



MINUTES OF THE TRAFFIC, BICYCLE, & PEDESTRIAN COMMISSION

MONDAY, OCTOBER 19, 2020, 5:30 PM

Virtual Meeting. Public may view via Zoom.

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 Mike Sobieck, Brighid Riordan, and 2 vacancies

Present and Voting: Ald. Craig Stevens, Brighid Riordan, Lieutenant Mike Sobieck, Vice Chairperson Daniel Theno

Present and Not Voting: Matt Kuepers

Excused: None

Absent: None (2 vacancies)

Others Present: Ald. Jesse Brunette

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the Monday, October 19, 2020 Traffic, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Commission meeting agenda.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Commissioner Daniel Theno, to approve the agenda of the Monday, October 19, 2020 meeting of the Traffic, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Commission meeting as amended to discuss Informational item FI after the approval of the minutes, followed by Regular Business items in this order: E4, E1, E2, E3, E5, E6-E14.

Yes- Brighid Riordan, Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Mike Sobieck

No- None

Abstain- None

Motion carried.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the Monday, September 21, 2020 Traffic, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Commission meeting minutes.

Moved by Commissioner Daniel Theno, seconded by Commissioner Brighid Riordan, to approve the minutes of the Monday, September 21, 2020 meeting of the Traffic, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Commission meeting.

Yes- Brighid Riordan, Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Mike Sobieck

No- None

Abstain- None

Motion carried.

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

I. *General Business*: Report by the Police Department of the 2020 3rd quarter serious injury and fatal crashes. (All Alders)

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Commissioner Brighid Riordan, to receive and place on file the 2020 3rd quarter serious injury and fatal crashes report.

Yes- Brigid Riordan, Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Mike Sobieck

No- None

Abstain- None

Motion carried.

2. *Initial Request:* Consideration with possible action on the request by the Traffic Engineer to establish a I-WAY YIELD condition on Ricky Drive at August Street. (Ald. Gerlach – District 3)

Moved by Commissioner Daniel Theno, seconded by Lieutenant Mike Sobieck, that, on a 90-day trial, to establish a I-WAY YIELD condition on Ricky Drive at August Street.

Yes- Brigid Riordan, Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Mike Sobieck

No- None

Abstain- None

Motion carried.

3. *Initial Request:* Consideration with possible action on the request by Ald. Vander Leest to establish a 4-WAY STOP condition on Parkwood Drive at Fawn Lane. (Ald. Vander Leest – District 11)

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Commissioner Daniel Theno, to refer to staff to study the request to establish a 4-WAY STOP condition on Parkwood Drive at Fawn Lane.

Yes- Brigid Riordan, Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Mike Sobieck

No- None

Abstain- None

Motion carried.

4. *Initial Request:* Consideration with possible action on the request by the Traffic Engineer to establish a NO PARKING zone on both sides of Hillcrest Drive from Haven Place to West Mason Street due to its narrow width. (Ald. Brunette – District 12)

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Commissioner Daniel Theno, that, on a 90-day trial, to establish a NO PARKING zone on both sides of Hillcrest Drive from Haven Place to West Mason Street.

Yes- Brigid Riordan, Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Mike Sobieck

No- None

Abstain- None

Motion carried.

5. *Referred Back From Study*: Consideration with possible action on the request by Ald. Wery to establish a 3-WAY STOP condition at Western Avenue at Maryhill Drive. (Ald. Wery – District 8)

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Commissioner Brighid Riordan, to deny the request to establish a 3-WAY STOP condition at Western Avenue at Maryhill Drive and maintain the existing I-WAY STOP control (Maryhill Drive traffic stops for Western Avenue traffic).

Yes- Brighid Riordan, Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Mike Sobieck

No- None

Abstain- None

Motion carried.

6. *Termination of 90-Day Trial*: Remove the NO PARKING zone on the north side of Thomas Street from a point 85 feet west of Velp Avenue to Velp Avenue.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Lieutenant Mike Sobieck, to remove the NO PARKING zone on the north side of Thomas Street from a point 85 feet west of Velp Avenue to Velp Avenue.

Yes- Brighid Riordan, Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Mike Sobieck

No- None

Abstain- None

Motion carried.

7. *Termination of 90-Day Trial*: Remove the NO PARKING zone on the south side of Radisson Street from Quincy Street to a point 35 feet east of Webster Avenue.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Lieutenant Mike Sobieck, to remove the NO PARKING zone on the south side of Radisson Street from Quincy Street to a point 35 feet east of Webster Avenue.

