

Madison Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)
May 4, 2005 Meeting Minutes

1. Roll Call

Members present: John Volker, Kris Euclide, Eileen Bruskewitz, Ken Golden, Al Matano,
Chan Stroman, Robbie Webber, Laura Rose
Members absent: Lisa MacKinnon, Bob Dye, Rose Phetteplace
Staff present: Bob McDonald, Bob Pike, Bill Schaefer, Dan Seidensticker

2. Approval of April 6, 2005 Meeting Minutes

Moved by Bruskewitz, seconded by Laura Rose, to approve April meeting minutes. Motion carried.

3. Communications

- E-mail from Rob Elwell regarding access to interstate system (I-94 and Beltline).
- Letter from Frank J. Busalacchi, WisDOT Secretary, to FHWA and FTA, copied to McDonald, approving Amendment #2 to the 2005-2009 Transportation Improvement Program, and including it in the 2005-2007 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).
- Letter from Busalacchi, to McDonald reappointing Rose Phetteplace as MPO representative from WisDOT.

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

None

5. Reconsideration of Action on Madison Area MPO Board Representation and Other Applicable Considerations Regarding Appointments

Laura Rose moved for reconsideration. Bruskewitz seconded. Motion for reconsideration passed 6-2 (Aye: Euclide, Golden, Stroman, Bruskewitz, Volker, Rose; No: Matano, Webber).

Volker motioned that for the County Executive's appointments, one must reside in the city of Madison, and two must reside in a small city or village within the MPO area. Representation is encouraged to consider transit-dependent, low-income populations, persons with a disability, and geographic balance. Bruskewitz seconded. Golden reminded of the friendly amendment made last month to eliminate the requirement that one of the city of Madison appointees be an RPC member with the understanding that the issue be revisited if a new agency is created to replace the RPC.

Webber asked Topf Wells if the County Executive's office was displeased with the proposal that was passed last month. Wells replied that they were taken by surprise but in discussions with the County Exec, she indicated that she could live with it. He said she had agreed to this compromise version also and she could live with that too.

Webber said that the proposal that was passed last month works very well. It adds an additional representative from the small cities and villages, which was requested and at the same time recognizes the amount of transportation burden that the city of Madison faces. She said although having an even number of board members is not ideal, the compromise that was passed was an excellent one. She urged board members to continue to support it. The small cities and villages got another appointment, the city did not lose one, and the County Executive seems to be happy or can live with it.

Laura Rose agreed with Webber and also thought it was a compromise. She said realistically, what she was told from the mayor's office, was that because the board would have to change its representation, it wouldn't necessarily have to be redesignated but would have to have governmental units representing 75% of the population sign on to an agreement. She said the city of Madison didn't think that number could be procured because there weren't any small cities and villages that would go along

with it, and the MPO needs to have one that would. She made the motion because she thought that this wasn't going to happen the way she thought it would. When she made the motion last month, she thought it was a compromise but being new to the political scene she said she was wrong. We have to have something that has 75% of the population in agreement.

Webber said she hadn't heard any negative feedback before tonight from anyone so she saw no reason to change her vote and saw no reason why anybody else should change their's. She did not hear of any protest from the mayor's or County Exec's office and was not convinced that this was going to be a problem. She said there are enough small cities and villages that would be happy to have an additional representative. She also recognized the position that the city plays in being the entertainment and employment center and the fact that despite where people live, the city of Madison still bears the burden of transportation for most of the people in the county. If you look at the number of lane miles under jurisdiction for any entity, the city of Madison has more. Since cars are the primary mode of transportation, the city is still bearing the majority of the transportation in the county. She said it is fair to maintain their representation.

Volker said he's heard some and they like the compromise that we had here and also the point that the percentage isn't that much. He talked with the County Exec and said she would support the motion as presented here and also supported the previous one. She would go either way but to keep harmony in the small cities and villages who have a majority of the population now, we strongly recommend this.

Euclide said she could support either motion, and preferred the one passed last month. She admitted that it was somewhat of a surprise to everybody at the time. She supported the first motion. She thought it was a good motion, but it failed. There was further discussion and then Laura's motion. We raised some concern about whether changing the number of members on the board would require us to go back and get a redesignation, which does require 75%. She thought that raised some significant issues and the board should try to keep this as simple as possible and support Volker's motion, which was simply to change the designation of the County Exec's representatives.

