

North Fish Hatchery Road Reconstruction Public Meeting #2 Notes 5:30-7:30 PM, November 8, 2018 Leopold Elementary School, 2602 Post Rd.

Total participants: 40 signed in

Meeting Video

A FACTv recording of this meeting may be found at:

<http://factv.fitchburgwi.gov/CablecastPublicSite/show/10689?channel=3>

Meeting Format

The meeting began with a welcome from Mayor Gonzalez, followed by a presentation of the North Fish Hatchery Road reconstruction project goals, timeline, background, and design alternatives for the cross section and streetscaping options.

The project team includes KL Engineering as the lead engineering consultant, Urban Assets for public engagement, and Vierbicher for landscape architecture.



Presentation Q&A Notes:

- Why are there plans to widen the road from McKee to Breckenridge?
 - A: We want to have enough space for design alternatives; for instance, there are considerations to reallocate space to accommodate a shared bus/bike lane.
- The yellow streetscaping zone was done some years ago, so it's already high-end; does it necessarily have to be dug out and replaced?
 - A: We believe so; it will be difficult to salvage and re-use for this project. We are evaluating if some can be salvaged and planted in other locations like city parks.
- Is there any thought given to green infrastructure?
 - A: We are beginning to explore potential green infrastructure techniques. It will be tough to implement in many areas because of the steep median grades.
- You referenced Monona Drive; how does their streetscaping compare to the "high-end" option shown tonight?
 - A: The high-end option shown tonight for North Fish Hatchery Road is more upscale, so to speak, than Monona Drive.
- Has the project team considered pedestrian scale lighting?
 - A: We are making sure the median lighting or street lighting hits all pedestrian areas. The intent of our design is to ensure roadway lighting will adequately shine onto the pedestrian

and bicycle areas. Some areas such as nine springs and the proposed pedestrian bridge may be specifically equipped with pedestrian-focused lighting.

- You mentioned the road is at capacity right now, but construction will limit traffic to one side; is that a problem?
 - A: Verona Road is supposed to be done in 2020, but there are also other conflicts, which is why we are looking to reasonably fit this reconstruction into a specific time slot.
- Was the road at capacity prior to the Verona road project or because of the project?
 - A: We worked with the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for projections and have accounted for some of the overflow from Verona Road. The data we've seen shows no indication that there's been an uptick on Fish Hatchery Road because of Verona Road.
- What factors led the project team to choose concrete over asphalt?
 - A: The decision to use concrete is not yet set in stone. The county is in favor of asphalt, but it largely depends on funding. We are currently in discussion with the County about the costs of material and the corresponding costs of maintenance. We are not sure if the County or City will maintain the road.
- How much are you going to expand the right of way, and what is the minimum we need to expand?
 - A: The alternatives consider the narrowest segments of right of way within the corridor; we attempted to fit the alternatives within those areas. That said, the roadway alignment and right of way vary throughout so there may be some areas where the right of way will need to be expanded a small amount to accommodate the preferred roadway configuration.
- Has there been studies or traffic predictions about what impact the North Fish Hatchery Road reconstruction will have on the arterial roads. In other words, what kind of diversion will happen?
 - A: City of Madison Traffic Engineering will work on modeling the diversion and will also work on strategies for diversion. We also met with Madison Police Department about re-routing; we have not yet received any information to report.
- Looking at traffic counts on the project website, they are lower south of McKee and higher at Greenway, but there is nothing shown in between the two roads; why is that?
 - A: We have a variety of traffic data, most of which was collected between 2015 and 2017. South of McKee road drops off drastically, but north of McKee up to Greenway shows between 40,000 – 45,000 vehicles per day on average.
- Once all the road reconstruction projects in this area are complete, what traffic projections do we see in 5 years?
 - A: We've been working with the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and we now have a traffic forecast that goes out to year 2040. It shows ~0.5% to 1% growth. It is generated with the assumption that the road could be 4 lanes, as well as another one that considers a 6-lane road.
- What's the approximate duration of reconstruction project?
 - A: The bulk of the project will happen March through November of 2020.
- Can the bus stops be placed in a way where they will not have to stop in traffic?
 - A: We are considering different options for bus stops. We are going to prioritize the ones where we can achieve "pull-outs" but there is not enough room for all of them.
- Do metro buses currently have the ability to have traffic signal priority?