Yes- Brighid Riordan, Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Mike Sobieck

No- None

Abstain- None

Motion carried.

8. *Termination of 90-Day Trial*: Remove the NO PARKING zone on the north side of Radisson Street from Webster Court to a point 90 feet east of St. George Street.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Lieutenant Mike Sobieck, to remove the NO PARKING zone on the north side of Radisson Street from Webster Court to a point 90 feet east of St. George Street.

Yes- Brighid Riordan, Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Mike Sobieck

No- None

Abstain- None

Motion carried.

9. *Termination of 90-Day Trial:* Remove the NO PARKING zone on the north side of Radisson Street from Quincy Street to Webster Avenue.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Lieutenant Mike Sobieck, to remove the NO PARKING zone on the north side of Radisson Street from Quincy Street to Webster Avenue.

Yes- Brighid Riordan, Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Mike Sobieck

No- None

Abstain- None

Motion carried.

10. *Termination of 90-Day Trial:* Remove the NO PARKING zone on the north side of Radisson Street from a point 588 feet west of Webster Court to a point 665 feet west Webster Court.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Lieutenant Mike Sobieck, to remove the NO PARKING zone on the north side of Radisson Street from a point 588 feet west of Webster Court to a point 665 feet west Webster Court.

Yes- Brighid Riordan, Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Mike Sobieck

No- None

Abstain- None

Motion carried.

11. *Termination of 90-Day Trial:* Remove the NO PARKING zone on the north side of Radisson Street from a point 60 feet east of Irwin Avenue to a point 30 feet west of Irwin Avenue.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Lieutenant Mike Sobieck, to remove the NO PARKING zone on the north side of Radisson Street from a point 60 feet east of Irwin Avenue to a point 30 feet west of Irwin Avenue.

Yes- Brighid Riordan, Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Mike Sobieck

No- None

Abstain- None

Motion carried.

12. *Termination of 90-Day Trial*: Remove the NO PARKING zone on the south side of Radisson Street from a point 30 feet east of Irwin Avenue to a point 60 feet west of Irwin Avenue.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Lieutenant Mike Sobieck, to remove the NO PARKING zone on the south side of Radisson Street from a point 30 feet east of Irwin Avenue to a point 60 feet west of Irwin Avenue.

Yes- Brighid Riordan, Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Mike Sobieck

No- None

Abstain- None

Motion carried.

13. *Termination of 90-Day Trial*: Establish a NO PARKING zone on the north side of Radisson Street from Quincy Street to a point 60 feet east of Irwin Avenue.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Lieutenant Mike Sobieck, to establish and adopt by ordinance a NO PARKING zone on the north side of Radisson Street from Quincy Street to a point 60 feet east of Irwin Avenue.

Yes- Brighid Riordan, Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Mike Sobieck

No- None

Abstain- None

Motion carried.

14. *Termination of 90-Day Trial*: Establish a NO PARKING zone on the south side of Radisson Street from Quincy Street to a point 30 feet east of Irwin Avenue.

Moved by Ald. Craig Stevens, seconded by Lieutenant Mike Sobieck, to establish and adopt by ordinance a NO PARKING zone on the south side of Radisson Street from Quincy Street to a point 30 feet east of Irwin Avenue.

Yes- Brighid Riordan, Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Mike Sobieck

No- None

Abstain- None

Motion carried.

F. INFORMATIONAL.

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

2. Next meeting: Monday, November 16, 2020, at 5:30 p.m. Location TBD.

G. PUBLIC HEARINGS.

H. ADJOURNMENT.

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

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

Yes- Brighid Riordan, Craig Stevens, Daniel Theno, Mike Sobieck

No- None

Abstain- None

Motion carried.

VERBATIM MINUTES

- All right, let's call to order the Meeting of the Green Bay Traffic, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Commission meeting for Monday, October 19th, 2020. I think we've got everybody but Commissioner Ray Smith.

- Can I just verify real quick, Matt?

- Yeah.

- Who's called in as City of Green Bay, Matt, is that you? 'Cause we need to have Matt as part of this meeting for recording purposes. And whoever dialed in as City of Green Bay, can you identify yourself? Okay, I just got a text, it's Matt. There's no audio from the desk computer, so, all right. Yeah, we should be good to go then. Sorry for that.

- Yes, all right. No problem, we'll go to item B Roll Call. Chairman Kuepers is here. Vice-chairman Dan Theno, Daniel?

- [Dan] Here.

- Alderman Craig Stevens?

- Here.

- Lieutenant Mike Sobeick?

- Here.

- Commissioner Brighid Riordan?

- Here.

