



MINUTES OF THE TRAFFIC, BICYCLE, & PEDESTRIAN COMMISSION

**MONDAY, OCTOBER 22, 2018, 5:30 PM
CITY HALL, ROOM 207**

A. ROLL CALL.

I. I. *Members:* Chairperson Matt Kuepers, Vice Chairperson Daniel Theno, Ald. Craig Stevens, Lieutenant Brad Strouf, Charles Karow, Brighid Riordan, and Ray Smith

Present and voting: Charles Karow, Daniel Theno, Ray Smith, Brad Strouf

Present and not voting: Matt Kuepers

Excused: Brighid Riordan, Ald. Craig Stevens

B. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the Monday, October 22, 2018 Traffic, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Commission meeting agenda. (*Note room change to Room 310*).

Moved by Commissioner Daniel Theno, seconded by Commissioner Charles Karow to approve the agenda for the Monday, October 22, 2018 Traffic, Bicycle and Pedestrian Commission meeting.

Motion carried. Yes- Brad Strouf, Charles Karow, Daniel Theno, Ray Smith, No- None, Abstain- None

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the September 17, 2018 Traffic, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Commission meeting minutes.

Moved by Commissioner Daniel Theno, seconded by Commissioner Charles Karow to approve the

minutes from the September 17, 2018 Traffic, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Commission meeting.
Motion carried. Yes- Brad Strouf, Charles Karow, Daniel Theno, Ray Smith, No- None, Abstain-
None

D. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. *General Business*: Consideration with possible action on the report by the Police Department of the 2018 3rd quarter serious injury and fatality crashes. (All Alders)

Moved by Commissioner Charles Karow, seconded by Commissioner Ray Smith to receive and place on file the report by the Police Department of the 2018 3rd quarter serious injury and fatality crashes.

Motion carried. Yes- Brad Strouf, Charles Karow, Daniel Theno, Ray Smith, No- None, Abstain-
None

2. *Initial Request*: Consideration with possible action on the request by the Traffic Engineer to modify the heavy traffic route system by removing Erie Road and adding East Mason Street from Erie Road to the east City limits. (Alds. Dorff and Corpus-Dax, Districts 1 and 2)

Moved by Commissioner Daniel Theno, seconded by Commissioner Ray Smith to approve the request by the Traffic Engineer to modify the heavy traffic route system by removing Erie Road, removing Finger Road, and adding East Mason Street from Erie Road to the east City limits.

Motion carried. Yes- Brad Strouf, Charles Karow, Daniel Theno, Ray Smith, No- None, Abstain-
None

3. *Initial Request*: Consideration with possible action on the request by Ald. Galvin to relocate the Hartung Street bike trail crossing of East Mason Street to Goodell Street due to safety concerns. (Ald. Galvin – District 4)

Moved by Commissioner Daniel Theno, seconded by Commissioner Charles Karow that the request to relocate the Hartung Street bike trail crossing of East Mason Street to Goodell Street due to safety concerns be:

A. To receive and place on file the request to relocate the Hartung Street bike trail crossing of East Mason Street to Goodell Street due to safety concerns.

B. To refer to staff to investigate federal and/or state funding for an alternative crossing option such as a pedestrian bridge over East Mason Street connecting the East River Trail.

Motion carried. Yes- Brad Strouf, Charles Karow, Daniel Theno, Ray Smith, No- None, Abstain-
None

4. *Initial Request:* Consideration with possible action on the request by Ald. Galvin to remove the school-related parking zones and signs related to the now-relocated St. Thomas More School. (Ald. Galvin – District 4)

Moved by Commissioner Charles Karow, seconded by Commissioner Daniel Theno that the request to remove the school-related parking zones and signs related to the now-relocated St. Thomas More School is approved on a 90-day trial to remove the NO PARKING DURING SCHOOL HOURS zone on the west side of Irwin Avenue from Cass Street to a point 200 feet north of Cass Street. Motion carried. Yes- Brad Strouf, Charles Karow, Daniel Theno, Ray Smith, No- None, Abstain- None

5. *Initial Request:* Consideration with possible action on the request by Power For Change staff to remove the 2-Hour 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Monday through Friday parking zone on the west side of Oakland Avenue just north of Shawano Avenue. (Ald. Johnson - District 9)

Moved by Commissioner Ray Smith, seconded by Commissioner Charles Karow to open the floor for discussion.

Motion carried. Yes- Brad Strouf, Charles Karow, Daniel Theno, Ray Smith, No- None, Abstain- None

Spoke in favor of the request:
Steve Shefchik (123 N Oakland Ave)

Moved by Commissioner Ray Smith, seconded by Commissioner Daniel Theno to return to regular session.

Motion carried. Yes- Brad Strouf, Charles Karow, Daniel Theno, Ray Smith, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Commissioner Daniel Theno, seconded by Charles Karow that on a 90-day trial to remove the 2-HOUR PARKING 7 AM TO 7 PM MONDAY THRU FRIDAY zone on the west side of N Oakland Ave from a point of 58 feet north of Shawano Avenue to a point 130 feet south of Hubbard Street.