- A: Madison Metro buses are installed with a computer that knows what bus stop it is at and if it is on time. Technically it is possible, but that would also require adding receptors onto each of the traffic signals.
- Will access points be consolidated or removed as part of the project?
 - A: We are currently evaluating those options.
- Can infiltration trenches be used in the medians/terraces for stormwater management?
 - A: They could be considered, but the terraces are very narrow and already contain numerous utilities.

Table Group Discussion

Working in small groups, participants reviewed and commented on potential cross-section alternatives (see "Public Meeting 2 Exhibits": <http://www.fitchburgwi.gov/2504/North-Fish-Hatchery-Road-Reconstruction>).

Table Group Report-Out Summary (6 groups total)

- 4 table groups preferred Alternative C
- 1 table group preferred Alternative D with the following changes: multiuse path for "periodic/leisure bikers," bikes allowed in bus lane, and right turn lane for commuters
- 1 group had mixed preference between Alternatives C and D

Below are full notes from the table group report-outs, in addition to written comments from each group's discussion worksheet:

Table 1

Verbal report-out comments:

- Alternative C is best
- We need to have 3 lanes for cars because the road is already at capacity
- Alternative C is good because bicyclists are safer off the road with the multiuse path
- Consider narrowing the bike path, center median, and green space in Alternative C so that all 3 traffic lanes are 11 feet

Written worksheet comments:

- Alternative A:
 - Like the cost
 - Need to get bikes off road
 - Only 2 car lanes
 - 24-foot median good but high-end streetscaping not needed
- Alternative B:
 - Get bikes off the road
- Alternative C:
 - Have 3 car lanes and get bikes off the road
 - Make multiuse path 8-9 feet wide and narrow median to make each traffic lane 11 feet
- Alternative D:
 - Only 2 car lanes
 - Good if bike lane is okay for cars too
 - Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) probably a no-go; not enough bus traffic

Table 2

Verbal report-out comments:

- Design the corridor more for pedestrians and cyclists
- Force cars to use Verona road
- Create a hybrid of Alternative D with multiuse path for “periodic/leisure bikers” and allow bikes in bus lane and right turn lane for commuters

Written worksheet comments:

- Alternative A:
 - Like that there is no vehicle capacity expansion = less induced demand. Sidewalk is adequate for pedestrians only.
 - Concerned about limited space available for less-experienced bicyclists.
 - Concerned about frequent crossings for pedestrian/bike/transit users. Crossings are extremely wide.
- Alternative B
 - Like bike lane, but comfortable only for experienced/brave bicyclists
 - Concerned about:
 - Capacity expansion = induced demand
 - Uncomfortable for less-experienced bicyclists
 - Bicyclists will ride on sidewalk which will be dangerous and scary for pedestrians
 - Transit is not prioritized which will slow transit
 - Bike lane is too narrow next to 10-foot transit lane
 - Will likely induce increased speeds and decrease safety for crossing
- Alternative C
 - This is the best alternative, except for dedicated right travel lane
 - Like the space for bicyclists and pedestrians off-street
 - This alternative is more comfortable for less-experienced bicyclists
 - Concerned additional capacity = induced demand
 - Worried about turning movements across path at all intersections and many driveways
 - Concerned that the width of off-street path is barely enough for higher levels of bike/pedestrian traffic that we want with more urban cross-section
- Alternative D
 - Like that this alternative is Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)-ready, but BRT would be best fitted in center lane, so there is no right-turning traffic in the way
 - Concerned that off-street paths are way too narrow
 - Concerned about same vehicle turning problems mentioned in C – across path
- General comments about all alternatives:
 - Build/design speed that equals urban roadway – not for speeds over speed limit
 - Need more frequent bike/pedestrian crossings
 - Need to slow turn movements – especially right, to make crossing safer
 - Tighten turning radii and improve crosswalks
 - Consider longer crossing time for pedestrians

Table 3

Verbal report-out comments:

- There are compromises presented in each option
- Alternative C is best

- Dedicating a lane to buses is not best use of a lane
- We like the multiuse path on both sides, especially in preparation for future development; bikers and pedestrians will feel safer on a multiuse path

Written worksheet comments:

