



City of Madison

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

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

Thursday, November 19, 2015

5:00 PM

Room 300 Madison Municipal Building
215 MLK Jr. Boulevard

1 CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Chair Gary Poulson called the 11-19-15 meeting of the Madison in Motion (Transportation Master Plan) Oversight Committee to order.

Present: 7 - Chris Schmidt; Matthew J. Phair; Amanda Hall; Rob Kennedy; Gary L. Poulson; Ken Golden and Jay B. Ferm

Excused: 4 - Maurice S. Cheeks; Lynn K. Hobbie; Craig P. Stanley and Michael W. Rewey

2 APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM SEPTEMBER 17, 2015 MEETING

The Minutes of the 9-17-15 Transportation Master Plan Oversight Committee meeting were unanimously approved, on a motion submitted by Ken Golden/Ald. Chris Schmidt.

3 PUBLIC COMMENT

Jeff Smoller (Willy/Wash) noted that Willy/Wash isn't a formal organization, but working on good things for the City. He said that there are opportunities emerging with the Public Market and Food Hub area and transportation options. He said he is looking at high-end park-and-ride near airport and MATC with shuttles that would run to Willy/Wash corridor and downtown. He said that he is also looking at special opportunities to manage pedestrian traffic at East Wash (such as at the 800 block of East Wash and the Yahara area).

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

[38966](#)

**MADISON IN MOTION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE: MEETING
MATERIALS (2015)**

**5 UPDATE ON PLANNING FOR STREET TYPOLOGY/POTENTIAL URBAN STREET
CROSS-SECTIONS**

Grant Foster (PBMVC member) offered public comment on the street typologies. He asked that the Plan not include standard bike lane on arterial boulevard cross section (with a single line). He cited new guidance from Massachusetts Separated Bike Lane Guide, CROW Manual for providing increased separation on busier and higher speed streets.

Rob Kennedy asked where in Madison he sees a problem? Foster said that Fish Hatchery Road would be a good example - it was redone and is better than it was, but still is not comfortable for bicycling given the speeds and volumes of traffic on that 4-lane roadway. Kennedy asked if he is concerned about streets posted 25 mph? Foster said yes, but added that the higher speeds are more important. He said that we need to build a low-stress network that feels comfortable for many users.

Jay Ferm asked if he could cite the smallest street in Madison that might need this treatment. Grant Foster said not off hand, as it varies widely based on volumes, speed, parking, etc. He said there is a particular need to focus on the primary corridors.

David Trowbridge asked if he would better define what he means by “buffer.” Grant Foster replied that it is a painted space separating cars from bikes. He added that something with a vertical element is considered a “protected” facility, which should be provided for higher speed and volumes of traffic. He said that it is important to get the space when constructed, and you can always change up the type of barrier later.

Dan McAuliffe then summarized the street typologies and cross sections. He said that these were recently shared with the Mayor’s office, Streets Division and Fire Department. He said that we are attempting to better relate the street typology and widths to the actual land use conditions. He said that local streets are generally 32’, but could be a bit wider where there is high parking demand. For collector streets, we are recommending a chicane that shifts parking mid-block and provides a 6’ bike lane.

Rob Kennedy said that the corner radii shouldn’t be too wide. Scott Langer (TE) said that it is location dependent, adding that most are 25’, but sometimes get down to

20'. Ken Golden asked what traffic volumes or speeds are expected for this? Dan McAuliffe said that it is 25 mph on collectors, and traffic levels aren't really set.

Ken Golden asked what the radii mean? Dan McAuliffe said that it relates to the corner size, and a smaller radius is tighter. Fire Department staff said that they have a good relationship with TE, and what they recommend has been working well for FD. Ken Golden said that there is a need for narrative in the Plan discussing the considerations that go into corner radii (and other dimensions that may be changed on a case-by-case basis). Langer said that this is a good starting point, but there is a need to right-size for the particular street/neighborhood. Jay Ferm said that he is always going to push for as tight of radii as possible, as it is best for pedestrians. He asked that, since many new developments have very little on-street parking, can we tighten radii and restrict parking to allow large truck movements? Scott Langer said that, in theory that is good, but you cannot count on parking restrictions to stay in place. He added that parking doesn't really come in to play with the truck movements.

Jay Ferm also said that there had been discussion of going to 1' standard gutters instead of 2' to tighten things up. Langer replied that, where there is on-street parking, it is irrelevant. Rob Kennedy said that the UW only did it because we were so space constrained, and that with new construction we would have done a 2'. Langer said that you can save width on gutters next to a median, but don't really save anything on the outside.

McAuliffe summarized the arterial with a buffered bike lane. He said that it would probably be just two parallel lines for buffer striping - cross hatching is too expensive. Rob Kennedy asked if this increases safety/comfort? Scott Langer said that it makes it more comfortable for bicyclists. Langer also said that the cost of striping is ~ \$10,000/mile every 3-5 years, and cross hatching would add at least another \$5,000/mile.

Jay Ferm asked Grant Foster if he felt this would be acceptable. Foster said that his preference would be for a physical buffer, but this could be acceptable. McAuliffe then summarized the arterial with a physical buffer. He said that a raised bike/parking lane (like Bay Street in Milwaukee) was possible, and that it could be plowed. Chris Kelley (Streets Division) noted that Milwaukee uses a lot more salt than Madison does, and that this would create issues here. If it were a physical barrier, it is not easily plowable. Kelley added that a lot more salt would be needed and it would create lots of ice issues. Scott Langer said that, if you are going to physical separation, you will need new plow equipment and more personnel. He

added that a valley gutter could work, but there would be iced in the valley (which presents a problem if a bicyclist has to move in or out of the lane)

Rob Kennedy said that there are the same issues on campus. He said the UW has standard equipment and have purchased some specialized equipment, but it becomes untenable budget-wise. He agreed that there needs to be better facilities for bikes, but it also has to be feasible to maintain. Jay Ferm said that we should also study what it would take to maintain a more complex street network - what changes would have to happen with staff and equipment.