Motion carried. Yes- Brad Strouf, Charles Karow, Daniel Theno, Ray Smith, No- None, Abstain- None

6. *Initial Request:* Consideration with possible action on the request by the Traffic Engineer to update the Index of Traffic Regulations as referenced in Sec. 29.307, Index of Traffic Regulations, relative to regulatory traffic conditions on public streets that are no longer needed due to roadway modifications or were missing. (All Alders)

Moved by Commissioner Charles Karow, seconded by Commissioner Daniel Theno to approve the request by the Traffic Engineer to update the Index of Traffic Regulations as referenced in Sec. 29.307, Index of Traffic Regulations, relative to regulatory traffic conditions on public streets that are no longer needed due to roadway modifications or were missing by:

A. Remove the following NO LEFT TURN restrictions:

1. Cherry Street at Jefferson Street, eastbound, daily.
2. Driveway (Cub Foods) at Military Avenue, eastbound, daily.
3. Driveway (Days Inn) at Main Street, northbound, daily.
4. Laura Street at Main Street, northbound, daily.
5. University Avenue at Fred Street, westbound, daily.
6. Velp Avenue at Atkinson Drive, eastbound, daily.
7. Walnut Street at Madison Street, westbound, daily.
8. Walnut Street at Jefferson Street, eastbound, daily.
9. Walnut Street at Museum Place, eastbound, daily.

B. Adding the following NO LEFT TURN restriction:

1. Clay Street at Mason Street, southbound, daily.
2. Leo Street at Military Avenue, northbound and southbound, daily.
3. Lyndon Street at Velp Avenue, southbound, daily.
4. Mason Street at a point 500 ft west of East Town Way (Fire Station #5), eastbound, daily.
5. Shea Avenue at Velp Avenue, southbound, daily.

C. Remove the following NO RIGHT TURN restrictions:

1. Ashland Avenue at Mason Street Exit, northbound, daily.
2. Ashland Avenue at Mason Street Exit, southbound, daily.
3. Cherry Street at Madison Street, eastbound, daily.
4. Forest Street at Cedar Street, southbound, daily.
5. Gregby Way at Main Street, southbound, daily.
6. Jefferson Street at Walnut Street, westbound, daily.
7. Madison Street at Walnut Street, eastbound, daily.
8. Main Street at Oak Grove Avenue, northbound, daily.
9. Pine Street at Madison Street, northbound, daily.
10. University Avenue at Fred Street, northbound, daily.

D. Remove the following NO U-TURN restrictions:

1. Main Street at Morrow Street, eastbound, daily.
2. Mason Street at Superior Road, eastbound, daily.
3. Military Avenue at railroad crossing between Western Avenue and Leo Street, northbound and southbound, daily.
4. Military Avenue at a point 450 ft north of Mason Street, northbound, daily.
5. Monroe Avenue at island between Mason Street and Chicago Street, northbound, daily.
6. Oak Grove Avenue at Deckner Avenue, northbound, daily.
7. Walnut Street at alleyway 100 ft west of Washington Street, westbound, daily.

E. Remove the following NO TURN ON RED restrictions:

1. Ashland Avenue at Ninth Street, southbound, daily.
2. Pine Street at Madison Street, westbound, daily.
3. Taylor Street at Mason Street, all directions, during left turn arrow.

Motion carried. Yes- Brad Strouf, Charles Karow, Daniel Theno, Ray Smith, No- None, Abstain- None

E. INFORMATIONAL.

I. *Next meeting:* Monday November 19, 2018, at 5:30 p.m. in Room 207.

Next meeting: Monday November 19, 2018 at 5:30 p.m. in room 207.

F. PUBLIC HEARINGS.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

I. Adjournment of the current Traffic, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Commission meeting.

Moved by Commissioner Ray Smith, seconded by Commissioner Daniel Theno to adjourn the current meeting of the Traffic, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Commission.

Motion carried. Yes- Brad Strouf, Charles Karow, Daniel Theno, Ray Smith, No- None, Abstain- None

VERBATIM MINUTES

Okay, let's call to order the meeting of the Green Bay Traffic Bicycle and Pedestrian Commission for Monday, October 22nd, 2018.

Mr. Chairman?

Yes, sir.

I move approval of B and C, the agenda and the minutes.

Okay, motion made by Mister Theno.

Second.

Seconded by Alderman, and I'll let you, you're the ringer, sir. Is that official enough? Don't be too official, guys, use names, or do I need to...

First name is fine.

First name is fine? Okay, all right. Motion been made and seconded, all in favor?

[All] Aye.

You want to vote on that one now?

I'll still help, okay.

Okay, did I do that in the wrong order?

Yeah.

We're gonna vote electronically on all of them.

Oh.

If you could give us just one minute, because this is for...

Oh, it has to have the...

Tryin' to figure it out.

I'm lookin' here yet myself.

Okay, right. Now do you have Item B1 active?

Okay, I do this.

Oh, we gotta do this.

Yeah, circle then close this. Do you see something on your pad that says Wolfram?

Oh, there.

No, it does. It just popped up.

Okay.

[Various] I'm not seein' it.

Okay, so Brad sees it.

Yeah, you should have a little box.

Ray sees it.

It's on, I think you gotta open up B.

Okay, I think you're on the wrong item.

Right here?

Go to B1.

Yeah, I see it there now.

There you go.

When I did that, the box popped open.

So you have that now.

But I'm not voting, am I? As long as the others can...

That's right, you wouldn't see that screen.

I wouldn't, all right.

Correct. Then go down, approval of the agenda, so this is B1 right? Did you get it to pop up for you or not?

Yeah, I did, and I...

Oh, and you voted already.

Yes, and C.

I just don't have Dan and Ray is doing it right now.

Okay.

You can go back home and to the right one.

Oh, you're not even signed in.

I was, how come I got signed out?

I think just from the back button. Just go ahead and sign back in.

Okay.

So do we only are down two yet?

I haven't seen that option pop up yet.

Yeah we did actually vote on both.

They voted, now we're waiting for one more vote. Then we can get into C?

Right, yes.

Yeah.

I don't think it's gonna let you in now.

And vote.

It's BI, right?

Yes, BI.

Thank you.

How long did it take for that box to pop up? Remember was it immediately?

It was almost two minutes, yeah

Okay.

Did they ask you if you were a voting member, when you signed in?

It should.

Well I can check on this end over here.

I can cancel it, if it would do it.

