

S. Syene Advisory Group Meeting #5 Notes

Scheduled for Thursdays in May and June from 12:00 – 1:30

- Overview of Previous Meeting
 - Speed data on S. Syene
 - Speed Management Countermeasures
 - Cross-sectional elements
 - Concept Cost Estimate
- Agenda:
 - Showed Fitchburg website for the project
 - Review of recently requested information
 - Speed data
 - Research on traffic calming features efficacy
 - Quick reference to state statute related to bicycle riding
 - Draft Typical Section feedback
 - Round Robin
- Speed Data on S. Syene
 - Before speed data collected in April 2019 (April 9)
 - Pneumatic tubes are used to collect the data. Only one day was used as the others showed anomalies
- Speed management countermeasures
 - Optical speed bars (+4 to –5 mph), speed limit pavement marking (+1 to –3 mph), bulb-out (-1 to –4 mph), driver feedback sign (-1 to –7 mph), center island (-1 to –8 mph), entrance treatments (entrance treatments have UK results)
 - Curb and gutter – still no research found to confirm reduction in speed
 - Roundabouts (-8 to –20 mph: max recommended speed is 20-25 mph)
 - Raised intersections – minimal to similar to speed humps
- State Bicycle Laws (Statute)
 - Link to WisDOT reference is in the slides
 - Lots of statute references (riding abreast, etc.) on the webpage
 - Riding abreast laws are seemingly left to interpretation
 - Q, Pat: There is nothing in there saying the bikers need to ride single file?
 - You cannot ride more than 2 abreast, but there is nothing specifically with the size of the path, based on judgement
- Draft Typical Sections
 - Cross section B: did have a raised median, but after using the cost spreadsheet Andrew has determined that we need to cut where we can (a financial shortcoming)
 - Suggestion: That curb and gutter starts a little further South because of the potential of development of Perkins Oil Lot (near pond)

- Cross section A includes ditches or curb&gutter depending upon the location
- Lacy Road and Syene Intersection
 - Pat wants it to be considered that there is an eastbound to southbound right turn lane from Lacy to Syene
- East Cheryl is going to also have some subtle changes
- East side has sidewalks on the majority of the corridor. The City is proposing filling gaps to complete the network. Andrew will follow-up with impacted property owners to discuss concerns.
- Cross section C
 - We aren't sure what the cost of parking will be yet, but can use the spreadsheet tool to get a close estimate
 - Pat is more favorable of doing something with Central Park Place so that Cross Section C can be extended
 - We would have to keep the alignment so this isn't really something that could be included with this project scope
 - People have to wait for their kids to get dropped off by the school bus so they end up parking at Central Park Place
 - Steve comments on lack of median
 - Motor bikes wont pass the centerline
 - The median enforces this (adds some deterrence but not much)
 - Could have access control
 - If we add another round about, we're adding some traffic / speed countermeasures
 - Sidewalk question: Do property owners have veto power when it comes to sidewalks
 - Staff's current interpretation of resolution R-185-16 and further refined language in R-69-17 is that these resolutions only apply in existing neighborhoods identified in the 2017 Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (pdf pg 64). The area in question along the corridor of S. Syene is not included in this neighborhood subset and therefore this resolution does not apply.
 - City staff still plans to work with the property owners to understand issues and come to an agreement.
 - No cost to date yet
 - Steve thought that instead of assessing, we should buy the strip of land that would take the sidewalk on and it would benefit the greater good
 - Water buildup – unhappy with where the existing curb and gutter ends and how localized ponding is created
 - Patrick – there is not outlet in the pond, maybe we should have an overflow option
 - Retention pond possibility
- Comments / concerns on this subsection

- Putting roundabouts in some medians spots
 - Still trying to cut costs
 - We will come back to the options for McCoy intersection
 - It is viable to get grant funding for this
 - Current options are a traffic signal or possible roundabout, most likely to be a traffic signal with a few different configurations
 - We will get back to it at a subsequent meeting
 - The west side path alignment is assumed to be stationary.
 - Steve noted that horizontal curvature that might be increased by deviating the center line, calms traffic, a nice added bonus
- Traffic counts
 - Steve - Assumptions that traffic would stay the same is a false assertion. It might be net no change from previous
 - Urban intersection, influences more to use Lacy or MM (less attractive for through traffic)
 - Anything that we can do to slow things down at that intersection is welcome
 - Must fix issue for seeing when a bike is coming
 - McCoy could be its own separate project, we shouldn't ignore it
 - Pat doesn't see how changes to the Syene & McCoy intersection would decrease speed on the corridor
- Next Steps / Follow up
 - Staff will follow-up on questions received from residents
 - Next meeting July 15
 - We should have roughly 4-5 meetings left
 - Andrew is going to go ahead and send out the Zoom invitations
 - Pat – since there is space at the end of Ninebark, if there's a possibility that we can, we should maybe move it out since there's so much space on the South end (straight through still lines up)
 - Steve – Typical sections that Andrew diagrammed, Bike Fitchburg would be very satisfied