- Okay. With that, I will move onto approval of the agenda. I probably will make a couple notes to change here. We have Alderman Brunette, Dave, so I will move him up to number one in the pecking order under Regular Business. And then we will move item FI up after the approval of the minutes for a little, insight into what's going on with that situation. Do I hear an approval for the agenda then, please?

- Motion to approve.

- [Dan] Second.

- Motion has been made and seconded. All in favor of the motion, carries?

- [All] Aye.

- Okay, motion carries. Under item C approval of the Monday, October 9th, oh, we've got the agenda, approval of the minutes from Monday, September 20th, 2020 Traffic, Bicycle and Pedestrian Commission Meeting Minutes. So do I hear a motion to approve?

- [Dan] So moved.

- Second?

- Second, all in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Okay, motion carries. And I said, we'll move item FI up, ahead of the Regular Business there. And FI Informational Report by the Traffic Engineer, under resignation of Ray Smith from the Traffic, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Commission. Dave, you want to start with that?

- Sure, I will. As part of your meeting packet, you should have as an attachment, his, Ray Smith's resignation letter. I ask you to read that that letter. It's part of the minutes now, or will be part of the minutes since it was an attachment. But long story short, it appears that he was a little distraught from the last meeting, and that was somewhat his last straw that broke the camel's back, so to speak. And he tendered his resignation. He was upset relative to the outcome of the Webster Avenue speed limit item, which was at the recommendation of 40 miles an hour from the study, and that the recommendation was 35 miles an hour. And he believed that he didn't have the opportunity to talk or discuss. So I just wanted to throw that out there 'cause this isn't, I guess, like a normal resignation on, I guess you'd say happy terms. So I just, I thought that now that we're together, that if there's anything or any input that anybody has about this subject, that now would be a good time to talk about it. I'll give my couple of cents on that. And I've already had a discussion with Craig Stevens on this earlier today. So I'll just basically reflect what I had said in that conversation, which was, as part of staff, we bring reports, and it's really up to the Commission whether or not to approve or deny the reports, or, quite frankly, it's really up to your decision on how you want to handle that. I don't take anything personal from these. I'm giving you objective information for you to make hopefully an objective decision. That said, I'm not really sure I interpret what Ray is concerned about. The reason I say that is, is that, I had to go back and watch the video to kind of see what he was concerned about. And when I watched the video, it seemed to me that there was technological issues, as in we had some audio and video latency issues that were taking place. And quite frankly, I think that could be some of the reason why this happened, and why he potentially didn't get heard. And it's, I guess of my, I'm just gonna kind of deduce what I can out of this situation, and I think that if we had been meeting in person, I think that probably his objection would have been heard because I literally think it was a matter of technology, and that is somewhat a contributory, if not completely contributory, towards his lack of been able to engage in the conversation. So again, that's just my opinion. But I just wanted to, A, give you that information, and B, have this be an opportunity for us to have the discussion on if there's something that we need to do to make amends with Ray, and or potentially does this factor into the Commission's decision to meet in person, potentially as early as next month, if that's even on the table per City policy. That's all I have.

- [Dan] Mr. Chairman?

- Yes, go ahead, Dan.

- [Daniel] So it's your interpretation that he was more concerned about technical issues, then the outcome of the decision of the Commission itself?

- No, it's the opposite, Dan. I think he actually, he comes right out and says he was disappointed in the recommendation and that there was really little discussion about why the recommend, why there was a motion for 35 instead of what staff's recommendation was, which was 40. And you have to understand, Ray is an engineer just like me. So now we kind of think similarly along these lines. So I completely see where he's

coming from. However, what I'm suggesting is that I think that we may have had some technological issues that are leading to kind of the same conclusion or, that he didn't have the opportunity to speak, is his belief, but I don't necessarily believe that the commissioners, at least from prior practice when we would meet or met in person, we always give people the opportunity to speak, that's always been the way that the Commission has been, very cordial to all its members. So I didn't see it that way. I didn't think that there was anything intentionally rude. I honestly, when I look at it, I think it was a matter of technological issues with the Zoom meeting.

- [Dan] Okay, Matt, I would just suggest that you send a letter out on behalf of the Commission to Ray and thank him for his service.

