



**Preliminary Engineering/NEPA Analysis
for the
Dane County/Greater Madison Metropolitan Area**

For additional project information: www.transport2020.net

Minutes

TRANSPORT 2020 IMPLEMENTATION TASK FORCE (ITF) MEETING

Thursday, May 11, 2006

4:45 p.m.

**Madison Municipal Building, Room 300
215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard
Madison, WI**

-- ROLL CALL

ITF Members Present: Sandy Beaupre; Jim Berkenstadt; LaMarr Billups; Michael Blaska; John DeLamater; Sup. Chuck Erickson; Kristine Euclide; Jesse Kaysen; Chris Klein; Sup. Al Matano; Sup. Scott McDonell; LeAnna Wall (*for Joe Olson*); Dick Wagner.

ITF Members Absent: Ald. Ken Golden (*notified*); Warren Onken (*notified*).

TAC/Staff Present: Ann Gullickson (Madison Metro); Stephanie Hickman (FHWA); Jeanne Hoffman (City of Madison, Mayor's Office); Lori Kay (UW-Madison); Rob Kennedy (UW-Madison); Mark Opitz (City of Middleton, Planning); Arun Rao (Wisconsin Department of Transportation, Urban Planning); David Trowbridge (Madison Planning and Development; *Transport 2020 Project Manager*).

Others Present: Steve Arnold (City of Fitchburg); Fred Bartol (Dane Alliance for Rail Transit); Margaret Bergamini; Ahnaray Bizjak (City of Fitchburg); Mike Cechvala; Robert Cervero (University of California-Berkeley); Tom Clauder (Mayor, City of Fitchburg); Phil Hanegraaf (HNTB); Ken Kinney (HNTB); Bob Schaefer; Connie White (HNTB); Royce Williams.

1. REVIEW OF AGENDA

Sup. Scott McDonell welcomed Transport 2020 Implementation Task Force members to the meeting. There were no suggested modifications to the meeting agenda.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM ITF MEETING OF APRIL 5, 2006

The Minutes for the 4-5-06 Transport 2020 Implementation Task Force meeting were unanimously approved, as submitted on a motion by Jesse Kaysen/Dick Wagner.

3. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no registrants for public comment on this agenda item.

4. UPDATE OF LAND USE PLANNING ACTIVITIES IN THE CITY OF FITCHBURG

Mike Zimmerman, economic development coordinator of the City of Fitchburg made a presentation to the Committee updating them on the land use planning activities in the City of Fitchburg. He asked them to consider a Fitchburg/Oregon commuter rail line. Fitchburg owns a 15-mile stretch of rail, which they purchased using a DOT grant as well as assistance from the Wisconsin Rail Transit Commission. The City feels that this is a significant investment on their part.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that as a major employment center, Fitchburg would make an important connection. He described their Fitchburg Technology Neighborhood, which consists of 2,000 acres. It has a rail line to it and is being developed under a Great Neighborhoods Grant from Dane County as well as an MG&E grant. It will be transit-oriented and high-density with over 5 million square feet and 1478 to 1664 dwelling units. The two main developers are T. Wall Properties, which has an option, and Kelly Development. The City has adopted a resolution in support of rail and letters of support have been submitted to them by T. Wall Properties, Kelly Development and Alexander Company. The area is of regional importance as part of a bio-medical collaborative, which also includes the UW's Bio-star development and Meriter Hospital and others. Other neighborhood developments are TOD, for example, Swan Creek neighborhood with 810 dwelling units. This neighborhood is filling out faster than expected.

Fitchburg Alderman Steve Arnold said the Village of Oregon passed a companion resolution in support of rail. Their emphasis is on downtown redevelopment. There will be 10,000 jobs, 6,000 residents and 2,500 dwelling units.

Mayor Tom Clauder of Fitchburg then asked the committee to keep the project moving. The governor gave them \$400,000 to improve the rail line and the County will take the role if Madison will not.

5. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES

Ken Kinney, HNTB Corporation, reviewed the initial range of conceptual alternatives and reported on the evaluation process being used to select the smaller set of alternatives for detailed evaluation. Evaluation by the Transit Operations Subcommittee led to a recommendation that Alternatives 2a, 3 and 5 be carried forward for detailed analysis under Work Task 6. He noted that there is the ability to assess combinations of elements from each recommended alternative.

Supervisor Al Matano moved to advance Alternatives 2a, 3 and 5 to detailed analysis. Motion seconded by Supervisor Chuck Erickson. Motion carried unanimously.

