



MINUTES OF THE TRAFFIC, BICYCLE, & PEDESTRIAN COMMISSION

MONDAY, JUNE 15, 2020, 4:00 PM

Note the time change: meeting begins at 4:00 p.m. CST.

Virtual Meeting
Public may view at
www.youtube.com/CityOfGreenBay

A. ZOOM MEETING INFORMATION

I. This item contains documents which provide call in information and instructions for the Zoom meeting.

B. ROLL CALL.

I. *Members:* Chairperson Matt Kuepers, Vice Chairperson Daniel Theno, Ald. Craig Stevens, Lieutenant Brad Strouf, Brigid Riordan, and Ray Smith (1 vacancy).

Present and Voting: Craig Stevens, Brad Strouf, Ray Smith, Brigid Riordan, Daniel Theno

Not Voting: Matt Kuepers

Excused: None

Absent: None

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the Monday, June 15, 2020 Traffic, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Commission meeting agenda.

Moved by Commissioner Brigid Riordan, seconded by Commissioner Ray Smith, to approve the agenda of the Monday, June 15, 2020 Traffic, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Commission.

Yes- Brad Strouf, Brigid Riordan, Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Ray Smith

No- None, Abstain- None

Motion carried.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the Monday, May 18, 2020 Traffic, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Commission meeting minutes.

Moved by Commissioner Ray Smith, seconded by Commissioner Brigid Riordan, to approve the minutes of the Monday, May 18, 2020 Traffic, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Commission meeting.

Yes- Brad Strouf, Brigid Riordan, Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Ray Smith

No- None, Abstain- None

Motion carried.

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

I. *Postponed from Prior Meeting*: Consideration with possible action on the request by Ald. Galvin to remove parking restrictions in the 600 block of South Irwin Avenue and the 1200 block of Cass

Street that apply to the former St. Mary of the Angels Catholic School. (Ald. Galvin – District 4).

Moved by Commissioner Daniel Theno, seconded by Commissioner Brighid Riordan that, on a 90-day trial, to remove the 4-HOUR PARKING ZONE on the south side of Cass Street from Roosevelt Street to Irwin Avenue.

Yes- Brad Strouf, Brighid Riordan, Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Ray Smith

No- None, Abstain- None

Motion carried.

2. *Referred Back from Common Council:* To remove the NO PARKING zone on the east side of Broadway from a point 10 feet north of Kellogg Street to a point 50 feet south of Kellogg Street.

Moved by Commissioner Brighid Riordan, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens, to remove the NO PARKING zone on the east side of Broadway from a point 10 feet north of Kellogg Street to a point 50 feet south of Kellogg Street.

Yes- Brad Strouf, Brighid Riordan, Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Ray Smith

No- None, Abstain- None

Motion carried.

4. *Referred Back from Common Council:* To remove the 2-HOUR 7 AM TO 7 PM MONDAY THROUGH FRIDAY zone on the east side of Broadway from a point 50 feet south of Kellogg Street to a point 175 feet south of Kellogg Street.

Moved by Commissioner Brighid Riordan, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens, to remove the 2-HOUR 7 AM TO 7 PM MONDAY THROUGH FRIDAY zone on the east side of Broadway from a point 50 feet south of Kellogg Street to a point 175 feet south of Kellogg Street.

Yes- Brad Strouf, Brighid Riordan, Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Ray Smith

No- None, Abstain- None

Motion carried.

3. *Referred Back from Common Council:* To remove the 2-HOUR 7 AM TO 7 PM MONDAY THROUGH FRIDAY zone on the east side of Broadway from a point 205 feet south of Bond Street to a point 10 feet north of Kellogg Street.

Moved by Commissioner Brighid Riordan, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens, to remove the 2-HOUR 7 AM TO 7 PM MONDAY THROUGH FRIDAY zone on the east side of Broadway from a point 205 feet south of Bond Street to a point 10 feet north of Kellogg Street.

Yes- Brad Strouf, Brighid Riordan, Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Ray Smith

No- None, Abstain- None

Motion carried.