- Yeah, I can do, I did send him an email. I don't know if you saw the email I sent already? Just sharing from my perspective, I always want every commissioner to be heard. It's not that we didn't want him to be heard and be able to raise objection to what was going on. And in all honesty, I really thought that we had hashed over the items pretty well, because I don't know how many minutes we spent on that item, but it was considerably more than we do for a lot of items. So I thought everybody's voice was heard. As Dave said, maybe with the Zoom meeting. I can't really, I've got a screen showing everybody, but maybe I missed him trying to object. And I'm not sure. It certainly wasn't intentional. And I think as Dave said, it was part of just the format of the Zoom meeting. It's hard to keep track of everybody. The dynamics are a little tougher. And I did send Ray an email. I wrote my own personal email to him. And I think I copied well, Dave, you included it in the, did you include that, so everybody saw that email, Dave?

- No, I simply just put his resignation letter as part of the attachment to the item in the agenda packet. But perhaps maybe you can just email that to the rest of the commissioners, just so everyone's on the same page.

- Yeah, you didn't add it, you can just forward it, Dave. I mean, you have it right?

- I do, I can do that.

- Why don't you just forward it to the other commissioners and the Alders and the Lieutenant and they can see what I sent to Ray or whatever, it was kind of, I apologize that it happened and wished him the best. And I thanked him for his years of service, 'cause he, as Dave said, he was an engineer, he brought a lot of good perspective to the meeting, and he some expertise that was good, and it's always good that I think the Commission is good, it's got a cross section of engineers and just kind of common people like myself that don't always understand the engineering part of things. So he was a good member and I hate to see him go. I know he was planning on going at some point, retire, because he does have a place up north that he goes to and he's alluded to me that it was gonna happen. I don't know when, I don't know, hopefully this didn't push him over the edge to do that. One of the comments he made and you'll see in the email was, he said he didn't want to be a part of this, it was, and I put it in quotes. I'm not quite sure what he meant by a part of it. I hope that he

didn't feel that the Traffic Commission was something that wasn't fair to everybody over the years, And I did not like I said, I did not get a response from the email I sent him. But I did send out something to him, Dan, thanking him for a service, yes.

- [Dan] Okay, great.

- And Dave, yeah, please do send that to the other, everybody else at the meeting here tonight so they can see what was sent out.

- I can do--

- I hate to see anybody leave under any circumstance, whether it's good or bad. But I've been on the Commission for over 20, almost 20 years and nobody's ever left like that. I feel bad about that and I'm sorry it went down that way and I wish I could undo it so he could have spoken his piece to a certain extent, but it didn't happen, and I guess we need to move forward, Dave.

- Right, right. Yeah. And if anyone has time, maybe just go take a look at that video and see if you are seeing some of the same things that I saw, that really led to my conclusions on it. I think that I may outreach to Ray just to, I've known Ray for a long time anyway, just to do the same, to thank him, and maybe just sort of explain to him that I think that after watching the video, that I think maybe there's might be some slight misinterpretation that I don't think that is an intentional slight by anyone on the Commission. And that I really do think that there were issues going on with audio and video at the time.

- Any other comments from anybody else from the meeting that, thinking back? Something to do different? As I told Ray, if there's things we can do better as a Commission, certainly let us know, because we're always open for ways to make it better. So. All right. If nothing else, I think we'll move on then. Unless, one last swipe for any comments? If not, I'm gonna move onto the next item then. Okay. We'll move onto, as I said, four, we changed our agenda a little bit, we'll move to item four. Initial Request, consideration with possible action on the request by the Traffic Engineer to establish a No Parking Zone on both sides of Hillcrest Drive from Haven Place to West Mason Street, due to its narrow width. Dave, if you want to take off? And I know the Alder is on to speak to it also tonight here.

- Sure, sure. Thank you. As many of, you know, Hillcrest Drive was recently reconstructed. And it wasn't actually changed in width, but rather the shoulder was replaced with a mountable outside curb, we call it roll top curb, and double yellow center line was painted on the roadway as well. The main reason for that is because of the hills and the valleys that you'll see on the roadway. It's mainly straight in nature, but there's a lot of hills and valleys. Now, when you actually have motorists parking on the street, there is not enough width to

park and operate traffic in each direction of that center line. So, what ends up happening is then if someone were parked there, a motorist is actually forced to cross the double yellow center line, which is certainly not a safe condition. So there's also been some complaints relative to running of the terrace area behind that curb. And I'm sure some of that has to do with that newly graded soil and grass behind that curb. But anytime a person would actually go to the right of that curb, they would actually run it up. So something that we've actually had to deal with on the construction end, but I don't really think that leaving the parking situation the way it is, is really a safe condition. And I certainly don't want to put the City in a position of liability that we don't have enough room there. Again, like I said, we've got hills and valleys there, and last thing you want to do is feel like this has somewhat contributory towards say a potential head on crash. So with that being said, I'm making a recommendation from staff to establish a No Parking Zone on both sides of Hillcrest Drive from Haven place to West Mason Street.

