

**Notes from 2 June 2016 Steering Committee Meeting
on the 1000 block E. Washington Proposal
from Summit Credit Union and Stone House Development**

Attendees:

- Patrick Heck, TLNA Development Chair
- City Traffic Engineering
 - Gretchen Aviles Pineiro
- Summit Credit Union
 - Jeremy Eppler
- Katie MacDonald, Ayers Associates
- Stone House Development
 - Helen Bradbury
- Neighbors and Interested Parties
 - Patty Prime (TLNA President) Richard Linster (TLNA Councilmember)
Chris Oddo, Jeff Reinke, Pat Kelly, Karla Handel

Timeline Updates:

After introductions Jeremy Eppler from Summit verified that there were no changes to their proposal timeline (see presentation slides from 4/7/2016 neighborhood meeting). They still expect to work through the City process by the end of December 2016.

Design Updates:

Jeremy said that now that they've worked through some of their concerns about getting an ordinance change to allow their desired height, the second order of business is traffic. They have started talking to city staff about some design issues, including signage and the TIF parameters they will need to work with, which could have design impact. Chris Oddo asked when they expected to officially file their proposal with the City. Jeremy said that Summit wants to get through the traffic issue before they spend too much on design issues and that they aren't sure when the filing will occur – it could be in several months, depending on how things go. Chris said he was eager to understand their design process and scale, their materials, how they articulate the facades, what the human scale will be, etc.

Zoning Change:

Patrick Heck gave a summary of the current state of the ordinance change to Urban Design District-8 that will be required for Summit to build their proposed tower on E. Washington. They have requested a change that will allow Summit to use commercial floor heights with the same number of allowable floors, which adds height to the building. At the last Steering Committee meeting, a committee majority recommended to TLNA Council that they support an ordinance change that would allow Urban Design Commission to determine whether or not increased height on parcels zoned for commercial use was allowable in UDD-8 based on minimal additional shadowing impacts on nearby properties. TLNA Council approved this tactic at their monthly meeting two days after the last Steering Committee meeting. Alder Zellers and Heather

Stouder from City Planning started pursuing this change. When consulted, Alder Rummel expressed concern about the impact of UDC alone having this decision-making power (most of the UDD-8 parcels to which the change would apply, those already zoned for commercial buildings, are in Alder Rummel's district). Ledell was not willing to sponsor the change without Marsha's buy-in, so Ledell has settled on a site-specific change that would allow Summit's desired height. That language is TBD, but it will not be pursued until Summit's full proposal is submitted to the City. The approval of that ordinance change would likely flow through the process along with the rest of their required proposal approvals.

Patty Prime asked how Summit felt about the ordinance change issue since they have said all along that they needed to know that their height was allowable before they could proceed with building design and also before addressing some other issues. Jeremy said that they still hoped it could be approved earlier; they plan to talk to Heather Stouder to see if there is a possibility that the ordinance change can be pursued sooner. Pat Kelly asked if the change would need to pass Common Council too. Patrick Heck said yes, both Plan Commission and Common Council would need to pass the UDD-8 change. Pat asked how many feet of additional building height we are talking about. Patrick answered 21'. Helen Bradbury said that proposed Summit's tower would be 144'. Patrick added that the current cap for a 10-story building using residential floor heights is 123' and they are requesting 144' due to using commercial floor heights.

Traffic Impact Study:

Jeremy described the traffic impact study process – Ayers Associates did an initial traffic study, showing the traffic impact of the development if no changes at all were made to the lights, turn lanes, etc, yet the approved Stone House development and the proposed Summit/Stone House development were both built. Ayers identified several issues in those results. Since that initial study, there have been a lot of conversations between Summit, Ayers, and City Traffic Engineering. On May 25, Summit met with City Traffic Engineering and got their feedback on the study results and discussed some potential changes. Ayers is now making a new model with some of the suggested changes already incorporated, but the City hasn't seen any of the new model results.

Katie MacDonald of Ayers Associates presented their model results in the form of color animations of traffic seen a monitor. The animations were centered on the N. Ingersoll and E. Washington intersection, but included about two blocks of N. Ingersoll, Curtis Court, and over to Breese Stevens Field. She showed results from before any model changes suggested by the City were in the model and then results after some suggested changes were added.

Katie also discussed their data gathering and some model assumptions. They did their data collection at the beginning of the process, i.e., when Stone House first proposed building on this block in 2014. After they gathered traffic data, they determined that rush hours in this area were 7:15 to 8:15am and 4:15 to 5:15pm. They determined this by finding the peak a.m. and p.m. times and then going one half-hour either side of those.

Katie showed the traffic animation with no changes to the lights, etc., during the morning and afternoon rush hours, and then with some of the changes from the discussion with City Traffic Engineering. Both versions showed the traffic as if the already approved Stone House development and the Summit/Stone House development were built and operating. They use the results of other studies and formulas that tell them how much traffic is anticipated based on residential and commercial square footage of the new developments, parking garages, etc. Those traffic numbers and patterns are added to the existing traffic state.