Bruskewitz said she still believes that in talking with several of the mayors and village presidents that are in the collar communities around the city of Madison which are bearing a tremendous transportation burden as people move further out from the city of Madison, they are the ones that are feeling it right now. She believes that the appointments should be made by those communities that are most affected and that was really federal highway administration's and the federal register's intention.

Golden said he was anxious to move on and added that the amount of time put into this was out of proportion to the amount of influence it was going to have on the future of the metropolitan area. He said there are some symbolic issues and some representation issues. He served 11 years on the RPC and said that with his experience in mind. If the MPO is parochially serve its appointing authorities, they will eventually have a major lack of success because they will be representing a narrow constituency and not representing the entire metropolitan area. He thought the MPO had to be citizens of that metropolitan area whoever appoints us at the risk of our own appointments and that's the level that we should be seeking to rise to. The risk of this body sticking it to some entity whether its throwing a six lane into Verona in the middle of town or throwing an 8-lane Washington Avenue or something like that is there. We all have to be mindful of what the various constiuent communities feel about various projects. We're all not going to be in agreement every time, but we have shown some ability to compromise and work things out. Lastly, when I left the last meeting, I thought the small cities and villages had reluctantly accepted what we did. I didn't like the 12 because of quorum issues, but I could live with it. If the small cities and villages act in unison, I don't know that would have the requisite 75%. I don't want to find that out. I would rather move to something not that different. It will be different for one of our members in terms of the overall future of the metropolitan area. It's not going to be that different. I want to move on so we can work on some of the more important and substantive issues that are before us.

Motion passed 5-3 on a roll call vote (Aye: Euclide, Golden, Stroman, Volker, Rose; No: Matano Bruskevitz, Webber).

6. Discussion and Consideration of Transit and Roadway Scenarios to be Used in the Development of Alternatives for the Regional Transportation Plan Update

McDonald said he wanted to talk to the board about an approach to begin formulating the alternatives for the long-range regional transportation plan update, so that staff can develop certain pieces of information that will help you put those pieces together. Starting with land use, one of the starting points is to take apart the plans and you've seen this map before. This is the composite of all the adopted plans that we know of as of this date. We've gotten some updated information from McFarland and Stoughton and there's going to be updated information coming from the City of Verona. This is what we are starting with in terms of geographic distribution and what we are going to do. This represents a build-out or a circumstance where there may be some plans that are on a 20-, 30-, or 50-year planning horizon. The idea is to bring all the plans to a common base, which is to the year 2030. Our approach in doing that is to take the department of administration's control total for the county and using the RPC's forecasts for the different urban service areas including the central urban service areas, sub-allocation control totals, and then using the individual plans to actually distribute that data, the population and employment, but in terms of that area being proportionately reduced. So, for instance, based on the phasing of the Village of Oregon, what they may have in the first 10 or 20 years we might assume to be 100% build-out by the year 2030 but then other areas in the next year would be 50% build-out and then 30% and 10% and so on. So instead of assuming all of the Village of Oregon's area being 100% build-out, it might be 70%. We went through all the urban service areas and looked at all the neighborhood plans based on that to do the allocation.

The second alternative that we want to do is an enhanced transit system or transit-oriented development type of land use pattern, where, depending on what scenario, whatever one we pick, will decide where we want to put additional roads, where we want to take from the edge or from other areas and put like it along station locations in terms of higher density and more dense development. It could not only be within the station but it could also be within the entire corridor. It could be corridor based and not just station based. But the more you put into the corridor the more we have to take from the edges because that's the nature of the control total.

