBMVC]</i>	SUPPORT – NO CHANGE – The City always works closely with neighborhoods on such projects.
87	Remove the path on East Dayton shown on page 87 from the plan. <i>[PBMVC]</i>	NO CHANGE – The path would provide a more direct pedestrian access from the end of E. Dayton to the Capitol Square area through some long blocks. Also, some of the right-of-way for this pedestrian connection already exists.
WAYFINDING		
88	Distinguish between regular visitors/commuters from neighboring communities, and infrequent visitors from further away. Their knowledge of the city was different, and Plan recs. for such things as parking and way-finding should be sensitive to that. <i>[TPC]</i>	SUPPORT – NO CHANGE – This would be a consideration of the updated wayfinding system in Recs. 151-154.
88	Key # 6 needs to separately discuss visitors from the city or county from visitors from outside the region. Their needs are very different. <i>[TPC]</i>	SUPPORT – NO CHANGE – See the recommendation in the row above.
88	Madison lacks real time information on where parking is available when people encounter full ramps. Some sort of signage and way finding should be considered. <i>[TPC]</i>	SUPPORT – NO CHANGE - This is covered in Rec. 154. Also, real-time availability in public parking ramps is now available on-line (including on PDAs and cell phones).
88	The use of technology is key to the future of wayfinding. <i>[TPC]</i>	SUPPORT

PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
88	The wayfinding problems of visitors described on page 88 should be identified as one of the enduring negative impacts upon the Downtown environment and economy resulting from the introduction of the one-way network of streets in the mid-20th Century. <i>[DCC]</i>	NO CHANGE – Staff feel that this comment is unnecessary and would not add value to the plan.
88	Obj. 6.7: We support the wayfinding recommendations under objective 6.7. <i>[DCC]</i>	SUPPORT
88	Install color coded wayfinding markers in the Capitol Square area including the inner and outer loop <i>[PBMVC]</i>	NO CHANGE – This could be a consideration in the updated wayfinding system in Rec. 151, but staff feel it is premature to propose a specific approach at this time.
TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT (TDM) PLANS		
89	City should fund a TDM or Smart Trips program for downtown businesses, residents, and events. <i>[PBMVC]</i>	NO CHANGE – The plan already discusses a smart trip program, but there may be multiple funding sources which may or may not include the City.
89	Mandate TMAs to the extent possible in the zoning code. <i>[TPC]</i>	NO CHANGE – The plan recommends requiring TDM plans for major developments, but TMAs are more of a collective effort that staff feel should not be mandated.
89	Incorporate TMA's into the zoning code, to the extent it can be mandated to either property owners or larger business and office concerns. Leaving it as an option would not be workable. <i>[TPC]</i>	NO CHANGE – See the recommendation in the row above.
89	The Plan should discuss marketing. The "Smart Trips" program (started in Portland) marketed existing transportation choices to neighborhoods, and saw a reduction in car trips of 9% per neighborhood, without adding any new infrastructure. Madison seemed to invest in infrastructure (for bikes and transit) without investing in marketing these assets. <i>[TPC]</i>	SUPPORT – NO CHANGE – Staff agree with this recommendation, however a TMA must first be formed and a marketing plan should be considered during its formation.
89	A robust set of Transportation Demand Management strategies is an essential part of diversifying travel demand across more modes of transportation and away from dependence on the single occupant vehicle (SOV). Such diversification will be essential to the successful conversion of the downtown street system from one-way to two-way. This section presents a rather passive role for the City in this area. There should more the City can actively do to increase the adoption and implementation of TDM programs. <i>[DCC]</i>	NO CHANGE – No specific change was recommended.

PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
89	<p>Obj. 6.8 - Add a new Rec.: "The City will support expansion of car sharing services in the Downtown including providing at least one car sharing vehicle in all Madison Parking Utility facilities." [DCC]</p>	<p>NO CHANGE – While staff agree with providing at least one parking space in City parking facilities (see the rec. 132 in the Parking section of this memo), staff do not support the plan recommending that the City provide the vehicles.</p>
COMPREHENSIVE TRANSPORTATION STUDY		
90	<p>Obj. 6.9 - with its single Rec. 158: "Prepare a comprehensive multi-modal transportation and parking strategy..." - is the over-arching recommendation of Key 6 and should be listed first. All other objectives and recommendations in Key 6 should be considered components of or inputs to the comprehensive transportation and parking study proposed in the City's 2012 budget. The area of study for the comprehensive transportation and parking strategy should conform to the expanded sense of "downtown" (including Capitol East, West Rail Employment, Park Street Health, and UW Campus areas) discussed in opening text of the whole plan and of Key 6. Moving Objective 6.9 up to the beginning provides a better segue from the opening statements of Key 6 and sets the context for the presentation of the subsequent transportation objectives. In addition to what is listed on page 90, important topics for the comprehensive transportation and parking strategy should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify a specific location for a downtown inter-city bus terminal. - Reevaluate the viability of Doyle Square as the site of a transportation hub. The site was hastily identified in 2010 by Governor Doyle as the location for the Amtrak Passenger Rail station. It's feasibility as multi-modal transit hub was not thoroughly studied. Now that the Midwest Regional Rail Initiative has decided it will by-pass Madison in the Milwaukee-to-Twin Cities route, the likelihood of this location serving as an Amtrak station in the next 20 years, if ever, is miniscule. The site should be considered for a local commuter rail station as part of future service between Middleton, the airport and/or Sun Prairie. Lastly, Doyle Square has limited Madison Metro connectivity compared to other potential sites. (Also see Recommendation 60 under Objective 4.1) <p><i>(continued on the next page)</i></p>	<p>SUPPORT IN PART – Staff believe that this recommendation is properly placed at the end of this section as all of the preceding sections provide the necessary background to frame the study recommendation. However, staff generally agree that the individual bullet points could be considered for inclusion in the scope of the comprehensive transportation study but could be rewritten to be significantly shorter.</p>

PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
	<p><i>(continued from the previous page)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evaluate converting the entire downtown one-way network to two-way operation to reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), improve navigation for out-of-town visitors, improve visibility and access for downtown businesses, and enable successful achievement of the complete streets principles for the downtown environment. - Identify physical strategies that would support a downtown two-way conversion such as establishment of closer-to-downtown park-and-shuttle locations (e.g. East Washington & First Street, South Park Street & the Beltline, and University & Segoe). Such perimeter sites to downtown will lend themselves to Transit Oriented Development in addition to relieving the pressure of the single-occupant vehicle on the core. - Identify incentive strategies that would support a downtown two-way conversion such as expanded Transportation Demand Management programs with local employers. <i>[DCC]</i> 	
90	<p>Rec. 158 is good: Add "Use data gathered from B-Cycle for the DT Circulator discussion along with data from our other partners". <i>[TPC]</i></p>	<p>SUPPORT – NO CHANGE – B-Cycle data should not be included in the plan since it is only one of many data sources to be evaluated.</p>
GENERAL		
Gen'l.	<p>Consider vehicular speed in the downtown as it is a barrier to pedestrians and bikes. <i>[SUSTAIN]</i></p>	<p>SUPPORT – This could be added to Rec. 127 that states: Continue to incorporate "complete streets" requirements in the design for all street reconstruction projects within the Downtown.</p>
Gen'l.	<p>The Committee recommended the following insertion into the Transportation Section or a separate section on measuring success of the Downtown Plan: Measures for safety, accessibility and mode split. <i>[LRTPC]</i></p>	<p>SUPPORT – This could be incorporated into Appendix D: Benchmarks, or as part of a separate follow-up benchmark study if that section is removed from the plan.</p>
Gen'l.	<p>Remember to include Taxi/Cab service when talking about modes/connections. <i>[TPC]</i></p>	<p>SUPPORT</p>
Gen'l.	<p>Create a Vision for what a true Multi-Modal system would look like and how it would function in a seamless manner. <i>[TPC]</i></p>	<p>NO CHANGE – Staff believe that this section presents a balanced vision to Downtown transportation.</p>

PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
Gen'l.	While the Plan contained many good recommendations, it lacked an overall vision or goal: In the end, what would transportation in and to/from downtown look like? The Plan needed an overarching vision of where we eventually want to get to. To what end were the individual recommendations made? [TPC]	NO CHANGE – See the recommendation in the row above.
Gen'l.	Since the city was on an isthmus, we should begin discussion about lobbying for congestion pricing ability. [TPC]	NO CHANGE – Staff feel that this discussion is premature and believe that the development of alternative modes will provide multiple transportation choices that could allow the Downtown to grow without necessarily seeing a corresponding increase in automobile traffic.
Gen'l.	Though a Transportation Plan was needed, the Downtown Plan was not intended to be that. The Downtown Plan contained a lot of different pieces taken from a lot of different places, which was fine, because the place for transportation innovation was not in a Downtown Plan. That belonged in a different plan developed by other agencies and committees (MPO, TPC, etc.). [TPC]	NO CHANGE – This is a comment and not a specific recommendation.
Gen'l.	While all good, these suggestions, in isolation, would be hard to implement without an overall vision. Was the city really ready to adopt a strategy like Strassbourg, which abandoned automobiles in its central commercial district, in order to implement these? [TPC]	NO CHANGE – This is a comment and not a specific recommendation.
Gen'l.	Instead of focusing only on efficiency for cars, consider the look and feel of the whole area for people in all modes. [TPC]	SUPPORT – NO CHANGE – This is the central concept behind the balanced multi-modal approach, including the “complete streets” section on page 78.
Gen'l.	Re: the Outer Loop and other downtown streets: Narrow the streets, take a lane, make pedestrian rights-of-way broader, install street-side amenities, have dedicated bus lanes, install bus shelters; and deal with the key issue of delivery traffic, look at rail corridors (for freight), and how to work with this commercial network to make small storefront businesses viable, which was central to the Plan. [TPC]	NO CHANGE – The outer loop is addressed on page 86 of the plan and the rest of this recommendation is unclear as to exactly what recommendations are being suggested.
Gen'l.	The Plan suggested amenities and improvements to the downtown to make it more livable and attractive for residents, workers, and visitors. Did it discuss delivery vehicles (suppliers) and their impact? [TPC]	NO CHANGE – Deliveries were not raised as an issue during the planning process, and staff do not believe that this is an issue that should be addressed in the plan. Typically, delivery logistics are addressed in the development review process.

PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
Gen'l.	<p>In preparing the Plan, staff and committee members were asked to put the cart before the horse: Without a robust Transportation Plan that addressed a lot of issues that had been raised and that set specific goals, priorities and a vision, it would be hard to develop that piece within the Downtown Plan. Without this, (naturally) the recs. in the Plan seemed rather piecemeal. For example, what were our goals for reducing vehicle miles traveled? <i>[TPC]</i></p>	<p>SUPPORT – NO CHANGE – This upcoming city-wide transportation master plan will set the community’s transportation goals and the Downtown is just a part of that larger effort.</p>
Gen'l.	<p>Alarming, 2000 census data showed that, even in dense, transit-friendly neighborhoods, the number of cars/household had gone up (to 1.7 cars/household), with only 2-3 persons in an average downtown household. With the trend was going the wrong way then, it would be good to know what 2010 data showed now. Word-of-mouth was that more and more students were bringing a car to campus, despite what had been done with transportation (inc. TDM, bikes and mopeds, etc.). Apparently, it was still hard to get around on Campus. <i>[TPC]</i></p>	<p>NO CHANGE – 2010 data is not available at this time.</p>
Gen'l.	<p>The Plan lacked a list of future legitimate modes of transportation, like bicycles. Bicycles seemed to just be thrown in here and there in the Plan; but it needed to be legitimized as a serious mode of transportation. The list should include bicycles, along with buses, automobiles, car-sharing, commuter cars, and B-Cycle. <i>[TPC]</i></p>	<p>NO CHANGE – Staff believe that all modes are fully supported and balanced in the plan.</p>
Gen'l.	<p>The Plan lacked a vision of how younger generations would use transportation: What would their needs be in the next 10 or 20 years? The Plan was a wish-list for the short-term, but didn't look at the long-term re: how people would move in out of the downtown conveniently. <i>[TPC]</i></p>	<p>NO CHANGE – The plan recommends the development of all modes of transportation to provide a variety of choices for all people to get around, regardless of their age.</p>
Gen'l.	<p>The Plan didn't address commuting issues. Suggestions contained in the Plan (such as adding bus/bike amenities) were good, and were likely offered by people who already used buses and bikes. But how do we get (new) people on the bus? Parts of the community didn't use the bus because they felt it wasn't an efficient ride for them (it took too long, the stop was too far from their house, etc.) Even with a Comprehensive Transportation study in the long-term, before the Downtown Plan was finalized, it should address the question: How do we help people better commute downtown, to add to a vibrant and thriving downtown? <i>[TPC]</i></p>	<p>NO CHANGE – This is a comment without a specific recommendation, but many of the issues raised will be considered as part of the upcoming city-wide transportation plan.</p>

PAGE	COMMISSION/COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
<p>Gen'l. *</p>	<p>Be bold about de-emphasizing vehicular use downtown, esp. in light of limited right-of-way and discussions about street direction and bike facilities. For example, Strassbourg removed lanes from streets, built high-capacity light rail service, and placed parking facilities outside of the city-center. To go so far as to try to improve the environment for pedestrians and bikes and to have a shuttle, the Plan could be more visionary and could expressly state the goal of limiting vehicular use long-term, even if this is a few generations away. At the same time, access to any point in the downtown by means of high-capacity transit, shuttle service, biking facilities, etc. should be guaranteed. <i>[TPC]</i></p>	<p>NO CHANGE – The plan supports the development of all modes of transportation.</p>
<p>Gen'l.</p>	<p>Consider a more robust goal for transportation and look for ways to increase percentage using alternative modes such as bikes and better way-finding, transit and increased service and downtown circulator. <i>[SUSTAIN]</i></p>	<p>SUPPORT – NO CHANGE – These are all addressed in the plan.</p>
<p>Gen'l.</p>	<p>Consider a more directly mention of the transportation plan. <i>[SUSTAIN]</i></p>	<p>SUPPORT - NO CHANGE – The plan includes a section on the transportation plan beginning on page 89.</p>
<p>Gen'l.</p>	<p>In general, BID recommends that this section be revisited after the city completes its Transportation Plan. <i>[BID]</i></p>	<p>SUPPORT</p>