



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes - Approved SUSTAINABLE MADISON TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (Madison in Motion)

Thursday, April 23, 2015

5:00 PM

215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
Room 300 (Madison Municipal Building)

1 CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Chair Gary Poulson called the 4-23-15 meeting of the Madison in Motion (Transportation Master Plan) Oversight Committee to order.

Present: 8 - Chris Schmidt; Amanda Hall; Rob Kennedy; Gary L. Poulson; Ken Golden; Jay B. Ferm; Craig P. Stanley and Michael W. Rewey

Excused: 3 - Maurice S. Cheeks; Matthew J. Phair and Lynn K. Hobbie

2 APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MARCH 19, 2015 MEETING

Committee members asked that the attendance be shown in the amended Minutes. The Minutes of the 3-19-15 Transportation Master Plan Oversight Committee meeting were then unanimously approved, on a motion submitted by Ken Golden/Jay Ferm.

The Minutes of the 3-19-15 Transportation Master Plan Oversight Committee meeting were unanimously approved, on a motion submitted by Ken Golden/Jay Ferm.

3 PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no 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 UPDATE ON PLANNING FOR STREET TYPOLOGY/POTENTIAL URBAN STREET CROSS-SECTIONS

David Trowbridge provided a brief overview of the draft street typology, asking Committee members not to focus on the numbers but rather the format. Mike Rewey said that we need to keep in mind when laying out specifics that backing in to parking spaces is difficult for older folks. Jay Ferm asked how this will be incorporated in to the plan? Stand-alone document? Include photos and examples of actual streets in Madison. David Trowbridge said that the intent is for this to be included as an individual chapter in the final Madison in Motion plan.

Mike Rewey said that he does not support a 5' bike lane- 6' should be the minimum. Rob Kennedy said that the street typology should be expanded to include terraces (i.e., need to specify certain widths for specific tree types and sizes). He said there also needs to be more specificity about bike facilities.

Jay Ferm said the all departments involved that work within the street right of way should be involved so that a full picture of what is needed is developed (i.e., forestry, maintenance, etc.). Mike Rewey said that there needs to be strong recommendations on downtown sidewalk widths, as the Plan Commission has been having a lot of issues getting the necessary dedications on new development.

Ken Golden said that the concept of "pocket parks" of some sort should be considered (almost like parklets, see Queens Blvd just west of 63rd Drive in NYC).

Jay Ferm asked what is next in the process. Kevin Luecke said that City staff need to work through the exact typologies and begin populating tables, but that the Committee would be provided periodic updates.

6 LAND USE/TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM EVALUATION CRITERIA/METHODOLOGY (BASED ON GOALS)

David Trowbridge said that Nelson Nygaard has begun putting together a basic approach for the evaluation process, essentially scoring two packages of land use/transportation system improvements. Paul Moore said that he began by looking at existing plans and projects, and packaged those into specific scenarios. He said there are nine primary goals, and he will work to rank the scenarios relative

to the goals. Moore said that it is a process of showing how various approaches rank in relation to the goals, and what the costs are (in terms of dollars and policy changes that may be needed).

Rob Kennedy said that there needs to be something more for measuring/scoring pedestrians. Paul Moore said that there is more of that in another goal, and he has tried to minimize double counting of specific things. Mike Rewey said that it does not appear we are measuring pedestrian demand vs. sidewalk width, which is increasingly a problem downtown. Paul Moore said that we don't have good data on this for demand or sidewalk width, it is also difficult to retrofit wider downtown. Mike Rewey said that it can help with redevelopment projects and getting dedications for wider sidewalks.

Paul Moore said that the travel demand forecasting model will be used to assess transit ridership and traffic congestion. Mike Rewey said that we have to find better ways to measure bike and ped travel, as we have always been good at measuring cars. Paul Moore said that he is confident that we are measuring bike and ped well with the criteria we have. David Trowbridge said that the intent of the evaluation is not to set up one project against another, but show different investment scenarios, and how those packages of projects and land use options measure up against the goals the Committee established at the beginning of Madison in Motion.