In a response for clarification from Euclide, McDonald said the first principal is to take adopted plans and put a control total based on growth and development. Golden said this was one aspect of his service on the RPC that he used to bang his head against the wall about because for urban service areas, which are the separate clusters of population, the RPC would allocate the numbers DOA gives us for population and the RPC allocates that population. We've always done a linear allocation so that if Verona grew at a certain level you would get that percentage of the new population. That kind of ducked the issue of whether or not allocating population differently as a matter of policy would produce a different transportation result. For example, go back to the highway 12 debate. If we had decided that we wanted to have less traffic on 12 so we didn't have to build it, one of the ways of dealing with that would be to allocate less population to that corridor and the urban service areas within it. I remember when the first Transport 2020 models came in and we were using Middleton rather than Verona as the base and Sun Prairie was on the map. The question was why don't we increase the allocation to the cities that are on the map at the expense of the cities that are off the map. That would be adverse to Verona in terms of lowering the population allocation. It's different when you try to perceive that in the metro area because the metro area is mostly the central urban service area and there's a couple of separate urban service areas within that. Stoughton is separate, Oregon is separate, but do we in this model step it down and actually have the capability of taking that central urban service area allocation and parse it out, not just by municipality but by location so that we put assumed density where perhaps the plans aren't necessarily consistent. So there may be more

population in the plans than there are on the ground. What range of disgression might we have were we to have a consensus about certain policy preferences?

McDonald said you can but it would be a “what if” scenario. Have to be careful about that because you are taking from one place in order to get to another ... Golden said Verona is about to put a commuter bus in. And that’s great and puts them in a position to support more population perhaps than Cottage Grove, for example. They don’t have a bus so Verona is participating in transit, it might not be rail transit at this time but if Verona’s plans call for population in excess of what we are capable of allocating them I would favor moving that population around so it favored communities that were participating in transit, Fitchburg, Verona, Middleton, for example. That’s an example of what I mean by we’d have a policy preference for those communities that were participating. And Sun Prairie would actually take a hit right now although I know they are starting to negotiate for transit as well.

Euclide asked what are the potential impacts and applications in the future of how we do this. How does it actually impact what the TIP looks like and what happens down ... McDonald said that’s what our modeling is those are the assumptions that we would like to model to see what those impacts are, see how the different corridors react in terms of transit ridership and in terms of the traffic volume forecast. That’s the whole point of going through the different scenarios. Euclide said but how does that actually influence anything in reality. McDonald said it’s relatively small because 80% of the development of the trip making is here. We are looking at a 20% increment in terms of total trips. You are playing with a margin on the edge. If we were to get Cottage Grove another 5 or 10 thousand people the corridor that would obviously be affected would be CTH BB and maybe TT or maybe even the interstate but it would be dispersed over those parallel corridors so you might see ... Euclide said which means that Cottage Grove Road, or CV whatever may come in there, might rank higher in the TIP analysis if there are more trips assigned to that corridor. McDonald said not necessarily. Arterials in terms of the TIP scoring get the first shot because they are carrying the most volumes. So a road like CTH BB which would be a major collector may or may not even make the cutoff. Typically we don’t have enough money to go below the arterials because the East Washington Avenues, the Monona Drives, and so on are sucking up all the money. So doing these peripheral major collectors coming in to the area probably wouldn’t make the radar screen ...

Euclide said she’s trying to figure out why this matters. Webber said we are looking at guessing where the population is going to be and then making transportation decisions based on that. On the other hand there is another way of looking at it and that is to decide where and what we want the transportation to be and then say growth is going to follow that. Because it’s interconnected. If you expand a roadway then people are going to go, its really fast to come into the city, I’m going to move out. If you put a train out there they are going to go, I can live along the train line. If you put a train line out, then its going to be much more compact vs. the highway which tends to make it much more ... I think that we have to look at the interconnectedness of the two. We can’t just say where’s the growth planned because depending on where we put our transportation dollars those plans could be completely wrong. They could be way under or way over.

McDonald said lets take Madison as an example. These are the current neighborhood plans that are adopted. This is where growth and development is occurring today. Some of these are already 10% into their build-out, others 15, others 20. We know this is where it is going to be because its happening here. Plats are coming in. Your question though is if we were to guess, we could guess wrong in that the growth in fact may not be here it might be over on the east side. It may be on the south side so what would happen is that this would grow at a slower rate. This would grow at a faster rate. But nonetheless it would still be here.

Webber said or if we totally change the transportation system its either we change the transportation system or world events change the transportation system, the growth could end up much more centrally located.

