



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes - Approved PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION

Tuesday, April 29, 2008

5:00 PM

Room LL110, Madison Municipal Building
215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
(After 6 pm, use Doty St. entrance.)

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Present: 8 -

Beth A. Whitaker; Aaron S. P. Crandall; Judy Compton; Robbie Webber;
Paul E. Skidmore; Mark N. Shahan; Mary P. Conroy and Susan M. De Vos

Absent: 2 -

Norm J. Schulman and Charles W. Strawser III

Excused: 1 -

Cheryl E. Wittke

The meeting was called to order at 5:03 p.m. by Chair Shahan.

Strawser arrived at 5:17 p.m., during item C.1.

A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - 3/25/08

A motion was made by Conroy, seconded by Compton, to Approve the Minutes .
The motion passed byvoice vote/other.

B. PUBLIC COMMENT - None

C. MADISON POLICE DEPT. REPORT ON TRAFFIC RELATED ISSUES

A roll call is shown to reflect that Strawser arrived at 5:17 p.m. during discussion of the MPD enforcement report.

Present: 9 -

Beth A. Whitaker; Aaron S. P. Crandall; Judy Compton; Robbie Webber;
Paul E. Skidmore; Mark N. Shahan; Charles W. Strawser III; Mary P.
Conroy and Susan M. De Vos

Absent: 1 -

Norm J. Schulman

Excused: 1 -

Cheryl E. Wittke

C.1. [10122](#) Madison Police Department Traffic Enforcement Report, First Quarter 2008

Lt. David Jugovich distributed a copy of the 2008 First Quarter Traffic Activity Report and summarized the findings.

- Speeders Hotline received 635 calls for the quarter; 85% of them contained

enough information for the MPD to send out 542 warning letters.

- A total of 4,534 traffic citations were issued for the quarter, with 3,299 for hazardous violations and 1,235 for non-hazardous. Of these totals, the Traffic Enforcement Safety Team (TEST) issued 642 hazardous citations and 114 non-hazardous citations.
- The two-year average (2006-07) for total citations issued in the first quarter is 5,262.
- There were two fatal crashes in the quarter, one on the West Beltline Highway near Old Sauk Road and one at the intersection of Commercial Avenue (CTH T) and Felland Road. Both involved alcohol.
- A WisDOT grant will provide funding for overtime enforcement starting in the second quarter. Initiatives include alcohol related driving violations and ped/bike safety enforcement.
- The MPD will also participate with the Dane County Sheriff's Dept. in a WisDOT-funded initiative focusing on alcohol and speed violations on the West Beltline Highway.

Compton asked whether statistics were available regarding the number of traffic violation warnings that were issued. Jugovich indicated he will include that information in the next report.

Compton noted that the West Police District had a significantly higher number of calls to the Speeders Hotline than the other four districts combined. She suggested that the captains of the other districts send out a notice to residents in their areas reminding them to call the Speeders Hotline and to utilize the MPD resources. Jugovich said he will raise the issue.

In response to Shahan's question, Jugovich stated that the ped/bike safety enforcement initiative will focus on violations that present safety concerns/hazards to peds and bicyclists.

Regarding the overtime enforcement, Webber asked whether all the enforcement takes place during overtime. Jugovich advised that the grant covers all salary costs related to the overtime through the end of the third quarter. However, the City matches the grant to cover benefits.

Webber commented that there has been an ongoing discussion about the fact that traffic enforcement in the afternoon significantly fell off after elimination of the p.m. TEST. This has been an issue for neighborhoods and Chief Wray has assured that it will be addressed. After the grant runs out, how will the afternoon enforcement be covered given that the MPD only has an a.m. TEST? People are very concerned about the after-school time period and Webber hoped that enforcement is not entirely reliant on a grant for this time period. Jugovich stated that the grant initiative is not designed to substitute for regular enforcement efforts. The MPD is coming up with a plan to address these kinds of issues and enforcement needs will be evaluated by the various MPD districts. Jugovich emphasized that the police districts will be undertaking other enforcement initiatives in addition to the grant ones. Webber was frustrated that she keeps hearing there will be a plan to cover the afternoon traffic enforcement but it never happens. Compton noted that the Community Policing Team (CPT) can issue traffic citations. The CPT operates from 2:00-11:00 p.m. and should pick up some of the enforcement that Webber is talking about. The purpose of the CPTs is to be in the neighborhoods and make themselves familiar to the

residents. Having the TEST in the a.m. and the CPT in the p.m. would provide excellent coverage. Shahan remarked that there's been talk about getting another CPT with the new officers included in the 2008 budget. Will there be an additional TEST for the p.m.? Jugovich indicated that the MPD continues to evaluate its staffing resources but he was not aware of a p.m. TEST in the works at this time. Shahan would like to see it considered. Compton did not want to see any funding taken away from the CPTs.

