1. **Roll Call**

   *Members Absent:* R. Ferrell, C. Gjerde, G. Hull, K. White  
   *Staff Present:* B. Schaefer, N. VanderZwan

2. **Approval of August 31, 2011 Meeting Minutes**

   Stoebig moved, Bartol seconded, to approve the August 31, 2011 meeting minutes. Motion carried.

3. **Review and Recommendation on Draft 2012-2016 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

   Schaefer reviewed the revised STP Urban priority project listings. He noted the change in the timing of the Allen Boulevard and Cottage Grove Road projects and revised cost estimates and funding for the 2012 projects that are short of full 50% funding. Stoebig asked if storm water costs were eligible for funding. Schaefer answered that storm water facilities are an eligible cost, but not other utilities (sanitary sewer, water, etc.). Stoebig asked for the rationale for delaying projects to future years, and Schaefer responded that it was in order to fully fund projects at the 50% level. Stoebig commented that the County budget discussions could delay projects as well. Schaefer said that was possible, noting that the City of Madison and County had not reached an agreement on funding for a number of joint projects on county roadways. Sundquist asked about the ability of the MPO to carry over its STP Urban funds from year to year. Schaefer said that while WisDOT prefers that a large amount of funds not be carried over from year to year, it is allowed and the funding is not forfeited by doing this. Sundquist commented that it would be desirable to move projects up to use the available funds, especially now to stimulate the economy. Schaefer agreed, but said this usually isn’t possible. Also, the MPO makes a funding commitment to projects several years out and must make sure the funding will be available in later years for those projects. The MPO discourages municipalities from asking for funding for a project in a given year if it won’t be ready to construct, but some projects are complex and unanticipated delays do occur. WisDOT completes design early for some projects to prepare an “advanceable” list of projects if others get delayed or new funding becomes available, but local governments typically don’t do that for budgetary reasons. The MPO could certainly revisit its policy to essentially reserve funds for a project if it gets delayed too long. Williams asked if the STP Urban funding was given directly to the MPO. Schaefer said WisDOT administers the program for the MPO. Some funding used to be used for this work, but now state funds are used.

   Schaefer then reviewed some of the more significant project changes and new projects included in the addition/correction sheet handed out. Sundquist asked about the Glacial Drumlin Trail connection. Schaefer stated that an earmark was received, but the funding was only enough to cover design. That is occurring now, but there is no funding for construction. Sundquist asked if the Cannonball Trail Bridge over the Beltline was also an earmark. Schaefer said no, but the City was attempting to get approval to shift funding to the project from the earmark received for the Aberg Avenue Overpass that wasn’t needed, but Schaefer said he didn’t know the status of that. Sundquist asked what level of funding might be received President Obama’s recently proposed jobs bill were passed. Schaefer he thought it would be similar to the stimulus funding received in 2009 – for STP Urban, about an additional year or year and a half’s worth of funding.

   Williams moved, Stoebig seconded, to recommend approval of the Draft TIP with the proposed changes to the MPO Board. Motion carried, with Sundquist abstaining.

Schaefer reviewed some of the language added and other changes made to the draft CMP report in response to comments received. He also highlighted the recommendations. Schaefer said one change is being recommended to the draft report, which is to change the Travel Time Index performance targets for both freeways and arterial streets. A value of 1.75 is being proposed now for both based on further review of data collected on Beltline and national data. He said the new value is more consistent with the overall Level of Service D goal. He handed out two graphs showing peak period speeds on the Beltline on days without and with an incident and related that to the travel time index. He said it was an example of the fact that the measures and particularly the targets would need to be refined over time as more data is collected. Bartol stated the goals or values like the Travel Time Index have a tendency to “take on a life of their own” and be difficult to change. Sundquist questioned whether the Travel Time Index should reference the posted speed limits instead of the free-flow speed. Schaefer responded that the industry standard was to use free-flow speed to accurately represent actual travel speeds and time since that is what people’s expectations are. He said it does raise the issue of why roads are designed for speeds above what the speed limit is set at. Williams asked if PM peak congestion was worse than the AM peak, and Schaefer said yes. Schaefer said the MPO will be receiving monthly traffic speed and incident data from the State Traffic Operations Center in Milwaukee, so it will be interesting to analyze that data. Stoebig commented that the 2005 Metro boardings and alightings data was rather old, and asked whether more recent data was available. Schaefer responded that boarding data by location is available, but not alighting data. Regarding the recommendation to investigate implementation of an incident response program for urban arterial streets, Stoebig asked whether local authorities might have conflicting policies regarding the response plan. Schaefer responded that they most likely would and there would need to be agreement or buy-in from the different agencies. Sundquist asked whether the CAC would meet again prior to adoption of the CMP report, and Schaefer said no unless the CAC wanted to have a special meeting. Schaefer said he recognized that CAC members hadn’t had much time to review the draft report. He asked they felt comfortable making a recommendation on the report or preferred to just submit individual comments. The consensus was to just have members provide individual comments. Sundquist stated that the different metrics in the report are a step in the right direction, but he would like the MPO to address more of the demand aspect. Sundquist stated that other MPOs in the country have used funding to support good land use development projects.

5. **Brief Report on Planning Project for Judge Doyle Square and Area Southeast of the Capitol Square**

Schaefer briefly mentioned the planning project and handed out some information on it. He said the focus right now was on redevelopment of the block that the municipal building is located on and the Government East parking ramp block. The ramp needs to be replaced, but parking needs to be in place on the adjacent block before that is done.

6. **Committee Member Reports**

None

7. **Staff Reports**

- **RTP 2035 Schedule, Separate 2011 TIP Amendment for 2012 Projects**

Schaefer stated the revised schedule for the RTP was to complete a draft report by the end of the year and get it adopted by the Board in February 2012. He said because of the delay in getting the RTP adopted a special amendment to the 2011 TIP would be processed for 2012 projects to make...
sure that no delays occur with those projects. The 2012 TIP won’t become effective until after the RTP is adopted.

- Transit Corridors and TOD Study – Part of Sustainable Communities Grant Project
  Schaefer mentioned this study and said staff would review the scope of work at the next committee meeting in November.

Williams commented that the City needs to begin work on an intercity bus terminal, especially when the University begins renovation at the Union. Williams also expressed concern regarding the parking situation at the Dutch Mill Park and Ride Lot and the fact that no gates will be installed for the long-term lot. Sundquist said a city staff committee is working on the bus terminal issue.

8. **Next Meeting Date**
   The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, November 16, 2011.

9. **Adjournment**
   The meeting was adjourned at 6:50 p.m.

*Notes recorded by Bill Schaefer and Nick VanderZwan*