No, the question came up as whether or not he is a voting member.

Oh, I probably have to get out of here.

Right.

It's supposed to speed up the process, isn't it?

Or I can just click on yes for this one.

Yeah, well, we'll vote for you on this one, and then we're gonna check.

Now that I know where I have to click that.

Okay.

Okay.

Now go to CI.

CI now.

Is that correct? Okay, now go to vote.

Is it motion first or vote?

A motion first, so it will be in a chunk. Approve, save, and now move to vote, start the vote.

Okay, I see a couple had it pop up.

Yup.

It looks like Daniel's only one that didn't get his.

It's still not on yours?

It's still not popping up.

Okay, Ray, did you get yours? Okay.

We're on C now too.

All right, we'll vote for you, Dan, on this one, and then we're gonna go to voting members.

We're on C?

Just give us a second. We're just checking to see how he's logged in. So he's present and voting, hmm. Oh wait; you haven't joined the meeting, Dan.

It says, where is that.

This column, see how it says that?

It's waiting for him to join.

How can he be present and voting, if he hasn't joined it yet?

It does seem a little strange, but I believe you have to have both of those.

Should he go back to the beginning?

So that's what we would have to do.

Where do I have to go?

I guess right after you log in it gives you that option. Join meeting, present voting.

Okay.

And save.

Okay, got that now.

Okay, is that coming up now?

No, for the next item it will. We already voted for you on those two.

Oh, on both those, okay.

Yeah, sorry. Now you just wait until the next motion.

Okay.

Okay?

All right, got it.

All right, I think we can roll with item D I.

Go ahead and set that current.

Problem?

I didn't get a motion for B and C.

All right, we're ready.

Dan's motion was for B and C, so we will need to vote individually for C then now.

We already did.

We already did?

It's already done.

So we're on D I now.

So we're on D I now? Okay, got it.

If you remember, there was two votes that were done, that was B I and C I.

Okay.

Okay.

All right, so we're on to D I.

Okay, regular business, item one, consideration with possible action, on the report by the police department of the 2018 third quarter serious injury and fatality crashes.

All right, thank you, David, for bringing that up. Normally I make paper copies. I apologize, I did not do that, but, if you look under this item, there should be a D I 2018, quarters three, and, if you click on that, which is doc., it'll open up, and you can actually follow along, if you want to, or you can just check the screen.

There you go. Everybody get there?

No we're truly paperless now.

That's where we wanna be.

The first one we'll talk about occurred actually in the parking lot initially, of Bay Beach Metro Boat Launch. A vehicle was parked there idling, when, all of a sudden, it was put into drive, reportedly drove at a very high rate of speed, and actually went airborne for a short period of time, entering the Fox River. There were emergency personnel, that'd be Coast Guard officers, that actually saw this occur. They went in the water, attempted to save the victim, who ended up being a 76 year old Green Bay male, the only occupant of the vehicle. If I didn't say, I'm sorry. This occurred 7/11 at 8:23 A.M., so July 11th. Ultimately, they were not able to get to the victim. He and the vehicle had to be towed from the water, and, unfortunately, by that time, the occupant was deceased. There's no indication on the exact cause of the crash. It's kind of left open as being either an accidental, medical, or suicide, based on witness statements and investigations. No indication one way or the other of it being more one than the other, if that makes any sense. Second one occurred on Tuesday, August 28th. 5:46 A.M. a pedestrian was struck, crossing the southbound lane of I

43, just north of the Mason Street exit. The pedestrian was a 29 year old Green Bay male, had been walking down in the bank, or in the north west shoulder of the interstate, when he made an abrupt right hand turn, and actually stepped right in front of a southbound vehicle. The investigation hasn't determined any type of violations on the part of the driver. The male was struck and pronounced deceased at the scene. What we did find out, after this was written, and after a period of time investigating, is that he had been involved in a motorcycle crash earlier, that morning, later that night before, where he had possibly sustained a head injury, so there's some thought that he may have been concussed, and maybe that would explain why he was walking on the interstate like he was, but that, at this point, is speculation. The third one is...

Brad?

Yes, go ahead.

Real quick, Brad. This occurred at 5:46 A.M. When, approximately, is the estimate of the other crash?

About 5:00 A.M., probably about 30 minutes prior.

Oh, so just...

He had been driving a motorcycle on wet pavement, and didn't get involved with any other vehicles. He actually lost control of the motorcycle and slid. We had a witness eventually come forward, a number of days after the fact, and said, "Yeah, I talked to the guy, "and he had a big lump on his head," prior to this second crash, I suppose we can call it. Again, it's speculation. Unfortunately, he was deceased at the scene from mass head trauma, and so it was hard to determine. We would have not known that, had we not had a witness come forward.

Right, and where did that one take place?

Alpine and Mason.

Oh, plenty of lighting then.

Right, and he was on his way to work in the Green Bay Industrial Park on the East side, so initially was not really walking in the right direction, but, at some point, probably corrected himself, made a beeline, eastbound, and that's what took him across the lane of interstate. Next one was September 8th, 10:38 A.M. A motorcycle,

westbound on University Avenue, struck a car that had turned left from Liebman Street. The car had a stop sign. Or is that a stop light there, David? It's a stop sign.

At University and Humboldt is a signal.

There's a stop light there. Liebman is a stop sign.

But Liebman is a two way stop, in truth.

