



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

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

Tuesday, July 25, 2006

5:00 PM

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

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

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

Absent: Carl R. Kugler

Excused: Michael Forster Rothbart, Mary P. Conroy and Cheryl E. Wittke

A. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - 6/27/2006

A motion was made by Logan, seconded by Strawser III, to Approve. The motion passed by acclamation.

C. [04205](#)

MPD Quarterly Reports - PBMVC 7.25.06

Captain Cam McLay gave the report. He advised that the MPD is continuing to work on improving its traffic safety systems, including developing a crash mitigation approach. They are building effective partnerships with Traffic Engineering and others to encompass the three E's of traffic safety: engineering, education and enforcement. Traffic Engineering developed spreadsheets for each of the five police districts showing the top crash locations in each district and the identified causal factors. The data was then given to the officers in each district in order to target their enforcement efforts. The MPD is hoping to see measurable results from this effort. The MPD is also working with the Safe Community Coalition on education and outreach and the WisDOT Bureau of Transportation Safety on multi-jurisdictional efforts such as the Beltline.

Captain McLay then briefly reviewed the 2nd Quarter Report that had been provided to members. The MPD received a number of grants that started during the second quarter including speed, alcohol and safety belt enforcement. The grants allowed the MPD to put extra officers on the street. Within the TEST unit, they are working on implementing electronic citations to expedite the issuance process. Speed enforcement in targeted areas is based on complaints and crash data, including Stoughton Road, Cottage Grove Road and Midvale Boulevard. The Stoughton Road initiative was driven by the district beat officers who recognized it as a problem and saw the need to do more based on the crash data, and McLay was pleased to see that traffic safety is not just something the TEST unit does. Upcoming efforts include a red-yellow-green motorcycle program, ped enforcement, Safety Saturday activities, and working with the Hispanic outreach group on traffic safety initiatives including seatbelts and child safety seats.

Second quarter enforcement report: Speeding citations account for 47% of the hazardous citations. From the first quarter to second quarter 2006, there was an increase in the number of citations directly related to accidents (speeding, running red light, stop sign violations and following too close). These violations get people injured and killed, and McLay was pleased to see these violations being ticketed by patrol officers. He has urged officers to concentrate on these types of violations when issuing citations and he felt the MPD is making headway in focusing on violations that cause the most harm.

Logan asked if there's any mechanism for identifying whether crashes are going down because of the enforcement focus, i.e., has behavior changed. McLay responded that in 2007, the MPD would identify 10 intersections with a crash problem and focus a great share of its resources on attacking those major crash locations. He anticipated seeing a statistically significant improvement in driver behavior and also hopefully it will have some halo effect at other locations.

DeVos referenced the Speeders Hotline data and wondered why there was such a big drop in calls from May to June, e.g., the west side went from 184 in May to 63 in June. McLay stated nothing changes on an operational basis from month to month. Shahan commented there appears to be seasonal ebb and flow to the calls and felt the number will probably go back up when school starts in September.

Shahan referenced a recent letter to the editor in the Capital Times in which a pedestrian said they were hit by a City vehicle while walking on the sidewalk. He wanted to know how long after the incident someone has to report an accident like this. McLay indicated that the MPD wouldn't conduct an investigation since they weren't called to the scene, but if it was a City driver, they would still look into it. Shahan indicated he would try to contact the citizen and tell them to contact Captain McLay.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS ITEMS

- D.1. [04198](#) Approval of Pedestrian/Bicycle/Motor Vehicle Commission Rules and Procedures

Shahan reviewed the proposed changes on pages 4 and 5.

- (1) P. 4, Item D, first paragraph, change eight to five to better reflect the timeframe between Common Council referrals and the PBMVC mailing.
- (2) P. 4, item D, Order of Business, New Business Items, re-word to reflect the type of materials typically provided by staff.
- (3) P. 5, item E., Appearances, re-word to reflect information from City Attorney that the PBMVC must allow public comment unless there is a specific reason not to allow it (e.g., the topic already had public comment at an earlier meeting).

Motion by Webber/Skidmore to approve the Rules and Procedures with the changes, carried unanimously.