McDonald said and that's why I'm suggesting that we have a scenario, a transit-oriented development land-use scenario. I'm suggesting that one would be as is, what the current plans say. And they we take another one that says let's take a look at not only this but let's take Summit Road, so in stead of this growing at a build out and our assumption is 60% let's just say its going to be 50 or 30%, take that additional growth and put it in the transit corridor. Put it downtown, put it in the other areas to see what in fact what would happen. That we have one based on this and we have one on transit oriented and it just means that the places where they are planned will be slower.

Matano said the idea that all these scenarios are based on the boomtown hypothesis, that Madison is a boomtown and will continue to be so forever into the future. Having grown up in the New York Metro area and spending many of my young adult years in the DC metro area, he thinks of Madison as a relatively small town in the middle of the Midwest. Maybe it was just undersized just as housing was underpriced and now housing has reached a point where it's equal to or above the equilibrium. At some point housing may crash and the population may crash as well because it would be difficult to fit into your model. I work for the State of Wisconsin which is talking about scaling back employment drastically and what attracted me here economically was state employment. When you talk about the major employer in town cutting its workforce population by 15-20% over the next several years, 20 years from now, 20 something kids might be looking to move to Chicago or other big cities and get out of Madison. I throw this out more to confuse the issue than to ask you to model for it. I see this potential implosion where Robbie suggests some of these neighborhoods that we have already planned for fail or economically don't do their developers well economically and then the next ring of development like you say the next ring beyond the currently planned around say the village of Oregon gets wiped off the map entirely because the market doesn't support it.

McDonald said under the transit other alternative is that these plans just don't build out as much or stop and we see shifts in the distribution of the population. That shift could be out of the county, adjacent counties or Chicago, or wherever ... Golden said is really the discussion here one of we represent the metropolitan area and we are familiar perhaps more with our own particular areas. But a lot of the plans that you are looking at the Madison map have been adopted by the city of Madison. Whether they are good or bad, they are adopted. The question is will the MPO honor what Madison has adopted as its plan, what Verona has adopted as its plan, what Sun Prairie has adopted as its plan or will the MPO I guess there's two levels of influence it could have. One it could completely ignore it and say we want a different transportation system. It's not likely that we would do that but we could for as long as the current appointment lasts, lets play around with that or we could be a little bit more subtle and try to influence it the existing plans by putting, if you did for example in the TIP say that we're going to absolutely favor some expense over another expense you presumably would encourage if you said we're going to fund buses and trains with our TIP funds. Line up for buses and trains Madison is going to make out like a bandit obviously right now and the communities that come in will be helped by that. What I'm trying to figure out is are we sitting here really and trying to design a transportation system around our constiuent municipalities plans or are we trying to influence those plans as well. That's really the core of this discussion.

McDonald said wouldn't that come at the TIP level rather than at the plan level. Euclide said our function on this body is to be proactive and not totally reactive. She said she gets very frustrated when it seems like we're always behind the 8 ball and there's this assumption that you build out here and somebody will extend sewer and roads and build schools and everything else. We're not doing the region a favor by always having this sort of reactive approach. What I'm struggling with is how do we best position this body to take up more proactive approach with respect to transportation decisions and dollars and have the tools we need to do that. I have to admit that many times we sit here looking

at TIP projects there are already graded and weighted, and we're told this scored this. How do we influence that scoring and is part of it through this process.

McDonald went through some of the transportation scenarios to give the board an idea of the levels of information that will help them make decisions so they can go back and look at the land use and that transportation relationship give and take under the different scenarios to see how you want to begin to try and influence that. You are not going to be able to do that until you see what the transportation thinking is on the transit side and on the roadway side.

Schaefer added that there is an interaction. We start with the land use scenario and then start to build in transportation. As we build in transportation scenarios we may go back and make some modifications in the land use assumptions based on whether or not certain transportation improvements are included in that particular scenario. For example: Fitchburg is planning for an interchange at 14 to serve a major employment center that they are planning. If that interchange doesn't happen, then that employment center may not happen or at least it probably won't happen as fast as it would otherwise. That's an example of the interaction in certain circumstances. Bob mentioned if you assume a fixed-route transit corridor obviously that is going to influence one of these. So it isn't as if we're just saying this is the land use and then we are doing transportation and then we never go back and look and see if there's a connection between the two. It's just that in terms of control, we have no control, there's no way to say, Ken's scenario we want to have 3/4s of the development occur in this fixed route transit corridor. We could assume that we could allocate the growth there and then we would projecting roadway needs in areas that may not need it and may not be projecting roadway needs in areas based on that because that's not what's going to happen.