Crandall asked if there will be continuation of the program targeting ped safety in crosswalks and the stop on red campaign. Jugovich stated the "duck" ped enforcement program will continue as well as initiatives addressing red light running. Compton asked when the test cameras for red light running will go in, but Webber indicated the City is still waiting for enabling legislation from the State legislature. Jugovich was aware there was a proposal but did not have any additional details.

Skidmore requested that future reports include a breakdown of citations issued for each police district. He appreciated the efforts of the TEST and patrol officers on the west side but felt the MPD is grossly understaffed. The City needs more officers to do more enforcement.

D. PRESENTATIONS

D.1. [09964](#)

MINERAL POINT/JUNCTION ROAD INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS: REVIEW OF ALTERNATIVES BY ROB PHILLIPS, DEPUTY CITY ENGINEER

Rob Phillips, City Engineering, and Matt Hintze, HNTB, provided an informational PowerPoint presentation on three alternative designs under consideration. The project is tentatively scheduled for construction in 2011 or 2012. The goal is a project that balances the needs of motor vehicles, peds, bicyclists and transit users. The alternatives were presented to the Long Range Transportation Planning Commission, and Phillips stated staff is looking at another alternative that might address concerns the LRTPC raised regarding ped/bike accommodations.

- Project tasks include the alternatives analysis, an environmental assessment, and then a preliminary design.
- Stakeholders include the City of Madison, Dane County, WisDOT, FHWA, and business groups. Ongoing contact with the property owners and business group meetings. There will be a public hearing on the environmental assessment.
- Displayed map of the adjacent Pioneer Neighborhood Development Area.
- Goal of project is to provide safe and convenient intersection for all users; provide acceptable operating conditions for now and into the future; accommodate future planned growth in the area (e.g., Pioneer Neighborhood).
- Reviewed current (2007) daily traffic volumes and projected volumes for 2030 based on data from the Metropolitan Planning Organization: Mineral Point Road = 40,500 (2007) to 70,000 (2030); CTH M = 21,000 (2007) to 32,000 (2030). Also reviewed daily traffic volumes for a.m. and p.m. key traffic movements.
- Design constraints include existing businesses, cemetery, coordination with Beltline traffic and Pleasant View Road.
- Alternatives being considered avoid the cemetery but may involve relocating some businesses.

Hintze briefly explained the three design alternatives and their traffic movements: advance left turn, jug handle, and offset split-grade.

Advance left turn

- Does not require grade separation or a bridge.
- Some businesses would need to be relocated.
- Includes both a bike path and a multi-use path.
- Not clear whether there's a right turn only lane southbound to westbound.
- Left turns would be pulled into a queue. Signage will be necessary to direct motorists into the left turn lane.
- Gaps for peds to cross the street will be worked into the signal timing. There will also be quite a few ped refuge islands. De Vos noted that islands can pose a problem in the winter especially for wheelchair users.
- Webber mentioned that LRTPC had brought up issue of sufficient stacking capacity. Hintze said signals will be timed to avoid stacking, modeling shows it will work.
- Getting more motor vehicle traffic through will be an issue and needs to be included in the modeling.
- This alternative moves a fair amount of traffic without a grade separation.
- Estimated cost: ROW = \$11.5 million, construction = \$7-8 million

Jug Handle

- Would be a grade separation (overpass) for north/south traffic on Junction/CTH M to travel over Mineral Point Road.
- To make a left turn from southbound, need to go on the jug handle and go around to head eastbound.
- Estimated cost: ROW = \$8.2 million, construction = \$9-12 million

Offset Split Grade

- Would have a bridge structure.
- Bike lane for all through movements.
- Advantage: at-grade by the businesses on the north side.
- Junction Road/CTH M to Verona would be four lanes. Would be 5-6 lanes between Watts Road and the intersection.
- Mineral Point Lane would be 6 lanes with additional turn lanes at intersection; might get by with 5 lanes.
- Estimated cost: ROW = \$8.9 million, construction = \$9-12 million.

DISCUSSION

- Phillips stated the Feds would cover 50% of the construction costs but the ROW cost is a concern. Have asked for a Fed earmark to offset some of the ROW costs. Each alternative has significant ROW costs. L
- Regarding the local share, it has yet to be determined how it would be split. Webber expressed concern that the local share is being reflected as all being borne by the City and not shared with the County. Skidmore asked whether there have been any conversations with the County as to their share. Phillips replied that the County has attended some of the planning meetings but is not actively participating at this time. Skidmore mentioned that much of the traffic through this intersection is regional.
- Why is this intersection a problem, i.e., is there a crash problem? Would a change in signal timing help?
- Is the potential for light rail playing into the numbers and scope of the

project? Phillips indicated that light rail would reduce some of the trips but the project is being planned with the transportation options that are available in the near term.