Ken Golden said that the document doesn't seem to match completely with what you are talking about. He also said that the MPO is working on a project that identifies road, bike, ped, transit projects and ranks them in a variety of criteria - this does set up direct competition between project types. It may be beneficial to look at what the MPO is doing. Paul Moore said that we are very aware of what the MPO is doing and aren't trying to duplicate what they are doing. Paul Moore noted that the idea is to present land use and transportation scenarios (100,000 people are expected in the coming decades - where will we place them?) Land Use Scenario A is roughly how the city has developed over the last 20 years and Scenario B pushes a stronger in-fill and transit vision that is achievable.

Jay Ferm asked will there be a point in this process where the city makes a clear decision on which scenario to go with and make the necessary policy changes? Doing this project by project won't do it - how do we get there? Paul Moore said

that indeed this discussion would take place (a qualified yes). This process should allow the city to make some value judgments and policy changes that will lead toward one scenario or another. David Trowbridge said that this is a tool to help inform the policy makers. This is already happening with recent sidewalk decisions in the city.

Rob Kennedy said that he assumes that you are going to fill out the land use scenarios very robustly. For example, University Research Park II is planned to be much denser and more like an old neighborhood than much recent development. University worked with the City a lot on this to ensure that it is transit-served. Also, years ago the City set goals to greatly increase residential and employment density downtown - we've achieved residential growth, but not an employment growth, so these goals don't always work.

Paul Moore noted that full BRT build out is really needed to achieve Scenario B - you won't hit your infill or employment goals without premium transit. Jay Ferm asked if roadway congestion measurements take into account land use? Paul Moore replied yes, we can model how many people will walk, bike, take transit. He said that mode shift numbers can be modeled relatively well. Paul Moore concluded by stating that this is really opening up the process - we didn't want a black box that people can't understand. This is still very much a draft, let us know if you think things aren't set up correctly.

7 UPDATE: BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN SYSTEM PLANNING AND EVALUATION

David Trowbridge introduced what staff and Toole have been up to with regard to bicycle and pedestrian system planning has been doing. Kevin Luecke provided an overview of the map and the process to look at bike/ped crossings of major roadway barriers (such as the Beltline and the Interstate).

Ken Golden said that he thinks we are missing a lot of streets that are barriers in the older parts of the city - Mineral Point, Midvale, Cottage Grove; these should all be assessed. He said that we should also show Sprecher and Reiner as it is comparable to Pleasant View. David Trowbridge said that we can indeed show bad crossing corridors in the central city, but it is hard to show the crossing improvements on some of those corridors. Mike Rewey said that if we are

including Pleasant View, you should include Sprecher/Reiner.

Jay Ferm stated that we need two “barriers maps”, one for the “major edge barriers” and one for “major internal barriers”. The “Major Edge Barriers” will be used opportunistically as the County, WisDOT and adjoining municipalities develop projects. The “Major Internal Barriers” map can be used both opportunistically as other City road projects occur and can also be used strategically to identify stand alone high impact improvements. David Trowbridge said that he would identify these corridors.

8 NEXT STEPS/SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS

David Trowbridge mentioned that next Madison In Motion Committee meeting is currently scheduled for May 21st, although it could be postponed.

Jay Ferm asked if there will be a future discussion about the goal “fiscal responsibility?” What does this mean, how are we defining it? He said that he would like the committee to spend some time on that - how we spend our money is how we value things. This is where the rubber meets the road.

Ken Golden said that he doesn’t think the Committee and staff are as aligned as they have been in the past - perhaps a meeting is needed to better align the two groups. He said that a check-in in May might be valuable. Also he added that CARPC has seen a lot of land being added to urban service areas by other communities, and he worries that the City having a heavy infill plan will just be offset by other communities. The committee should discuss this a bit more. Mike Rewey said that Madison has limited growth areas as it is, and we should make the best use of it that we can.

9 ADJOURNMENT

The Committee adjourned its meeting at 6:20 p.m.