



City of Madison

City of Madison
Madison, WI 53703
www.cityofmadison.com

Master

File Number: 04272

File ID: 04272

File Type: Ordinance

Status: Passed

Version: 4

Reference:

Controlling Body: PUBLIC SAFETY
REVIEW BOARD

File Created Date : 04/17/2007

File Name: neighborhood electric vehicles

Final Action: 04/08/2008

Title: THIRD SUBSTITUTE - Creating Section 12.792 entitled "Neighborhood Electric Vehicles Allowed" to permit and regulate the operation of such vehicles on Madison streets and amending Section 1.08(3)(a) of the Madison General Ordinances to establish a bail deposit amount for violations of the section.

Notes: 3990elecveh/SCB
INTRO FROM FLOOR
MAYOR APPROVAL DATE: 4/11/08

This wasn't on the PBMVC's Aug. agenda since the Traffic Eng. staff working on in it were on vacation and there wasn't any written report to give to the Commission.

On hold per

Sponsors: Mark Clear, Brian L. Solomon, Julia S. Kerr, Paul E. Skidmore, Judy Compton, Eli Judge, Larry Palm, Satya V. Rhodes Conway and Michael Schumacher

Enactment Date: 04/26/2008

Attachments: 04272-Original.pdf ,04272- Substitute.pdf
,04272-2ndSubstitute.pdf ,NEV staff
memo_ID04272.pdf ,04272 Registration Stmt2.pdf

Enactment Number: ORD-08-00045

Author: Steven Brist

Hearing Date:

Entered by: Diane Althaus

Published Date: 04/26/2008

History of Legislative File

Ver- sion:	Acting Body:	Date:	Action:	Sent To:	Due Date:	Return Date:	Result:
1	Attorney's Office/Approval Group	08/01/2006	Approved As To Form				
1	Attorney's Office	08/01/2006	Fiscal Note Required / Approval	Comptroller's Office/Approval Group		04/30/2007	
1	PUBLIC SAFETY REVIEW BOARD	08/01/2006	Refer	PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION		03/21/2007	
1	COMMON COUNCIL	08/01/2006	Refer	PUBLIC SAFETY REVIEW BOARD		06/12/2007	

	Notes:	<i>Additional Referral(s): Pedestrian-Motor-Vehicle Commission, Municipal Judge</i>				
1	Comptroller's Office/Approval Group	08/02/2006	Fiscal Note Pending	Attorney's Office	08/02/2006	
	Notes:	<i>Bohrod</i>				
1	Attorney's Office	08/02/2006	Referred for Introduction			
	Notes:	<i>Public Safety Review Board; Pedestrian/Bicycle/Motor Vehicle Commission/Municipal Judge (for review of bail deposit amounts)</i>				
1	PUBLIC SAFETY REVIEW BOARD	08/03/2006	Fiscal Note Required / Approval	Comptroller's Office/Approval Group	04/30/2007	
	Notes:	<i>fiscal note should be approved on substitute & returned to PSRB</i>				
1	PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION	09/26/2006	Refer	PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION	03/21/2007	Pass
	Action Text:	A motion was made by Conroy, seconded by Webber, to Refer to the PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION Arthur Ross stated that staff's recommendation is to refer to a future meeting. The resolution is not fully developed yet. The motion passed by acclamation.				
2	Attorney's Office/Approval Group	02/26/2007	Approved As To Form			
	Notes:	<i>Substitute.</i>				
2	PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION	03/21/2007	Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s)	PUBLIC SAFETY REVIEW BOARD	06/12/2007	Pass
	Action Text:	A motion was made by Skidmore, seconded by De Vos, to Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s) to the PUBLIC SAFETY REVIEW BOARD The PBMVC recommended approval of the Substitute Ordinance with the comments and recommendations contained in the 3/21/07 memo from Arthur Ross, Pedestrian-Bicycle Coordinator. (The memo is attached to the legislative file.)				

PBMVC members emphasized the need for additional Traffic Engineering staff resources to implement and maintain the Neighborhood Electric Vehicle program and wanted to ensure that the licensing fee covers the cost of the program. Since these costs have not yet been determined, it was suggested that the Substitute be referred to the Board of Estimates once the fiscal note has been added.

DISCUSSION

Ross provided written comments and suggested changes.