- Is there another possibility to reroute traffic to other roads? The planned extension of Pleasant View Road would create an alternate route. However, this extension would not solve the problem at Junction-Mineral Point although it would provide an alternate for traffic when the intersection is under construction.
- Accommodations for non-motorized traffic need more work.
- Traffic issues are about more than just roads, also about economic development. Madison needs to offer destinations on both the east side and west side to split the traffic. Also, decision makers need to listen when traffic engineers raise concerns about the traffic impacts associated with developments.
- This intersection has been a trouble spot for a long time, and decisions made many years ago created the problem. Changing the signal timing will not have an impact. Light rail/commuter rail may help but that is years away and is not a panacea. CTH M was over capacity many years ago and now the City is trying to catch up. This intersection project would help a lot to solve the congestion.
- De Vos wanted to know the role of the MPO in this project. Webber indicated the MPO basically allocates Federal funding and bases its funding decisions on the requests from the local municipalities and the County. Webber pointed out that the Dane County proposal for a Regional Transportation Authority would likely be focused on transit and would be unlikely to fund new roads.
- Shahan recalled that the Pioneer Neighborhood Plan included a dedicated transit corridor and he wondered about its connections. The traffic impact analysis for the Neighborhood Plan assumed that 15% of motor vehicle traffic would be diverted to other modes and the Plan contained a high capacity transit corridor. How would rail or a dedicated bus rapid transit route get through the intersection? Phillips noted there is a possibility for dedicated bus lanes on some streets but not on Mineral Point Road between Junction and the Beltline since there isn't enough roadway width. There have been discussions with Madison Metro about a bus route through the new Research Park but it's not clear how it would work. Metro is working with Engineering on including transit in the planning but not necessarily a dedicated bus route through the Research Park. Shahan expressed frustration that a high capacity bus corridor keeps being taken off the table. The idea was to get transit out there early on in the game. The high capacity bus corridor shown on the Pioneer Neighborhood map appears to be a fairy tale. Phillips believed that transit in the Research Park could be accommodated well but whether there is a separate road just for transit is up to others to decide, and he has not seen it "rise to the surface." Shahan reiterated that it was in the Neighborhood Plan and he's disappointed and frustrated that it's not going to happen. When it was first put on the map, he questioned whether it was realistic.
- There should have been several more arterials in this area to create a grid. Decisions made a long time ago now preclude some things from happening. The area where Target is was not supposed to be high density retail, and Traffic Engineering staff and the PBMVC warned against it. A grid of arterial and collector streets is important. Development and density occurred that could not be supported by the infrastructure.
- Skidmore reminded members that the Pioneer Neighborhood Plan is separate from the intersection project. But more transit is integral for the Research Park as well as other developments in this area.
- Crandall remarked that there are different pools of funding. Transit needs more funding, but now the City is spending millions to improve motor vehicle

access and he was somewhat disappointed. The project is too accommodating for getting people into Madison.

- Compton pointed out that there's no way that buses could operate efficiently unless the intersection is improved.

- Compton reiterated her concerns about the City's planning process and commented that you can't plan a city on a little piece of paper. You need to see the whole picture, the entire grid, not just one store, need to see the inter-relationship. The Junction-Mineral Point Road is a problem that needs to be addressed and it will cost a lot of money.

- Webber commented that one problem is the lack of a north-south road, especially since there's a lot of traffic coming from Verona. CTH M is a disaster. There are also gaps in east-west connections. There needs to be a better grid system.

- This intersection carries regional traffic and the County needs to be involved; not fair for the City to bear the local share of this project.

- One of the requirements in the Pioneer Neighborhood Plan was that before development happened, a high capacity transit corridor was to be in place. This is a requirement of the adopted Plan but every time it's brought up, the response is that it's something for the future. The adopted Neighborhood Plan is not being followed. The Plan anticipated that 15% of the traffic volume would be taken off Mineral Point and Junction, and that is a very high percentage. This road system is not good for biking or walking and a bus line cannot carry the necessary capacity to reduce traffic by 15%. This intersection will fail without a high capacity transit corridor.

- Webber offered several suggestions for the Junction-Mineral Point intersection: (1) to solve the bike/ped issues, build a roundabout under the roadway. All non-motorized traffic would go under the roadway. This likely would not be much more expensive to do and would allow all users to get through this intersection. Would address the ped winter issues (snow covered refuge islands) and the issue of accommodating multi-stage ped crossings without delaying other traffic. (2) Oil is currently at \$120 a barrel and gas is going up to \$4 a gallon, so are the traffic projections realistic? Or will there be a decrease given the high cost of driving. Need more innovative solutions, need more transit service. As a city, need to come up with transportation solutions other than simply expanding the roadway.

- Strawser asked about the current level of service (LOS) at this intersection, and Dryer replied that at certain times of the day it's failing. Strawser noted that in 2030, the alternatives would bring this intersection to a LOS of D. How long before the intersection fails again? Phillips said he couldn't answer that. There would be more delay on certain movements, including left-turns.