Currently, there is no left turn arrow off E. Washington to N. Ingersoll, so the no-change version in the a.m. showed traffic backing up that was trying to turn left onto N. Ingersoll. Most of that traffic was drivers trying to access the Summit garage. The City said that a left-turn signal was permissible there, so the change version was shown and the backup issue was resolved. Note that there is also a non-signalized left-turn lane on E. Washington to access N. Brearly, so most eastbound E. Washington drivers wanting to go into the Stone House garage will turn there, not at N. Ingersoll.

Katie noted that the City would also allow the left turn lane from E. Washington to N. Ingersoll to have a flashing yellow arrow when the green arrow was off and E. Washington thru traffic had a green light. This would help some traffic turn without having to wait for the green arrow.

At p.m. rush hour, the biggest problem seemed to be traffic going south on N. Ingersoll and either crossing or turning at E. Washington. Currently, there is only one lane on N. Ingersoll, although there is often enough room for cars to drive by a left-turning car. Ayers and Summit believe that they will need a dedicated left-turn lane and a separate right-turn/thru lane for this intersection so that traffic leaving N. Ingersoll can flow better. The animation with no changes showed a backup that would prevent cars from getting through the intersection in one light cycle whereas the version with these lane changes showed no backup. Note that the N. Ingersoll traffic in the model included traffic coming from the Summit garage as well as any other currently existing traffic.

Jeff Reinke, who lives on Curtis Court, asked if they would need to widen Ingersoll to accommodate the two southbound lanes on N. Ingersoll as drivers approach E. Washington – yes. Jeremy added that the additional land that would be required to widen N. Ingersoll would come from Summit's property, not other neighboring properties. It was asked how many seconds the left-turn arrow onto E. Washington would be on. Katie and Gretchen Aviles Pineiro from City Traffic Engineering said that it was TBD. All the light timing issues still had to be worked out once actual changes were proposed. Any change to E. Washington light timing has a domino effect down that very busy street.

Jeff asked if the street parking along that first block of N. Ingersoll will be removed. Helen Bradbury from Stone House Development said that yes, she believes it will be removed and that Ayers recommended its removal when doing the traffic study for the approved Stone House development. It was asked if it was mostly commuters who parked in those spots on N. Ingersoll. Helen thinks so and some others agreed. She also asked the

Lapham School principal if teachers parked there and the principal didn't think so – there is plenty of parking in the school lot. Richard Linster asked how many street parking spots would be lost. It was estimated to be about ten. There is no parking on the west side of N. Ingersoll. Helen noted that Studio Red on N. Ingersoll might be allowed to use spots in the Summit ramp since their events are typically in the evening. Jeff added that some homes on N. Ingersoll don't have driveways so they might lose convenient street parking. There are 5 homes on N. Ingersoll between E. Washington and E. Mifflin. Chris Oddo asked if N. Ingersoll could be a one-way towards E. Washington. Jeremy added that some earlier committee discussion included other ideas, e.g., dead-ending N. Ingersoll at E. Mifflin or requiring traffic that is exiting the Summit garage onto N. Ingersoll be limited to right-turns only. The City said that right-turn only was allowable, but dead-ending the street was not feasible. Summit, Ayers and the City have not talked about a one-way option. Chris added that one-way southbound might allow the current street parking spots to remain. It was then pointed out that those trying to get into the Summit garage from eastbound E. Washington wouldn't be able to get to the garage if N. Ingersoll was one-way southbound, so that idea was abandoned.

Pat Kelly said her main concerns are the traffic impact on the bike boulevard and on the school. She wants to know how that will be handled. Katie said that the increase in traffic in the neighborhood is relatively limited. Ayers believes most cars will not go through the neighborhood. Chris Oddo asked if they have any numbers on the percentage increases in the neighborhood. Katie answered that traffic that might be using N. Ingersoll straight thru might double from about 30 to 60 cars at peak time. Pat Kelly said that this was quite an increase for a street with a school and that crosses a bike boulevard. It was asked what the scenario would be if traffic leaving the Summit garage was limited to right-turn only, i.e., towards E. Washington. Katie reminded everyone that the right-turn only out of the garage was not yet in their model, so she wasn't sure, but it was likely to make any p.m. increase much smaller.

Chris asked if the increase from 30 to 60 cars was a ballpark number. Katie stressed that all their model numbers are approximate. Chris said that both magnitude and percentage increases are important. Jeremy said that the model mostly focused on problems that might occur at E. Washington and N. Ingersoll, so some of the impacts on the neighborhood are not necessarily in the model.

Pat Kelly asked if the increase on N. Ingersoll was because most Summit employees start work at the same time. Jeremy said no and reported numbers on when employees typically start their day: 96% start between 6:45-9:15am with

- 27% arriving before 7:45am
- 52% between 7:45 and 8:15am
- 21% after 8:15am

Katie said that their model assumed 52% of the workers would arrive during the one-hour a.m. rush hour and 60% would leave during the p.m. rush hour.

Karla Handel said that with start of the school day traffic and many walking and biking commuters, she thinks the intersection of N. Ingersoll and E. Mifflin is already a problem intersection. Katie said that while the approximate increase on N. Ingersoll is a doubling of cars, traffic increases on other streets may not be that large. Jeremy added that he didn't bring along the numbers indicating where employees live, hence what streets they might be driving on, but his recollection is that more than 60-70% would be using E. Washington. They will have more solid numbers at a next meeting and as the traffic study matures.