- The fiscal note is not done yet. Traffic Engineering is trying to get an idea of the amount of additional staff time required to implement and maintain the program. A budget amendment will be necessary to fund the increased staff time. If the Common Council does not support a budget amendment, it means Traffic Engineering staff will have less time for the bike registration program.
- While there is no timeline for the ordinance, the UW would like to see the ordinance go through soon; it has purchased some NEVs and will be purchasing more.
- The ordinance does not take effect until 180 days after the Common Council passes it. Thus, the earliest it could be implemented would be October 2007.
- PBMVC expressed concern that the NEV registration fee covers the cost of the program. Ross did not have an estimate of the potential number of users. He did not envision there would be a lot of users.
- A NEV must meet federal safety standards.
- Ross indicated the term "immediately" in Section (7)(d) is modeled on bike registration language and has a liberal interpretation.
- Re: section (7)(h), Ross stated Traffic Engineering staff will not do inspections; a determination of mechanical condition will be based on the submitted paperwork. The motion passed by acclamation.

2 Comptroller's Office/Approval Group 04/30/2007 Approved Fiscal Note By The Comptroller's Office (SUBSTITUTES) PUBLIC SAFETY REVIEW BOARD 04/30/2007

Notes: Bohrod

2 PUBLIC SAFETY REVIEW BOARD 06/12/2007 RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL WITH THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS - REPORT OF OFFICER OFFICER Pass

Action Text: A motion was made by Judge, seconded by Skidmore, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL WITH THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS - REPORT OF OFFICER Captain McLay of the Police Department explained that these vehicles are basically golf carts which have been beefed up with seat belts, lights etc. to meet minimal requirements for street use. After driving one on Johnson Street, he found/felt them to leave one very vulnerable since they are highly fragile. State Statute regulations on authorization of their use is vague. Their top speed is about 22-23 mph, and were designed for use within residential neighborhoods. Police have worked out a compromise to allow on roads up to 30 mph with NEV routes designated (where the speed limit exceeds this but a needed arterial road to get from one area to another). The price range of these is from about \$10,000 to the cost for a small economy car (depending on how "deluxe" the electric vehicle is). Police do not anticipate a great number of these but those who have them (UW) or want to buy one, want to be able to legally use them on Madison streets. Ecologically they are great but feel they would be used in lieu of a bike or moped and not in lieu of a car. Police support is ambivalent due to safety concerns. Smith asked if we should do it (legalize) just because we can when the safety issues and probable angry car drivers who get stuck behind one, are so great. A motion was made and seconded to approve to allow for discussion. Adding a sunset clause was suggested but not decided on. Scott made a friendly amendment to the original movement that these vehicles be kept on streets of 25 mph period, and this was accepted as part of the PSRB recommendation. The ordinance had earlier been reviewed and approved by the PBMVC. The motion passed by the following vote:

Notes: Allow these vehicles on 25mph streets only.
 Absent: 1 Adam G. Lichtenheld
 Excused: 1 Larry Pasha
 Ayes: 4 Paul E. Skidmore; Eli Judge; Michael S. Scott and Terry E. Moen
 Noes: 2 Tyrone W. Bell and Amy R. Smith

2 PUBLIC SAFETY REVIEW BOARD 06/19/2007 Refer PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION 03/25/2008

2 COMMON COUNCIL 06/19/2007 Rerefer PUBLIC SAFETY REVIEW BOARD 07/10/2007

Notes: Additional Referral(s): Pedestrian/Bicycle/Motor Vehicle Commission 1 Registrant(s) in support wishing to speak.

3 Attorney's Office/Approval Group 07/03/2007 Approved As To Form

3 Attorney's Office 07/03/2007 Fiscal Note Required / Approval Comptroller's Office/Approval Group 07/03/2007 07/03/2007

Notes: 2nd Substitute.

3 Comptroller's Office/Approval Group 07/03/2007 Approved Fiscal Note By The Comptroller's Office (SUBSTITUTES) PUBLIC SAFETY REVIEW BOARD 07/03/2007