- The 2030 projections are based on trends, census data, regional travel patterns, planned developments, and DOA population projections for surrounding communities. Strawser clarified that the projection also uses AASHTO guidelines that certain land uses generate "x" number of trips per day. The Pioneer Neighborhood Plan process assumed that past trends would not be extrapolated and instead there would be a radical change in land use and transportation modes, i.e., shift of 15% to other modes. But the process for this intersection project does extrapolate past trends for traffic generation. It's unfair to adopt a Plan that assumes a change in culture and then have a process for a \$20 million "improvement" in the roadway that is based on the assumption that there will be no change in culture. Can't plan for everyone to change and then design roads that assume people will not change.

- Shahan recalled that shortly after the PBMVC was established, he handed out

articles about trends and resource depletion and questioned whether traffic trends would continue as in the past. Are the 2030 volume projections really realistic? He felt big changes are coming and the City needs to look at different ways of moving people and having a vibrant economy.

- From the numbers today of about 40,000 on Mineral Point to the projection of 70,000 in 2030, how much of a solution do we need? And can transit get back in the mix?

- Skidmore remarked that those who ignore history are doomed to repeat it. He referenced past decisions by the Plan Commission to not extend roads, which only resulted in traffic congestion on other streets.

- This intersection carries regional traffic. As the West Towne area expands, it will bring more regional traffic. This is a big retail area. There is an opportunity to try and manage the traffic with better transit. If the County doesn't want to participate, that's a mistake. Shahan stressed that the solution needs County participation to make it work.

- Compton reiterated that you need to look at why people are driving here, need to look at the economic development and spread it out.

- Crandall supported Webber's suggestion for a roundabout underneath the roadway, mentioning that Davis, CA did something similar.

- As an alternative to accommodating projected traffic volumes based on past trends, Strawser wanted to know how much of a reduction in the current traffic volume it would take to make the intersection not fail. Shahan felt it sounds like the intersection is maxed out on capacity. How much additional capacity does each alternative provide? Are there other alternatives that might provide less additional capacity but cost less? Phillips said there are other alternatives but they would not accommodate the projected growth, and many would feel it's a waste of money to do a project like that.

- Phillips advised that the L RTPC had commented that the alternatives needed more accommodation for peds and bicyclists, and staff is working on another alternative to do that. It needs to be refined but he felt it has promise. He will bring it back for review. Shahan asked that it address De Vos's concern about multi-lane crossings for peds. Phillips commented that he would like to meet the challenge of accommodating peds and bikes, Come up with something that most of the community can endorse. Would be happy to come back with more refined alternatives, show in more detail the various movements and how peds and bikes would get through the intersection. Shahan would like the alternatives to preserve as much transit capacity as possible, preferably east-west. De Vos asked that the plan also take into consideration the use of NEVs, which can't travel on streets with a speed limit above 35 mph.

- Skidmore requested that Dane County transportation planning staff be invited to attend when the refined alternatives are presented. If the County is serious about commuter/light rail, they should participate. Also need to talk about an expansion of Metro, and perhaps Metro staff could be invited as well or possibly have a joint meeting with the TPC.

E. NEW BUSINESS

- E.1. [09234](#) Adopting the *Regent Street - South Campus Neighborhood Plan* and the goals, recommendations, and implementation steps contained therein as a supplement to the City's *Comprehensive Plan*.

This Resolution was Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s) to the PLAN COMMISSION

The PBMVC recommended to approve the resolution with the following recommendations: (1) that the Plan provide enhanced bike parking, (2) that the form and function of the traffic islands be considered for all types of weather and for all types of users of the islands and that staff design something that works well for everybody and have it come back for approval; (3) that upon completion of the Zoning Code rewrite, this Plan be revisited to address the recommended parking ratio of three spaces per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area; (4) that both ends of the block of Monroe Street between Regent Street and Randall be made more bike friendly; and (5) there needs to be better off-street bike parking accommodated, including covered bike parking.

DISCUSSION

Bill Fruhling from City Planning provided an overview. The steering committee appointed to guide the development of the Plan included residents, alders, business owners, the UW, area medical institutions, and students. The committee met between January and November 2007.

- This is a multi-modal neighborhood. The emphasis in the Plan is to ensure that it remains balanced in transportation as the area evolves. Currently, the area is a hodge-podge of land uses, and the Plan tries to provide a framework for cohesive development.
- The Plan identified sub-areas that could be built upon.
- The bike paths through this area were viewed as major assets and a building block of the neighborhood. One recommendation is to have new development address the bike paths by having more attractive areas adjacent to the bike paths. Make using the paths a more pleasant experience.
- For peds, the streetscape along Regent is not in the best shape; the sidewalks are narrow and it's difficult to cross at many intersections.
- To address street crossings, the Plan recommends that ped islands be installed at non-signalized crossings of Regent Street. Islands may not be the ideal solution but trying to work within the existing ROW and provide an opportunity for peds to cross one direction of traffic at a time. Plan also recommends accentuating the crosswalks to emphasize to the ped crossing to drivers.
- Plan recommends more amenities for peds and separation from traffic. This is difficult to do with the existing space. The recommendation is that as properties re-develop, to require a 3-foot dedication or easement along the front property line so that the sidewalk could be widened to accommodate trees, benches, bike racks, etc.
- There is a major underground utility main on the south side of the street, which is why there are no shade trees. The recommendation is for small trees or planters to enhance the feel of that space.
- At last week's UDC meeting, they raised the idea of narrowing the roadway in order to widen the sidewalk. One suggestion is to reduce the road configuration from four to three lanes. There would be two travel lanes and one lane of parking. Another suggestion was to narrow the lane widths (currently two 11' travel lanes and two 13' parking lanes). Narrowing the roadway width to widen the sidewalk poses some problems, rather than doing it incrementally as properties redevelop.
- On-street parking is very important to the businesses. Businesses owners suggested that meters be installed on Regent to provide more turnover of parking.
- Another sub-area is the three blocks of Regent from between Randall and