- D.2. [03712](#) Adopting the Spring Harbor Neighborhood Plan and recommendations contained therein as a supplement to the City's adopted Comprehensive Plan. 19th Ald. Dist.

A motion was made by Ald. Compton, seconded by Ald. Skidmore, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation to Approve as Substituted to the PLAN COMMISSION

The PBMVC recommended approval of a substitute resolution that includes the following language: As traffic improvement projects are developed for this neighborhood, City staff will work with the neighborhood to develop plans and specifications that address the desires of the neighborhood and that are consistent with adopted City criteria including the City's adopted Pedestrian and Bicycle Transportation Plans and the Neighborhood Traffic Management Program.

DISCUSSION:

Archie Nicolette, City Planning, and Noel Radomski, district alder, were present for this item. Nicolette displayed a map of the plan area and described the neighborhood's boundaries. The Planning Department has a planning grant program whereby successfully neighborhood applicants can use the grant to hire consultants to develop a neighborhood plan. The Spring Harbor Neighborhood Plan is the first one that had to follow the City's adopted Comprehensive Plan. Nicolette handed out an excerpt from the Neighborhood Plan highlighting the major transportation-related recommendations.

Ald. Radomski noted that representatives from the neighborhood were present to speak and he was available to answer questions. He said the neighborhood was very engaged in the planning process and advanced an elaborate and complex process that involved residents and the business community.

Members then heard from the registrants.

Celest Regenberg, 5118 Lake Mendota Drive, co-chair of the Spring Harbor Neighborhood Association Steering Committee:

- The Plan was developed with broad neighborhood input.
- Spring Harbor Neighborhood Association Board of Directors selected the consultant and then established a steering committee consisting of 13 members (8 residents, 5 businesses).
- Used neighborhood forums and various focus groups (residents, businesses, rental property, etc.) and met with the stakeholders as well as City and County staff.
- Top eight priorities were identified for solutions. The surface condition, design and safety of University Avenue was the number one concern of the neighborhood.
- Additional modes of transportation to move people are addressed in the Plan (bike trails, rail, Metro).

Bob Steffen, 5317 Lake Mendota Drive, co-chair of Spring Harbor Neighborhood Association Steering Committee:

- Recommended approval of the Plan.
- Process has been a learning experience.
- This is a three- to five-year plan.
- Elements of the Neighborhood Plan may not be the same as the Comprehensive Plan, for instance, have many unimproved streets that residents wish to preserve for the character they give the neighborhood. Very hard to have traffic calming on unimproved streets, willing to look at but need to follow City standards and policies (NTMP indicates traffic calming only installed on improved streets). There are other alternatives the neighborhood could undertake, such as

a "Slow Down" campaign.

- Neighborhood has identified speeding problems on streets with curb and gutter.
- Supported the TE staff report.
- Goal is to get Plan adopted and start working on top recommendations and then update the Plan.

Shahan noted that the TE staff recommendation is for a substitute resolution to add language that where the Plan is in conflict with the City's adopted Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plans, the Bicycle and Ped Plans supersede the Neighborhood Plan, e.g., bike path on University Avenue. Mr. Steffen noted that the steering committee worked with concepts, not firm design plans. Shahan commented that flexibility on the neighborhood's part makes things easier. Mr. Steffen suggested that future neighborhood planning grants explain upfront what's in the City's Master Plan so that the neighborhood plans have the same wording. Get it upfront in the planning process to improve communication with the various City commissions that need to approve neighborhood plans.

Jon Snowden, Erdman Holdings, 5117 University Avenue:

- Throughout the planning process, the neighborhood association has tried to be very inclusive of stakeholders and to keep the Neighborhood Plan consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.
- A plan should be a broad framework so the neighborhood can evolve with changing needs and it should provide a context for that evolution.
- Biggest component of the Plan is University Avenue. It's both a commuter route and a neighborhood street that residents need to cross to access services. West of Whitney Way, it is not very ped or bike friendly. It also divides the neighborhood.
- Hopefully in the future, the County, the City and the neighborhood can work on a design that addresses some of the concerns, especially with respect to ped/bike safety.
- It will require due diligence on the part of the City and County to respond to the diverse transportation needs. The neighborhood worked very hard on making areas safer for alternative modes of transportation.