5. *Referred Back from Common Council:* To establish and adopt by ordinance a NO PARKING zone on the east side of Broadway from a point 85 feet north of Kellogg Street to a point 70 feet south of Kellogg Street.

Moved by Commissioner Brighid Riordan, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens, to establish and adopt by ordinance a NO PARKING zone on the east side of Broadway from a point 85 feet north of Kellogg Street to a point 70 feet south of Kellogg Street.

Yes- Brad Strouf, Brighid Riordan, Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Ray Smith

No- None, Abstain- None

Motion carried.

6. *Referred Back from Common Council:* To establish and adopt by ordinance a 2-HOUR 7 AM TO 7 PM MONDAY THROUGH FRIDAY zone on the east side of Broadway from a point 205 feet south of Bond Street to a point 85 feet north of Kellogg Street.

Moved by Commissioner Brighid Riordan, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens, to establish and adopt by ordinance a 2-HOUR 7 AM TO 7 PM MONDAY THROUGH FRIDAY zone on the east side of Broadway from a point 205 feet south of Bond Street to a point 85 feet north of Kellogg Street.

Yes- Brad Strouf, Brighid Riordan, Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Ray Smith

No- None, Abstain- None

Motion carried.

7. *Referred Back from Common Council:* To establish and adopt by ordinance a 2-HOUR 7 AM TO 7 PM MONDAY THROUGH FRIDAY zone on the east side of Broadway from a point 70 feet south of Kellogg Street to a point 175 feet south of Kellogg Street.

Moved by Commissioner Brighid Riordan, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens, to establish and adopt by ordinance a 2-HOUR 7 AM TO 7 PM MONDAY THROUGH FRIDAY zone on the east side of Broadway from a point 70 feet south of Kellogg Street to a point 175 feet south of Kellogg Street.

Yes- Brad Strouf, Brighid Riordan, Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Ray Smith

No- None, Abstain- None

Motion carried.

F. PUBLIC HEARINGS.

G. INFORMATIONAL.

1. Report by the Traffic Engineer on the resignation of Stephanie Birmingham from the Traffic, Bicycle, & Pedestrian Commission. (All Alders)

2. Discussion regarding in-person Committee and Board meetings. (All Alders)

Commissioners discussed meeting in-person or virtually for the Monday, July 20, 2020 meeting of the Traffic, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Commission meeting and decided to meet virtually for said meeting.

3. Next Meeting: Monday, July 20, 2020 at 4:00 p.m.

H. ADJOURNMENT.

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

Moved by Commissioner Daniel Theno, seconded by Ald. Craig Stevens, to adjourn the current meeting of the Traffic, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Commission.

Yes- Brad Strouf, Brighid Riordan, Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Ray Smith

No- None, Abstain- None

Motion carried.

I. VERBATIM MINUTES.

Matt Kuepers: To order the meeting of the Green Bay Traffic, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Commission meeting for Monday, June 15th, 2020. Down to item number B, roll call. Members: Chairman Kuepers here. Vice-Chairman Dan. You want to mark him accordingly then, Dave?

David Hansen: Yes.

Matt: Okay. Alderman Craig Stevens.

Alder Craig Stevens: Here.

Matt: Lieutenant Brad Strouf.

Lieutenant Brad Strouf: Present.

Matt: Commissioner Brighid Riordan.

Brighid Riordan: Present.

Matt: Commissioner Ray Smith.

Ray Smith: Here.

Matt: Okay. With that, we'll move on to agenda item C, approval of the agenda. Approval on Monday, June 15th, 2020 [inaudible 00:00:48] Bicycle and Pedestrian Commission agenda. Do I hear a motion to approve?

Brighid: I move.

Ray: Second.

Matt: Motion made and seconded. All in favor?

Members: Aye.

Matt: Motion carries. Approval of minutes of the Monday, May 18th Traffic, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Commission meeting minutes.

Ray: [inaudible 00:01:11]

Brighid: Second.

Matt: Motion made for May's meeting. Seconded. All in favor?