- Go ahead, Alder, if you want to comment.

- Yeah, thank you, Chairman. And thank you, Dave and I did have a conversation. I've spent a lot of time on Hillcrest over the last two and a half years and have gotten to know the constituents out there quite well. Big issue out there is perceived speeding. That's a separate issue, I know. And Dave and I are kind of working on a few solutions to that issue. But as far as Dave's recommendation, I agree. I think that given my familiarity with many of the constituents out there, if there are any objections once this is put in place, we certainly will be hearing that. There's a 90 day trial, from what I understand, is that correct, Dave?

- That's correct.

- So I'm in support of it. And I thank Dave and the City Traffic Engineer Department for bringing this forward because he is correct that, putting people, parking on one side of the road or the other will force other traffic into the center lane of traffic, so across the center line, I should say. So I'm in support of this. And I thank you all.

- Okay. Thank you, Alder Brunette.

- I'll make a motion to move forward with No Parking.

- Okay.

- Second.

- Motion has been made. Do I hear a second?

- [Dan] Second.

- Motion made and seconded. All in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Okay, motion carries.

- Thank you all.

- Thank you, Alder Brunette.

- Thank you.

- Let's go back to item one, General Business, Report by the Police Department of the 2020 3rd Quarter Serious Injuries and Fatal Crashes. So turn this over to the Lieutenant. Mike, hopefully Brad gave you some insight into what to share?

- He did.

- He's not holding your hand there, I'm sure you can do just fine on your own there.

- Yeah. He's actually, yeah, he's not here.

- Okay.

- So we had two serious crashes in the 3rd Quarter. The first one was on July 15th, about 4:54 AM, on Bellevue and Amy street. A bicycle was traveling south on Bellevue and was struck from behind by a southbound vehicle. The vehicle didn't stop to render aid and continued south on Bellevue Street. A separate passing motorist located an injured bicyclist just a few moments later and emergency responders were sent. Ultimately the bicyclist died. He's a 26 year old Green Bay resident. And he died a couple of days later on 7/22. So July, seven days later, he died. July 29th, officers located a suspect vehicle, and after investigating it charges were filed to the Brown County District Attorney's Office for that subject. The second crash was in September, September 3rd, around 2:22 PM. A motorcycle traveling west on Main Street was struck by a vehicle that had been traveling east on Main Street, attempting to make a left hand turn north on Irwin Street. The motorcycle was occupied by one person and prior to the crash, had tipped the motorcycle over and was sliding down the roadway. After an impact, the motorcyclist struck a second stopped vehicle, after hitting the first, before stopping. Unfortunately the motorcyclist was pronounced deceased at the scene and was a 56 year old Green Bay resident. The accident reconstruction team is still working on the causes of that crash, but it does not appear that there's any criminal behavior or criminal charges that are gonna be filed in that one. Any questions about the two crashes?

- I do not have any. Any other Commissioners or Alders?

- I do not.

- Okay. All right. Thank you, Lieutenant Mike.

- You're welcome.

- I'll make a motion to receive and place on file.

- Okay. Motion made, do I hear a second?

- Second.

- Motion made and seconded. All in favor?

- [All] Aye. Motion carries. Two, Initial Request, consideration with possible action on the request by the Traffic Engineer to establish a one way yield condition at Ricky Drive, on Ricky Drive at August Street.

- Yes, I was actually emailed by an officer of the Traffic Enforcement Unit, and he was questioning whether or not a Yield or Stop sign was supposed to be installed on Ricky Drive at August Street. And I responded that no, it's actually an uncontrolled intersection. And I asked him, was there any issues that he had seen? And he said that there was a number of vehicles that he was observing that would pull out from Ricky Drive onto August Street, and were having to make an emergency stop. So kind of starting to go. And had to make an emergency stop to avoid a crash. Now the intersection is a T-intersection. So Ricky Drive T's into August Street. And I think most drivers behave in a way that they treat T-intersections at the roadway that comes into the T should yield or stop, even when there's not any traffic control, it's just normally what we witness. Obviously we have drivers that understand the yield to the person or the motorist on the right and otherwise you have the right of way. But it doesn't seem like everyone is treating it that way. So in this case, given the report that I received from the Police Department, I think that's a good enough reason for me to make a recommendation to convert the intersection from an uncontrolled intersection to a one way yield condition, so that Ricky Drive yields to August Street traffic. And I make a recommendation so it be installed in a 90 day trial.

