



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes - Approved SUSTAINABLE MADISON TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Thursday, February 20, 2014

5:00 PM

Room 300 Madison Municipal Building
215 MLK Jr., Boulevard

1 CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Chair Gary Poulson called the 2-20-14 meeting of the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) Oversight Committee to order.

Present: 8 -

Maurice S. Cheeks; Chris Schmidt; John Strasser; Rob Kennedy; Gary L. Poulson; Lynn K. Hobbie; Craig P. Stanley and Michael W. Rewey

Excused: 3 -

Denise DeMarb; Ken Golden and Jay B. Ferm

2 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Minutes of the 2-20-14 Transportation Master Plan Oversight Committee meeting were unanimously approved, on a motion submitted by Michael Rewey/Rob Kennedy.

3 PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no other members of the public wishing to speak in regard to future Committee agendas.

4 DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

There were no disclosures or recusals reported by Committee members.

NEW BUSINESS

[32012](#)

**MEETING MATERIALS: TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN
OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE**

5 REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF DRAFT PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PLAN AND OUTREACH/WORKSHOP SCHEDULE

Paul Moore of Nelson\Nygaard presented an updated project schedule showing a timeline that extended into early 2015. The four main phases of the project are Visioning, Idea Generation, Technical Evaluation, and Documentation.

David Trowbridge described the multimedia components of the project,

including a project website, Facebook page, Twitter feed, and neighborhood email lists.

Paul said that the public involvement plan will include stakeholders meeting and focus groups. Lynn Hobbie asked if the list of stakeholder groups on the presentation slide was the list the final list, because she did not want certain business groups to get lost in the process. Maurice Cheeks asked how many focus groups could be held at the most. Paul replied that the presentation slide was just a sample as the focus group categories are still yet to be decided, and he said that they could do up to 20 focus groups. Paul also proposed holding presentations where people are located (churches, schools), and getting on the agendas of standing meetings of community/interest groups. He asked the Oversight Committee for input on these strategies.

Paul described the Fact Book part of the project, which would include the relevant technical detail and policy from the TMP. It would be a short, printed document that is better suited for a public audience as compared to the complete technical plan. He passed around a similar document used in Spokane, Washington. Maurice asked how many copies would be printed. The exact number was not known at the time, but David replied that the Planning Division could print more in-house as needed.

Paul continued that in addition to Vision Meetings 1 and 2, the process will include a possible Kickoff Meeting and a Multi-Day Work Session. Rob Kennedy asked how the project team will incorporate the many neighborhood detailed plans. Paul replied that prioritization would be necessary, and David added that they would be able to incorporate some of the bigger recommendations from the neighborhood plans.

Paul said that the Multi-Day Work Session is an event in which several engineers, architects, and planners from the Nelson\Nygaard staff set up shop in Madison and work with the public on planning issues. They could do mapping exercises, run simple models, and just talk to the public about on-the-ground issues. He described some Google software where people can map issues/concerns. Lynn Hobbie asked about whether there would be an online component for people who cannot attend meetings. Paul replied that his team is working on making the Google software usable for the public. David added that he is working with the city's IT staff on this issue, as certain rules prohibit what the city can and cannot do with its website.

Craig Stanley suggested that the project team create specially-designed questionnaires for each neighborhood group. These questionnaires would be centered on specific issue areas such as the sidewalk network, and they would be broken down by neighborhood. He said this would help identify priorities on a neighborhood level. Neighborhood leaders could be in charge of gathering information and getting it to the project team.

Gary Poulson asked how they will ensure good attendance at the second Public Vision Event. Paul said that they would need the city and the Committee to assist with promotion through all channels. Michael asked about the location, and Paul said since there is only one event, they would choose a central location with good transit access. The Committee members generally discussed the dilemma between providing easily available parking versus transit access, as each affects who will attend the event. Rob Kennedy asked about how the project team will reach out to commuters who live outside of the city. David suggested a commuter focus group.

Paul said that the project team would evaluate the different transportation projects and share the results with the public at Prioritization Meetings. Maurice Cheeks asked if cost estimates related to each of the projects would be provided. Paul said that they would, because it helps people understand

where the money is going. He shared an example from another city in which most of the proposed projects were bike projects, but the cost estimates helped explain this apparent disparity by showing that 90% of the estimated costs would be spent on one or two car-related projects. He also showed how members of the public were able to rate the proposed projects against the plan goals.