Darin Burleigh, 5018 Tomahawk Trail:

- He has been involved with the process since 2003.
- There was a lot of public participation and the Plan represents a consensus of the neighborhood.
- He felt the Plan is a very good product and thanked those who were involved.
- Strongly supported transit and suggested having a rail station with integrated transit near Whitney Way.
- There are things the residents like about the neighborhood and want to save.
- University Avenue does divide the neighborhood. Some ideas in the Plan address that by making it the kind of development that is integrated in the neighborhood. Also would signal to motorists that they are entering a neighborhood and hopefully would reduce some of the speeding.
- Growth on the outskirts increases the pressure on University Avenue, and this needs to be addressed.

Strawser indicated he had read several times in the Plan about improving ped safety, and he asked whether the neighborhood has any ideas on how to improve ped access and maintain the character of the streets, i.e., is the neighborhood actively advocating for sidewalks? Mr. Burleigh was not sure.

Susan Skubal, 5126 Flambeau Road:

- Supported the Plan and encouraged the PBVMC to support the ped and bike friendly portions of the Plan.
- Wants to maintain the natural human flow to the neighborhood.

Registered in support of the Plan but did not wish to speak:

Carrie Dellinger, 1840 Baker Avenue

Mary Lindquist, 5809 Julia Street

Bill Fitzpatrick, 5156 Spring Court (also provided written comment: Please approve the neighborhood plan. Plan was written with input from City staff and revised to insure consistency with existing City plans such the Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plans.)

Motion by Compton/Skidmore to approve.

Ross stated that City staff met with Ald. Radomski and worked out language that deals with the concerns identified in the TE staff report as follows: "As traffic improvement projects are developed for this neighborhood, City staff will work with the neighborhood to develop plans and specifications that address the desires of the neighborhood and that are consistent with adopted City criteria including the City's adopted Pedestrian and Bicycle Transportation Plans and the Neighborhood Traffic Management Program." He was not sure whether the language should be added to the Plan itself or incorporated in the adopting resolution. Nicolette preferred to have the language added to the resolution.

Compton/Skidmore accepted friendly amendment to insert the language in the resolution.

Compton remarked that the biggest problems in neighborhoods tend to be traffic-related. Many of the city's neighborhoods are old with unimproved streets, and many residents can't afford to be assessed for curb and gutter. She would like to see traffic calming options that don't require a major investment by the residents. If the street is too narrow for sidewalk, then sidewalk should not be required. Also need to consider whether there is mature landscaping when putting in sidewalks. Neighborhoods need to be looked at individually to make their streets safer, even if they don't meet the current guidelines of the NTMP. Compton noted that traffic calming is often installed as part of street reconstruction projects when curb and gutter is put in, but Spring Harbor residents have indicated a desire to retain the character of their unimproved streets. She would like to see traffic calming options that don't require curb and gutter. Shahan felt the NTMP requirements are a separate item and can be put on the PBVMC's pending list.

DeVos noted that the Comprehensive Plan does not mention the adopted Pedestrian Plan. She stated she had brought this out before the Comprehensive Plan was voted on but it was not changed. Shahan commented that the Spring Harbor speakers referred numerous times to the Comprehensive Plan, yet the adopted Comprehensive Plan is not on the City's web site. He would like to see the adopted version, especially since he had also spoken on the Pedestrian Plan issue. DeVos was concerned that the Comprehensive Plan seems to be used as a template yet the Pedestrian Plan is missing. Shahan suggested this also be put on the PBVMC's pending list.

Shahan clarified that the motion on the floor is to approve the staff report recommending a substitute resolution with the language read by Ross.

Shahan noted that some of the references in the Neighborhood Plan are incorrect, e.g., there's no reference to figure 2.11 on page 17, and page references figure 2.11 but it should be figure 2.12. He asked that staff check the figure references.