Mills. It is envisioned as the neighborhood shopping area. Plan recommends enhancing Orchard Street as a ped corridor to connect the neighborhood shopping area and Union South. Orchard would remain one-way but rather than two travel lanes would have one travel lane and a bike lane as well as two parking lanes. Bump-outs would be added at corners and also mid-block to emphasize ped crossings. Where the Southwest Bike Path crosses Orchard, bump-outs would emphasize the crossing to drivers. Strawser suggested extending the bump-out at the Southwest Path all the way across Orchard, i.e., a speed table. There are more bicyclists on the path than motor vehicles on Orchard, this is a perfect opportunity to showcase how a speed table could work.

- De Vos agreed with the recommendations re: (1) preference for parking be given to carpoolers; (2) sidewalks should be at least five feet wide; (3) install countdown signals for crossing streets.

- De Vos recommended that (1) All one-way streets be reverted to two-way, which is a major traffic calming measure; (2) Restrict parking on Regent during certain hours; (3) Paint a bike lane on Regent where there is now parking; (4) Restrict parking on residential streets to two hours and allow residents to apply for residential parking permits. Webber stated that's already the case. (5) Remove the ped refuge islands; (6) Re-evaluate the parking ratio of 3 spaces per 1,000 square feet of building floor space because it's not ped-friendly; and (7) Consider more bike parking.

- Strawser felt metered parking on Regent Street is a good idea but noted that the Parking Utility is moving towards multi-space meters so each parking space would not necessarily have a meter. He would like a pole with a loop at the top at each parking space to provide a bike parking spot. Monroe Street already has a good example of "hitching" posts for bikes.

- Conroy supported the recommendation to promote strategies to reduce parking, and she wondered if most of the residential street parking is by students. Webber advised that south of Regent is some student parking along with faculty and staff. On-street parking is fairly limited. As far as off-street parking, the largest provider is the UW and it's for faculty and staff. Businesses would like to see more parking become available, but the TPC made it clear that if the business community wants more parking, it has to be privately funded and the City will not provide it. During the evenings and weekends, some of the UW lots are available to the public. Transit service in this corridor is very good.

- Referencing bike parking, Shahan asked whether the Plan talks about the parking requirements. What is required by the ordinance and what is actually needed in this area are two different things. He felt there needs to be some enhanced bike parking including covered parking for residential areas. Webber pointed out that the bike parking zoning ordinance does not apply to buildings constructed before 1988 (unless the building is redeveloped). The committee undertaking the zoning code rewrite will look at the bike parking requirements and consider different requirements for different areas of the city. Fruhling noted that the rewrite will also look at motor vehicle parking requirements, which might address De Vos's concern about the 3 spaces per 1,000 square feet ratio. Shahan thought the Plan should have more about bike parking in the transportation section and should recommend more parking than what is required by the current ordinance.

- Shahan noted that Monroe Street between Regent and Randall will be resurfaced this year and asked that consideration be given to amenities that might help bicyclists. For example, pavement markings to make better indicate turning movements, improve the geometrics of the Monroe-Regent intersection, etc. Also, the Randall intersection geometry is poor, would be nice to allow a

motor vehicle and a bike side by side to make the turn. Webber advised that Randall Street is being redone this year and bike lanes will be put in.

- Shahan commented that the Plan mentions the UW possibly putting in a parking ramp, but the UW has indicated to the Joint West Campus Area and the Joint Southeast Campus Area Committees that it will not increase net parking. Fruhling said the UW has mentioned that when they relocate the Physical Plant, there will be a parking structure for the vehicles that could possible include some metered short-term public parking. Shahan commented that implementation of the parking by the UW could be tricky based on promises made to the neighborhoods.

- Shahan wasn't clear what type of bike facilities were being recommended for Mills Street and asked whether bike lanes would be added. Fruhling wasn't sure and indicated the suggestion had come from Arthur Ross. Shahan supported bike lanes on Mills.

- Crandall supported whatever steps could be taken to improve the Regent Street sidewalks for pedestrians. He also supported making Regent more bike friendly to provide better access to the businesses.