The male on the motorcycle, who was the sole occupant and operator, was transported to a local hospital, already pronounced deceased from head trauma. He was not wearing a helmet. A witness reported that he had been driving recklessly, prior to the crash, doing wheelies, excessive speed, which the investigation lead us to believe that the female driver, of the car that was struck by him, was not able to see him, probably, from the speeding. The driver of that car, a 73 year old Green Bay resident, who was not injured. Then, finally, our fourth fatality in this period occurred on September ninth, at 8:30 P.M., also involved a motorcycle, this time southbound on Main Street, struck a car crossing Main Street, from Newberry to Abrams. Newberry turns into Abrams, for those who aren't aware of that, so it's the same street. In this case, the driver of the car had a flashing red light, and, again, witnesses reported the motorcycle driver, driving at a pretty significant speed. Matter of fact, when he impacted the car, he spun it in a complete circle, which is not, I'll say it's not normal, but it's not what you would expect, based on the posted speed limit of 30 miles an hour. The driver of the motorcycle sustained some pretty serious lower leg injuries, however he had a passenger on the back seat, an 18 year old female, that was ejected, thrown over the car that was struck, and she, unfortunately, died at the scene. The driver of the car, and she had a front seat passenger, a 16 year old Green Bay boy, were not injured in the crash. This occurred during a Packer game, Sunday night Packer game, so the Brown County Sheriff's Department actually was called in to assist with the reconstruction of the crash. All of our recon workers were actually working at the football game, so that's why you see the Brown County Sheriff's Department assisting in that. That'd be the fourth for the third quarter.

Not a very good quarter, or past, I mean.

No, it's not been a very good year.

What does that make for the year now, in the city?

I think eight, seven or eight in the city.

Eight?

Yeah, I think it's eight.

Eight I think we're at No, did we have none last year?

I was gonna say.

Last year? No, I think we had more, didn't we?

Did we?

I mean, it was a significantly less number.

I mean, it's significantly up from last year.

Right, so, at least with two of these four, it's the driving behavior of a motorcyclist, really, that was the causative factor, so there's definitely some enforcement that can be done. There also people having to be educated while driving motorcycles.

Okay, thanks Brad.

You bet.

Entertain a motion to, should they be placed on file?

I make a motion to receive and place on file.

I second.

Motion by Chuck, second by Ray. Go to vote.

We done?

We've still got one more.

D2.

Yeah, all the votes are recorded.

Okay, good.

The next item should come up, after the votes, right?

I'm not sure, I think you have to select it.

Just kidding.

I think you can just close that.

Right, and go to the next one there.

The voting came up, right, so everyone voted?

Mm

hm.

That sounds like, okay, so now I think you just need to get back to the agenda and select D2.

Okay, that's where I'm at.

As long as he announced the voting.

I know, that's what I was about to say.

Probably won't get it.

Friday night we will.

Yeah. I guess you have to say motion was made and approved.

Am I going to get that on my screen then?

I honestly don't know. I wouldn't know what you necessarily gonna see on this end.

Because everybody's voting.

Right.

I'm not gonna see what they vote, right?

I don't think so.

I don't know how I would see how anybody's voting.

Unless you wanna do it verbally too?

Yeah, I guess that's somethin' that we'll have to ask Celestine and the IT team. I'm not aware of you seeing the vote, but, if it's not popping up, then obviously it's fine.

I'm not getting it, so I don't know how anybody's voting.

As terrifying that sound, I don't get to see the votes either, but then whoever's recording it reports what the votes are. Usually it's like unanimous, or, if it's not, then they report whoever voted against it.

Okay.

We could do that. Stacie could, after everybody votes, she could say.

Then you, yeah.

When the votes are in, then you can announce it.

You could say yeas for yes, or zero, something like that.

Okay.

Yeah, that's what happens when I chair the team.

Okay.

So do you wanna read that in to the record then, Stacie?

All votes marked as, "Yes."

Okay.

All right. Item two, the initial request consideration, with possible action, request for the traffic engineer to modify the heavy traffic route system, by removing Erie Road and adding East Mason Street from Erie Road to the East City limits.

This item is more or less a clean up type of request. This, as you know, I've shown you, where it says County V, that's actually East Mason Street. Many of you may recall that East Mason Street actually teed into Erie Road at one time, before this was extended a number of years ago, probably about five years ago. In review of the heavy truck route map, it was realized that the map was never updated to include East Mason Street, so it needs to happen. Currently, right now, we'll see Erie Road and Finger extended out to Mason Street, used to be on the heavy truck route. We need to take these two segments off and, in essence, add East Mason Street up to this point is really all it is, just some clean up work is all.

Move approval.

Motion by Dan.

Second.

Second by Ray.

Okay, so all votes marked as, "Yes."

Okay, thank you.

We're getting it.

Three, consideration with possible action, on request by Alderman Galvin, to relocate the Hartung Street bike trail crossing off East Mason Street to Goodell Street, due to safety concerns.

I'm not sure if you've had the opportunity to review the packet, but I did include some information in the packet, relative to background on this location. If you look at the screen, you can see where the push pin is for D3, and I'm just gonna zoom out a little bit, so you get an idea where in the city this is. East Mason Street, well the actual crossing is just east of the East River. The proposal is to move the crossing here. I think this actually shows it quite well. You can see the East River Trail to the north, the East River Trail to the south. The crossing happens to be the west leg of the East Mason Street and Hartung Street intersection, and proceeds along the north and goes across the bridge, and then connects. Many of you have lived through this and have lived through a few of these items as they've come to the Traffic Commission over the years, but the late 2000s is actually when this crossing was made. It was an effort between Parks Department and Public Works Department in order to get this installation installed. I'll show you a street view image of what we have in place. As you can see, here is the East River bridge, then, although it's difficult to tell, maybe, from this image, but you can see there's a crest right on the bridge, so a little bit of a crest hill, as eastbound motorists are coming over before this crossing, so, as you can see, we have pedestrian warning signs, we have an overhead cantilevered sign, with the pedestrian and bike symbol warning. You can see we have a state law sign saying, "Yield to pedestrians." This is basically the overhead version of what you see for those end street signs sometimes. There is a no left turn condition for all motorists at all times at the intersection. That was implemented many years, even before my time here at the city, so prior to 2006. It's my understanding that this no left turn condition was established because of lack of gaps in the opposing through movement, and that would surprise motorists coming over the ridge eastbound, and then someone would just be sitting there at an intersection, taking a left. Fast forward to today. Before I start bringing up some recent information, I guess

