1. **Roll Call**

   **Members present:** Mark Clear, Ken Dahl, Ken Golden, Steve King, Jerry Mandli (arrived during item 5), Al Matano, Ed Minihan, Mark Opitz, Chris Schmidt, Robin Schmidt

   **Members absent:** Jeff Gust, Chuck Kamp, Paul Lawrence

   **MPO Staff present:** Bill Schaefer, Mike Cechvala

   **Others present in an official capacity:** Jeff Berens, Michael Hoelker (both WisDOT SW Region Staff)

2. **Approval of March 6, 2013 Meeting Minutes**

   Moved by R. Schmidt, seconded by Minihan, to approve the March 6, 2013 meeting minutes. Motion carried.

3. **Communications**

   - Letter from WisDOT approving amendment #2 to the 2013-2017 TIP;
   - Newsletter from WisDOT regarding the USH 51 (Stoughton Road) study and public meeting.

4. **Public Comment (for items not on MPO Agenda)**

   None

5. **Presentation on the Stoughton Road/USH 51 (Terminal Dr. to STH 19) Study (WisDOT SW Region Staff)**

   Jeff Berens, Project Manager, WisDOT SW Region, provided a PowerPoint presentation on the study, which covered past studies on the corridor, the project purpose and need, safety and operations conditions, study schedule, and details about the improvement alternatives for the different sections of the corridor. He said that from 2007 to 2011 there was on average more than a crash a day on the corridor with most occurring at the signalized intersections. There were also ten fatalities. The current study was approved as a major project in the fall of 2011 and this last EIS phase of the study was initiated after that. The major project designation was required to conduct the EIS and look at major capacity expansion alternatives. There are three general alternatives or levels of improvement: (1) a TSM alternative that keeps most intersections at grade; (2) an enhanced expressway, which adds interchanges at some intersections; and (3) a full freeway conversion. The recommended alternative includes a mix of the alternatives for the different sections of the corridor. He said a public informational meeting was held the week before and the draft recommended alternative presented. That alternative could change over the next few months as input is received. The schedule was to complete a draft EIS in the next few months and have a public hearing in late August. After that a preferred alternative would be selected and another public meeting held. A final EIS would then be completed in the summer of 2014.

   Berens then reviewed the engineering designs and some conceptual drawings of the improvement alternatives starting at the south end of the corridor.

   Golden asked how the issue of segmentation of the corridor was handled given the other study of USH 51 from McFarland to Stoughton. Berens said the issue was addressed early on and it was agreed they were independent. Hoelker said the traffic volumes change significantly at the Beltline, and all of the alternatives for the south end of the corridor have at-grade intersections through McFarland. Golden asked about the development assumptions for the different roadway alternatives. Schaefer respond that the growth assumptions were based on local development plans, but there weren’t separate assumptions for the different alternatives. There was a panel convened to discuss the issue and the conclusion was that expanding USH 51 to Stoughton would not have a large impact on the rate or type of development in the Stoughton area or other...
areas in the corridor. Minihan added that the towns in the corridor were not planning any for development. Berens said the first and recommended alternative for the Beltline to Broadway section included a diverging diamond interchange and an “echelon” for the westbound Broadway and southbound USH 51 to westbound Beltline movements. Asked if people using the park-and-ride facility could access that, Berens said yes from the eastern end of the facility or they could travel through the intersection. A staged approach was planned with a free flow flyover ramp to/from the Beltline to the west added later when needed. Opitz commented that the diverging diamond interchange appeared to be problematic for pedestrians. Hoelker responded that it was safer because while there are more crossings they are shorter and through the middle of the interchange they are separated by a barrier. At some crossings with free flow traffic a pedestrian signal might be required. A video was shown of a diverging diamond interchange.

Berens reviewed the Pflaum and Buckeye Road area alternatives. He said Alternative B is the recommended alternative, a split diamond interchange (south ramps at Pflaum and north ramps at Buckeye) with the streets connected by one-way frontage roads. With this alternative Stoughton Road would be dropped down about twenty feet with retaining walls. Three street crossings are planned along with some slip ramps for additional access. A third lane would be added in both directions on Stoughton Road. Golden commented on the high cost of depressing Stoughton Road. At Highway 30 and Lexington and Commercial Avenue, Alternative A is the recommended alternative, converting the interchange to a diverging diamond interchange with improvements to the Lexington/Commercial intersection. Alternative C, a longer term one, would take USH 51 over Highway 30, the rail line, and Lexington and Commercial. Schaefer asked about the planned Goodman path and Hoelker said they still needed to work out a grade separated crossing for the path under the recommended alternative. At East Washington Avenue and Pierstorff, the recommended alternative is either B or C and they are similar. Alternative B includes a single-point interchange at East Washington Avenue with East Washington Avenue raised and Stoughton Road lowered. He said because of drainage issues, Stoughton Road would go up and over Anderson and Kinsman. Access to Anderson would be via a collector street system and slips ramps. There would be no direct access to Kinsman. He noted the high level of relocations with the alternative. He reviewed the access issues in the area to/from East Washington. Alternative C is similar, but with the north end of the split diamond interchange at Kinsman instead of Anderson. It also includes the Lien Road extension, but that could be part of Alternative B as well. It would require about ten residential relocations. All of the alternatives would add a lane on Stoughton Road in both directions between East Washington Avenue and Rieder Road. Matano asked if there was a recommended alternative, and Berens said either B or C.