Euclide said I don't think we start on a premise, we start on a clean slate. I think that certainly we want to encourage and have encouraged the local land use planning to take place. My only point is that part of our job is to look at all of those land use plans but then include in that some analysis about what we think the region as a whole should develop for transportation purposes and not necessarily have to accept all of the individual land use plans as okay, because then we have no function.

Bruskewitz said in terms of Madison being an employment center and looking at the transportation trends that we see people moving further out and further out, is that scenario looked at so its not just population and its not just land use, but also employment.

McDonald said we are forecasting both population and employment. When we did the trends presentation we showed the pattern and what was happening built into that forecast. On the employment side is the employment labor force and employment population ratio. See what that trend is happening. Seeing what that ratio is happening in adjacent counties and right now the trend if we assume that we could be off on my guess but that's what's been happening in the last 25-30 years. It might be a little slower or faster than that. But we are continuing to have a circumstance where we have more jobs than we have the labor force to fill those and while that's a good thing on the economic side on the transportation side it's a bad thing. At least in terms of the geographic distribution in that. What I propose we do is that we do an approach similar to what we did in the East Side Arterial and Collector Study. But before we get there I suggest we take our current transit system and do an existing and committed system. Only trend, don't look at any roadway projects, wipe the slate clean in terms of projects. We'll start with the existing transit system and add what's currently in the works. So we'll have express transit system to Verona and while this is a little nebulous nonetheless there is some activity to try to get service out here to Sun Prairie ... probably strong enough had to do that. So we will run our transportation model and again assume the current land use and future land use and the future based on the plan or we can assume the future based on that more concentrated type of land use. But we could have three of those that we could see what the ridership is and see what the impacts are and see what the roadway congestion levels look like. Then the next level up again would be what I call TSM transportation system management or enhanced ... moving

toward an enhanced system we're not talking about rail or anything like that. Here we're talking about bus and taking the piece from the Transport 2020 project which had the bus system and then on top of it the TSM which is basically a bus system but to try to get as much transit ridership by enhancing your current system rather than going to this more technology intense type of solution. What that basically is it's a system of park and ride lots connected by express bus coming from the suburbs getting into the transfer points as well as express bus service between the transfer points. So we have a total express lot a service that is not out there today. We have seen our preliminary runs from Transport 2020. This works so well that it creates problems for us when we start looking at other technologies. So we're suggesting laying this on top because what can happen is Madison Metro while they may not be able to do all of this they can begin to do pieces of it. In response to a question from Bruskwitz, McDonald said this is slightly modified from transport 2020, this is actually better than transport 2020 and we think it will model out better than transport 2020. We've looked at these routes pretty carefully and we think that this will work. And even if Metro can't do all of this they can begin doing pieces like they are now. Here's the loop to Verona, here's Sun Prairie, start doing this so I'll start looking at some selected express bus from between maybe one or two of the transfer points not necessarily all. Because there are some cost implications here we need some funding to go along with it to make that service happen.

Euclide said does this assume express lanes or don't you get to that level. McDonald said this does not assume that at this point in time, just express bus and then we can decide whether or not ... that the enhanced transit system could go one more level up ...

Schaefer said that the express transit system in addition to those routes would also be adding some improvements to local service such as some of the recommendations in the TDP connection between the south transfer point and the east transfer point around the periphery and through Monona extending route 53 so it connects to the two transfer points, so some of those other minor circular improvements that would go along with that express service.

McDonald said so far I've given you two things and I was going to give you two very important pieces of information and we haven't added one roadway project here yet. But its giving us information about the type and level of service and the cost that would be involved in order to begin moving in this direction, begin talking about how are we going to program that, what can we do both at the state and federal level try to make some of this happen because right now we don't have the funds to do any of this. So the next level up is to look at the commuter rail version. This board is on record in support of that although now as part of Transport 2020. We've looked at and have realized that there are other technologies out there that will allow us to leave the rail corridor if necessary to reach markets to get closer to our markets or to go out corridors where there aren't necessarily rail corridors today, like Whitney Way and Mineral Point Road where we have diamond lanes out there on Mineral Point Road and its gets out to these developing communities and to these other activity centers that are happening on the edge. And this is where we get back to the land use part. Then we go back then after we ran this and say what about under our enhanced land use scenario where would we then given this either this or the BRT where we begin putting some of that development how would we begin reforming that in order to see what the effects are. And again at this point we haven't done one ... so this is where I want to get us to on the transit side and this will give us four very valuable pieces of information and we can then take those pieces and start formulating specific alternatives.