Notes: Simon

2 PUBLIC SAFETY REVIEW 07/10/2007 Rerefer PUBLIC SAFETY 08/14/2007 03/11/2008 Pass
BOARD REVIEW BOARD

Action Text: Mark Clear, alder from the 19th district spoke suggesting referral until staff suggestions can be worked out. Spoke of Arthur Ross who was not available for this meeting. Said the street list was a problem and that there were parts of the city you could not get to without 35 MPH NEV routes. Amy Smith raised her concerns about user conflicts, with different capacities for speed. Moped analogy not a good one as they are faster, easier to get around, more maneuverable. While police staff agrees with Amy, traffic engineering does not, so what if it slows traffic down. Eli raised the issue of seat belts making them safer. Mike Scott said mopeds are not a good idea either. Said the city need to redesign to accommodate slow moving vehicles. Amy & Paul both addressed the issue of silence for electric vehicles, no warning properties. Suggestion to look at municipalities that allow these vehicles and see what the problems are (see listing in public comment section). Mike suggested that the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, NHTSA, should have a report on this. Alder Judy Compton how far a vehicle would go on one charge? Will it die in traffic? Tim Johnson said they go 30 miles all the time, 40 mile on a good day. They have an indicator like a gas gage that tells you the state of charge, a red light goes on when you only have 1 more mile left. Said Wall Mart allows people to recharge vehicles. Paul moved referral and Eli seconded. Paul wanted to know if UW would have placed to plug in so you can get home. Amy addressed the carbon footprint. While you reduce emissions at site of operation, what is the relationship to the total carbon footprint? Motion to refer was passed unanimously.

3 PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/ 07/24/2007 Refer PEDESTRIAN/BIC 03/25/2008 Pass
MOTOR VEHICLE YCLE/MOTOR
COMMISSION VEHICLE
COMMISSION

Action Text: Sponsor of the proposal, Alder Mark Clear (19th AD), spoke before the group. He had asked this item be referred back when it came up at the Council because a number of good changes suggested by PBMVC and PSRB had not been included in the draft of the ordinance.

He thought that proposed ordinance was unnecessarily complex, and he distributed information from Green Bay, LaCrosse and Sun Prairie regarding their ordinances and sample registration form used in LaCrosse. Clear said that these items provided examples of ordinances that were simple, mirrored state law, and treated electric vehicles much like bicycles. He said that there was movement at state level to have State DOT handle registration of these vehicles but that this didn't need to stop Madison from proceeding with its ordinance, which could be sunseted if the state took over the process. He hoped enactment and implementation would be a simple and timely process. His next step would be to redraft the proposal and send it back to the Commission for another look.

Arthur Ross of Traffic Engineering said that staff wanted to recommend referral of the item. In light of certain changes that had been made to the draft, involved alders and staff needed to meet to work out some issues and develop a proposal that folks agreed on (re: registration and streets of operation), which could then be brought back to PBMVC and PSRB.

Compton/Skidmore moved to refer the item.

Compton was happy that the proposal would mirror state law and wanted electric vehicles to be treated more like cars than like bicycles or golf carts. She had safety concerns about the vehicles if they were to stop suddenly in traffic. She also wanted them to be licensed to operate.

Shahan supported referral and wondered what happened to the changes that PBMVC had recommended to the draft. He hoped that the state would take over registration (so that each municipality would not have to set up their own agencies for this).

3 PUBLIC SAFETY REVIEW 08/14/2007 Refer PUBLIC SAFETY 03/11/2008 Pass
BOARD REVIEW BOARD

Action Text: Item referred to future meeting. Alders Clear, Judge and Skidmore want time to work out revisions.

3 PUBLIC SAFETY REVIEW 09/17/2007 Rerefer PUBLIC SAFETY 03/11/2008 Pass
BOARD REVIEW BOARD

Action Text: Staff wondered how big the map was mentioned in the proposed ordinance. A/C Davenport said police will probably ask to have that provision deleted. Arthur Ross of Traffic Engineering shared information that State Statute allows the use on streets up to 35mph even though the vehicles only reach a 25mph level. The problem is that if ordinance limits speed to 25mph, users wouldn't be able to reach these streets so there would not be full city access to streets. Are looking to give maps when persons register, however if register with State and not just City, this would become more complicated. Staff asked if 3-prong outlets would be available throughout the city so vehicles could plug in and recharge. This is the individual property owner's decision but more are doing it. These vehicles are basically for short distances. The concern of some members is the incompatibility of mixing motorized vehicles with electric vehicles. Additionally, these vehicles do not make noise like scooters so that is an additional safety problem. Could a UW staff person (where these are and/or would have a more concentrated use) come to a future meeting to address some of these concerns/questions?

3	PUBLIC SAFETY REVIEW BOARD	10/11/2007	Rerefer	PUBLIC SAFETY REVIEW BOARD	03/11/2008	Pass
---	----------------------------	------------	---------	----------------------------	------------	------

Action Text: Alder Clear has not had time to do the amendment yet so will address this at November meeting.

