Madison Area Transportation Planning Board  
Citizen Advisory Committee  
Meeting Minutes  

January 21, 2015 Madison Municipal Building, Room LL-130 5:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call/Introductions

*Members Absent:* J. Canela, R. Ferrell,  
*Staff Present:* W. Schaefer, D. Kanning

2. Approval of November 19, 2014 Meeting Minutes

   Rider moved, Rylander seconded, to approve the November 19, 2014 meeting minutes. Motion carried.

3. Staff Reports

   Schaefer reported on the status of the Metro Transit on board survey. He noted that Cambridge Systematics, the lead consultant, is working with the University of Wisconsin and another firm to administer the survey. The survey will be administered in late February and early March. Springman asked if the survey would ask why people take transit. Schaefer said that the primary purpose of the survey is to collect data on trip patterns and the characteristics of the riders so that an origin-destination table could be created. The O-D table will help calibrate the mode choice component of the MPO’s travel demand model and improve transit forecasts. He said the MPO planned to conduct a household survey for the Regional Transportation Plan and would include a question like that as part of that survey. Arnold asked if the results of the survey will be made available to municipalities in the Madison area, and Schaefer said yes the results and associated data will be made public. Arnold asked if SRF, whom Fitchburg hired to do a transit study for the city, had contacted the MPO about the study. Schaefer said yes and that they have offered their assistance.

   Schaefer said that an update on the status of the regional bicycle transportation plan will be provided at the next meeting in March.

   Schaefer provided an update on the functional classification map update. He explained that WisDOT is responsible for updating the map every ten years, but must work with the MPOs for updates in the larger urban areas. Rylander stated the map update is a national practice required by the FHWA. Schaefer noted that the roadway functional classes have an impact on the design standards of roadways should they receive federal funding. Also, roadways must be functionally classified as a collector or arterial to be eligible for federal funding. Schaefer said that the functional classes are assigned from a regional standpoint. Therefore, a roadway classified as a collector on a local municipality’s map may not be classified as a regional collector on the official functional classification map. The committee discussed how the urban or rural designation of a roadway affects roadway design. Springman asked if the functional classification map will be sent to the municipalities in Dane County. Schaefer confirmed that the map will be distributed to the municipalities for review and comment.

4. Presentation on WisDOT Southwest Region Park-and-Ride (PNR) System Study

   Schaefer provided a presentation on the Southwest Region Park-and-Ride Study. The primary goals of the study are to reduce traffic volumes on state highways and to provide cost-effective travel options. Maintenance and patrol agreements are required prior to new lot development. Hull asked who is responsible for lot security. Schaefer said that security is an issue that is addressed in the maintenance and patrol agreements and is a local responsibility.
Schaefer said that park-and-ride lots are generally sited adjacent to state highways and constructed with highway improvements. Eleven park-and-ride lots are located in the Southwest region. Ten of those lots are located in Dane County. Hull asked if the study is examining potential park-and-ride lot sites outside of Dane County. Schaefer confirmed that it is.

Schaefer described the study’s objectives and geographic limits. Wallace asked how Objective No. 8, “Establish long-term coordination with local officials” was accomplished. Schaefer said that WisDOT has held several meetings with local officials. In addition, the Region’s office has a multi-modal coordinator. He said he wasn’t sure how else WisDOT planned to implement that objective other than establishing good working relationships with communities. Schaefer described the data collection efforts and displayed a map of county-to-county commute patterns. He also presented a map that showed proposed future express bus routes. Next, Schaefer displayed a slide that showed vanpool route density. The largest concentration of routes is located in east and southeast corridors. A map was also displayed of the vanpool pick-up locations. Hull commented that he was surprised Epic Systems does not have their own buses to transport employees to and from the Epic campus. It was noted that Epic contributes funds to Metro Transit for bus service that serves the campus.