Pat Kelly said that the street at E. Mifflin and N. Ingersoll has a tilt downward, so it is hard to see cross traffic. She asked if the City would consider making that a 4-way stop. She thinks it would slow thru traffic. Gretchen Aviles answered that they would need to do studies to determine the feasibility of that; they can't just put it there and then see what happens. Patty said that apparently this intersection has been a question even without the proposed development, so it would be good to check it out. Pat Kelly added that this intersection might be hard to study because it is unique with the school and the bike boulevard. Gretchen said that it is possible that with increase of trips due to the development, it could work, but a study would have to be done. Patrick Heck asked if the City would do their own modeling or rely on Ayers models/numbers. Gretchen said the City would do their own study.

Katie said that she sees no reason for drivers to take the bike boulevard. Chris Oddo noted that most Lapham kids are dropped off on the E. Dayton side of the school. They are not allowed to use the rounded driveway on N. Ingersoll. School drop-off patterns need to be looked at.

Patrick asked what time school starts and ends - 7:35am and about 2:35pm. Chris asked how many total cars use E. Washington each weekday – Katie said they did not study the entire day – they only have studied the peak rush hour times.

Jeff Reinke added that with the new developments already constructed, there has been an increase in morning traffic at N. Ingersoll. With more going up and with this proposal being considered, more traffic will be using N. Ingersoll. Katie said that most of these developments have been factored into the model. Patty added that drivers do choose Ingersoll, Paterson, and Baldwin because they have no stoplights or stop signs between E. Washington and E. Johnson – they currently are thru streets.

The group then viewed the afternoon rush hour animation, both before and after possible changes. This verified the backup on N. Ingersoll for drivers trying to turn left onto E. Washington to go east. If they changed the signal timing and added two lanes (as previously described), the backup goes away. Katie added that the side street traffic is very “peaky” in the model results. They think it will be steadier flow, particularly since the school gets out at 2:35pm, outside peak hour. Jeremy said that if they don't change the light timing and lanes on N. Ingersoll, then at times Curtis Court drivers might not be able to get in or out to access N. Ingersoll. They need to ask the City what they can do to make sure this doesn't happen, e.g., can they change signal timing.

Pat Kelly asked if they had measured and modeled pedestrian traffic. Katie answered that they did include the usage of the pedestrian signals at E. Washington, but when those were activated it didn't make much of a difference.

Jeff Reinke suggested that for future planning and studies, they should include the impact of the McGrath building at N. Few and E. Washington. It is opening soon and will have 76 units with 76 parking stalls - some of those cars will want to go east, so will go to Baldwin St. on E. Mifflin and some will be on Curtis Court to end up on N. Ingersoll.

Pat Kelly said that the Lapham swimming pool users could overlap with afternoon rush hour or the end of the workday for Summit garage users. Many families bring children there to swim and people with disabilities use it a lot. Katie said that if they do overlap with the hours they counted traffic, those cars would already be included in the model. They were there until 8pm when they did their counting. Patty mentioned that Madison Metro could oppose the 4-way stop idea. Many busses leaving the bus barn use N. Ingersoll to get to Johnson/Ingersoll and their routes further east or west. She suggested that they probably wouldn't support a 4-way stop.

Next Steps:

In discussing when that committee might meet again, Patty asked Gretchen how it usually takes to evaluate the feasibility of having a 4-way stop. Gretchen said might take 3 weeks just to start the process and the process could be months, depending on other needs in the department. All agreed that the school would likely like the 4-way stop.

It was verified that City Traffic Engineering can get some light timings changed, but the domino effect down E. Washington means studying it can take a while. Karla Handel noted that even now it can be impossible to make a left run off E. Washington to get to her neighborhood and the people often run red lights at signaled intersections to do so at peak times.

Jeremy said that Summit wants to pin down the traffic as best they can and hopefully have some more building ideas before the next committee meeting. They haven't worked on landscaping yet and they have to do design work, which ties into the height issue.

Patty Prime suggested that we tentatively have a meeting in mid- to late July when we can get an update on the height ordinance issue, discuss traffic study updates, and talk about design issues. All agreed. Jeremy is unavailable July 25-29. Patrick is unavailable approximately July 21-27. Patrick said he would talk to Ledell about her open dates.

Pat Kelly added that she saw so many positives about the proposal and would hate for us to lose it over 21' additional feet. She hopes Summit can rethink their design.

Patrick went over an abbreviated list of Issues/Concerns that encompasses most input received:

- Shadowing of Ingersoll
- No street activation on Ingersoll
- Not forward thinking re: parking
- + Like credit unions and Summit
- + Employment opportunities
- Thru traffic on Ingersoll and near Lapham
- Lack of Green Space
- Abrupt height drop-off to residential neighborhood

The last point was suggested as an addition by Chris Oddo and included similar concerns expressed about the N. Ingersoll side of the development.

Attendees and the developers were thanked for their attendance and good input.