Members: Aye.

Matt: Motion carries. E, in the regular business, item one, postponed from prior meeting: consideration with possible action on the request for Alderman Galvin to remove parking restrictions in the 600 block of South Irwin Avenue and the 1200 block of Cass Street that apply to the former St. Mary of the Angels Catholic School. No Alderman Galvin tonight. Have you conversed with him on this topic or on this agenda item, Dave?

David: Yes, I have. I asked him and he said he was going to attend, but I'm presuming since it's getting close to 10:00, after that, he's running late or something else came up. I do have some updates for you because I know where he's coming from now on his request. We did get clarification, would you like me to move forward with that?

Matt: Yes, please do.

David: Okay. I did receive an email from Bill who had talked with the requester on the phone. Apparently, there's not enough room in front of the school for all the staff. Even the way it exists as I explained it at the last meeting, and as the alder had stated, that the backlot is controlled by Bellin Hospital for their staff, and there's no room in there for school staff. The hours that they work, they have regular full-time jobs there, so it's eight-plus hours per weekday. That the four-hour area is really the only available area for them to park, but it's just not long enough.

His request is for the four-hour zone, which is on the south side of Cass Street-- You might want to look at the images that I put in the packet. I have a map that shows different zones of the area, but Cass Street west of Irwin on its southside, you'll see highlighted in yellow, that is actually a four-hour zone, and that extends all the way west to Roosevelt, sorry. It's that

entire block. Then once you get past Roosevelt towards the hospital, then it all becomes residential permit parking. It's the request of the alder to remove the four-hour 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM restriction that's existing on Cass Street.

From a staff perspective, we don't really have an issue with that request or that deposition. We're simply looking at it from an engineering perspective of, can the roadway accommodate not only the parkers, but is it still safe for two-way traffic on Cass Street east and westbound? The answer is yes. We don't really have a concern. The only thing I would bring up is that these zones obviously went in for a reason, the four-hour zones, and that was to prohibit some of the business and hospital employee parking that was taking place.

I think over the years we've seen what's happened with the construction of these various ancillary lots that they get shelled in. The parking structure that they've made good attempts to get this all resolved. I don't know if the four-hour is even needed anymore. I really don't know, but I'm going to trust the alderman's position on this one. That he's taking his due diligence in contacting [inaudible 00:05:02]. If that's his request, I have no reason to not support it.

Dan Theno: Mr chairman, I'd move approval of this request.

Matt: Okay. Motion made, do I hear a second then?

Brigid: Second.

Matt: Motion favor?

Members: Aye.

Matt: Motion carries. Good to hear your voice, Dan.

Dan: You're lucky you're not seeing my picture [unintelligible 00:05:30].

Matt: All right. We'll leave it at that. We won't go any further with that comment. Two, referred back from common council: to remove the No Parking zone on the east side of Broadway from a point 10 feet north of Kellogg Street to a point 50 feet south of Kellogg Street.

David: Can I interject real quick chair? Items two through seven are all related to the same item, which is the construction of Kellogg Street as part of the railyard development. I think really the discussion is on item, let's see, it's item five, is really the item that's I guess where the primary discussion should be taking place. They are all interconnected, so whatever happens as a result of tonight's meeting, there would be some adjustments probably to many of these items. That's the primary item there. This was pulled at council from Alder Johnson, and I did see that Alder Johnson is on the Zoom meeting, so I would make a recommendation that we let the alder speak on behalf of these items.

Matt: Yes. Please go right ahead, Alderman Johnson.

Brian Johnson: Thank you, chairman. I reached out to Dave today and we had a really good conversation around what [inaudible 00:07:05] my concern in this particular area. To sum it up, essentially what we're looking at is on where Kellogg intersects Broadway. What was initially in place was the removal of three parking stalls south of Kellogg and three parking stalls north of Kellogg. Now after conversing with staff earlier today, it sounds like the sign on the south end of Kellogg was initially misplaced, and so they've repositioned that last week, that allowed the recapture of one of those parking stalls.