3	PUBLIC SAFETY REVIEW BOARD	11/19/2007	Refer	PUBLIC SAFETY REVIEW BOARD	12/11/2007	03/11/2008	Pass
---	----------------------------	------------	-------	----------------------------	------------	------------	------

Action Text: A motion was made by Judge, seconded by Lichtenheld, to Refer to the PUBLIC SAFETY REVIEW BOARD, due back on 12/11/2007. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

Notes:

3	PUBLIC SAFETY REVIEW BOARD	01/08/2008	Rerefer	PUBLIC SAFETY REVIEW BOARD	02/12/2008	03/11/2008	Pass
---	----------------------------	------------	---------	----------------------------	------------	------------	------

Action Text: A motion was made by Judge, seconded by Skidmore, to Rerefer to the PUBLIC SAFETY REVIEW BOARD, due back on 2/12/2008. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

Notes:

4	PUBLIC SAFETY REVIEW BOARD	02/12/2008					
---	----------------------------	------------	--	--	--	--	--

4	PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION	02/27/2008					
---	---------------------------------------------	------------	--	--	--	--	--

Notes:

4	PUBLIC SAFETY REVIEW BOARD	03/11/2008	RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL WITH THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATION S - REPORT OF OFFICER				Fail
---	----------------------------	------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	------

Action Text: A motion was made by Scott, seconded by Judge, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL WITH THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed the following vote: 5 ayes, 1 no, 1 excused.

Skidmore asked if Police felt these vehicles were unsafe - the culture of driving now is that he often has to dodge traffic when driving the maximum legal speed. Asst. Chief Davenport replied that they were concerned about the speed and the significant public information is needed. Some users will self-select which streets to use but others will use all available because the ordinance says they can. Who and how will the education be done? What about an option to have headlights on at all times of operation (like motorcycles)? Police do have safety concerns - the community needs to be educated before these vehicles go out on the city streets. Bell commented that the Board is charged with "public safety" - will there be chaos on the streets if these vehicle hit the streets? Davenport replied that he couldn't give that assurance for any vehicle used on city streets - it is dependent on operators: skills, patience, how interact and sensibility. Scott said he had been looking for a green light from poilce before voting for the measure but would now vote for it unless they gave a red light. Smith felt that the burden of safety was still the issue and their charge is public safety. Didn't feel there was significant information to show these are safe. Police could give no official support one way or the other nor a recommendation as to their safety. Chief Wray stated that if asked for an official position, they would take another look at this internally. Scott proposed having it built in to the ordinance that headlights be on at all times of operation. Arthur Ross explained that since these are now to be regulated by the State (and they don't have that regulation) instead of the City, it could be difficult for users to know this if coming from an adjoining community. He stated that the city ordinance was crafted as close to the state statute as possible. Skidmore added that they are something we would have to integrate and accept the problems with just as we have with other vehicles. Scott said that Milwaukee required the use of headlights on these vehicles at all times of operation and asked to have the city ordinance amended to include that requirement. With this proposed amendment as part of the ordinance, a vote was then taken.

Notes:

Excused: 1 Larry Pasha
Ayes: 3 Eli Judge; Michael S. Scott and Terry E. Moen
Noes: 3 Paul E. Skidmore; Tyrone W. Bell and Amy R. Smith

4	PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/ MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION	03/25/2008	Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval	PUBLIC SAFETY REVIEW BOARD	03/11/2008	Pass
---	----------------------------------------------------	------------	--------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------	------------	------

Action Text: A motion was made by Compton, seconded by Strawser III, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the PUBLIC SAFETY REVIEW BOARD.

Ross provided some background information. State statutes permit municipalities to allow neighborhood electric vehicles (NEVs) on local streets with a maximum posted speed limit of 35 mph. It's up to the local municipalities whether they wish to allow NEVs. The UW-Madison already uses NEVs on campus. Ross noted that the Third Substitute before the PBMVC incorporates changes to reflect 2007 Wisconsin Act 33, which provides that WisDOT will register and license the NEVs, not the local municipalities.

Ald. Mark Clear, main sponsor of the ordinance, registered to speak. He commented that the ordinance is very simple and allows NEVs on streets with a posted speed limit of 35 mph or less. The ordinance is similar ones adopted in Janesville, LaCrosse, Green Bay, Stoughton and Milwaukee.