- [Dan] Mr. Chairman, so moved.

- Motion's been made, do I hear a second?

- I second.

- Motion made and seconded, all in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Motion carries. Item three, Initial Request, consideration with possible action on a request from Alderman Vander Leest to establish a four way stop condition on Parkwood Drive at Fawn Lane. Dave?

- Yes, I'm familiar with the intersection. It actually, it's almost like a T-intersection, one of the legs, minor legs, to the intersection actually, dead ends, I think like one lot in, and then it goes into a trail system that connects over into the village of Ashwaubenon. But that's really all I know about it at this point in time. So just like any of these other locations where there's a request to change an intersection traffic control, at least when it comes down to a multi-way stop condition, there are warrants for that in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, therefore I make a recommendation to the Commission to refer to staff to study the request to establish a four way stop condition on Parkwood Drive at Fawn Lane.

- I'll make a motion to refer to staff.

- Okay. Motion's been made to refer to staff. Do I hear a second?

- [Dan] Second.

- Motion made and seconded. All in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Okay, move onto item five then. Referred Back from Study, consideration with possible action on the request from Alderman Wery to establish a three way stop condition at Western Avenue at Maryhill Drive.

- Okay. I'm not sure if everyone had the opportunity to read the study, but it was attached to the agenda packet. But I can definitely summarize it up briefly for you. I don't know if you want me to share my screen Commissioner? I can do so, I have the PDF of that document handy. And I'll go to this.. All right, so can everyone see my screen?

- Yes.

- Mm hm.

- Yeah.

- Okay. Let me. Oh, thank you. There it is. So it starts off, the report, just describing the existing conditions, that you can see it's located on the City's west side. And when you look at the neighborhood view, as figures 2a, b, and c show, you'll see that it is a T-intersection, Maryhill T's into Western Avenue. Western Avenue is, although technically a local residential street, it functions as a collector roadway, meaning it's got higher traffic volumes, it feeds into multiple arterial roadways. We do have proximity to two schools, Notre Dame Academy here, and...

- Franklin.

- Franklin.

- Franklin, yes, thank you. So here's another view you can see of the intersection itself. This is actually looking to the west. You can see Highway 41 in the background, and there's two parallel arterial streets as well. There's Shawano to north, and you have West Mason to the south. And so a little bit more of a detailed view, an intersection view, so you can see we have sidewalks on both sides at the intersection itself, which doesn't really surprise me, given the age of the intersection and the neighborhood and its proximity to schools. So we have curb ramps, although we don't have any marked crosswalks, they legally are, would be considered unmarked crosswalks given the prevalence of sidewalk. The study that I did actually was taken, obviously, post pandemic. So school was not in session at the time. I wanted to capture school traffic, but I believe that Notre Dame Academy had recently just shut down and went back to all virtual. And I believe Franklin Middle School was the same. So both roadways are actually 36 feet in width. They contain one travel lane in each direction. Parking is regulated on both sides of Western. It's got a two hour zone, 7:00 AM to 4:00 PM school days, for obvious reasons. There are some No Parking Here to Corner zones that free up the vision triangle at the intersection, it keeps the intersection sight lines open. Both roads are posted at 25 miles an hour. We don't have any center line markings or paint markings, with the exception of west of the intersection actually. Right here, you can kind of see where this red car is, there's actually 540 feet of double yellow center line. We do have some school markings, just the word School on Maryhill. I did check the in-field for what we call stopping sight distance or SSD. The calculated, the required distance that we need to have preserved is 155 feet. That's based off the posted speed limit of 25. The in-field stopping sight distance that was observed is actually 365 feet. So just about 200 feet more than was even required. And actually I'll show you some photos here in moment, you can kind of see what I'm talking about on how wide open this area is. We don't have any Metro Transit stops nearby. We don't have any warning signs or anything like a Stop Ahead or anything like that either. So looking at figure 3a, you can see this is the eastbound movement of Western Avenue. It's kinda hard to see in the picture, but right about here is about where Maryhill T's in. This is looking the other way, westbound. So you can see right here is actually where Maryhill ties in. to the left and to the south. And this is what I was talking about relative to intersection sight distance. And so this is north on Maryhill, if you're sitting at the intersection, taking a look to your left or west. And actually if you look close, you can actually see a car coming over, It's kind of in the shade right there, but there is actually a car there. So you can see the sight lines are quite open. And the same thing looking to the east. The crash history is always something we look at when it comes down to multi-way stop warrants. We did not have any documented crash history. We always look back five years, I didn't find anything. Vehicle and pedestrian traffic. There was no pedestrian or bike counts as part of this traffic, simply because road tubes were used as part of the survey to collect the data plus the multi-way stop warrants do not address any sort of pedestrian or bike count values or marks or thresholds. But this table here, Table I, really goes over, you can see the numbers all summarized here in this table. Maybe I'll