Correct me if I'm wrong, Dave, I actually went out and measured some things, but when you say 70 feet south of Kellogg, is that from the end of the stall to the kerb of Kellogg?

David: The measurement that we use for the ordinance books, that 70 feet would be from where you see that white mark next to the two-hour sign. Actually, the signpost is what we use as in this case, it would be the southerly border. Then the northern edge of that measurement would be if you would extend the face of kerb of south Kellogg Street towards Broadway. You have the radius where the kerb ramps are for pedestrians to enter, but if you

would extend that salt kerb line west where it would intersect the east kerb face of Broadway, that's the northern point. It's actually probably maybe a little longer than you measured.

Brian: Got it. I went to the kerb and that number was in fact 70 feet to the kerb. From what you're saying, it sounds like we'd actually even have a little bit of a buffer in there, which is good. After this conversation, really, where my concern was raised was just the loss of six parking stalls in downtown urban setting. Particularly in a area that is about to see a lot of expansion. We had a great conversation about needs right now versus needs maybe a year from now or two years from now and some of the options we have in the future to reassess this particular modifications.

After Dave and I finished our call today, I went out and I took those measurements and the measurements for the south of Kellogg lined up with where the signage is right now.

However, on the north side of Kellogg, when I took a measurement [inaudible 00:09:43] parking stall was to the kerb, it is 105 feet. What I'm seeing in the ordinance request is that it's 85 feet. By my math, that suggests to release one additional parking stall based on where- to release one additional parking stall, based on where the No Parking signage was put in place.

That is my request of the Traffic Commission today, is that we basically enforce the 85 feet as it's outlined in the ordinance, and then we release one of those parking stalls. Essentially, all you have to do is move the sign, to put it in the appropriate place that measures 85 feet as opposed to 105 feet. Again, this is new information since Dave and I spoke. Dave, I don't know if you have some thoughts on that, but I did take a roller and I measured it out, and 105 feet is the number that it came up to. I did measure it twice.

David: If the measurement is what it is, and our sign north of Kellogg Street is in the wrong spot, by all means, it should be moved to the proper location. If that means moving it and it adds another stall, then that's what it will be. I don't see any reason to make it any greater than it would, that stall or anything. Because these numbers that were arrived at, the 85 to 70 feet, that are in item five, are engineered values based off of AASHTO criteria for intersection sight distance. We would support that in what is already existing in the proposed ordinances that we're moving forward for adoption at Council.

Brian: Again, if we can just basically enforce what's here in the ordinance, I'm good. Then, based on the conversation that Dave and I had earlier today, recognizing what future actions might look like, and I think we'll tackle that, sometime in my perspective, what that would allow us to do is essentially recover two of the six parking stalls lost. Again, it may not seem like a lot, but in these downtown settings, two parking stalls can be very valuable with some of the businesses down here that have that in-and-out traffic. That's all I've got.

Matt: Thank you, Alder Johnson. Dave, do you want to let us know how you want to handle these items, two through seven, then or?

David: Yes, items two through seven should move through as they did at the last meeting for approval. In essence, basically, we're approving items two through seven, relative to movement of the current sign. Now we can take care of that at the staff level. There's no action or anything like that, that needs to take place at the Council level, more or less that as long as this is going to get approved at 85 feet at Council [inaudible 00:12:56] modify the sign to reflect 85 feet. I can handle that at staff level, not a problem.

Matt: Items two through seven, do you want us to [unintelligible 00:13:08] place on file [unintelligible 00:13:09] if you're going to handle it at staff or?

David: No. Because they were actually pulled from the last Common Council meeting, so they need to get put back on the next. The proper motion would be to approve items two through seven. I believe Dan was calling or stating-- had something to say.

Dan: Well, just a question Dave, do we need to approve number five, or do we not need to include it if you're going to do it through staff?

David: Contrary. All of these need to be adopted. Because think back of where we were at the last meeting. I was making recommendation for all of them to come through the Alder Council and he pulled these items for further discussion. We're all back on the same page, so they should all be moving forward. Like I said, no action is required tonight by the Commission for the simple fact of **[unintelligible 00:14:10]** we have 85 feet that's moving forward to Common Council. That's what we are going to have established in the field.