Compton expressed interest in being added as a sponsor. She wondered whether Clear would be willing to accept an amendment that NEVs must be able to reach a certain speed in order to be allowed on a 35 mph street. Ross noted that NEVs are legally restricted to a maximum speed of 25 mph. Compton expressed concern that some NEVs may not have enough power to reach 25 mph. She did not want to see accidents occur because motorists are trying to get around a NEV. For instance, if a NEV can only go 10 mph will it still be allowed on City streets? Compton wondered whether the ordinance should be amended to include a requirement that the NEV be able to achieve/maintain a speed of "x" miles per hour in order to be operated on the street.

Strawser wanted to know how the state statute defines a NEV. Ald. Clear indicated that the ordinance references the state statute. A NEV is smaller than the typical passenger car and usually looks similar to a motorized golf cart but has safety equipment like a car such as a windshield, headlights, seat belts, turn signals, etc. Federal law requires that they have a maximum speed of 25 mph. Clear did not think there was a problem with NEVs being unable to attain a speed of 25 mph but indicated some of the registrants might be better able to address this issue.

Jim Bogan, representing the UW-Madison Fleet, distributed photos of several NEVs used on campus. The UW uses an orange triangle on the back of each NEV to indicate a slow-moving vehicle. The UW uses the vehicles for various purposes, including patrolling grounds, shuttling between buildings, transporting relief workers to the parking ramps, etc. He indicated the vehicles work well for getting from one side of campus to another.

Compton indicated support for NEVs but felt she was hearing that they are utilized like golf carts in a resort. She wanted to know if there's a problem with maintaining speed when the vehicle starts to lose power. Bogan replied that it depends on the terrain, vehicle load and weather. He stated that the ones purchased by the UW have a fairly high carrying capacity. The governing factor is the motor must spin fast enough to turn the wheels. He estimated that a NEV going up a steep hill would probably travel only 16 mph. Bogan felt the vehicles have great visibility, more so than a bicycle or moped.

Lucy Zweep and Juan Olveda, representing Ozee Cars, 516 E. Main Street, Stoughton, registered in support.

- Their company sells NEVs.
- The vehicles are designed for neighborhood use. They are safe and don't have emissions.
- The vehicles are limited to 25 mph. Customers are urged to maintain the battery and keep it charged. With a full charge, a NEV should get between 30-70 miles per charge. The outside temperature should not have an impact on the battery.
- Shopping malls in some cities have charging stations for electric vehicles.
- NEVs are the wave of the future.

Compton commented that although the emphasis is on using the vehicles in neighborhoods, the ordinance talks about streets with a 35 mph limit, which means an arterial street. In communities where NEVs are already being used, how many times are they restricted from going on arterial streets? Zweep stated there have been no problems in Stoughton, even with 35 mph streets. In

response to Conroy's question, Zweep advised that most NEVs cost between \$8,000-\$9,000 for a custom-built vehicle. She added that NEVs are very quiet when operated and do have a back-up beeper.

Matt Schaefer, 621 Vernon Avenue, Madison, registered in support.

- He has test-driven a NEV and will purchase one if the ordinance passes.
- He envisioned using a NEV to commute to work and for trips close to home. He wants to use a NEV to reduce the number of trips made by a gas-powered vehicle.
- He indicated that Federal standards specify that the vehicle must be capable of reaching a speed of at least 20 mph within a mile; if a vehicle can't do that, it would not be classified as a NEV. If a vehicle is going less than 20 mph, perhaps the driver could be cited for impeding traffic. Something like that might address Compton's concerns.
- He noted that other vehicles such as bicycles that don't go 20 mph.

Dane County Supervisor Kyle Richmond, 929 O'Sheridan Street, Madison, submitted a registration slip in support and urged that the ordinance be passed soon.

Motion by Compton/Strawser to recommend approval.

Strawser felt the ordinance should be consistent with the state statute in allowing NEVs on streets up to 35 mph. This would allow the NEVs access to the whole city since a driver would often need to cross a 35 mph street to reach a lower speed street. Compton clarified that her concern is about a loss of power. The human factor re: vehicle maintenance comes into play. Many motorists speed or drive recklessly to get past slow moving vehicles. She would like to see a minimum standard for speed. She did not have a problem with a NEV going 25 mph on a 25 mph street, but she was concerned about NEVs going slower than 25 mph. On narrow streets, a slow moving vehicle could cause safety problems. Crandall agreed with Strawser that the ordinance should reflect the state statute. People who purchase a NEV will learn which streets to travel on. He did have a concern that if a NEV is consistently being passed, the driver will move too far to the right and infringe on the bike lane.

