

**Minutes of the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board
Citizen Advisory Committee**

January 19, 2011

Madison Municipal Building, Room LL-120

5:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call

Members Present: F. Bartol, R. Ferrell, C. Gjerde, J. Rider, R. Williams, E. Sundquist

Members Absent: G. Hull, D. Phillips, S. Hiniker, T. Stoebig, J. Guo

Staff Present: B. Schaefer

2. Approval of July 21, 2010 Meeting Minutes

Schaefer said there wasn't a quorum at the October meeting so there weren't minutes to approve, but just notes.

Sundquist moved, Gjerde seconded, to approve the July 21, 2010 meeting minutes. Motion carried.

3. Update on the Regional Transit Authority (RTA) and Review of Draft Plan for Transit to Support Referendum

Schaefer said the RTA Board and its Plan for Transit Committee have been working to put together a Phase 1 conceptual plan for improving and regionalizing the transit system to support a public referendum on a sales tax. Metro and MPO staff have been providing information and technical assistance. A draft of the plan was in the packet. Additional edits are continuing to be made to the document. The conceptual plan included a general scope of services with cost ranges for the different categories of new and improved services. The thinking is that this level of detail is adequate to support the referendum, and that a detailed transit plan would be prepared following the referendum before new services are implemented. The plan only includes a first phase of service improvements that would be implemented within a 3-year time period. The scope of services builds off of the work that was done by the expanded TDP committee that MPO staff created to develop RTA service scenarios. He said it appears the RTA Board is leaning towards going with a ¼ cent sales tax initially. The plan notes that study of commuter rail and/or BRT would continue for possible implementation in later phases. The plan also includes study of a new intermodal station. Schaefer said the RTA Board hasn't made a final decision yet to go forward with a referendum this spring.

Williams questioned why Fitchburg was listed both under the new regional express bus service and the expanded service between Madison and adjacent communities and why Middleton wasn't listed under express service. Schaefer said express service from Fitchburg was discussed by the TDP committee as part of Metro service improvements, but wasn't included in the regional express services developed that was the basis of the cost estimate. He said part of Middleton could be served by the Waunakee route. Schaefer said he thought some express service should be included for the peripheral neighborhoods of Madison, particularly the SW side. Bartol commented that the document was really a "framework" for regionalizing the transit system, not a plan. Ferrell asked if Metro would become the regional transit service provider. Schaefer said the plan initially is for the RTA to just provide funding and use the existing and potential new providers. He said the mechanics of providing the funding hadn't been worked out. For example, if a community decided to contract with Metro for new service would that community or Metro apply to the RTA and WisDOT for funding. Williams said the funding issues needed to be discussed. He also mentioned the importance of the intermodal center issue. WisDOT was going to be contracting with private providers for new intercity bus service to/from Madison, increasing the need for an intercity bus terminal. He also said that the Madison Area Bus Advocates had taken a position supporting a spring referendum for a ¼ cent sales tax.

4. Presentation on Regional Transportation System Performance Indicators for the Regional Transportation Plan Update

Schaefer said there has been increasing emphasis on performance-based transportation planning at the federal level. FHWA and WisDOT have strongly encouraged MPOs to develop transportation system performance indicators, and the Madison MPO committed to doing so. The idea is that the indicators will be used in the future as a diagnostic tool to alert the MPO about changes or trends. An initial list of indicators has been developed. For each one, a baseline measure has been calculated, generally for the year 2009. Where earlier data was available, a comparison has been made to the prior year, generally 2005. He reviewed a table created that grouped the indicators by the relevant plan objectives that the indicators were measuring progress on and then reviewed the data for some of the indicators. He said some additional analysis of the data would be added.

Williams questioned the high pavement condition rating for I-39/90 south of Madison. Schaefer said that did appear to be wrong since a pavement repair project for the roadway was programmed in the TIP. Ferrell questioned the high rating for Mid-Town Road. Sundquist asked about the connection between the indicators and the project selection process. Schaefer said the system-wide indicators are meant to paint a picture and alert the MPO about potential issues. Plan recommendations might then flow from further analysis of the data. Sundquist commented that he didn't see any true accessibility measures. Schaefer agreed and said the initial indicators were viewed as a starting point with revisions likely as additional data becomes available. Sundquist said there was a relatively simple methodology for creating a walk score for areas as an example. He commented that he thought there were too many indicators, but suggested two others—energy consumption and bicycle/pedestrian LOS. Schaefer said some corridor/area specific performance measures would be developed as part of the congestion management plan project.

5. Brief Update on Congestion Management Plan Project

Schaefer noted that a project summary was in the packet. He briefly explained the project, and said that a staff advisory committee was being created for it. The committee, which will be a subcommittee of the MPO technical committee, will be a permanent committee charged with overseeing implementation of the enhanced congestion management process to be developed and future updates. A kickoff meeting for the project was scheduled for January 26. There was some discussion about the scope of project. Schaefer said a more detailed analysis would be conducted of some problem intersections. Williams mentioned the difficulty pedestrians have crossing University Avenue by the UW Engineering building.

6. Discussion of Committee Meeting Schedule

Schaefer said he put the item on the agenda because Al Matano, who had been attending meetings, now had a conflict and couldn't make the meetings. Matano didn't suggest changing the schedule just for him, but Schaefer said he thought he'd see whether another day might work. He said some changes would be made to the committee membership and it made sense to wait until the new members were on board before considering a change. He said the other options were the second Wednesday of the month, third Tuesday, or fourth Tuesday. Schaefer said the latter two worked best because they were closer to the MPO Board meetings when materials would be ready for review with the committee before taking them to the board.

7. Committee Member Reports

Williams mentioned that a group of people met with the head of the Assembly Transportation Committee. One of the messages they heard was that the state transportation fund is in bad shape.

8. Staff Reports

Schaefer reported that the MPO Policy Board approved a 2011-2015 TIP amendment at its January meeting, and he distributed a copy of the resolution. The amendment was needed due to changes in the timing and cost of four WisDOT projects (STH 113, USH 14, USH 151/Main St. interchange, and S. High Point Road bridge over Beltline) and to reflect programmed Federal funding for four bicycle projects and two E/D transit projects. He mentioned that the new MPO planner would be starting on 1/31, but in the meantime the MPO's staff modeler unexpectedly retired. A consultant, HNTB, would be hired to provide modeling services in the meantime. HNTB has already been providing some modeling support to the MPO through a contract with WisDOT. He said that revisions were being made to the MPO's rule and operating procedures. Most of the proposed changes simply codify existing procedures or add information from other documents (redesignation agreement, work program, etc.). The impetus for revising the rules was questions that were raised about the MPO's authority that came up during the hiring process for the MPO Planning Manager and the Board's role in that process. Staff decided to draft a comprehensive set of revisions. He also mentioned that a group of six people from the Capital Area Sustainable Communities Consortium, including Brad Murphy and him, attended a workshop in Boston for some of the regions that received HUD Sustainable Communities grants. The grant for the Madison region includes a transit corridors study.

10. Next Meeting Date

Schaefer said the next meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, March 16. Gjerde and Ferrell said they couldn't make the meeting. Schaefer said an additional meeting or two would probably be added this year with all of the work on the different projects this year.

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Minutes recorded by Bill Schaefer