Dan: Okay. Thank you.

Brighid: Could we make a motion to approve items two through seven then?

Craig: Yes.

Brighid: By me.

Matt: Motion made, do I hear a second?

Craig: Second.

Matt: Motion made and second. All in favor?

Members: Aye.

Matt: Okay. Motion to **[inaudible 00:14:38]** carry. I think that pretty much takes care of our normal stuff tonight. Just on your G, informational, report by the traffic engineer and the resignation of Stephanie Birmingham from Traffic, Bicycle and Pedestrian Commission.

David: Yes, thank you. I normally don't put these on the agenda, but seeing how I received her resignation via email, and I believe that she had copied most of the--, if not all the commissioners, but I just know in prior resignations that there usually was some sort of upfront knowledge that this was going to occur. Someone's bought a house and moving out of the area or whatever. It was just common knowledge that this was going to occur. Stephanie's resignation came to me as **[inaudible 00:15:34]**. I believe the email had described her reasonings, but long story short, she moved out to the area. She moved to **[inaudible 00:15:42]**. I accepted that resignation and just wanted to put that out there that we will now, or I should say not will, we do already have that one vacancy. If there are any qualified individuals that you think would serve well on this commission, by all means, have a discussion with them and feel free to forward their name over to the mayor's office or, better yet, have them express their interest. The mayor's responsible for appointments and they get approved by common councils. That's all I've got.

Matt: Thank you. Moving to item two, the discussion regarding in-person committee and board meetings. We've been doing Zoom, this is the third month now. Dave, I don't know maybe you want to go in a little more depth if City Hall or city building is opening or City Hall is opening back up so meetings can now be held on-site again. I guess more the, how do we want to go forward as a group, as a traffic commission? I'm thinking that's the conversation you want to have, Dave.

David: Yes. Well, I do want to throw in a few conditions that are being placed, so it's not really going to be business as normal. Today actually starts our phase one of coming back in the City Hall. Today we actually saw more staff than we normally have because we have been operating as a skeleton crew here. Not many, but we now have this phase in that we're working through where there's more people coming in. They're also in, as part of this order that we received was that committee members, commission members, board members can now attend in-person these meetings at City Hall. The only stipulation on that is that, these meetings are held in council chambers, for the time being.

That would be different from our normal meeting room, obviously, which is 310. I believe the reasoning behind that is, is because they're not opening up City Hall to the general public, it's just to, in essence, in this case, would be commissioners. We're just opening it up to

commissioners and that people from the general public won't be able to attend our meetings. Therefore, they are still going to be, if they want to, attend virtually.

That being said, I understand the reasons why going to Council. I'm throwing it out there that I'm open to it. I literally had this information last week and we could have had that discussion about even tonight's meeting, having it that way. **[unintelligible 00:18:37]** my thoughts and I threw it by Matt, who agreed that it was probably too early, there's too many unknowns at this point in time. We wanted to have a discussion with everybody because of these conditions. It's not going to be 310, you're not going to probably have the luxuries of the screens and all the great videos and imagery that I normally bring to all of these awesome **[inaudible 00:19:03]**. Sorry.

Anyway, so just think of it like, I think we had it a little bit over a year ago, I think it was right around the election time, when there was alders and Mayor elected, that we had a meeting in council chambers. I just wanted to offer it out there that if we do meet, at least where things stand right now, it'd be similar to how we had that meeting a year ago in council chambers. If everyone's open to that, I'm open to it. We can have our face if the commissioners decide that you want to wait until things really are back to what I would call normal or new normal and we're back into 310. That's the discussion I really wanted to have.

Matt: Did anybody else have any thoughts? Any other commissioners?

Ray: This makes it a lot easier for me. I don't have to run to town all the time. Usually, there's something going on, but not always.

Matt: Okay.

Brighid: Either way, it's fine for me. I'm up for whatever.

