

**Minutes of the
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board
Technical Coordinating Committee**

November 28, 2007

Fitchburg City Hall

2:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call

Members Present: Beaupre, K. Clark, Dryer, Dunphy, Clayton (for Hoelker), Kennedy, McComb, Murphy, Nelson, Scheel, Sylvester, Vela, Woodard, Andros (for Violante)

Members Absent: R. Clark, Coville, Even, Ginder, Kirchner, Kugler, Persich, Simon

Others Present: McDonald, Schaefer, D. Paoni, R. Phillips, R. Anderson

2. Approval of September 21, 2007 Meeting Minutes

Vela noted he was listed as both present and absent. Schaefer said he would check the roll call sheet and correct the error. Moved by Woodard, seconded by Kennedy, to approve the September meeting minutes with the one correction. Motion carried.

3. Presentation on the USH 51/Stoughton Road (USH 12/18 to STH 19) Corridor Study

Adam Clayton, WisDOT Southwest District, reviewed the power point presentation that was given at the public information meetings in October on the study. The presentation covered background information, purpose and need for the project, previous work and public input, some alternatives that have been eliminated, the three roadway alternatives being carried forward in the Draft EIS and their impacts and costs, and potential bicycle/pedestrian improvements. He noted that the final recommendation would likely draw from a mix of the alternatives in different parts of the corridor. Under Alternative A, at-grade intersections remain and Broadway and the frontage roads at Pflaum and Buckeye are relocated. They are also looking at connecting Anderson Street to Lien Road. Improvements (signals/roundabouts) would also be made to the Hoepker Road and CTH CV intersections. Under Alternative B, interchanges would be added at Pflaum and Buckeye (split diamond), E. Washington Ave., Hoepker Road, along with a free flow to/from the Beltline. Under Alternative C, the entire corridor would be free flow, including through movements at the Beltline and single point urban interchange at E. Washington Ave. With regard to impacts, he noted that the number of relocations was actually greater under Alternative A than B, which was due to the need to relocate the frontage roads. He reviewed the project costs, which are quite high even for Alternative A. One of the things they discovered from the operations modeling is that the capacity problem is at crossings. There isn't a need for additional travel lanes. He reviewed some planned short-term improvements such as the Beltline ramps. Once a final alternative is selected, WisDOT will start to prioritize projects.

Nelson asked about the implementation schedule. Clayton said the Final EIS and a Record of Decision should be completed by the end of the year. For any large projects, it would probably be 6-10 years before they could be funded. The fact that Stoughton Road is not a backbone corridor limits the funding options. Some smaller projects could potentially go forward before then. Referencing the Stoughton Road Revitalization Plan project, Phillips asked if relocating the Broadway intersection was compatible with Alternatives B and C. Clayton said no, and that is true with some aspects of the alternatives. WisDOT will need to keep that in mind in implementing any interim improvements. Murphy commented that means that two alternatives for access should be planned for the Broadway area. McDonald said he attended the last meeting of the revitalization project and pointed out the conflict with the relocation of Broadway and the fly over (free flow) to/from the Beltline. Nelson commented that it might be more cost effective to improve the Reiner/Sprecher Road corridor. Clayton said the modeling showed that expanding that roadway didn't draw enough traffic to significantly improve conditions on Stoughton Road.

4. Discussion Regarding Modifications to STP Urban Funding Application Form

Schaefer said that MPO staff was planning to make revisions to the application form for STP Urban funding and would be asking for more information on proposed projects. The additional information will assist staff in scoring the projects. Part of the reason for this is the increased level of scrutiny that the MPO Board is giving to project scores. At the last meeting, there was considerable discussion about the scoring of the University Avenue and CTH S/CTH M intersection projects. Schaefer reviewed a preliminary draft of the revised form with the members. One of the issues staff was seeking input on was whether to request that the cost of construction be broken out by mode of transportation. The current project selection process paper asks for this data. Schaefer said he calculates funding by mode of transportation as an informational item that it is included in the TIP appendix. He calculates the cost of bike lanes based on the percentage of pavement width, but then discounts that. Nelson and Vela noted that there might be significant right of way costs associated with bike lanes such as on Monona Drive. McDonald said staff was only seeking the information for the construction cost. Schaefer said the cost by mode wouldn't really affect the scoring of projects, but is more informational. It was suggested that the methodology for calculating the costs by mode should be provided. Nelson said using the percent of pavement area made the most sense, unless there were unusual circumstances in which case a more detailed breakdown could be provided. Schaefer said they would be looking for more detail in terms of any changes to the median and/or intersections. Phillips suggested including a list of potential activities with check off boxes.

Schaefer reviewed six questions that staff propose to add to the application that relate to the scoring criteria. The first addresses safety problems and how the project might address them. Schaefer said crash data from the MV4000 reports was available through the UW Transportation Center. Dryer commented that there are often errors with these reports. He and Phillips noted that the more important issue is not the number of crashes, but how the project would address them, if at all. The second question relates to security, a new stand-alone planning factor under SAFETEA-LU. Dryer asked if this included terrorism threats, and Schaefer said yes. One of the other questions relates to land use, and there was discussion about this one, using University Avenue as an example. McComb said the criterion should relate to the planning process and whether the project actively implements the plan or is consistent with needs identified in the plan. Beaupre commented that not all projects are related to land use changes. Schaefer said perhaps they should ask for data on pavement quality of the roadway. McDonald said staff would make changes to the form and bring it back to the committee for comment again.

5. Committee Member Reports

Woodard reported that a 4-way stop sign was being placed at the intersection of Seminole Highway and Lacy Road. He also said that Fitchrona Road was now open.

Kennedy stated that construction of the Campus Drive Bike Path was about one-half completed with the bridge over Walnut Street the last remaining issue. Completion of the path is anticipated in the spring. Construction of the roundabout at Walnut Street and Observatory Drive is partially done.

Vela reported that a new roundabout on South Towne Drive near the new Super Walmart store is open and is working well.

Sylvester said that reconstruction of E. Verona Avenue was almost completed and a jurisdictional transfer of the roadway from the county to the city would occur officially next month.

Phillips reported that all lanes of the third segment to the East Washington Avenue project were now open. All lanes on Park Street would open soon with temporary pavement.

Dunphy said the CTH PB Bridge was still closed, but should open December 7.

Scheel commented that the City was anxiously awaiting completion of the USH 51 South Corridor Study. Some of the recommendations may impact the potential new Walmart development, which has been delayed.

6. Staff Reports

McDonald noted that copies of the MPO Work Program, Regional Transportation Plan Supplement, and TIP were at members' places.

7. Next Meeting Dates

The next meeting dates are Wednesday, January 23 and Wednesday, February 27.

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

Minutes recorded by Bill Schaefer