On the roadway side this is what we call our existing and committed system for roadways. Existing is all of what's shown here in green, the projects, the small roadway connections and some small capacity expansions that have happened since the year 2000. This shows a slice in time of what our congestion levels were under very congested and severe in 1990. This is what it is in the year 2000. This is the traffic implications that are out there today and what we're suggesting is wanting the model and we can run the model with any of these transit scenarios with the existing and committed

roadway projects. By committed what we are talking about are the ones in blue that are already in the TIP. And this is where the connection starts happening between the land use side, the transit, and here. This is where we start thinking of all four of these things simultaneously and what the tradeoffs are for that. So that's what this and I would suggest ... this down on top of any one of those scenarios and I'm thinking ... enhanced transit system. Let's try to get as much transit ridership as we possibly can before we begin considering anything beyond anything what's in our TIP. This is what most units of government are expecting to happen anyway. We would start with that and then I want to use the process we used for the East Side Arterial Collector Study. On the East Side Arterial Study we wanted to see what the impacts are. Here were the road assumptions and because we had some cross section issues to deal with with the interstate and the Reiner/Sprecher Road corridor, and Lien Road and Fellen neighborhood coming in because we had to decide what those cross sections were because the plats were coming in and we had to decide how big some of the bridges were or needed to be what the box culverts needed to be and what the right-of-way dedication should be now particularly for Lein Road and the Reiner/Sprecher corridor and so on. We were asked by the city of Madison to look at a buildout scenario on the east side so they could begin making decisions about some of the right-of-way dedications ought to be. Doesn't mean it necessarily will be built to that but at least you have the right-of-way there to handle it on the road. If you recall one of the things the board really liked about this particular study was the importance of making connections. First in terms of the grid system where might we go completing the grid pattern within the neighborhoods and within the collector and the arterial roadway system. We were looking for crossings of the beltline here. We were looking at a crossing of the interstate here. We were looking at the importance and these are all two-lane facilities by the way. Extending Lien Road to connect to the Reiner/Sprecher Road but also a collector roadway in this neighborhood which would then complete this grid pattern in here. And then extending Milwaukee St. over to Gaston Road for a two-parallel road facility there because if you have that in there that slows down the need for the interstate to be expanded. Because people can then use the Milwaukee Street and the CT TT because you have provided this connection here. And again it's a two-lane road its not necessarily a four-lane so you are distributing traffic and holding off that other facility becoming something bigger in the future. Similarly, and not shown on here because as a result of our modeling efforts and work with Sun Prairie, we've shown them the importance of Thompson Drive crossing over 151 not just doing the interchange, but providing them the necessary crossing. So what I would suggest is before we do anything in terms of looking at capacity look at important connections throughout the entire metro area. I listed some in your handout here. For instance, he read some of them aloud.

The point is we should look at what we already have in the plan and what pieces or what parts of these projects do we want to continue into the current plan. Do we want to revisit some of those or do we agree that these are important. They are already underway. Lets make them part of our current plan update and then see what those impacts are. We have a number of studies that are going on in the region. We have the Verona Road/West Beltline project again, part of the plan, the Highway 51 corridor, this portion of 51 is under study right now and the results of this show even though we pointed this out as being important, that you don't need to do a capacity expansion on here. All it needs are intersection improvements at this time. Wis DOT has asked us as part of our plan update is to look at something to make 138 and they already started that in terms of making this a more desirable corridor to bring them into 14 into downtown so that you don't have to do more types of improvements on 51 and bring people up to a very congested level on the bridge. Bring them this way and one way to do that would be to maintain the mobility on that particular corridor by not allowing any more driveway accesses. So they are looking at making that a limited access roadway so that that corridor doesn't degrade. That it stays what it is and it continues to be mobile and puts any type of improvement out here out into never never land. So we need to think about, of these pieces, of these studies that are ongoing, which ones of those do we want to bring forward and model and test and see what those impacts are. And then we can mix match piece together. But you need all those pieces of information at all these different levels and all these different slices in order to do that mixing and

matching. So I'm suggesting that that's a course of action that we do that we spend some effort on so that we bring that information back to you.