Skidmore stated he wanted to be added as a sponsor. He requested a roll call vote on the motion.

Notes:

Excused: 2 Robbie Webber and Mark N. Shahan

Ayes: 8 Beth A. Whitaker; Aaron S. P. Crandall; Judy Compton; Paul E. Skidmore; Charles W. Strawser III; Mary P. Conroy; Cheryl E. Wittke and Susan M. De Vos

4 COMMON COUNCIL 04/08/2008 Adopt Pass

Action Text: A motion was made by Ald. Clear, seconded by Ald. Verveer, to Adopt. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

Notes:

Text of Legislative File 04272

Fiscal Note

No significant fiscal impact is anticipated. Some additional signage may be required, but it is likely that associated expenses can be accommodated within the existing Traffic Engineering budget. There may also be some minimal additional General Fund revenues derived from fines for violators.

Title

THIRD SUBSTITUTE - Creating Section 12.792 entitled "Neighborhood Electric Vehicles Allowed" to permit and regulate the operation of such vehicles on Madison streets and amending Section 1.08(3)(a) of the Madison General Ordinances to establish a bail deposit amount for violations of the section.

Body

DRAFTER'S ANALYSIS: This Third Substitute has been prepared in response to 2007

Wisconsin Act 33, which took effect on December 4, 2007. The City no longer needs to establish a registration and licensing procedure for Neighborhood Electric Vehicles (NEVs), as provided in prior versions of this proposal, because registration and licensing are now the responsibility of the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT). State law also establishes the requirement that the operator must have a valid driver's license. The shared jurisdiction issues that had to be addressed previously have been deleted by the new state law. This proposal will permit the operation of NEVs on Madison roadways that have a speed limit of 35 miles per hour or less. The City is required to provide written notice to WisDOT of the ordinance including identification of any connecting highway or state trunk highway intersection to which the ordinance will apply. This draft provides that the Traffic Engineer will provide such notice and if WisDOT objects, the Traffic Engineer will place signs at those locations advising that NEVs may not be operated in those locations. WisDOT may object within 21 days of receiving such notice to the use of NEVs on those connecting highways or state trunk highway intersections. If WisDOT consents to such use or does not object within 21 days, the ordinance is valid for those connecting highways or state trunk highway intersections.

The Common Council of the City of Madison do hereby ordain as follows:

1. Section 12.792 entitled "Neighborhood Electric Vehicles Allowed" of the Madison General Ordinances is created to read as follows:

"12.792 NEIGHBORHOOD ELECTRIC VEHICLES ALLOWED.

- (1) Definition. "Neighborhood Electric Vehicle" means a vehicle subject to Sec. 340.01(36r), Wis. Stats.
- (2) A Neighborhood Electric Vehicle may be operated on any roadway that has a speed limit of 35 miles per hour or less, subject to the limitations in Section 3, herein.
- (3) A Neighborhood Electric Vehicle may be operated on a connecting highway or an intersection where the roadway crosses a state trunk highway, if, pursuant to Sec. 349.36(3), Wis. Stats., the Wisconsin Department of Transportation has either consented to such use or has not made a timely objection to such use.
- (4) The Traffic Engineer shall provide the Wisconsin Department of Transportation written notice of the enactment of this ordinance, which shall include identification of any connecting highway or state trunk highway intersection to which the ordinance will apply. If the Wisconsin Department of Transportation objects, as provided in Sub 4, to the application of this ordinance to such connecting highway or intersection, then the Traffic Engineer shall cause appropriate signs to be placed at those locations objected to by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation, advising that a Neighborhood Electric Vehicle may not be operated at those locations.
- (5) Any person who operates a Neighborhood Electric Vehicle contrary to this ordinance may be required to forfeit not less than ten dollars (\$10.00) and not more than five hundred dollars (\$500.00)."

2. Subdivision (a) of Subsection (3) entitled "Schedule of Deposits" of Section 1.08 entitled "Issuance of Citations for Violations of Certain Ordinances and Providing a Schedule of Cash Deposits" of the Madison General Ordinances is amended by adding therein the following:

<u>Offense</u>	<u>Ord. No.</u>	<u>Deposit</u>
Operating a neighborhood electric vehicle on illegal roadway.	12.792(2)	\$100"

EDITOR'S NOTE: New or amended bail deposits must be approved by the Municipal Judge prior to adoption. This deposit is pending his review.