zoom out just a little bit so you can see. So here you can kind of see where the peaks happen here, eastbound and westbound. And you can see some added up, the eastbound westbound numbers here. And then I put a rank here for the hours. Four o'clock, it was the highest, followed by the two o'clock hour, and three o'clock. So everything's really kind of tied around, into that school peak, and then really varies from between 11:00 AM and 7:00 PM. Those are when the highest peak hours took place. You can see here, total vehicles, just under 3000. And there are the entering vehicles. So this is really the summary, right from the MUTCD. The multi-way stop warrants that we went and looked at. So no signals are warranted or justified at the intersection. Already addressed crash history, there is none. Looking at the eight hour volumes, it actually didn't meet any of the thresholds, 'cause if you look at the top eight hours and none of the thresholds are actually met on either street. We look at 70% of the values as well, and those weren't met as well. And there's other things that we do look at that are on that sheet. We looked at left turn conflicts. We look at the vehicle ped conflicts, high ped volumes. Can't really say there's high ped volumes, 'cause there's a lot of, the majority of the pickup and drop off from the schools are actually done in vehicles. And majority of the students at Notre Dame, actually drive or get picked up, a lot of them drive. So we don't really see a lot of that activity. Locations, where you can't see conflicting traffic. I already explained intersection sight distance, so that's not an issue. And we have, asking if these roadways are similar in characteristic and nature and operating characteristics, and the answer's no, there's significantly more traffic in Western than there is Maryhill. There really wasn't anything that I could find that would lend to any sort of need to say, yes, we need create a multi-way stop at this location. In the discussion segment of this study, I wanted to point out there, some items relative to, sometimes the request for these multi-way stops are for speed control. And as many of you that have been on the Commission may have seen some of these reports in the past and know that staff's position, that we continue to maintain what the State and the Federal Highway Administration state, which is that the Stop signs are not to be used for speed control. That it's actually been proven that they don't work. And that's what this discussion portion of this study actually gets into. So you can see, they don't control speeds. As a matter of fact, some years ago, I actually did a before and after study. There was some debate, this is probably a little over 10 years ago, I'm dating myself here. Matt, you probably actually may recollect this, but the intersection of West Point and Wood Lane was actually one that the study was done and there was a political change at Council and they put the Stop sign in. And I actually did an after study, and the speeds on West Point, they actually went up, after the Stop sign went in. And it's clear to me that they just don't work. And anytime you add a Stop sign at a location it's not needed, all you're really doing is unnecessarily stopping people and motorists, which leads to rear end crashes. Anytime you introduce a Stop condition, you're always increasing that potential to have a rear end crash. And it's usually what you find, especially at the onset, because it's a new condition. People aren't used to stopping. So that's typically something that can happen. But you can read through the rest of these. But they basically, all this really did is this, this professional engineer from Georgia actually summarized from, I forget how many studies he had. There was like 80 plus studies, it was a lot of them, and really came up with these conclusions. The compliance rates are really poor. As I mentioned after speeds usually go up. Increased delay time. Operating costs actually, anyone that's environmentally sensitive, you know that that actually just increases fuel consumption, vehicle emissions, travel times. But it gives a, I guess, kind of a safety for peds, it gives them kind of unwarranted sense of safety, I guess you'd say, because when the people start rolling through the Stop sign, which ultimately happens, if they don't see people stopped on the side street, it actually decreases the safety for pedestrians as well. And the people that live right next to them don't really like them either because of all the increased noise from braking, from acceleration. Some people might be angry because there's a new stop there, and they squeal their tires. There's a lot of different reasons that we really need to be careful and put them in where they actually are needed in order to make them function quite well. And to me, I think that the warrant analysis really just proves that. So in conclusion, there is no warrants that were met. Multi-way stop warrant resulted in a recommendation to continue operating and maintaining the one way stop condition, Maryhill traffic stopping for Western Avenue traffic. So my recommendation is to, A, deny the request for the three way stop at Western and Maryhill, and B, to maintain the existing one way stop control of Maryhill traffic stopping for Western Avenue traffic. Any questions?