Volker said if highway M you have the local arterial street to grade that all the way up and then you run into the light blue areas, which it doesn't really do you much good to go south of M or south of PD there and then run into this huge congestion in Verona. McDonald said it isn't so much getting into Verona as it is getting out. This part of Verona is already being rebuilt so you got this piece from here to here. Volker said you are saying that's done, that's how its going to be. McDonald said the cross section is set, it's not done, you are that far from having that part of it finished. But you have that circumstance everywhere where you have the blue population center a population center and you step that traffic down and not all that traffic is destined for there. A lot of it is peeling off as a result of these neighborhoods that are up here.

Matano is interested in the major transit corridor to Mazo. He felt that that vision was more prevalent 10 years ago than it is today. McDonald said it is less likely to happen now because the population centers are small and they are not going to be big but do you really want to increase the accessibility of the Black Earth Creek corridor given all the environmental situations that are there. Not only with the creek but the bluffs and the unglaciated area. It's a high-quality environmental corridor with a lot of things going for it. To such an extent as you know, the village is actually doing a plan right now to see what to do with the highway 14 traffic to the extent they are considering wiping out as an alternative the whole south side of the businesses of the roadway in order to create an environmental corridor. Webber said you are talking about the Village of Black Earth? Euclide said Cross Plaines. McDonald said because of the runoff from the development going directly into the creek. They actually want to create a detention buffer through that area. But you have development there. So as a scenario, they are actually thinking about well how important are some of these businesses, I don't know whether they will do it or not is another thing. They are thinking about it seriously because of the impact to the corridor and how important those bluffs and that creek and that whole village really is. Putting a high transit corridor out there to a stop or a station you probably increase the density on that and increase the trip making and everything but the downside of it is look at all those other auto trips that you are creating not necessarily between but around the village. That could be a problem.

Golden said when I started this game long ago there was something called a priority corridor. Right when I started they had clipped it from Verona to Middleton. Part of the logic was that it would eventually extend west of Middleton. I don't know if we still have that concept but it would seem to me with some of the stuff that's going on in Verona that we need to have a dual focus for transit on the west side of the county. I agree that the merits of decreasing the emphasis on 14 I've been there when Cross Plaines tried to put a printing plant on the Black Earth creek and I think that would be wonderful even if they just stopped any more much less did away with some of what they had. But at what point do we really need to start saying that we need to have a more complicated system on the west side and its not just one line. Because when we did the bus hubs that collapsed because it was one line and it was up at Hilldale. And when we went to a four-hub system, it became a lot more reasonable and should we be thinking more in that direction and I'm guessing they are comparable issues on the east side in terms of the east and north transfer points. I realize the north has some environmental constraints with Cherokee Marsh but certainly that east transfer point ...

McDonald said this TSM sets a very good base for it. It will kind of tell us what some of the ridership is, whether or not some of these should be something more than just bus. And that includes this one. That includes Cottage Grove Road. But this begins setting that base and the ridership pattern and we could actually go in and even though I said this is what Transport 2020 said that doesn't hold us to that. We can go in here and we can look at any number of corridor combinations ...

Golden said and Fitchburg's plans to the south as well. They have a tremendous plan in terms of numbers of jobs and numbers of people. They came to Transport 2020 and said put us on the map and

we said right now there are just cows there. There is literally no development, its alittle premature. But still there it is.