Finally, Paul described the Draft Plan/Adoption phase. Part of this would involve developing policies related to growth, land use, parking, and the city's relationship with partner agencies. He said that the Multi-Day Work Session would be in July, the Prioritization Meetings would be in winter, and the Draft Plan/Adoption would take place in early 2015. Rob Kennedy suggested coordinating with the MPO to ensure that the projects would be competitive for state/federal money. David said the city tends to compete well for these funds. Michael mentioned a federal or state preference for funding bike projects.

6 LAND USE ASSETS, VALUE STATEMENTS AND GOALS: DEVELOPMENT OF LAND USE VISION SCENARIOS

Rob Gottschalk of Vandewalle & Associates outlined the plan for the next several meetings. He said that this Committee meeting was intended to get the Committee's reaction to confirm the assumptions, vision, and scenarios. He said that would like the Committee to help determine whether the vision scenarios he will propose is the right approach. The next Committee meeting will include trends presentations and a review of example scenario graphics. The Public Vision Event in April will gather public input on the scenarios. Rob introduced the assumptions the project team is making about the future of Madison. He noted that the project team is taking a long view, and that their population projections are consistent with actual growth over the last twenty years. The assumptions include that Dane County will add 60,000 people per decade and that Madison will add 25,000 people per decade. Epic will add 800 jobs per year for next four to five years. Rob mentioned the high economic multiplier from these types of tech jobs. He said that Madison's healthcare footprint is growing, and noted that the city is at the size and scale at which other tech centers have started to accelerate their growth; the stage is set for the Madison to do the same. Another assumption is that there will continue to be a constant pipeline of young people due to the colleges and university. He said all of this growth is expected to continue and the transportation system needs to recognize this. Other assumptions include: the city's form shapes its options, neighborhoods favor stability over change, Madison's growth is limited to a handful of areas, and the city is surrounded by aggressive growth areas and prime agricultural land.

Rob also described technology trends - smart phones, car sharing, self driving cars - which will change the way people get around. He explained how technology is being developed that allows people to order a self-driving car that can arrive at their door, on demand. He also noted demographic and retail trends, including a change in attitudes/lifestyles between Baby Boomers and Millennials and the evolving shape of retail given the impact online shopping. Rob asked the Committee if these trends were on target.

Discussion:

- Gary Poulson: How does the fact that we are the state capital impact how we can and cannot grow?
- Rob Gottschalk: We'll benefit from the state employee presence,

state funding, and other state investments.

- Craig Stanley: I heard a UW real estate professor predict that Wisconsin would have nominal population growth in the future unless the state imports labor. Is Madison just going to be doing better than the state as a whole?

Rob Gottschalk: Yes. Madison is a different animal than other parts of Wisconsin. It has a more diverse economy than a place like Michigan, for example.

- Craig Stanley: With regards to the neighborhoods favoring stability, I suspect there are a lot more people who are open to change, but who don't verbalize it like many of the louder, more vocal people who oppose change do. Is there any way to test the assumption that neighborhoods are resistant to change?
- Rob Gottschalk: Great question. I would love to see this project test this.
- Paul Moore: I've never worked in a city where single-family neighborhoods are totally welcome to redevelopment of their neighborhoods and parks.
- David Trowbridge: If you want to attract people to the city, you have to create living environments that they'll respond to.
- Maurice Cheeks: I think the majority of people are adverse to change individually, but collectively, we can be open to change. In order to be visionary, we need to acknowledge the reality that people are adverse to change, but then ignore it.
- David Trowbridge: We can show them that these environments can be attractive, and that this has been done before in other cities.
- Lynn Hobbie: Yes, the images of urban neighborhoods that Paul showed in his presentation are great, and they can be powerful.
- Rob Kennedy: I was involved in the Isthmus 2020 project, where our employment predictions didn't pan out. We have to have a good strategy for attracting more employment, especially downtown.
- Chris Schmidt: With regards to the neighborhoods favoring stability, the "stable point" is varies across the city. Often it depends how you present something to the neighborhoods. Input over time will be easier to sell and avoid a fight. We shouldn't act like we're going to face a wall of resistance.
- Paul Moore: This process introduces a set of agreed-upon goals and presents scenarios showing outcomes that people want. Because of this, we can more effectively explain how a development (like a ten-story building) fits into what people have said they wanted.
- Maurice Cheeks: Vehicle-to-vehicle networks could be added to the tech trends list. (He explained that vehicles can communicate with each other, vehicles know where each other are, and cities can install systems that helps guide/inform the cars.)
- Paul Moore: Also, there are numerous crowdsourcing transportation apps. For example, Pittsburgh has a crowdsourced, real-time bus predictor, and there are parking apps that tell you when space is available, anticipate where parking will open up, and estimate the price to park.