Further north, Berens said that only right ins and outs would be allowed at Hanson Road because the intersection is in the airport flight path. Golden asked if there were options for relocating the intersection, and Hoelker said no. He added the industrial area there would have good access via the planned interchange at Hoepker Road. Another option is a “Texas U Turn” north of Hanson. For the Hoepker Road area, Berens said the recommended alternative is B, a diamond interchange at Hoepker with CTH CV becoming an overpass of USH 51 and connected with Anderson Road. As with Alternative A, the the access points at the truck stops would be removed. There would be a right-in/right-out from East Metro with a connection to Pepsi Way up to Highway 19. Berens said WisDOT staff had been working with the local municipalities to provide pedestrian and bicycle accommodations along with corridor, including several new ped/bike overpasses of Stoughton Road. The costs for construction and real estate range from $215 to $875 million depending on level of improvements. He said no funding was programmed now for construction. Once the EIS was approved, the project would compete with others for Majors program funding. The earliest construction of the preferred alternative could begin is 2020.

Golden asked if WisDOT had considered moving to an urban boulevard type cross section rather a freeway approach. He said right now the traffic volumes are similar to volumes on East Washington Avenue. He added that he realized the development in the corridor was mostly industrial now, but that could perhaps change. Berens said some have advocated for that in the past, but it is an important regional route and trucking route. Hoelker added that most people using Stoughton Road either originate or are destined for a location in the corridor. He also said that an urban boulevard couldn’t handle the anticipated future traffic as
evidenced by the traffic operations analysis. Opitz asked if WisDOT was concerned about traffic diversion to the Interstate under this scenario. Berens said the traffic that might divert has already done so because of the congestion and safety issues on Stoughton Road. Golden mentioned that some of the cost of the roadway improvement could be assessed to property owners if an urban cross-section was built. He said the main state highway through Brookfield was an example of this. He asked if WisDOT would evaluate this if a formal request was made by the MPO and/or one or more municipalities. Berens said it would create diversion to both the Interstate and local streets and wouldn’t meet the purpose and need for the study. Hoelker added the issue wasn’t as much the speeds, but the at-grade intersections. In that sense, they have looked at the concept, which is the low-build alternative. Minihan asked about signage, and Berens said the issue had come up given the reduced visibility of the businesses. WisDOT would be working with the municipalities on a signage plan.

6. Resolution TPB No. 73 Approving the 2010 Urban Area and Metropolitan Planning Area Boundaries for the Madison Urban Area

Royce Williams, 2437 Fox Avenue, Madison, registered to speak. He expressed support for including the Village of Oregon in the MPO planning area. He noted the new planning area would otherwise be contiguous to Fitchburg. He also mentioned that the village’s water system was tied to the urban area.

Minihan commented that the village has a planned industrial park along USH 14 at the City of Fitchburg border. He said it didn’t make sense for Oregon to not be in the planning area. Matano noted the email communication with the village administrator in the packet reflecting the misunderstanding by the village that the choice was theirs whether to be in the planning area or not.

Schaefer said he talked with the village administrator. Originally the issue was going to be referred back to the village plan commission, but the village board decided not to. The board didn’t see the benefit to being included in the planning area. Schaefer said his recommendation was not to include the village since it isn’t in the urban area. The MPO would still plan for Oregon as well as the rest of the county. There aren’t any major projects planned in Oregon in the near future and therefore no real practical impact either way. However, he said it was more of a policy issue for the board to decide. He said he did talk to FHWA staff to make sure it wouldn’t violate any federal rules to include Oregon in the planning area. FHWA staff recommended against it, but said it would not violate any federal rules because village officials were consulted.