one thing that should be noted is that this is probably one of the highest complaint areas that we get from pedestrians and bicyclists, relative to lack of compliance of motorists stopping or yielding for pedestrians in this crosswalk. At one time, we did have flashing lights here, so really what they were, they were LED lights around the perimeter of this sign and this sign and in both directions, and that item, again, came up to the Traffic Commission years ago, from a request from the Alder and the Neighborhood Association, Oak Grove, if I'm not mistaken, to remove the flashing component to those lights, given that it was providing a false sense of security to those that were crossing. In other words, people would press the button. It was hard for them to see the LED lights flashing, 'cause they were flashing at the motorists and not at the people in the crosswalk, and especially parents, because they're concerned about their children crossing there, that the cars just weren't stopping for them, so, rather than have that in, and have a younger person, or anyone for that matter, crossing the intersection and then vehicles aren't stopping for them, so they're getting hit, it was recommended, and it was actually approved at council level, to remove the flashing component of those lights, so this is what you see there today. We still do get calls and complaints about it, although they have tapered down over the years, but the calls still come in. The one thing I wanna add to the discussion here is that I did do a cursory evaluation of crash history, so I looked at a five year crash history at this location. Over five years we've had 16 crashes at this intersection. Of those crashes, one involved a northbound runner getting struck by an eastbound motorist. This occurred in 2015, so, coming from this end over here, the runner just basically darted out into traffic, and got hit by a motorist going in this direction, as you can see on the screen. The runner was actually issued a written warning for darting out into traffic, 'cause our state statute, although it does offer protections for pedestrians crossing the street at a marked or unmarked, legal crosswalk, it does provide protection for the motorists as well, that, if someone would dart out, it doesn't give them enough time to respond and react to that action, so then this case, actually the pedestrian was at fault, so issued the written warning. Five of the 16 crashes involved motorists stopping for pedestrians in the crosswalk, so it was actually noted that a pedestrian was either crossing or was about to cross, motorists actually were stopping and complying to the law, yet it was still surprising other motorists coming up to the intersection that didn't necessarily know what was happening, and that there was just a stopped vehicle in a live lane of traffic and there was a rear end crash. No pedestrians or motorists were struck or injured in those crashes. I wanna say, it's really not only pedestrians, I should say, motorists injured in part of that environment. Four of the five crashes occurred in 2018, so I thought that was kind of a unique statistic to find out that actually, just this year, so we're talking just three quarters worth of crash data, that four of those five crashes actually occurred this year, so motorist non

compliance may be increasing, due to the recent increase of rear end vehicle crashes, while peds are crossing. Just as a way of information, 25,000 vehicles per day travel East Mason, near this intersection. In 2013, Public Works conducted a 12 hour pedestrian count, and found that 34 bicyclists were crossing the intersection and 43 pedestrians, so there's definitely some activity happening. Those numbers sound high, but over a 12 hour period, that really doesn't amount to a lot per hour, but, like I said, I just wanted to kind of focus in on the fact that I'm gonna probably attribute some of this problem to the Green Bay Police Department for their Operation Frogger efforts. I know that this has been a location that's been used for Operation Frogger. Those that don't know what Operation Frogger is, it's when there would be staged crossings of a pedestrian at a crosswalk, and there are officers observing whether or not there's compliance for a pedestrian crossing the street, and those that do not yield or stop for the pedestrian, that's legally in the crosswalk, are then pulled over and either a written citation or a verbal warning or a written warning is issued at the discretion of the officer. I guess with that being said, let's just get back to the original item at hand, and the Alder is looking for moving the crossing, and I'll get back to...

Hey, Dave?

...a view of this.

Dave?

Dave, before you jump ahead. What time of day were those crashes? I'm assuming they were eastbound vehicles that were rear ended?

I have a very cursory summary. I did not summarize the time of day, although, anecdotally, I do remember a lot of 'em occurring more in the afternoon.

Okay, so sun in the eyes might be a factor.