Matt: All right. Alderman Stevens, your take?

Craig: I am ready to get back to City Hall, but we can still do Zoom.

Matt: Okay. Lieutenant?

Brad: I'm glad I'm not the tiebreaker. Either way, it's fine for me.

Matt: Brad, your thoughts?

Brad: I'm content doing it either way. This works out fine. I'm in my office right now anyway, so I can come down the block. Occasionally, I have done it from home, so I'm willing to do either or, but I think the traditional way is probably a little more user-friendly.

Matt: Dan, you'd like to comment?

Alder: I have a question.

Dan: I can go either way, but what about a middle ground of doing **[inaudible 00:21:12]**?

Matt: I think anything's in the conversation at this point. Dave has made us aware that we can start having our meeting in City Hall when we're ready for it. We don't necessarily need to go. We can decide as a group what's most comfortable. If we get to have majority what their take is, I'm indifferent. The other part of the conversation, Dave, if we had it at City Hall, what time would the meeting be? Would we be at 4:00 or would we be back to 5:30?

David: That's a great question. As it sits right now, our last meeting, we motioned for the next two meetings to take place at 4:00. Unless we decide otherwise, it would be at 4:00. I think that's a great question to have. I'll be honest with you. I think there's some unknowns at this point in time, so if I had to make a decision one way or the other, I'd say let's keep it virtual for one more month.

Two reasons. Number one, the unknown, which I just explained. Number two, I think it's much more conducive to meeting exchange of information that **[unintelligible 00:22:30]** in the meetings, but rather, they can come in in attendance. We have the traditional fill out the form if you want to talk. I just think that that's probably a more useful exchange of ideas than Zoom. I think Zoom with its technology is awesome, but there are latency issues and

obviously like we had earlier on even today, we had almost a 10-minute delay in start because there oftentimes can be technical difficulties.

Again, it's just my recommendation, is I would just stick with what we have for one more month, and then I can put this identical item back on. I'll probably have more information on what phase two is going to look like in one month. I think we could probably have a more fruitful discussion and probably have a more educated decision.

Matt: Yes, I would agree with you, Dave. Let's plan on Zoom for the July meeting and maybe have this agenda item on-- I don't know if we want to vote or if we can just agree the way it is. I do agree that it's difficult for the general public to get involved in our meetings right now and some of the meetings, we get a pretty good turnout for people that want to speak, so long term, I think we should get back to meeting at City Hall when the time is appropriate. I think, like you said, for next month, let's plan on Zoom for July and go from there and maybe have a discussion in July and see what all the commissioners and lieutenants and others think about it.

In the meantime, I see Alderman Galvin is in our meeting now. We went to your item already. We voted in agreement with it, so I don't know if you had any comments at this point, Alderman Galvin.

Bill: Was that to lift the four-hour restriction, I guess?

Matt: By St. Mary of the Angels School.

Bill: Yes, it'll go into a 90-day trial period and see what happens from there.

David: Correct. Yes. The actual four-hour zone, since I didn't know what limits you really wanted, I didn't know if you wanted to preserve any of the four. The four-hour is basically that entire block in the south side of Cass between Roosevelt and Irwin, so without that knowledge, I just said, let's just remove all of the four-hour because once you get west of Roosevelt, it's a permanent parking and you're a little bit closer to the hospital. The motion actually was to remove all of that four-hour for the entire block of south side. I'm assuming that's what you wanted.

Bill: Yes. I appreciate that. I apologize. I'm having some problems with our AT&T internet here. It's affecting our phones, so I couldn't even get in on the phone part of it. I apologize, and I appreciate you folks taking the time to push that forward.

Matt: Yes.

David: Sounds good.

Matt: No problem then. All right, if we've got everything covered, I think, Dave, for this month, then I will entertain a motion to adjourn then.

Dan: I move.

Craig: Second.

Ray: Second.

Matt: Motion made and second. All in favor?

Members: Aye.

Matt: We are adjourned until July. Take care.

[00:26:45] [END OF AUDIO]