Schaefer described the public participation efforts that WisDOT has initiated. Several meetings have been scheduled with local officials and stakeholders. Schaefer displayed a map that shows informal van pool and carpool parking sites, lot locations evaluated, and state trails. Arnold asked why the state trail system was shown on the map. Schaefer said that trails may be shown to identify bike-and-ride opportunities, but more importantly for joint projects with DNR or local communities where the lots could serve a dual purpose serving the trail as well. Wallace added that the City of Cottage Grove is working on adding bike paths to CTH N that will connect their park-and-ride with the Glacial Drumlin trailhead. Schaefer described how potential park-and-ride lot locations were evaluated. More than 130 general locations were evaluated with a demand model. The model is based on travel costs which consist of travel time, vehicle operation and parking data. It also utilizes employee origin-destination data sets.

Williams commented that vehicles cannot park for extended periods at the Dutch Mill facility. This is problematic for travelers who take Van Galder buses to Union Station and are gone for longer than one week. He noted that there is no signage that posts the restriction. Schaefer said that a maintenance and security agreement is in place that governs the parking restrictions. He explained that WisDOT had previously discussed the possibility of reserving a section of the lot for long-term parking and charging for that, but the City of Madison was not interested in maintaining such a facility.

Discussion ensued on the need for and potential funding sources for an the intercity bus terminal.


Schaefer provided an overview of the STP-Urban funding program. He presented a revised version of the draft STP Urban roadway project scoring criteria and described why it is important to have categories not only for roadway projects, but also for ITS and transit projects. The proposed scoring system is more transparent than the existing system and provides additional details to applicants that describe how a project can score well.

Schaefer reviewed the three example projects that were evaluated and scored using the proposed draft criteria: Monona Drive, University Avenue, and the southern segment of CTH M, from Cross Country Rd. to CTH PD. The three example projects received the same ranking as the current system, but with a wider scoring spread. Schaefer explained the reasons why the University Avenue score increased relative to the others. The new system provides a larger range of scores, which Schaefer said was good because currently scores tend to fall within a very narrow range.

Stoebig asked when the MPO Policy Board would approve the new criteria. Schaefer said staff needed to review the criteria with the technical committee and finalize the draft criteria for the ITS and transit project types prior to the board approving them. Rothe asked if categories 9, 10 and 11 are
in the existing system. Schaefer said that the existing system addresses some of these categories. Hull asked Schaefer to describe the main problems with the existing system. Aside from the scoring spread issue, Schaefer said that the existing system has very general criteria, which makes it very difficult to score projects, particularly non-traditional projects. There is also little guidance on how projects are scored. Stoebig asked if the proposed scoring system will remove some of the existing subjectivity. Schaefer confirmed that it would. Members commented that it should be up to the applicant to provide data to support an application.

Schaefer said an issue covered in the criteria that must be examined further from a policy standpoint is how far along a project should be in environmental review/design prior to an application. Rylander stated that some preliminary work is needed in order to generate a feasible cost estimate. Schaefer explained that a community may not want to spend a large sum of money to design a project if they do not have an assurance of project funding. Rylander commented that this may be a good screening mechanism.

Schaefer commented on the proposed criteria. He noted that there is not a separate criterion for projected future traffic volumes, but the MPO’s policy is not to provide capacity improvements before they are needed. Other criteria address this issue. Rylander commented that CTH M would be a state highway if it was located in a different metropolitan area. Rylander said that the proposed criteria and scoring system is an improvement over the current system. He noted that there is a limit to the extent criteria can be quantified. Rylander suggested removing the criterion which measures total number of crashes. He said that “crash rate” is a much better criterion since rates are normalized. The average crash rates in Dane County should be used as a benchmark rather than statewide rates. Stoebig asked if crash severity should also be considered. Rylander said that the total crash rate is sufficient as a planning tool.

6. Presentation on MPO and CARPC “Active Living Places” Project
   Deferred.

7. Review of Draft Schedule for Regional Transportation Plan 2050 and Public Participation Ideas
   Deferred.

8. Committee Member Reports
   None.

9. Next Meeting Date
   The next meeting date is scheduled for Wednesday, March 18, 2015.

10. Adjournment
    The meeting adjourned at 6:45 pm.

Minutes were recorded by W. Schaefer and D. Kanning