Strawser wanted to know what happens if City staff are unable to come up with a design that addresses both the neighborhood's interests and is consistent with the adopted Ped and Bike Plans. Ross stated that nothing would happen until there is agreement. The neighborhood has a strong interest in what happens and he felt that when it comes time to implement improvements, there will be a good working relationship between the neighborhood and staff. He couldn't tell what will happen until there's a specific project. Ross remarked that 3-5 years is probably too short a timeframe for the major recommendations. The County will be a major player in whatever happens on University Avenue. Shahan felt the biggest problem will be on the narrow, unimproved side streets.

Compton felt the neighborhood has done a great job with the Plan and can serve as a role model for neighborhoods in her district as they start the planning process.

The motion passed by acclamation.

D.3. [04015](#)

Adult School Crossing Guard Assignments

Members first heard from the registrants.

Ald. Judy Olson, District 6

- Opposed the elimination of the ASCG at Atwood-Division.
- She asked the PBVMC to take into consideration that the school was not notified of the elimination until the end of the school year and to give the ASCG another year. The school would know it's a one-year trial.
- This would give them time to notify parents and let them decide whether to make use of the crossing guard. Also, the PTO can work on educating the parents on the value of having a crossing guard at this location. She felt the parents might be disenfranchised if they simply find out the guard is gone.
- Expressed concern that if the guard is removed, it will never be reinstated because parents will get in the habit of driving their children to school.

In response to Compton's question, Olson said there was construction going on near this location but she couldn't say whether it impacted the number of children crossing. Compton felt that if some parents drove their children because they didn't want them walking near a construction site, this would play a part in the decreased number of children crossing at this location. Olson remarked that it's possible, although she couldn't be sure what caused fewer children to cross at this location.

Tammy Bieberstein, 1320 Spaight Street:

- She has been the ASCG at Atwood-Division for the last two years, and she opposed the elimination of a crossing guard at this location.
- This location is not as busy as others she has worked at, but parents are concerned about the possible elimination.
- Expressed concern that the school was not given adequate notice in order to inform the parents that the crossing guard may not be there in the fall.

- There are 9 children who regularly cross and another 15 children that cross here on a sporadic basis. A family with children has moved into the neighborhood, and some third graders from Tenney-Lapham will be coming to Marquette Elementary in the fall.
- In the morning, there are two lanes of traffic heading into the city. The presence of a guard slows down the traffic. In the afternoon, the sun can shine in the eyes of motorists. She has seen accidents, but no children were hit which she attributed to having a crossing guard.
- Agreed with Ald. Olson that parents should be given adequate notice of the possible elimination and let them decide whether to utilize the crossing guard.
- She appreciated that the MPD is facing budget cuts.

Logan mentioned that he uses this intersection quite often and has noticed, especially in early spring, that Atwood traffic is very heavy in both directions and he wondered how often that happens. Bieberstein replied it's sporadic. Strawser asked whether moving the crossing guard to Corscot would increase the number of children crossing. Bieberstein said yes since there are a number of children who cross there now and she felt the children who now cross at Division would be willing to cross at Corscot. However, putting in a crosswalk would mean the crosswalk would be at the driveway to Monty's Blue Plate Diner.

Deborah Sproule, 1617 Tarragon Drive, representing Local Union 60:

- Opposed the elimination of the crossing guard at Atwood-Division and echoed the comments made by Ms. Bieberstein.
- The ASCG sees the crossing differently than children and can take preventive measures to avoid accidents. Children don't have the same perceptions of traffic.
- It's imperative to retain guards at high traffic intersections so the children have adult guidance to cross the street.
- The affected schools were notified in an untimely fashion, only two days before school ended for the summer. This was not enough time to notify parents or to have parents put in place a process for getting their children to school in the fall. Many parents would not be aware that the guard was gone.
- The guards are trained to be aware of multiple hazards and problems.
- The presence of a guard is another visual clue to motorists to slow down.