- Dave, this was shared with Alderman Wery?
- It's shared via the packet. This packet was published in the Agenda.
- Right, you didn't hear anything from him or any comments from him then?
- I did not.
- Okay. Any other comments from anybody else?
- No. Well, thank you for the writeup.
- You're welcome.
- [Dan] That was very complete.
- I'll make a motion to move forward with the recommendations.
- Second.
- Second.
- Okay, a motion's been made and seconded. All in favor?
- [All] Aye.

- Okay, motion carries. Okay, let's move on from six to 14. Terminations, Dave, I'll let you maybe handle them in a speedy way there.

- Sure, sure can. Number six is a standalone item. This is, we're moving the No Parking Zone on the north side Thomas street from a point 85 feet west of Velp Avenue to Velp Avenue. This was at the request of, as you recall, from Alderman Steuer, from the business owner that is next to this parking zone or was next to this parking zone. It came out as it's been working just fine with it being removed. Mark Steuer actually called me today, asking me about this item, just double checking. Sometimes they question the phrasing of it. And I said, this is exactly what you wanted, and it seems to be working fine. So he was in support of that. He wanted me to relay the message that he and I did speak and that he's in support of this termination of the 90 day trial for six. So I would make a recommendation on that, and also seven through 14, I guess you can really take these all en masse. These are all related to the parking zone changes. It looks like a lot, but it really was just that two block area between Webster Avenue and Quincy Street for, on Radisson Street for the parking zone removal. And I should say to add no parking there, due to the buffered bike lanes that were recently installed. And we've been getting some great positive feedback on those bike lanes. I don't really see them being removed or anything like that. I think it's a great connector between the Webster corridor and Bay Beach Park. So I will make a recommendation as well on seven through 14 to terminate the 90 day trial. So actually six through 14, I'm in support of, as they are stated in the agenda.

- I'll make a motion to terminate six through 14.

- Okay, thanks, Dave. A motion's been made, do I hear a second?

- I second it.

- Okay, a motion's been made and seconded. All in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Motion carries. Let's go back to item two under Informational, F. Next meeting will be Monday, scheduled meeting, Monday, November 16, 2020 at 5:30. I don't know, Dave, what's the word from City Hall about potentially having the meeting in person?

- Yeah, I think nothing has changed. I have not received anything from Human Resources relative to any changes in the current policy. So the discussion that we had at the last meeting about whether or not we can meet in person still stands. It sounds like some accommodations can be made with conditions on them. I'll just give you my two cents on it. I think that given the recent uptick in cases and deaths regarding COVID-19, regardless of whatever your position is on COVID-19, I think there's probably just an increased level of fear, I guess, in contracting the virus. So I would say we kind of just need to continue to meet virtually, even though I know I had my concerns that I expressed earlier, in item FI, about some of the glitches that are still in place, but I think if things change, I guess, between now and November 16th, we can always have that discussion to make the change to go in person. Who knows, maybe the City policy will change. But I haven't seen a change in the last month from what I presented the last time. So I'll just make a recommendation to the Commissioners that we continue to meet virtually unless we see a change either in the City Hall policy and or in how the pandemic is playing out.

- Okay, no, I think, concur with everything you just said there. It's kind of a day-by-day thing, and we'll see where we're at in November. And the hope is, I think, it's a better everybody if we could meet in person at some point, but I don't think we're there yet. So I would concur let's plan on the Zoom meeting for next month. The only other comment I'd make at this point, we usually don't have a meeting in December, so we should probably try to get anything that you think is gonna be coming down the pipeline done in November, Dave, so that hopefully we can be off in December like we normally are. That would be the only comment there. If you see anything coming into you, let's try to deal with it in November, virtually, through our Zoom meeting. But anybody else have any comments about meetings, virtual or in person, that they want to share right now? Nope?

- I'm good.

- Okay. We're all good then? Want to give everybody a chance, 'cause I don't want to miss anybody, 'cause it's, I guess a little different dynamic. I don't want to miss anybody's comments if they have something. So if not? Okay, I don't think there is, Dave, so I will entertain a motion to adjourn our meeting for tonight. Do I hear a motion to adjourn?

- Motion to adjourn.

- A second?

- Second.

- Okay, a motion has been made and seconded to adjourn. All in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Good, we're all adjourned. I would say, everybody please be safe. As we just talked about, it's a challenging time for all of us. I think everybody's COVID fatigued, but, my little two cents worth, stay strong, keep the mask on, do your distancing, and hopefully the vaccine is coming to help us out at some point here. So with that, I will end the meeting, unless anybody else has anything else they want to add?

- Nope, thank you.

- Nope? Okay.

- Good night, thanks, Dave.

- Be safe, everybody.