Rob Gottschalk presented the Vision Statements, which were available to the Committee has a handout. He explained the six vision statements that have been developed based on existing plans, the TMP mission statement, a Committee questionnaire, and current trends. The Vision Statements are centered on the following topics: Place & Personality, Physical Form,

Economic, Transportation, Social & Cultural, and Environmental.

Discussion:

- Michael Rewey: I'd like to see something about interconnectivity between the modes (rather than the "seamless system" in the Transportation Vision Statement). The North American Bike Capital idea not terribly exciting to me. And it should "intercity" rail rather than intra-city.
- Rob Gottschalk: Connecting peripheral neighborhoods with different travel modes and transportation options is important, too.
- Gary Poulson: This looks pretty good. If people have minor edits, please send them to David.
- Rob Gottschalk: I want to emphasize that this is a vision that will be used by the City of Madison.
- Michael Rewey: Maybe we can change the North American Bike Capital idea to something more specific to what we are doing on the ground in Madison, rather than focusing on earning recognition from outside organizations.

Rob Gottschalk then showed a series of maps that depicted where the key areas of change in the city are located. He said it was helpful to start with where things are not going to change. He showed maps that subtracted the environmental corridors, lakes, right-of-ways, and low-density residential. The "areas of change" that remained were highlighted in purple. Areas of change not within the city limits were highlighted in light purple. Rob explained that these areas of change can be boiled down into four typologies: Central City, Urban Corridors/Neighborhood Centers, Retrofitted Employment/Retail Centers, and East/West New Growth Areas. Committee members suggested that the graphic showing the Central City area should include the entire UW campus.

Next, Rob identified some potential big opportunities in each of these four categories. He said big opportunities in the Central City include Alliant Energy Center and John Nolen Drive. In the Urban Corridors, there could be multimodal, transit-oriented, mixed use areas throughout the city. When discussing Retrofitted Employment/Retail Centers, many Committee members expressed dissatisfaction with the UW Research Park development pattern.

Discussion:

- Gary Poulson: We weren't able to provide what Epic wanted, which is how they ended up in Verona. We may need to provide something unique for opportunities like Epic in the future.
- Michael Rewey: We should retrofit employment areas, too.
- Rob Kennedy: Are you guys going to map where our transit or pedestrian Level of Service issues are in the city?
- Paul Moore: Yes. The examples you all are identifying are instances where the stated vision of the city does not match reality. That's something we can work on.
- Rob Gottschalk: Although this is a City of Madison plan, we need to consider areas outside of the city from a transportation standpoint.

Rob Gottschalk turned to big opportunities in the East/West New Growth Areas. He said the city is somewhat boxed in, but there are some growth areas on the east and west sides. He suggested they be designed as transit-oriented from the start. David Trowbridge said that for the most part, the city knows where its ultimate boundaries are going to be and we should recognize this. Rob Gottschalk agreed and added that the city needs to be efficient and maximize what we do with the growth areas it does have. Rob

Gottschalk added that another opportunity that should be considered is a high-capacity transit spine. Rob Kennedy asked what the project team recommended for development in the Beltline area. Paul Moore said that they could demonstrate specific elements that should be incorporated into the design of that area. He confirmed that these design ideas would be done graphically and would include images.

Rob Gottschalk continued and explained that in many of the key redevelopment/infill areas, there are many development projects that are happening right now, are in play now, or are likely to be in play very soon. He said transportation solutions and options need to be committed to now, because the trajectory for these redevelopment sites is going to be set very soon. He said that even though this is a long-range plan, this committee has an important job in the short term. Paul Moore added that if these sites are not developed in a way that matches the city's vision, there will not be another opportunity to get it right for another fifty years, and so the vision statements have to be just right. Maurice Cheeks suggested having a focus group composed of people from the redevelopment/infill areas. There was strong support for this suggestion.