Written comment was received from Dan Melton, Chair, Schenk-Atwood-Starkweather-Yahara Neighborhood Association:

- Association urged the retention of the Atwood-Division crossing guard.
- At the very least, retain the guard until June 2007 while the location is reassessed.
- Having been trying for years to encourage parents to let their children walk to school and have emphasized safe walking routes. Having a crossing guard is an important component.
- The crossing guard helps students in crossing both Atwood and Division at a corner where Atwood traffic is making a quick, no-stop turn with short visibility.
- Removal of the guard will likely cause more parents to drive their children to school, thereby increasing congestion and making it even less safe for the children who do walk.
- All current City policies call for maintaining and expanding neighborhood "walkability."
- The crossing guard also provides a service by watching for bullying between children and observing potentially dangerous adults.
- Asked that the guard be retained for the 2006-2007 school year to update the

count and to give the parents an opportunity to voice their needs and the time to reassess the safest route for their children to take to school.

Skidmore asked whether the PBMVC would be having this discussion if the Mayor had not directed the MPD to cut its budget. He has an extreme problem with cutting MPD's budget. Captain McLay of the MPD was present and said he appreciated the support for the MPD. He stated that in early spring, he met with the ASCG supervisors and advised them of the need to monitor resources appropriately and asked the supervisors whether all crossing locations met the adopted criteria. He asked the supervisors to look at a number of locations that they felt might not meet the criteria. Subsequent to this, the MPD became aware of the Mayor's budget concern. When the ASCG supervisors presented their initial list, the MPD worked with Ross to conduct studies, waiting until spring when the weather is nice and more children are likely walking. Captain McLay emphasized that the wheels were already in place to review the crossing locations before the Mayor's budget directive.

Compton wanted to know whether the studies take into account things like construction in the area that might affect the number of children walking. She strongly felt that a savings to the MPD of \$13,800 is not worth the life of a child. Referencing the Buckeye-Droster ASCG location, she pointed out that Buckeye is an east-west road and thus has many blind spots because of the location of the sun when motorists are driving during the crossing times. Compton also questioned the criteria that recommends discontinuance of a crossing guard if less than 15 children are crossing. She did not feel the number should be that definite. For instance, the Cottage Grove Road bridge is currently out of service for reconstruction so the traffic on Buckeye has increased. The neighborhoods in her district are becoming more ped-friendly and have been working with the Safe Community Coalition to encourage children walking to school. But removing the crossing guard takes away a tool to encourage walking. She did try to get busing for the students at Elvehjem Elementary but they don't live far enough away. Compton pointed out that one of the reasons for the recently-installed traffic calming on Ellen was to provide a safer walk route to school, and it's too early to tell whether the traffic calming has encouraged more parents to have their children walk to school. She felt the traffic calming will have an impact on the number of children crossing. Compton expressed disappointment that PBMVC member Wittke was absent because she'd like to hear the Safe Community Coalition's reaction. Compton strongly opposed taking away crossing guards. As far as she was concerned, one child crossing the street is all that is needed to have a crossing guard. Compton noted that a crossing guard helps not only the children crossing at that location but also children crossing downstream since traffic is slowed. Compton urged the PBMVC not to jeopardize the safety of these children.

McLay pointed out that the City has adopted criteria for school crossing guards, and when he asked the crossing guard supervisors to look at locations that might not meet the criteria he emphasized that they should only bring forward those locations where they were comfortable letting children cross without a guard. The two supervisors supported the elimination of crossing guards at Atwood-Division and Buckeye-Droster because they felt it could be done without impacting the safety of the children. While no one likes taking away a service, it's sometimes necessary to make the hard choices when looking at a finite budget. Captain McLay emphasized that he confirmed with the crossing guard

supervisors that these two locations could be cut without an adverse impact on safety.

Skidmore stated that he had talked to some School District members who are opposed to the school crossing protection policy. Ross noted that the School District is not involved. State statutes allow the school district or the municipality to hire crossing guards, and the MPD has administered the crossing guard program for decades. Ross reiterated that the PBMVC and the Common Council adopted the criteria, which were last modified in 1999. The criteria are based on some national standards but are more liberal to reflect community values. Ross noted that it is always an emotional issue to remove a crossing guard. No one wants to lose one, regardless of the number of children crossing. Ross noted that state statutes require that the students live at least two miles from the school in order for the school district to receive state aid for busing them.

