Minutes of the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board
Citizen Advisory Committee

August 12, 2008 Madison Public Library, Room 201 5:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call


*Staff Present:* B. Schaefer

2. Review of Draft Listing and Scoring and Ranking of Candidate Projects for STP – Urban Funding for 2009-2013

Schaefer reviewed the draft listings by year starting with the current year projects. He noted the temporary decrease in the funding allocation in 2008-'09. The major 2009 projects are the final segment of the East Washington Avenue reconstruction and the first segment of the Monona Drive Segment 1 reconstruction. Construction for Monona Drive isn’t scheduled to start until the fall and will carry over into 2010. Because the CTH M/Valley View Road intersection project was delayed until 2010, additional funding is freed up for these 2009 projects. In both cases, there still isn’t enough money to fully fund the projects according to the current cost sharing policy. Because the CTH M/Valley Road project was supposed to occur in 2009 and the MPO committed 80% funding for that project, it is proposed that the project be funded at that level even though 2010 is the first year of the new 50/50 cost sharing policy. The three major projects in 2011 are the first phase of the CTH S/Mineral Point Road (CTH M/Junction Rd. Intersection), University Avenue/CTH MS (Allen Blvd. to Segoe Rd.) reconstruction, and the second segment of the Monona Drive project. The only major project in 2012 is the second phase of the CTH S/Mineral Point Road Intersection project. Major projects in 2013 are CTH M (Cross Country to CTH PD), the last phase of the Monona Drive reconstruction, and East Johnson Street (Butler to First St.) reconstruction.

Williams asked if the East Washington Avenue interchange with Aberg Avenue and STH 30 was being designed to allow room for a rail line through the interchange area. He thought this was preferable to using the existing rail line going through the East side neighborhoods. Schaefer said he didn’t know, but doubted that that has been considered. Williams also questioned the need for the reconstruction of University Avenue from Allen to Segoe. Sundquist questioned the CTH S/Mineral Point Road Intersection project and wondered if land use plan changes had been considered. Schaefer said there is a significant capacity problem at the intersection now, which will get worse as the new UW Research Park and other West side areas develop. Also, the intersection has a high number of crashes. Schaefer mentioned the traffic analysis that had been conducted as part of development of the Pioneer Neighborhood Plan and the changes in the intensity of planned development that were made to ameliorate the projected congestion problems. Conditions were also included as part of approval of the plan related to TDM, transit service, and pedestrian/bicycle facilities. Committee members questioned whether transit service was required to be in place when development of the UW Research Park occurred. Schaefer said he thought so. In response to a question, Schaefer said the Pioneer Plan recommends provision of additional street right of way for a dedicated transit facility (rail, BRT), but he wasn’t sure if the CTH S intersection design included plans to continue the bus lanes through the intersection area. A more preferable routing might be to use Watts Road and avoid the Beltline interchange area. Schaefer said the City of Madison and Dane County were still negotiating over the local share funding for the projects on county roadways. The county has agreed to contribute to the CTH M (Cross Country to CTH PD) and University Avenue/CTH MS projects, but not the CTH S/Mineral Point Road Intersection project.
Sundquist asked about submitting comments. Schaefer said comments could be provided in writing or via phone to staff. Staff would review comments received and proposed changes to the draft TIP at the next meeting in September, and would seek a recommendation of approval at that meeting. He clarified that the STP – Urban project listings are approved as part of the draft TIP.

3. **Review of Major Projects in the 2009-2013 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County**

Schaefer reviewed the other major projects in the draft 2009-2013 TIP, which was handed out to committee members. He explained that the TIP represented a coordinated listing of planned projects by WisDOT, Dane County, and local jurisdictions. All federally funded projects must be in the TIP and consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan. Other state and locally funded projects are included for informational purposes.

4. **Committee Member Reports**

Item deferred.

5. **Staff Reports and Announcements**

Schaefer mentioned that staff just found out the MPO’s top two ranked Transportation Enhancement (TE)/SMIP projects—the final segment of the Starkweather Creek path and northern segment of the Badger State Trail—had been recommended for funding by the State SMIP Committee. This was good news. He said the agenda for the next meeting would include a review of planned bicycle facility projects in the Madison area. Following the review of the TE/SMIP projects at the last meeting, Sunquist and Hiniker had suggested the MPO develop a list of priority projects that committee members could then promote on a proactive basis at the local level. Schaefer said there is in fact such a list. He said the bikeway system plan component of the Regional Transportation Plan included a list. This list was then recently updated and expanded as part of the area’s participation in a national campaign headed by a non-profit organization, Rails-to-Trails Conservancy, to get increased funding for bicycle/pedestrian transportation in the next Federal transportation reauthorization bill.

Guo mentioned she and a colleague had just finished a paper reporting on a model they developed to quantify the travel, health, and environmental impacts of bicycle/pedestrian infrastructure improvements and other built environment elements (density, land use mix). Committee members expressed interest in the paper, and Schaefer said perhaps Guo could provide a brief presentation on it at the next meeting. Guo agreed. Hiniker suggested undertaking a planning effort to identify potential future rail corridors to make sure they are preserved and opportunities aren’t lost. Schaefer said potential extensions in existing rail corridors are shown in the long-range vision developed as part of the Transport 2020 process and several communities are planning for future rail stations, including Middleton, Sun Prairie, and Fitchburg. He said that perhaps staff could update and expand on this as part of the interim update of the Regional Transportation Plan in 2010.

6. **Next Meeting Dates**

   September 16, 2008
   November 18, 2008

7. **Adjournment**

   The meeting was adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

*Minutes recorded by Bill Schaefer*