No, like 12:30, 2 o'clock, I do remember some of them happening around that time frame, so I don't think that was necessarily the case, you know, I didn't really. That doesn't mean that there wasn't, but I do remember, just by checking some of them, that was the case. I do have, this is more of the crossing study from '13. This right here, this is actually my summary, so you can see 2014, 15, 16, 17, 18, nothin' too fancy. I just wanted to look at this, so you can see that just a very generic description of what happened, so, again, looking at those one's where, right here it says, "Penned on injury, "just present while forcing traffic to stop." This was eastbound rear end crash. Here's one, eastbound slowing down, maybe four had, it wasn't enough detail, eastbound to eastbound. Again, here's that motion of coming over the bridge and then being surprised. This one was actually westbound, westbound. This one's eastbound, eastbound, westbound, and then eastbound eastbound, so the majority of them are eastbound, some are westbound, so we are actually seeing a little bit of both. One thing is is that those signs, in the crossing, the overhead signs, the cantilevered signs, are present for hundreds of feet in advance of the crossing. When we installed this installation, almost a decade ago, that was one of the things we wanted to make sure was that it was highly visible, by using fluorescent yellow backing on the signs, it's highly retroreflective, so I don't think visibility is an issue, per se, but I think maybe the crest of the bridge may be contributing to some of it. Is that enough information there, Chuck? Any other questions on the crashes? No, okay? Getting back to the original request. You have the crossing here. You can see where the trail's coming in, so the Alder's actually saying, "Well why don't we just move it over to this intersection?" I guess that's an option. I'm not really sure that we have a potential of reducing crashes. The only reason I say that is that we're further removed from this bridge, so any of the eastbound related crashes potentially could go down. The one thing, though, that is still, I see the pattern developing, is that, and that's why I brought up the number of over 25,000 vehicles a day is that, you just have a lot of traffic on this road, and any time you start introducing a stop condition, whether it's the way it is, whether let's say we had the RRFB, the rectangular rapid flashing beacons, that are so popular around, or even a stop light or a traffic signal. The fact of the matter is that you're stopping traffic that has 25,000 vehicles a day, so I think inherently you're always going to have some sort of a rear end problem at this crossing, so, whether it's gonna be here or there, I still think that you're still gonna have problems. I don't think it ever is gonna go completely away, with whatever sort of treatment would ever be there, and, quite frankly, I think the only thing that is ever going to solve this, and I know it's a very expensive solution, but it is one, would be a grade separated crossing of the trail and the roadway. Again, pedestrian bridges are expensive, but we do have a crash history that is there, and they do have grants available, the HSIP Grant Program from the Feds and State. Those offer, at least in application process, that you could put something like this through for that. HSIP, I believe they cap the projects at 1.7 million each, so I don't know how much a pedestrian bridge costs, but, if you could build one for 1.7, this location potentially could be eligible. The good thing is is that this is all parkland, over here and over here, so, again, not having looked at the engineering component of this, just looking at it conceptually, that it at least is an option, I think, that is out there, but that would be something that would have to be considered by Parks Department, because it is their trail, that they should really be part of the discussion.

Right now, Dave, you cross at Hartung?

Yes.

You walk on the south side of Mason to get across the bridge?

No, the actual trail, technically, would be on the north side.

The north side of Hartung?

Yeah, and then the crossing is right here.

I'm just thinkin' what's the shortest path. They have to go down to Goodell Street. You could change that, but are people really gonna...

Right.

Abide by that.

If you look at it now, the pattern is this, as you watch the hand, right? In the option that's presented as part of the request, the trail goes would have to go west, crossing Goodell, again, an uncontrolled crossing.

That's my point.

And then go on the south side, and over here, so it's a little bit lengthier, certainly.

Can they go on the south side, is there...?

There's sidewalk on both sides.

There's sidewalk there, okay.

Yeah, there's sidewalks on both sides of Mason Street.

I made an appearance before the Traffic Commission, before I was a member, as President of the Oak Grove Neighborhood Association, which is the area to the right of the river. That's the Oak Grove neighborhood, where I'm president of the association, to get rid of the flashing light. I don't like this alternative at all, because I think you're gonna have more violations caused by pedestrians and bikers, because they, like our Chairman said, they aren't gonna go down a block west, go across and come back, well, almost two blocks, three blocks, no two blocks, to get on the trail again, so I think you're gonna exasperate the situation, and not solve anything. I would like to make motion to receive and place on file, with the caveat of the traffic engineer looking at the possible grant applications for a pedestrian bridge, along with the Parks Department.

Okay, do you want that as a complete motion, or do you think that, perhaps, maybe we need to get the Parks Department opinion. Maybe they have no interest in this, or do you think that this should all go in one package.

I agree. Public Works is involved, because of the trail, and we have a concern, so I just wanna throw that out there.

I guess my motion would be that I would be asking staff to contact the Parks, Recreation & Forestry department to see if there's another alternative here for a pedestrian bridge. I've even looked at putting a pathway floating underneath the bridge, and there just isn't enough head room.

The water elevation would kill it, when it was high.

It's a terrible intersection. It really is a bad intersection.

Okay.

Just one thing that this application, you have to show a benefit to cost on one of the lines, so the benefit would be the elimination of the crashes, and do we have enough crashes to justify a cost of a bridge.

Right.

We might not. I'm not saying we don't, we might not, but that's somethin' that they would flush out in the application process, because, if you can't show that, then your process is, or your application is dead on arrival.

If you look at this, just looking at it, all the crashes over five years, we have a total of four injuries and zero fatalities, and none of 'em are pedestrian related, they're all people within the cars or vehicles.

Right, you have to show that they're related to the pedestrian, the pedestrians are causing the crashes and the injuries in the vehicles, or the rear ends.

So to put it in other words, the cost of the four injuries would have to be higher than the cost of the bridge.

Correct, the bridge would have to eliminate those crashes that cause those injuries, enough to justify the Federal Safety money.

Do you know, and no one ever wants to put a money value on this, but obviously they do, in order to compute this, do you know what they would save for an injury type crash?

I have no idea, Scotty Nelson...

Scott Nelson?

...at the office does that, so I don't know what the numbers are.

Okay.

All right, so we have a motion made, by Dan.

It's a two part motion, is what I heard, is receive and place on file the request, and that to direct staff, or the Traffic Engineer, to investigate HSIP funding for a grade separated crossing.

Made.

Okay.

Do I hear a second?

I'll second it.

Motion made by Dan, seconded by Chuck. We can vote.

Oh, and go back.

Did you get your votes?

That one was all marked as, "Yes," and we need another vote, another motion.

Oh, well, I think the vote was on everything, unless you guys have different thoughts.

No, one vote.

Okay

Okay.

Is it on?

That's it.

Okay, got everyone's vote, Stacie?

Yes, I do, yep, all yes.

All right. For consideration, with possible action request, from Alderman Galvin, to remove the school related parking zones and signs related to the now relocated Saint Thomas More School.