Rob Gottschalk used the Capital East district as an example, and he anticipated that over \$200M would be spent on the storage of cars in the district, based on the parking provided in recently constructed developments.

Discussion:

- Craig Stanley: How do we design in a way that pulls development downtown? There are bigger public policy issues that have to help that along.
- Rob Gottschalk: Political fortitude is needed to hold all of that property for employment. If the property develops as residential instead, the parking needs would change.
- David Trowbridge: Craig, what's your reaction to those parking ratios?
- Craig Stanley: Generally the downtown office guys are good with two stalls per 1,000 square feet, but parking can still be a struggle for downtown employers. Outside of the central city, employers tend to need 2.3-2.6 stalls per 1,000 square feet.
- Rob Kennedy: In a project I worked on several years ago, employers were supportive of rail transit because it solved their parking issues.
- Paul Moore: One important point is that while rail is expensive, the cost of parking storage is really high too.
- Craig Stanley: Yes, and parking costs are going to keep going up.

Finally, Rob Gottschalk presented the Vision Scenarios. He explained that the project team began with four scenarios, but the four scenarios didn't differ much. He said that the scenarios have to be very different in order to get distinct results when modeling and that the public sometimes struggles with multiple scenarios. For this reason, he proposed two scenarios. Rob said that an underlying assumption is that both scenarios would implement the Comprehensive Plan, commit to great bus transit, bikeability, and walkability, and achieve the goals of the Sustainable Madison Transportation Master Plan. With that in mind, he presented two scenarios: A and B. He said Scenario A tends to reflect what the city is doing now, and Scenario B reflects what the city says it is going to do.

Discussion:

- Paul Moore: This gets at those mismatches we were talking about before, where the vision doesn't match what's on the ground. Scenario A is "keep on doing what we're doing," but Scenario B is where we live up to all of those vision statements and the

demographic changes that are coming. Note the policy changes that would need to happen for B.

- David Trowbridge: What Rob just presented is an illustration. More details will be fleshed out later.
- Paul Moore: Today we are looking for your approval of the two scenarios. We can test the two scenarios and get info about impacts on air quality, vehicle miles traveled, etc. later.
- Lynn Hobbie: I think the concept of "what we're doing" versus "what we say" is a great idea.
- David Trowbridge: We will show maps at a later meeting, showing examples of the types of development the scenarios would involve. We will test the scenarios with the public at the Public Vision Event on April 24.

7 DISCUSSION OF PROPOSAL FOR BRANDING OF TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN PROCESS

Arthur Ross, a member of the city staff, showed the Committee a logo developed for a 2009 marketing plan for *Bike Madison*. The name on the logo had been changed "Move Madison." Arthur said that the city already owns the logo and has paid for it.

Discussion:

- Gary Poulson: Besides *Move Madison*, there are other contenders for the name, too.
- David Trowbridge: We can wait until next month to decide.
- Arthur Ross: Is the general concept okay?
- Craig Stanley: Was this used for the bike promotion plan?
- Arthur Ross: Yes, but it's not well known because it wasn't used too much in the end.
- John Strasser: Wouldn't the platinum bike project need to use this? It looks like a bike logo. This doesn't say "regional transportation" or "21st century" to me.
- Maurice Cheeks: It doesn't say "We're thinking about 2050."
- David Trowbridge: Could we retool it?
- John Strasser: In my experience, that doesn't work.
- Craig Stanley: Can we have a subgroup to work on this?

There was strong agreement to have a subgroup work on the branding/logo. David Trowbridge said he would send an email around to see who is interested in participating. Paul Moore said he could help. He mentioned that 90% of transportation plan names contain some variation on *Move* or *Connect*.

8 NEXT STEPS/SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS

Next Committee Meetings:

- Thursday, March 20th, 5:00 p.m., Room 300 MMB

- Public Vision Event II: Thursday, April 24 or Thursday, May 1 (time/location TBD)

Next Transportation Master Plan meetings:

- Thursday, March 20th, 5:00 p.m., Room 300 MMB

- Public Vision Event II: Thursday, April 24 (time/location TBD)

9 ADJOURNMENT

The Committee adjourned its meeting at 7:10 p.m.