Ross indicated that the crossing guard studies are typically done after the spring break. Staff looked at five locations and came up with these two as the ones they were most comfortable with to recommend discontinuance of the crossing guards.

In response to a question from Strawser, Ross stated that the study analysis considers the actual speeds, not the posted speed limit. The crash history criteria were modified in 1990 to include the history of other crashes that might impact student safety, such as rear-end crashes. Ross briefly reviewed the criteria, which require a hazard rating of at least 40 points and a minimum of 25 students crossing. If the hazard rating drops below 30 or there are less than 15 students crossing, the location is recommended for discontinuance of the crossing guard. The crossing guard at Atwood-Division has been there since the beginning, while the crossing guard at Buckeye-Droster went in about 10 years ago even though the location didn't meet the criteria. The neighborhood asserted that it didn't meet the minimum number of students because there wasn't a guard and that more children would walk if there was a crossing guard. However, the location never did meet the criteria. Referencing an earlier comment about Atwood-Division, Ross indicated that during his study it appeared that most of the students who were crossing at Corscot were middle and high school students.

Webber asked what time of year most students walk. Bob Olson, crossing guard supervisor, indicated September-October and April-end of school year. Webber then asked if the spring counts are as high as the fall counts, and whether these two locations also had low counts in the fall. She noted that spring bike usage is not as high as the fall bike usage. She wondered whether spring crossing counts are low because many students are driven during the winter and the parents then continue driving them. Olson reported that for Atwood-Division, the fall count was 12 crossing in the a.m. and 10 crossing in the p.m.; the spring count was 5 crossing in the a.m. and 8 crossing in the p.m. Ross stated that he uses the higher number crossing, i.e., 8 for the spring count. ASCG Bieberstein suggested that counts be taken the first few weeks of school.

Compton noted that Buckeye just got sidewalk five years ago and it will take time for parents to feel comfortable having their children walk to school. If you want to encourage walking, you need to make it as safe as possible. She reiterated her concern about drivers on Buckeye having the sun in their eyes and being unable

to see children crossing. She would like the study to include visual problems like that. Ross explained that the study analysis is based on criteria adopted by the Commission and the Common Council. State statutes require drivers to slow down if they can't see. It's impossible to take something like that into account. He reiterated that the studies were done based on adopted criteria and then staff made their recommendations, and it's now up to the PBMVC to decide what it wants to do.

ASCG Supervisor Olson advised that several locations have been eliminated over the past 10 years, including Milwaukee-Marquette, Milwaukee-Bryan, East Washington-Wright, Troy-Marcy, etc. If the criteria are lowered, it could mean every corner qualified for having a crossing guard. You need to look at what the City can afford.

Skidmore questioned some of the criteria. He noted that Tree-Gammon has two guards. He has gone out with the MPD TEST Unit and saw the officers write speeding tickets, including one for 27 miles over the limit in a school zone. There may be crashes that don't show up in the study analysis, or students may be hit but not right at the crossing location. The criteria greatly under-emphasize the importance of the crossing guards. He was very upset with the direction this is going. Ross explained that his job, as City staff, was to conduct the study analysis, evaluate the data based on the criteria, and report back on his evaluation. It's up to the Commission to make the decision.

Shahan referenced the two crossing guards at Tree-Gammon, and Ross pointed out that the criteria determine where a guard is warranted; how to staff that location is an internal decision for the MPD. The MPD budget contains a certain amount of money for crossing guards, so if a location is added during the year the MPD needs to go to the Common Council for more money or shift money from other locations. The criteria do not address the number of crossing guards at a location. Assigning two crossing guards at Tree-Gammon was a decision by the MPD. Captain McLay advised that the proposal was to staff Tree-Gammon with one permanently assigned crossing guard and then also use a relief guard. He noted that the criteria are based on the number of elementary school children crossing. If the crossing guard program is to include middle and high school students in heavy ped areas, then the MPD needs to know that.

If the PBMVC rejects the elimination of either one or both locations, Logan wanted to know if the MPD still needs to find budget savings. McLay advised that is outside his control.