Yep, I'll just show you where this is located, so you've got an idea, if you don't already. That's really close. Saint Thomas More School used to be located, for a number of years, at the intersection of Irwin and Cass, and, for this school year, have actually relocated back to its old building, which is over on Harvey Street, which is all located with John Dewey Academy now, so, as part of this, there's no need for any of the school related parking signs on the street. There was actually only one zone, and that was on Irwin, so it was a no parking during school hours zone, contiguous to the school. Cass Street did not have any school related parking, but rather had permanent no parking restrictions on it, due to the narrowness of the roadway, so there's nothing to change on that road, so it's really just one zone that we're looking to remove, and that would be, "No parking during school hours," west side of Irwin Avenue from Cass Street to a point 200 feet north of Cass Street. That's my recommendation.

Thank you, I'll be entertain, we'll have a motion.

I'll make that motion.

Second.

Motion by Chuck, second by Dan. Everybody wants to vote, please.

Okay, so all votes were marked as, "Yes."

Five, consideration, with possible action request, by Power For Change staff, to remove the two hour, 7:00 A.M. to 7:00 P.M., Monday through Friday parking zone, on the west of Oakland Avenue, just north of Shawano Avenue.

I'm showing a location here on the screen of the area. The Power For Change business is located on the northwest corner of Shawano and Oakland. As it sits right now, there is a two hour parking, 7:00 A.M. to 7:00 P.M., Monday through Friday zone on the west side of Oakland, from a point, this is prior regulations, about 58 feet north of Shawano Avenue and to a point 130 feet south of Hubbard, which is here, so it's a good part of this block in here, and I guess it probably covers two to three of these homes, in front of them. It's my understanding, and we do have some people here, to speak on behalf of their request, from Power For

Change, but it's my understanding, based on conversations, the parking zone be removed so staff can park on the street, in order to free up some on

site parking spaces for clients, but they are here to speak about this, and we do have a comment form that was submitted.

Dave, is there no parking restriction, is that what you want?

Well the request would be just to remove it.

Just remove the two hour time limit, with restrictions.

To remove the two hour, yeah, and I'm looking here at the request and comment form. It's for Steve Shefchik, and Vanessa Blanchette. We do have just a one person at a time to speak, so, if you wanted to speak separately, that's okay.

Do I come up to the front?

Just one second, we're gonna suspend the rules and get you going here. Do I hear a motion to suspend rules?

So moved.

Motioned.

Moved by Ray, second by Chuck, and we will vote on that.

So they decide?

No, open the floor.

Do we need to vote, we don't need to vote on that, do we?

Yeah, that's right, we're gonna need to vote on that.

Okay.

It should be opened up in a second.

All votes marked as, "Yes."

Okay, all right, rules are suspended. Steve, you wanna come to the podium there. You have his address, everybody good, Dave on the Foreman.

Yes, I'll read the... Steve Shefchik, 123 North Oakland Avenue. One thing too, I do want to just clarify on here, you have marked...

I made a mistake because I'm against the parking, the motion to remove it.

Right. If you don't mind, I'll just go ahead and mark this as you are for the request, the approval of the request, okay.

One of the other difficulties with parking for our agency is we have very limited parking. By a permit, we have seven spots to our whole, one of which is handicapped, by regulation, and the opposite side of the street is no parking, and it sounds like, knowing the history of the building, this used to be the Fort Howard Library, for many years, so it would make sense that, at one point, there was two hour parking in front of the library. Obviously, we can't park on Shawano, so we're hoping that the two hour parking can be removed, so we can have clients able to park in the lot, and our staff, we don't have a lot of staff, but basically I've told them to park on the street, and, if they get a ticket, to give it to me until we find out about parking is gonna change. This street.

You can see here is a no parking, near the corner, so this is at 58 feet, or whatever it was that I had mentioned before, and then, here's where the two hour starts, and then moving north, you'll see that it continues, and you should find another sign that has a left arrow on it. Well, maybe not, I thought there was. There it is, this is at 200 feet north, so, in essence, the request would be, I mean, what you would actually see on the street then, would be just the removal of those signs, of the green signs.

Is that enough width on that street for parking on both sides?

Yes.

There's no parking on the other side of the street.

Oh, there's no parking on the other side of the street.

In the area that is being requested. I mean, right now, it's just regulated area, so people can still occupy, just on a limited basis. By removing the time stipulation, simply just a car can occupy it at different hours, so, yes, definitely, based off the restriction on the other side, you can have parking on the west side and still maintain two

way traffic, given the no parking this side of street on the east side of the road.

Anything else from you, sir?

Just if you had any questions or anything.

Okay, any questions?

Our parking lot, we can't make it bigger, and we can't make it any bigger, so we don't have. They're usually not that far down the road.

You can see, in that there's the parking lot for the business. What, can you even fit six or seven vehicles, right?

Seven total, and one of 'em's handicap, and we already have a variance. That's why we're a little bit closer to the sidewalk than is normally allowed. It's my understanding, that, if you would have to expand,

We can't. you'd probably have to go to Zoning Board of Appeals to get that.

Yeah, that's right, I think.

Okay, thank you sir. Vanessa, did you wish to speak?

I think he covered it.

Covered it, okay, all right. Can the motion we go back to regular business then?

So moved.

Motion by Ray, second by Dan, and like that.

Is that the first one?

Close one.

All right.

Oh, is that the one? And wait. All votes marked as, "Yes."

Okay, back to regular business then. Anyway, so we've been out and looked at the request, and do you have any issues with it?

No, I mean, from an engineering stand point, they, there's definitely enough width there. The only thing that I would say is that we just preserve that no parking here to corner, 'cause that's there to preserve the turning movements and side vision at the intersection. That's not part of the request anyway.

Okay.

That no parking here to corner, I would definitely keep in place. I've had limited contact with Alderman Johnson on this. We did touch base on it, and I honestly don't know what his opinion is on it. I did see he popped in before, but I don't know, maybe he went to another meeting, but I honestly don't know what his opinion is on it.