Golden noted the population table that was distributed and said that inclusion of Oregon would actually make a stronger case for changing the board structure, which is ironic. R. Schmidt asked if there was something that could be offered to only communities in the planning area. Schaefer responded that one benefit is the eligibility for funding under the new Transportation Alternatives program. Minihan said he didn’t view including Oregon as bullying, but simply including them in the planning process. Matano said he didn’t see any harm to the village to include it in the planning area. The board is just approving a rational map from a planning perspective. Opitz said he was sensitive to the wishes of the village, but added that there was no cost to the village to be included in the planning area. Golden said he had changed his mind and supported inclusion of the village. Mandli said the rationale is a good one that the village is contiguous to the rest of the planning area. Clear agreed, saying it was a data driven decision based on geography and commuting patterns.

Moved by Opitz, seconded by Golden, to approve the 2010 Urban Area and Metropolitan Planning Area Boundaries for the Madison Urban Area with the inclusion of the Oregon area shown on the attached map. Motion carried.


Schaefer the TDP recommendations were presented to the Board at an earlier meeting. The draft report was released for review and comment after the February meeting. MPO staff led the TDP through the City of Madison approval process since the city adopts the TDP as well as the major transit operator. The Madison Common Council adopted the TDP recommendations with some minor changes recommended by the city’s
Transit & Parking Commission (TPC). MPO staff supported those changes, which were included in the packet. Golden commended MPO staff on the process and product, and said the TPC demonstrated a real commitment to use the TDP as a decision making guide. Schaefer added that Metro is planning a series of service improvements for the fall, which are consistent with and draw from the analysis done as part of the plan.

Moved by Mandli, seconded by Golden, to adopt the recommendations of the 2013-2017 Transit Development Plan for the Madison Urban Area. Motion carried.

8. Citizen Participation Effort and Schedule for Preparing the 2014-2018 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

Schaefer said MPO staff seeks approval of the TIP process and schedule each year. The planned process is the same as previous years, except that staff will not be holding the two informational meetings as in past years. The turnout for the meetings has been very low, and staff will instead offer to meet with people individually. The request for projects and STP-Urban applications will be sent out later this week. A draft TIP will be released in August with a hearing in September and approval of the final TIP in October.

Moved by R. Schmidt, seconded by King to approve the schedule for the 2014-2017 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County. Motion carried.

9. Status Report by Madison Area TPB Members on Other Projects Involving the TPB

Schaefer said the draft EIS document for the USH 51 (McFarland to Stoughton) study was expected to be released by May. A kick-off staff level meeting for the Beltline study was recently held. Meetings of the technical and policy committees will be held in the next few months. The first phase of the Interstate study looking at potential new interchanges and crossings was underway. MPO staff was working with WisDOT and its consultants on the growth allocations to be used for traffic forecasting. A new travel model was being developed for the Interstate and Beltline studies.

Opitz commented that for the Beltline study he would like WisDOT to look at alternative routes that take local traffic off of the Beltline. Schaefer said that WisDOT would be doing this. Opitz said he wanted to make sure the Pleasant View Road corridor was considered. Schaefer said it would be since it is a recommended project in the MPO’s long-range transportation plan. Opitz said he didn’t think WisDOT was including the corridor as part of the study area.

10. Discussion of Future Work Items

Schaefer said the BRT study was wrapping up. A public meeting to present the study findings was scheduled for April 15. Meetings have been or would be scheduled with the City of Madison and Fitchburg Common Councils. Work on the Metro bus size study was continuing. Some passenger loading survey work still needed to be completed. Staff completed an initial review for the roadway functional classification update and would be meeting with WisDOT staff in two weeks to review MPO suggested changes. MPO staff will also be working close with local staff on that. With the new planning area approved, the board will now need to consider possible revisions to its structure. Schaefer said he would probably put that on the agenda for the June meeting to start the discussion. Work would also be starting now on the Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Transportation Plan update.

Mandli commented that the functional classification update should consider the impact on maintenance policies and funding. Schaefer said WisDOT had adopted criteria that are used for the functional classification. R. Schmidt asked whether the MPO wanted to discuss or submit comments on the transportation items in the state budget. Schaefer said he could ask WisDOT staff to provide a presentation on the budget if there was interest in that. Golden commented that it would be more effective for an association of MPOs to provide comments.
11. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings

Matano said he had asked a friend of his who is an Epic employee and new City of Verona Alder to provide a tour of the Epic campus the Saturday before or after the next boarding meeting. Only self guided tours are generally available on weekends. After some discussion, it agreed to plan the tour for Saturday, May 4 from 10 a.m. to noon.

Schaefer mentioned that due to a City of Madison budget meeting, the MPO Board meeting in November would need to be rescheduled for the second Wednesday. That conflicts with the Madison Transit & Parking Commission. He suggested scheduling the meeting for downtown, and it was agreed to do so.

The next meeting will be held May 1, 2013 at 7:00 p.m. at Verona City Hall, 111 Lincoln Street, Verona.

12. Adjournment

Moved by Opitz, seconded by King, to adjourn. Motion carried. The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:05 PM.