Motion by Webber/Skidmore to reject the proposal.

Webber stated that besides her concerns about the criteria and the safety of the children, she was also concerned about the late notice to the schools. The notice was not adequate for parents, and she did not feel an appropriate process was followed. Although the elimination of these two crossing guards might save the City some money, it might cost the School District a lot more to bus the students. The crossing guards will never be restored because the locations will never have at least 25 children crossing if there's no guard to help them. So now the burden will be on the School District to provide busing. She reiterated her concern that the schools and the parents were not informed in time and now the burden is being shifted to the School District.

Compton agreed with Webber. The crossing guard program is not the place to find budget savings. The MPD needs to stop trying to find budget savings with the crossing guard program. Once a crossing guard is removed, it's a major undertaking to get it back. Compton indicated that there are a number of kindergarten-aged children in the Buckeye area who will be starting school this fall. She urged the retention of the crossing guard to provide a ped-friendly trip to school. She reiterated that the traffic calming on Ellen just went in and she believed it will have a positive impact on increasing the number of pedestrians. Compton also reiterated that the study analysis numbers aren't everything; the criteria don't consider things like blind spots for drivers. A savings of \$13,800 is not worth it for even one child crossing.

Skidmore stated he will try everything he can to prevent someone from getting killed. He understood that there are adopted criteria, but children need as much help and protection as possible when crossing the street. Skidmore commented that he didn't believe the PBVMC would be having this discussion if the MPD were not facing a budget situation. He suggested the PBVMC re-study the criteria. There have been many near misses at Tree-Gammon, even with two crossing guards. The elimination of crossing guards is not the way to cut the budget.

Shahan agreed the PBVMC may want to revisit the criteria, including consideration of having at least one crossing guard if a major arterial goes through, such as Buckeye. For intersections like Tree-Gammon, the number of students per guard should be considered. The PBVMC could also consider including middle school as well as elementary students in the number crossing. Review of the ASCG criteria will be added to the pending list.

Shahan remarked that this issue relates to the kind of community we want to build, whether it's a community that is friendly to families. Neighborhoods go through cycles and it can take 10 years to change the demographics, not the five years worth of data that staff look at when reviewing locations. He echoed the comment of other members that once a crossing guard is removed and parents start driving their children to school, it's very difficult to get a guard back. At the very least, he thought the two crossing guards should be retained for the coming school year in order to give the schools and parents adequate notice and to let the PBVMC revisit the criteria.

Motion carried unanimously.

E. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

Motion by Skidmore/Webber to refer the remainder of the agenda to the next meeting (although Skidmore had an item for referral under G.3), carried unanimously.

- E.1. [04199](#) Pedestrian and bicycle improvement projects, Ped/Bike/Motor Vehicle Commission follow-up discussion to 6/27/06 public hearing
Referred
- E.2. [04201](#) Pedestrian/Bicycle/Motor Vehicle Commission pending list

Referred

F. REPORTS OF OTHER COMMITTEES - SUMMARY OF ACTIVITY

F.1. Plan Commission

Referred

F.2. LRTPC

Referred

F.3. Joint West Campus Area Committee

Referred

F.4. Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee

Referred

F.5. School Traffic Safety Committee

Referred

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

G.1. Executive Secretary Report - Status of 2006 NTMP Projects

Referred

G.2. Items by Chair

Referred

G.3. Items for referral and/or announcements

Skidmore stated he met with staff today about the Commission on People with Disabilities. He'd like the next agenda to include an item about the people first language in the CPD ordinance relative to signing for barrier free parking spaces. Skidmore mentioned that the issue has been brewing for months and he would talk to staff about it to come back at the next meeting.

Strawser referenced the earlier discussion about students using the Corscot crossing of Atwood Avenue and mentioned that he also uses this crossing. He wanted to know what was necessary to get a marked crosswalk there. Ross indicated that part of the problem is that a crosswalk here would not have curb ramps, and to put in curb ramps would entail a significant public works project .

ADJOURNMENT

Upon a motion by Skidmore/Strawser, the meeting adjourned at 7:25 p.m.