Right, okay, any other questions on this then?

There's no big generator down there that would clog it all up, and get the neighborhood all upset?

No, not that I can think of. Just talkin' to some staff that's been here for a while, it's our understanding that the two hour zone was actually in place when this was, I think, a Storheims or a different restaurant, that was probably a little bit more busy, and then this parking lot would fill up pretty quick, and then restaurant goes would just park on the street. I think what they did then, it was kind of like what they were doin', where the employees would be parked there all day, and then it was always that way, so that's my understanding of what it was at that time, but it's 2018 now, and it's really up to everyone that comes to a meeting to speak for or against the item, and hear the information that you have.

All right, entertain a motion?

So moved.

Motion by Dan.

And I'll second.

Second by Chuck. Now is the vote.

All votes marked as, "Yes."

Okay, great, they approved your request.

Thank you very much.

Thank you very much, glad we were here.

The sign should come down relatively soon. I usually put those work orders in within this week. This one's an easy one, 'cause it's just a removal.

I think there are two or three signs there.

Yeah, well normally, and not that it makes any difference to you, but we usually just leave any posts in place, just in case something happens during that 90 day trial.

Sure.

...that something just explodes or has to be moved or whatever like that, at least those sign posts are still in place, but after the 90 day trial, we usually remove them.

Thank you.

Thank you. Thank you for considering, appreciate it.

Yes, you're welcome.

Consideration, with possible action request, by the Traffic Engineer, to update the index of traffic regulations, as referenced in section 29.307, index of traffic regulations relative to regulatory traffic conditions on public streets that are no longer needed, due to roadway modifications or where missing.

Could you translate that for me?

I'm not sure if you had gotten the entire packet or if reviewed the entire packet. You'll see all the recommendations in there I presented in two forms.

Yes. This is probably, maybe, a good little history lesson. I can make it short. Once a year, it was my office's job to put together a list of parking and traffic regulations. This is a pre electronic era and sharing of data and things, so, if someone wanted a parking book, wanted to find out where the parking restrictions were, that's where they were located. We would give 'em to the staff up front in parking division, so that, if they ever had questions, they could look it up, but we have all this information electronically, so it didn't really make sense to update and print all these books, so it's basically just available in electronic format and upon request, at all times, and we keep it up to date. Obviously, there was one chapter that was not up to date, so these changes that you're seeing on here are not things that just happened now. These are things that have happened probably over a decade plus. I'm just gonna give you some examples that you'll see on here, and then you'll go "oh Okay, that makes sense." Like right here, driveway of Cub Foods, Military Avenue. We all know Cub Foods doesn't exist anymore, so... Then also, this has to do with the reconfiguration of the medians on Military Avenue as well, so, any of you that were around back in 2008 to 2010 era, when we were designing and building that roadway, we reconfigured all of the medians and access points and left turn lanes and median openings, so that's a prime example. Yeah, Leo at Military, same thing. We closed the median up to. There used to be a signal at this intersection. Shea at Velp, when Velp was reconstructed in 2012, that was that.

These should really come as no surprise. These are just, they don't exist anymore, a lot of 'em, the ones that you see crossed out, and then the ones that were highlighted and bolded were ones that were added because of that. Also, we had some regulations or ordinance book chapters were reconfigured a little bit differently too, so 29.307 is a new reference. It think it was 29.29 or 29.30, so when the ordinance book was reconfigured and renumbered, some of those changes are in here as well. Nothin' really, like I said, of big surprise in here. If anyone has any questions on any of these, I'd be more than happy to answer any of 'em, but it's kind of like the first item that came up, where the truck route map was just not updated after a construction project. This really no different, there just happens to be a whole bunch of 'em. I do have 'em summarized in the meeting packet, how I want them presented in motion format, so really just I've got summaries of the removals, I've got the summary the additions of each of 'em, and that's really about it, so it's kind of just some clean up work.

Okay, I'll entertain a motion.

I'll make a motion to do everything that's in the summary.

Second.

Motion by Chuck, second by Dan. Put in votes, please.

Keep it simple, right?

All votes marked as, "Yes."

Okay, thank you. Information on next meeting, Monday, November 19th. Are there any conflicts that anybody's aware of, their schedules or that's coming up.

I couldn't find any. I couldn't see any, like a Packer game, yeah, nothing like that.

All right, here next meeting then?

Yep, and it should be back in 207 as well.

Okay, all right, and I'll entertain motion to adjourn.

So moved.

Second.

Motion by Ray, second by Dan. We're adjourned.

Fair.

I guess you would have ordered that, don't you.

Mm

hm, we had trouble again.

We voted on adjournment, so that will resume.

Okay, let's check then. Oh, I have to click on a couple things before I get there, so I'm just a little behind. So who initiated it?

I moved it.

Ray initiated and Dan seconded that, sorry.

Okay, thank you.

And then to adjourn actually I think it was.

Oh.

Yes. And then the next one.

We'll get somebody in here saying you and I are the only ones to make a motion.

Okay, all the votes marked as, "Yes."

Sweet, okay, now to get out of here.

Right here, we're adjourned.

Oh, I didn't do half bad, but I screwed some stuff up again.

There you go, exit and power it off, on your left there.

All right.

Maybe one of these days we'll get it.

Don't forget to do the time end and adjourned.

Yeah.

There's a gentleman you know sittin' there.

What's that?

There's a gentleman sittin' there.

Well how are you?

That's not bad ministry, gents.

I assumed if you had anything, the speaker would have signaled.

All right, are you ready, Stacey?

No.

Are you ready now?

No, I had unplugged the mouse.

What's that?

I unplugged my mouse.

You plug it in?

Yes you do.

Okay, now I'm ready.

Okay, on the count of three, one, two, three.