

Community Advisory Committee Meeting #3

May 6, 2016, 10 a.m.

Madison City Hall, Council Chambers

CAC members in attendance: Jim Olson, Mark Cash, Matt Wirth, Nathan Hadley, Dan Baughman

Team members in attendance: Eric Arthur, Adam Burns, Cassie Reiter, Michelle Allen, Chris Wahlman, Whitney Carlin, Whitney Pflanzner

1) Introductions

2) Recap of CAC, stakeholder feedback

We were not originally anticipating the need for a CAC meeting in May. With feedback from the stakeholder meetings and public meeting in February, we have not narrowed the alternatives down to one. There are three “build” options remaining, and we want your feedback on the pros and cons of each, and your opinions on how to make these alternatives fit in with the community.

3) Today’s agenda and overview

Today’s goal is to review the preliminary preferred alternatives. Other alternatives were eliminated based on their performance against the other alternatives and project’s goal – which is to select a route that best addresses the safety concerns, mobility challenges and economic development needs of Madison. We will discuss the performance metrics and non-numerical benefits and challenges of each alternative. We will also discuss potential enhancements for the alternatives, including the desire to keep aesthetics consistent with city-wide initiatives, and mobility and connectivity opportunities. Please be sure you’re speaking for your organization.

Preliminary preferred alternatives

- Alternative 1 – No build; provides a benchmark to evaluate all other alternatives. No cost, no impact. Doesn’t solve the goals.
 - Doesn’t address to meet the needs. It still directs traffic through the residential area, still has environmental impacts and continues to have difficult intersections.
- Alternative 4 – Grade-separated with bridges over 2nd St. Allows US 421 traffic to flow freely between the river and Main St.
 - North of 2nd St, the road would be elevated. S.R. 56 tees into US 421 north of 2nd St.
 - Impacts seven parcels completely, and several other partials.
 - This alternative has impacts to the Dry Dock Banquet Center, 2-Story White Residence structure, and used car lot/produce store because US 421 is elevated. If INDOT buys all three parcels, it could accommodate a gateway/visitors center.
 - The red roadhouse that sits below SR 56 grade would be impacted by the project. The structure itself could be protected, but the remaining property might not be attractive, which might lead to a full acquisition.
 - Liquor store and lawn mower repair would both be acquired.
- Alternative 6 – This is the at-grade alternative. Cuts through the bluff to get down the grade at 2nd St. SR 56 ties into the intersection at 2nd St.

- Stop signs at 2nd St. Traffic numbers do not warrant a traffic signal for a number of years.
 - There are six properties affected in this alternative.
 - There would be a five-foot buffer between curb and trail; pedestrians would be routed along 2nd St.
 - There's an access road at the north end. There is a retaining wall because we have to cut into the bluff. 2nd St. north has a vertical grade at 4 to 5 percent. There would be a dedicated left-turn lane for trucks heading west to continue along SR 56. There would be more noise in those homes where SR 56 connects to 2nd St. Cul-de-sac in alley for trash pick-up.
 - There's a concern about how a retaining wall will fit into the context of the historic district. Can we use materials that keep with the aesthetics of the district?
- Alternative 8 – Roundabout; addresses resident requests to remove traffic from the neighborhoods altogether. The roundabout would be located at Ferry and SR 56. We would build a connector up to 2nd for local traffic.
 - Impacts twelve parcels completely, and several other partials.
 - There's a mountable apron within the roundabout (similar to a curb) for the truck traffic.

4) Group Discussion

- In terms of traffic flow, alternatives 4 and 6 perform very similarly. Alternative 8 increases travel time by approximately 30 seconds, and the average speed would be about 3mph slower than alternatives 4 and 6.
- The alternatives that provide the least right of way/land acquisition impacts on the community are alternatives 4 and 6. Alternative 6 provides the least impacts to historic properties.
- All remaining alternatives provide a reduction in total vehicular crashes. Alternative 6 provides a 20 percent crash reduction and Alternative 8 provides a 23 percent reduction. However, the design team cannot measure the predicted severity of vehicle accidents.
- Noise analysis has not been performed on any of the remaining preferred alternatives. At this time, the design team estimates that there will not be an increase in noise with Alternative 6. With Alternative 4, the noise is anticipated to go upward, rather than outward toward surrounding streets, due to the height of the grade-separated barrier wall.
- Bike and pedestrian safety are important to CAC members, and a connection point to/from the bridge – without stairs - and Harrison Street is preferred.
- Residents on 1st and 2nd streets are more concerned with a traffic increase on these streets than the appearance of a grade-separated option. Some residents would like to see options for allowing less access to local streets from US 421.
- CAC members agreed Alternative 8 feels inconvenient, and that motorists would not use the route, but local streets instead for a “shortcut.” Roundabouts are also difficult for large trucks to maneuver. Using local streets as a “shortcut” is not as likely with alternatives 4 and 6.
- CAC members believed that Alternative 6 may prove difficult for pedestrians to cross US 421.

- To soften the look of the bridge for Alternative 4, the design team could consider narrowing the traffic lanes on 2nd Street, installing an archway/gateway structure and including some sort of historical treatment to tie into the current standards for the city.
- There was some discussion about whether the barrier wall for Alternative 6 would fit in aesthetically with the city. There would be a retaining wall stretching immediately north of 1st Street to the north side of 2nd Street.
- Alternative 6 is not designed for left turns for semis onto 2nd Street. Cars would be able to turn left onto 2nd Street in this configuration. Discussion included whether the alternative design could be tweaked to allow for a right-in turn from southbound US 421 to westbound 2nd Street, a right-in turn from eastbound 2nd Street onto US 421 and no left-turning movement from northbound US 421 to westbound 2nd Street.
- Less traffic would be present on 2nd Street in alternatives 4 and 6.
- Alternative 6 would likely be preferred for semi drivers.
- Preferred aesthetics include decorative lighting similar to Main Street and decorative concrete.
- CAC members outlined what a “gateway” to Madison might include: archway over Broadway Street, decorative element along the at-grade wall, “Madison” sign in wrought iron, Welcome Center (comfort station, city literature, etc.).
- CAC members did not wish to see a tattoo shop or strip of businesses along US 421 as part of this “gateway.”
- Wayfinding signage and a walking path loop to accommodate pedestrians would be ideal. There was some discussion about whether the walking path loop to the bridge could tie into the Heritage bike trail.
- In terms of initial project costs – including construction, right of way acquisition and utility relocation (simply for comparison purposes, not final), Alternative 4 is estimated to cost \$9.9 million, and Alternative 6 would cost approximately \$6.7 million.

5) Next steps

The next CAC meeting is expected to take place in July/August. This meeting will include the review of the single preferred alternative. The team also plans to host a public open house to share this information with the entire community.

6) Meeting adjourned at 12 p.m.