- Crandall asked for clarification of the map on page 5-13 showing proposed improvements to the Park Street and Brooks Street intersections on Regent Street. He recalled seeing the map during the Meriter development process and the discussion about Brooks Street being the main street to/from the Meriter campus. Fruhling replied that Park-Regent had been identified by Traffic Engineering as one of the most dangerous intersections in the city, and what's shown is a concept proposal in progress as to how the intersection can be improved to improve safety, allow traffic to flow more easily, and make it better for peds to cross. Crandall indicated he was more interested in the plans for Brooks Street and wondered if turn lanes were being added.

- Shahan asked members whether they wished to address the UDC suggestions to either narrow the Regent lanes or change the lane configuration. Strawser asked whether Regent has a majority traffic flow in one direction in the a.m. and in the opposite direction in the p.m. Dryer stated that Regent has a parking restriction on the north side in the p.m. and the reverse in the a.m. Narrowing the lanes would force the space for bicyclists and result in lost parking. Webber noted that there's not a lot of space to work with, and even though there are peak period parking restrictions, traffic goes both ways.

Motion by Webber/Compton to approve the resolution and Plan.

- Shahan pointed out that members had mentioned several possible amendments, such as making sure there are poles at the metered parking spaces. Compton suggested adding "with enhanced parking for bikes." Strawser replied that it's not just enhanced parking but specifically that if the Regent Street business community moves to a system of paid on-street parking, that there be something to affix a bicycle to at every motor vehicle parking space. Webber advised that the TPC's preferred alternative is a pay-by-space system, which does have a numbered marker at each space. Strawser could support that if the marker could easily have a loop at the top. Webber said she was willing to amend her motion. De Vos asked whether the issue of the ratio of parking spaces to square footage was part of the amendment. Webber clarified that so far there were no amendments; the motion is simply to approve the resolution. Members need to make a motion if they want an amendment. Compton thought there was a friendly amendment to add enhanced bike parking. Strawser had hoped that

his suggestion was friendly; Webber replied it might be.

- Fruhling directed members to the parking ratio language on page 5-9 that De Vos referred to. Since the development is mixed use, the ratio is an average of what is typically required for office space (3 per 1,000 sq. feet), non-mall retail (4 or 4.5 per 1,000 sq. feet), and urban housing (1 per unit).
- De Vos referenced the recommendation on page 5-12 to widen Regent Street from Brooks to Murray to add left turn pockets and pedestrian refuge islands. Fruhling interjected that this is what is shown the map referenced earlier by Crandall. Webber explained that Brooks Street is going to be a major entrance to Meriter and a lot of left turns are anticipated. De Vos stated that she does not like ped islands and recommended that it be removed from the recommendation. Webber did not accept that as friendly.

Motion by De Vos/Compton to remove all traffic islands from the Plan.

- Webber emphasized that crossing Regent is very difficult for peds and crossing in two stages is essential. Shahan felt there two issues, putting in islands and then winter maintenance of them.

Motion to remove islands failed (aye: De Vos; no: Strawser, Conroy, Whitaker, Compton, Skidmore, Webber, Crandall)

- Dryer indicated that Traffic Engineering would recommend the islands with an open nose, which are more easily plowed by Streets to keep it open. Shahan suggested a motion to recommend that type of island.

Motion by Compton/Conroy that the form and function of the islands be considered for all types of weather and for all types of users. Compton clarified that she did not want to give a dictation on what is installed; she would like staff to design something that works well for everybody and then have it come back for approval. Webber accepted this as a friendly amendment.

Motion by De Vos/Strawser to revert all one-way streets to two-way.

- Webber pointed out that basically you would have to remove parking, which is going to be extremely unpopular with everybody in the neighborhood. Strawser remarked that he's almost always in favor of returning streets to two-way, but the one-way streets are low volume and the neighborhood wants to retain the parking. When this Plan was at the Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee, Alder Verveer indicated he was okay with keeping the one-way streets even though he had found it to be big improvement in his own district to revert one-ways to two-ways.

Motion to revert one-way streets to two-way failed (aye: De Vos; no: Strawser, Conroy, Whitaker, Compton, Skidmore, Webber, Crandall)

- Referencing De Vos's concern about the parking ratio, Webber noted that 3 per 1,000 is considerably less than general retail. The development here will be mixed use and will need flexible parking. Webber remarked that the parking ratios will be addressed in the zoning code rewrite. De Vos asked if would be reasonable to suggest that this be reevaluated.

Motion by Compton/Skidmore that upon the zoning code rewrite, this Plan be

revisited to address the parking ratio of three per 1,000 square feet. Webber accepted this as friendly.

- Crandall referenced the discussion about creating more bike parking and especially covered bike parking; Compton noted there already was a friendly amendment.
- Shahan referenced the suggestion to look at both ends of Monroe Street to make the intersections more bike friendly. Webber accepted that as friendly. Shahan also referenced the bike lanes on Mills Street.
- Webber reiterated the amendments: to look at making both ends of the block of Monroe Street between Regent Street and Randall more bike friendly. And there needs to be better off-street bike parking accommodated, including covered bike parking.