- Alternative A
 - Commuting cyclists prefer on-street bike lane shared only with buses
 - Alternative A is most preferred for commuting cyclists
 - Prefer to push vehicles over to US 14 and Verona Road
 - Design Fish Hatchery road for pedestrians and cyclists in mind
 - Multiuse path should be planned along entire west side of corridor
 - Happy to see Pike Drive is being put through with this project
 - Plan corridor for more bike and pedestrian traffic, not vehicles
- Alternative B
 - When BRT comes, we will lose a lane of traffic
 - On-street bike lane too close to travel lane
- Alternative C
 - Concerned with Bus Rapid Transit having a dedicated lane
 - Casual cyclists prefer to be separated from vehicle travel lanes
 - Make outside lane a right-turn lane and bike lane, not for buses
- Alternative D
 - Alternative D compromises casual and commuter bicyclists
 - Prefer lane for avid bicyclists and buses, as well as a path for pedestrians and casual bicyclists

Table 4

Verbal report-out comments:

- No consensus agreement on an alternative
 - 2 like Alternative D
 - 1 likes Alternative C,
 - 1 with no specific choice
- Alternative A
 - Do not like that it disrupts current footprint
- Alternative B
 - Like dedicated bike lane
 - Do not like that buses have to stop in traffic
- Alternative C
 - Like multiuse path
 - Concerned about buses stopping in lane of traffic and pull out
 - Needs are met for bicyclists, but pedestrians must share path
- Alternative D
 - Like dedicated bus lane and multiuse paths on both side
 - Like that it maintains two true traffic lanes

Written worksheet comments:

- Alternative A
 - Like that it doesn't disrupt the current footprint
 - Like that buses have less disruption to traffic
 - Concerned about increasing/expanding the roadway capacity
 - Concerned about bikes being kept off the road

- This alternative best serves commuters by automobiles, buses (not co-mingling with cars), pedestrians, and commuters turning right out of the businesses
 - This alternative does a poor job of serving bicyclists and commuters due to less travel lanes
- Alternative B
 - Like the dedicated bike lane and an additional travel lane
 - Concerned this alternative forces bikes and buses into traffic lanes
 - This alternative best serves commuters by automobile by adding capacity for cars
 - This alternative does a poor job of serving buses because they have to stop in traffic with no pull-out
- Alternative C
 - Like that this alternative adds a multiuse path for bikes and pedestrians
 - Concerned about buses stopping in lane of traffic with no pull out
 - This alternative best meets the needs of commuters by car and recreational bikers
 - This alternative does a poor job of meeting pedestrian needs as they have to share multiuse path
- Alternative D
 - Like the dedicated bus lanes
 - Like the multiuse paths on both sides
 - Like that this alternative maintains 2 true traffic lanes
 - Like that this alternative adds a terrace

Table 5

Verbal report-out comments:

- Looking at alternative A compared to alternative D, the multiuse path would be great but do not believe there is enough room on both sides
- Looking at alternative A compared to alternative B, it is not practical to have cars on the far lane with buses

Written worksheet comments:

- Alternative A
 - Would like to see narrower lanes
- Alternative C
 - Alternative C is best option
 - Like that this alternative increases traffic capacity
 - Multiuse path is better than on-street path for bikers
 - Not worried about a potential impact to transit

Table 6

Verbal report-out comments:

- Alternative C is best
- Keep far-right lane for transit only
- Move potential Bus Rapid Transit into the center instead of right lane, which will also be better for loading
- Adequately mark paths so that it is very clear to cars at intersections that bicyclist may be crossing
- Add additional crossings, allowing pedestrians and bikers to get to other side, especially with a potential increase in development

Written worksheet comments:

- *No input provided/written down*

Open House Exercise

Before and after the presentation, participants were given the opportunity to comment on maps of the roadway and individual worksheets. In addition, participants were each given a set of numbered stickers to post on the maps in order to directly identify areas they chose to refer to; the following comments correspond to a number posted on the map (see appendix B).

(✓ = number of additional times an item was mentioned)

Open house input form results:

#124

- Make turn-off lanes in center longer – especially at Cahill main
- Center turn lanes are often built too short and need to be extended
- Since this considers/predicts new stoplights at Traceway-Pike intersection, what about Cahill Main?
- Southbound from Caddis Bend is a long traffic stream blocking a Left (west) turn at Cahill into the stores in the shopping center, from northbound on Fish Hatchery going west.

#125

- Of all options, alternate "C" is best, especially due to 3 traffic lanes. Some use the 3rd lane "thru" now, but lanes should be 11 feet each. Squeeze either or both multiuse paths to 8-9 feet and terrace to 4-4.5 feet as shown in other alternatives.
- No need for bike lane on Fish Hatchery; bikes don't belong in these traffic lanes. An 8-9-foot-wide multiuse path on both sides will suffice.