McDonald said this provides a piece to begin to work with to see what that is and mix and match ... otherwise I don't really have a very good approach for developing alternatives because they are so complicated. They have land use underneath it, transit intertwined, existing programming stuff, ongoing studies, and then the plan just doesn't have to recommend improvements. We can say we're not sure about this corridor. We really want to study this further and can recommend that as a corridor for further study. We can call it a transit corridor, a roadway, a combination of things, could be a number of things. I should point out interchanges are also on the table in terms of what we say and don't say about them because Fitchburg will be in for the Lacy Road interchange. They are putting a lot of pressure on WisDOT now to do a new interchange just north of Lacy Road in order to serve that new Green Tech Village. They are talking major employment center there, right next to existing rail line. They have a rail station as part of the neighborhood plan right in the middle of that village. They are coming forward with the interchange first. Like the next interchange, if we're going to make this Reiner/Sprecher Road corridor a local arterial, you've got to consider something here. Particularly with traffic coming off the interstate and heading east and west. Potentially something there and if anything happens with the Ho Chunk nation here with expansion opportunities and they will because they are going to be looking for parking, they are going to be looking for structured parking and expansion you will see pressure for hotels and motels here so if that's going to happen we want to make sure we get not necessarily build the interchange but make sure that we have the right-of-way and have some sense of what the impact would be if that were to come forward. McFarland is talking about something on the interstate. There are these number of interchange issues that are out there that will be for us to deal with at a TIP level. We should have some sense of what that's going to be now during the planning process. I haven't identified all those potential locations.

Bruskewitz motioned, seconded by Volker, to endorse staff's approach to the planning for the transportation plan. Motion carried.

Bruskewitz said when you go back to this one so these are after all of this that you talked about it seems to me that looking at land use plans for these other cities and villages and communities outside of Madison ... these land use plans that they have it seems that that is a very important overlay and maybe our proactivity is not so much in determining where but the amount and these connections that you are talking about so you are taking that into consideration, the job centers ...

McDonald said the reason why I don't want to do what the community has fully endorsed here at that level because it moves projects prematurely. It puts the need out there sooner when it may not be there. Bruskewitz said I'm trying to remember who it was that told me that most of the little cities and villages all around the county have like a cycle to them that they start out small and then they pick up the pace. They increase it about 5% per year for a few years and then it goes back down to less than 1% and has that really been a consistent pattern and can we use that, what's happened in the past is likely to happen in the future. McDonald said less so here in Dane County. We see some of that like this corridor very little for a whole lot of different reasons but then we see other communities that are more aggressive and so they are alittle more pro development and less likely to fall into that cycle. Bruskewitz said she was thinking when we looked at North Mendota Parkway, we saw that with Middleton, Waunakee, its probably happening in DeForest. She wondered if you could generalize that for the rest of the county.

Euclide said she was concerned and added that sometimes people think that when there's an alternative identified and studied that that's the first level of endorsement. She said it was very important to have some language that would say that just because it's being identified as an arterial roadway to look at, that that in no way implies that there is any kind of endorsement of going in that direction.

Golden reiterated the idea of holding MPO meetings in MPO constituency areas.

Webber said that WisDOT doesn't want a state highway system and an interstate system to be for local transportation. Assuming that there's going to be an interchange really can screw up the traffic pattern on a highway. You really have to put the message out there that interchanges are not going to be looked at favorably. For instance, one of the reasons we have problems on the beltline is the interchanges are too close together and it totally screws up the traffic pattern. If indeed we want to follow WisDOT's request that highways be for long-distance travel, we don't want to have an interchange every mile.

7. Status Report by MPO Board Members on Projects Potentially Involving the MPO

- **US Highway 12:** McDonald distributed a handout from WisDOT regarding US Highway 12, which stated from WIS 19 West to Sauk City, most work is complete, and from US 14 to WIS 19 West, including the Middleton Bypass, construction should start the week of May 4 or 11.
- **Transport 2020 Implementation Task Force:** Golden said there has an RFP was released and he requested that Trowbridge contact the Finance and Governance Committee to meet.
- **USH 51 (USH 12/18 to I 90/94/39) Corridor Study:** McDonald reported that the TCC met a couple of times. The policy group has met one. Environmental assessment document went to EIS, the process was slowed to bring in more parties.

McDonald also distributed a handout regarding City of Madison peripheral neighborhoods, population, households, employment year 2030 allocations.

8. Discussion of Future Work Items

- **Discussion of RTP Alternatives for Plan Update**
- **Dane Co. Clean Air Coalition**
- **West Side Bicycle Corridors Study**
- **Mid-West Regional Rail**

9. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings

Scheduled for Wednesday, June 1 at 5 p.m. in the City-County Building, Court Room 2-D.

10. Adjournment