Compton called the question.

Motion to approve as amended carried unanimously.

E.2. [09550](#)

Adopting the Stoughton Road Revitalization Project Plan and the goals, recommendations, and implementation steps contained therein as a supplement to the City's Comprehensive Plan.

This Resolution was Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s) to the PLAN COMMISSION

The PBMVC recommended to approve the resolution with the following recommendations: (1) that there be five multi-modal bridges and no Texas U-turn bridges in the Grid Development Area; (2) that WisDOT should consider the needs of pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users and their connections to businesses on Stoughton Road when looking at frontage roads and/or other parallel routes to Stoughton Road; (3) consider how buildings interface with streets in the Garden Area; (3) that Stoughton Road be an at-grade 45 mile-per-hour boulevard in the SRRP corridor; (4) that there be no flyover interchange at Stoughton Road-Highways 12 & 18; (5) that WisDOT be encouraged to create a different park-and-ride facility than what is in place now; (6) that there be a transit connection from the park-and-ride lot to the East Transfer Point; and (7) that the Plan identify missing sidewalk segments.

DISCUSSION

Rebecca Cnare from Planning was present and distributed an 8-page summary of the project.

- The Plan focuses on the segment of Stoughton Road (Highway 51) from Highway 30 on the north to the Beltline interchange on the south, approximately 4 miles.
- The Plan is a vision of what the corridor could look like in the future.
- WisDOT is undertaking its own planning process for the reconstruction of Highway 51, and the SRRP segment is a small piece of the WisDOT project. To date, WisDOT has completed a needs assessment and alternatives analysis. WisDOT's study includes three alternatives.
- The SRRP tried to work with and relate to the WisDOT alternatives. However, the Plan is not a fan of the flyover ramp concept but if that is the way things go,

the SRRP must be ready to make the best of it.

- The SRRP has three development areas: Garden Area, which includes the Post Office and American Family; Grid Area from Buckeye Road to Pflaum Road; and Gateway Area at the southern end.
- The Gateway neighborhoods want to see more development.
- The Grid Area wants better connections across Stoughton Road and more complete streets.
- The Garden Area goal is to maximize the landscaping and amenities for a parkway feel.
- The SRRP has been to three City commissions so far. The EDC recommended adoption and highlighted the need for more economic development. The UDC found WisDOT alternatives B (flyover) and C (sunken road) to be unacceptable and also recommended that Stoughton Road be a 45 mph roadway in this corridor. The LRTPC felt the SRRP has some good ideas but expressed concern about the WisDOT alternatives.
- The SRRP looked at Level of Service for all modes, not just motorized traffic. The SRRP wants to increase sidewalks and bike lanes.

There were two registrants on this item:

Fred Arnold, 1242 Meadowlark Drive, supported the resolution. He had to leave before the item came up on the agenda.

Jim Polewski, 5010 Starker Avenue, representing the Stoughton Road Revitalization Project, supported the resolution. The committee spent a lot of time working on the Plan. It is not a transportation plan per se; rather, the committee tried to make transportation work for the eight neighborhoods in the area. The neighborhoods have a real interest in how Stoughton Road will work and look for the people who live there. They want connections across Stoughton Road, including better ped/bike access, to knit the neighborhoods together. He urged the PB MVC to approve the Plan.

Webber expressed concern about one-way frontage roads. Bicyclists would have to cross Stoughton Road to travel in the opposite direction. It's fairly onerous to go a mile out of the way to travel in the other direction. Cnare indicated one-way frontage roads are also a concern to the neighborhoods. The Plan asks WisDOT to look at two-way frontage roads, even if it makes some intersections more crowded. Webber asked about the areas north of Buckeye or south of Pflaum, but Cnare indicated that the Grid Area is the only segment where WisDOT talks about one-way frontage roads.

In response to Shahan's question, Cnare was not sure whether the Texas U-turn bridges recommended by WisDOT allow for bike accommodations. Compton indicated that one reason the Plan recommended other bridges was to accommodate bikes. Shahan emphasized that the bridges need to be bike friendly. Cnare noted that the Plan says all bridges should be multi-modal.

Motion by Webber/Compton to suspend the PB MVC Rules & Procedures to continue the meeting past 8:00 p.m., carried unanimously.

Shahan mentioned that that Garden Area section does not contain much detail about setbacks from the sidewalk and orientation to the street. Cnare said the Plan tries to emphasize the landscaping elements and looks at this area a little

differently than the others. Shahan suggested adding language to place more emphasis on the orientation of buildings and how they interface with the streets.

Shahan noted that the Gateway Area section talks about an expanded park-and-ride but it's not shown on the map. Cnare explained that an expansion of the park-and-ride is envisioned as part of a redevelopment project so it's not sure where it would be located. Compton noted that WisDOT owns the park-and-ride and has a strong interest to create something more pleasant than what's there if the plan is to redevelop the parcel as multi-level shopping facility. Cnare pointed out that the existing facility is indicated on the map.