6. OVERVIEW OF LAND USE IMPACT EVALUATION AND TRANSIT-ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT (TOD) ACTIVITIES

Ken Kinney reported that meetings/workshops were held earlier that day with City planning staff and with key developers to better understand the land use impacts and transit-oriented development (TOD) activities and opportunities. Robert Cervero of the University of California -- Berkeley then made a presentation on transit-oriented development. He commented on TOD related issues and cases of

interest. He also made recommendations regarding the Transport 2020 study area:

- Interim zoning to enable TOD is vital, as is shared parking. Parking can be shared between night and day uses. Mockingbird Station in Dallas is a highly successful example. In addition, Ridge Home, a planned transit village in Arvada CO, outside Denver is an example of a “transit-ready development” where they adopted interim zoning before the completion of the transit project.
- Transit adjacent development (TAD) is not really TOD, it is only adjacent land use, but without the mixed used and pedestrian friendly development. It is not successful.
- A TOD walkshed is within 1/4 to 1/2 mile of a station. Within this area, it is important to consider the “3 Ds,” density, diversity and design.
- Diversity is varied land use mix, which makes it pedestrian friendly by consolidating trips, spreading trips throughout the day and week, allowing for shared parking.
- Design must soften the perception of densities, create attractive comfortable space, get the walkability right and have a secondary feeder system for bicycles and pedestrians as well as buses.
- You must zone and design for transit. Use tools to implement TOD such as zoning density bonuses, funding plans to lay out development thereby avoiding piecemeal or ad hoc development. Developers are most effective if their development plans can be expedited. They want clarity of the review process. They want funding for infrastructure, lighting, etc. They want TIF or a reduction in impact fees if near transit.

Mr. Cervero earlier participated in a windshield survey and informal SWOT (strength, weakness, opportunity, threat) analysis earlier that day and made the following recommendations regarding the strengths and weaknesses in the opportunity areas within the study corridor:

- West Isthmus: There is a high infill/TOD potential with good access to the center.
- University, stadia and hospital: These are good trip generators.
- Hill Farms: He positively noted the mid-rise condominiums, the DOT site, excellent views and boulevard designs. These characteristics give this area good potential for redevelopment and TOD.
- Mineral Point and areas southwest: The auto-oriented character of development is quite unlikely to change, especially in the short or medium term. Mineral Point/Westgate is choked with traffic and big box infiltration. Opportunity exists at University Research Park with its 2.5 million square feet. The key in this area will be parking and site design within the commute shed. To retrofit the area, will need to break up super-blocks, which will be expensive.
- Middleton: There is downtown charm and a good urban fabric at a human scale. Other anchors such as Greenway Center and the proposed Tribeca development are important. There is a commitment to shared parking. They need interim zoning/TOD zoning.
- Capitol: There is a need for infill employment, housing and shared parking.

- East Isthmus: This area has lots of potential redevelopment land. Will remediation be an issue? There needs to be an economic development strategy, airport access, participatory planning. There is niche housing that is serving the creative class. Issues might include gentrification and displacement.
- Airport: Here is a good trip generator that will add depth to the ridership. Need a seamless transfer and ancillary activities. This will not be TOD, but you cannot have TOD everywhere.
- East Towne: This area is more redevelopable than West Towne. It could be considered for redevelopment as a Town Center. The landscape is decidedly auto-oriented. Perhaps at this east terminus there could be a park and ride to serve the hinterland and enlarge the catchment area for ridership.

In an overall regional context, the focus should be on growth inward and upward.

7. REPORT OF MADISON STREETCAR STUDY COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

David Trowbridge reported that the Streetcar Committee met on March 22 and reviewed the scope of work for the Preliminary Feasibility Study. He said that the Streetcar Committee will next meet on May 24th. He also said that the project will hold its first public informational meeting (termed a “Streetcar Summit”) on June 21st. Trowbridge said that the Summit would include a panel discussion of individuals from other communities with streetcar systems and how Madison might benefit from a similar system.

8. IMPLEMENTATION TASK FORCE AND SUBCOMMITTEE SCHEDULE/NEXT STEPS

David Trowbridge summarized various Transport 2020 meetings currently scheduled:

- Land Use Workshop (w/Robert Cervero): Friday, May 12, 8:30 a.m.-noon, Room 260 MMB; and,
- Management Team: Thursday, June 8, 12:00 noon, Room 260 MMB.

9. INFORMATION AND ANNOUNCEMENTS BY TASK FORCE MEMBERS

There were no announcements or information provided by Task Force members.

10. ADJOURNMENT

The Committee adjourned its meeting at 6:10 p.m.