McAuliffe summarized the arterial cycle track, which shifts bikes back behind the terrace away from intersections. He said it keeps the corridor narrow, but can't have driveways (brings the same dangers as biking on the sidewalk). Ken Golden asked if having alleys help this out, as it could allow for parking and create access in new development?

Scott Langer said that there are a number of retrofit places this could work - Sprecher, McKee - places where development backs up to the arterial. He added that a key benefit to this is that it really narrows the street and can help hold speeds down, but still presents plowing issues. He said that it would take longer to clear snow from these types of facilities.

Ald. Chris Schmidt asked why the cycle track comes back to the street at intersections? McAuliffe replied that this improves visibility and safety where the turning movements occur, and allows motorists to see the cyclists better. Scott Langer said that you can either bring bikes back out to the street like shown here, or you can pull them even farther away from the intersection, but that presents problems as well. Dan McAuliffe said that these ideas are still in development with this, but have received a lot of good feedback

Jay Ferm asked if, when selecting facility types, ADT or speed is more important a consideration. Scott Langer replied that mainly the volumes.

6 REVIEW OF WOONERF STREET DESIGN CONCEPT

Tom Huber reviewed the concept of woonerfs/slow streets/shared streets. He said that they are essentially below the local street category. He reviewed typical characteristics of shared streets and provided North American examples.

Rob Kennedy said that the UW has lots of locations on campus where we mix peds

and cars. Ken Golden said that Pinckney Street (in front of Judge Doyle Square) could be an opportunity for something like this. Tom Huber pointed out that there can be some downsides, as these types of streets are more expensive than standard construction and can have drainage and maintenance issues. Kennedy that that these can work well, adding that the costs are higher, but not undoable.

Ken Golden said it would be good for the Plan to highlight under what conditions these streets can be utilized in the City, but not include specific locations. The Plan should also consider implementation mechanisms, like property owner assessments or Business Improvement District (BID) fees. Rob Kennedy said that he was very skeptical of this 6 months ago, but now has a much more positive impression. He urged the Plan to be coordinated with the UW's Master Plan.

Jay Ferm said that he is working to bring this concept to a residential street. He said that it is a very narrow right-of-way. He showed key elements of the design - bringing the street up, neckdowns to narrow space, different street texture in shared space areas and rain gardens in terrace areas. He said that there are concerns about plowing and fire access, and he is working with the appropriate departments to try to resolve them.

7 REVIEW AND COMMENT: DRAFT BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN CHAPTER (AND MAPS)

Dan McAuliffe reviewed some information he pulled together from Census data, regarding home-work distances in Madison. He said that the data showed that biking, walking and transit use are all rising in Madison while driving has been decreasing slightly. He said that data also are showing that fewer people live less than 10 miles of work than a decade ago, which limits potential for more walking, biking and transit use.

Rob Kennedy said that this isn't as bad as expected, and that Madison is getting more expensive to live in. He said that part of the answer has to include things like shared-ride vans and carpooling.

Grant Foster provided some public comment on the Bicycle and Pedestrian Element of Madison in Motion. He said that it would be a big mistake if this isn't a detailed, comprehensive bike plan, and that there is a need for a master transportation bicycling plan. He said that we need to identify what the key primary bikeways are and if on major roadways, these will need some protection with them. He added that we are at the point where we have to impact motor vehicle access if we are serious about significantly boosting bicycle mode share. He said that, when doing separated lanes, there needs to be at least a 5' separation for snow storage. He also felt that

parked cars should be used as a separation measure.

Tom Huber noted that the bike/ped element is ahead of the rest of the plan, so it is not entirely clear how the information in the draft memo will integrate with rest of plan (including goals, policies and project priorities). David Trowbridge said that he would like to receive detailed comments by email. He also noted that is not intended to be a detailed Bicycle Plan. That said, Trowbridge said that the team has been working to develop a complete network for a variety of bicyclists, improving connectivity and addressing functional classification (primary and secondary system). He said that this will lay the basis for completing the system with specific projects over time (and MiM will show specific projects, as best we know them at this time). Madison in Motion was never intended to identify exactly the type of facility to build at specific location, knowing that (particularly within the street rights-of-way) there are numerous competing needs. He said that those specifics will need to be worked out in corridor plans and/or street reconstruction processes, with all of the necessary stakeholder outreach.

Rob Kennedy added that we need to make sure City and UW are recommending the same things for bicycle mobility and for facility planning. He said there seems to be very good consistency so far, based on the network maps produced to-date.

8 [08484](#) **INFORMATION AND ANNOUNCEMENTS BY CHAIR AND COMMISSION MEMBERS**

- Note: No Discussion of Specific Items

Ken Golden stressed the importance of the Plan to include transportation governance. He also said that Dane County's budget includes \$2 million and a ½ time position for transit, which is significant.

Jay Ferm noted that Madison achieved "Platinum" bike status this week.

9 **NEXT STEPS/SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

- Oversight Committee: Thursday, December 17th, 5:00 p.m., Room 300 MMB

David Trowbridge mentioned that next Madison In Motion Committee meeting is scheduled for December 17th, although it will likely be postponed. He said that he would be providing draft chapters of the Plan (and other draft deliverables) via email over the next several weeks. He said that he hoped to reconvene the Committee January 21, 2016.

10 **ADJOURNMENT**

The Committee adjourned its meeting at 7:00 p.m.