Shahan commented that WisDOT is talking about rebuilding Stoughton Road in 10-15 years. If that doesn't happen, how are the Plan recommendations affected. Cnare stated that the Gateway Area improvements could start next year since it's in a TIF district. The neighborhoods want to get ahead of the WisDOT plans. Shahan was more concerned about the Grid Area because WisDOT alternatives B and C recommended depressing Stoughton Road. Cnare felt development could happen without a sunken roadway. Compton emphasized that the neighborhoods' desire is to keep traffic at 45 mph. Some things could and should happen regardless of what WisDOT does.

De Vos asked if there is a transit corridor. Cnare indicated that one potential light rail line would come down just north of the Garden Area. Webber suggested that Metro run a bus from the park-and-ride lot to the East Transfer Point, which would eliminate some of the trips up and down Stoughton Road.

Webber commented that the LRTPC had pointed out a lack of graphics for ped and bike connections in the Plan. The neighborhoods have expressed how important ped and bike connections are, so better representation in the Plan would be good. Cnare indicated she will look into it. She noted that the Plan does talk about how a better street system is good for bikers as well as motor vehicles. Webber noted that there is a disconnect between some of the streets and the Plan should identify where connections need to be made.

Shahan suggested that missing sidewalks should be shown in the Plan and identified as things to be fixed. Also, key locations for any additional transit service should be identified in the Plan.

Motion by Compton/Webber to approve the resolution, reserving approval for one-way frontage roads and Texas U-turns, making bridges multi-modal in the event overpasses are required (the road is dropped), paying attention to the garden area and how the buildings interface with streets, recommend a 45 mph. boulevard with at-grade levels and no fly-over at Hwys 12/18 & 51, encourage WisDOT to create a different park-and-ride than what is in place now with a transit connection from the park-and-ride to East Transfer Point, and identify missing sidewalk segments.

Compton indicated that the Plan tries to create a pallet of recommendations for a blighted area. The City needs to create another business area so people don't have to travel to the other side of town. The neighborhoods want to create a different atmosphere, something that is more bike/ped friendly. A boulevard would be a little more mid-speed rather than the high speed roadway envisioned by WisDOT. The Plan would encourage an economic development quadrant

(Gateway Area) by offering employers something for their employees (places to eat, shop, etc.).

Webber asked for clarification of the motion, was Compton in favor of Texas U-turns? Compton replied no. She didn't want the PBMVC to go on record approving one-way frontage roads or Texas U-turns. When DOT presents its plan, she doesn't want them saying "you approved this." Her intent was to reserve approval on both Texas U-turn bridges and one-way frontage roads until such time as WisDOT has a plan.

Friendly amendment by Webber to remove the language about reserving approval and instead say that the PBMVC goes on record as recommending that there be five multi-modal bridges, not including Texas U-turns; that WisDOT should consider the needs of pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users and their connections to businesses on Stoughton Road when looking at frontage roads and/or other parallel routes to Stoughton Road.

Webber believed that if consideration is given to the needs of peds and bikes, two-way frontage roads will be the logical choice. However, she also recognized that two-way frontage roads require more right-of-way and this may not be accepted by all the neighborhoods so she did not want to specifically recommend two-way frontage roads.

Motion: The PBMVC recommends approval of the resolution with the following recommendations: (1) that there be five multi-modal bridges and no Texas U-turn bridges in the Grid Development Area; (2) that WisDOT should consider the needs of pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users and their connections to businesses on Stoughton Road when looking at frontage roads and/or other parallel routes to Stoughton Road; (3) consider how buildings interface with streets in the Garden Area; (3) that Stoughton Road be an at-grade 45 mile-per-hour boulevard in the SRRP corridor; (4) that there be no flyover interchange at Stoughton Road-Highways 12 & 18; (5) that WisDOT be encouraged to create a different park-and-ride facility than what is in place now; (6) that there be a transit connection from the park-and-ride lot to the East Transfer Point; and (7) that the Plan identify missing sidewalk segments; motion carried unanimously.

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

F.1. [08224](#) Pedestrian/bicycle capital projects ranking

A motion was made by Webber, seconded by Skidmore, to Refer to the PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

G. REPORTS

This item was not taken up due to time constraints.

G.1. [07831](#) REPORTS OF OTHER COMMITTEES/COMMISSIONS (verbal reports for information only) Plan Commission Long Range Transportation Planning Commission

Joint West Campus Area Committee
Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee
School Traffic Safety Committee
Platinum Biking City Planning Committee

H. REPORTS OF OFFICERS AND MEMBERS FOR INFORMATION/DISCUSSION

This item was not taken up due to time constraints.

H.1. Executive Secretary Report

- a. Scheduling of annual public hearing on ped/bike projects

H.2. Items by Chair (verbal report and/or announcements)

H.3. Member requests for future agenda items and/or announcements

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Webber, seconded by Strawser III, to Adjourn . The motion passed by voice vote/other.