#126

- I like the multiuse path bridge at Nine Springs Creek west side. What about similar bridge on the east side? If Nine Springs box culverts are touched (re-done), place 1 box culvert lower, to take all low volume water, other culverts join in for higher flow volume. Add in another culvert at higher level, as a pedestrian-bike tunnel.

#162

- 10-foot multiuse path on the Speedway gas station side of the street and 5-foot sidewalk on the other side.

#163

- Maintain "bus, bike, & right turn only" lane – enhance paint marking – also include the planned 10-foot wide multiuse trail

#164

- Make this area pedestrian-friendly – there is a lot of multifamily housing and they need access to commercial development

Miscellaneous Comments:

- We may not need to have a multiuse path on both sides; we could just have it on the one side with businesses but don't necessarily need it on DNR side. University Avenue exercises this method and it works even though they have more traffic counts.
- Make sure to consider designs that make it easier for pedestrians to cross the street.

- The area near Nine Springs has a high water table due to the soil/rock underneath; we need to include underdrain along the pavement structure throughout the corridor to handle the water that builds up into the subgrade.
- Make sure that the typical section accounts for more single-occupant slower-moving vehicles, such as mopeds, electric vehicles, and ELFs.
- Prefer asphalt, smoother ride.
- Preferred the off-road bike accommodations in the typical sections. ✓
- Concerned about the raised median on Post Road. Mobile Gas Station owner will not be able to get the gas trucks into the business if the raised median is in place. This would also impact the gas station north of the Mobile.
- This was a great meeting and engagement process. I live in McFarland and when they re-did our main thoroughfare, there wasn't any kind of public engagement process available like this one, at least that I was aware of.
- Would like to see an alternative with a path on one side and sidewalk on another. No preference for which side, but that was missing as an option.
- UW Credit union is interested in a backage road network and has made arrangements to do so with neighbor (Avalon) and their new building on Fish Hatchery Road.
- There are safety concerns regarding increased traffic volumes and higher speeds within the neighborhoods west of Fish Hatchery Road during construction.
- Increase the terrace/add barrier along northside of CTH PD. Existing width is too narrow and an errant vehicle could easily strike a pedestrian on the sidewalk.
- Verify side road radii can accommodate bus turning movements.
- Do not make the outside lane a vehicle travel lane; traffic will go even faster and will continue to not respect the on-street bicycles. Sideroad traffic (Traceway and Brendan) entering FHR ignores bicycles on a regular basis with several near misses.
- Prioritize bicycle, pedestrian, and transit over expanding volume for regular cars. That traffic should use HWY 14, etc. and expanding Fish Hatchery will slow buses without significantly helping congestion. Traffic will expand to fill available space.
- Prefer multiuse path for pedestrians and more hesitant cyclists in addition to road lane for only buses and right turns and faster commuting bikes.
- Regardless of style, all lighting should be full cut-off.
- Streetscaping will have an impact on traffic flow and quality of life – it should be as extensive and beautiful as possible.
- Bury power lines where possible (which also helps prevent downed-line issues from weather).

Comment Cards

The following comments were submitted on individual comment cards at the end of the meeting:

- In addition to street profiles, have aerial photos and maps of fish hatchery road to discuss specific locations and the neighborhood environment and demand of the road.
- I'm interested in retail and residential areas along Fish Hatchery road; could these be utilized as alternative neighborhood "slow traffic routes"?
- Concerns regarding safe bus stops.
- Listening to the small group discussions, many of the descriptions for safety and access are best described using overhead diagrams of intersections. There was a lot of concern regarding right turns, but not enough consideration for left turns.

Input Sheets

Meeting participants were given an opportunity to complete a survey-like input sheet regarding streetscaping and design themes. The following input was received:

Question 1: Overall, how important is it to improve the streetscaping of North Fish Hatchery Road?

Response: not at all important – streetscaping is not a priority for North Fish Hatchery Road

Question 2: Are there design theme(s) that you would like to see in future streetscaping or public art along the roadway? (For example: fish, nature, bicycling, shopping, active themes, peaceful themes, etc.)

Response: as much pedestrian focused landscaping as possible

Question 3: Are there any additional comments that you would like to share about this project?

Response: no 6-lane highway through my neighborhood!