Minutes of the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board  
Citizen Advisory Committee  
February 17, 2010 Madison Municipal Building, Room LL-120 5:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call  
*Members Present:* F. Bartol, R. Ferrell, G. Hull, J. Rider, R. Williams, E. Sundquist (left during item #5), C. Gjerde, J. Guo, T. Stoebig  
*Members Absent:* D. Phillips, S. Hiniker  
*Staff Present:* B. Schaefer  
*Others Present:* A. Matano

2. Approval of November 18, 2009 Meeting Minutes  
Sundquist moved, Bartol seconded, to approve the November 18 meeting minutes. Motion carried.

3. Brief Discussion on Milwaukee-Madison High-Speed Intercity Passenger Rail Service Project and Process for Selecting the Madison Station Location(s)  
Schaefer said he had included some information from WisDOT’s application for funding in the packet. He also distributed a memo from the Legislative Fiscal Bureau to the Joint Finance Committee (JFC) that provided a nice summary of the project. The JFC approved the Governor’s request to receive the funding and work on the project should begin soon. Schaefer summarized the service proposal. He said an environmental study was needed for the four new stations, including Madison, and that would provide the opportunity for input on that issue. Track and crossing construction is scheduled to begin in late 2010, station construction in 2011, and the service started in 2013.  
Williams commented that the MPO would have a say on the station location since the MPO must approve the federal funding for the project. Bartol commented that the need for an intermodal facility should be kept in mind in deciding on the station location. He wondered what the role of the RTA would be. Hull said the RTA should play an important role. Bartol said the multimodal services and facilities will evolve over time. Schaefer said that was true. A second true downtown station might be added later if commuter rail service is implemented in the future. However, there is concern about getting a commitment for a second station from WisDOT now if that becomes the plan. Williams mentioned the application states that the municipalities would be responsible for the design and construction of the stations. Williams and Sundquist said there were numerous potential station locations mentioned when the environmental study on the project was done. Williams commented that the fencing of the rail corridor in urban areas would be controversial with the neighborhood.

4. Brief Update on the Dane County Regional Transit Authority  
Schaefer reported that all of the appointments to the RTA Board had now been made. He said the first meeting of the Board would be held in early March. County Board staff will be setting up the first meeting, which will be posted on the county’s website.  
Williams asked whom he should send comments to regarding suggestions for Metro bus system improvements for the RTA transit scenarios being developed. He said some of the core weekend routes such as Route 7 needed an increase in frequency to 30 minutes. Schaefer said that will be part of the improvements proposed. He suggested sending comments to him and he’d pass them on to Metro staff. Williams also said he thought the North Transfer Point should be moved to MATC Truax or the airport. Stoebig commented that he thought the location of other transfer points should be considered for re-location. Schaefer said a restructuring of the bus system, including the transfer points, might be needed for the rail scenario and possibly the BRT scenario.
5. Review and Discussion of Draft Conceptual Bus and Demand Responsive Transit Service Improvements for RTA Scenarios

Schaefer noted that he had reviewed the three conceptual service scenarios at the last committee meeting. The TDP committee is now in the process of fleshing out the details of the first scenario, which includes bus and demand response transit service improvements. He said a number of materials were included in the packet related to these improvements. He pointed out the map listing improvements to Metro routes by area. To serve intra-community trips for areas without local bus service demand responsive service (shared-ride taxi) would be provided. The Cities of Sun Prairie and Stoughton currently have such service. Schaefer explained the draft concept for how this service might be structured, which is based on a zone system. Service would be provided within each zone or to a connection point where persons could access the bus system. Schaefer said an outline of potential improvements to specialized transportation services and programs for seniors and persons with a disability was also included in the packet. These services might also be partially funded by the RTA, although Schaefer said the county would probably still continue to administer these countywide services. Stoebig pointed out that the RTA law says RTAs are not eligible recipients of state section 85.21 program funding—the main source of transportation funding for these programs. Schaefer said he’d bring back more information in the future as the details continue to be worked out.


Schaefer said all MPOs in urban areas over 200,000 in population are required by federal law to have a congestion management process (CMP) that meets specific requirements. The CMP is intended to be a systematic, transparent way for identifying and managing congestion and is intended to be part of the overall regional transportation planning process. The CMP for the Madison area does not meet all of the federal requirements. Schaefer said the outline that was included in the packet is MPO staff’s initial attempt to identify how the process would be enhanced to meet the federal requirements. He said that staff is still figuring out what will be done. Much of the document to be prepared will reference the recent and ongoing studies and efforts such as Madison’s traffic signal coordination program. The MPO’s role will be primarily a coordinating one. A congestion management subcommittee will be created to help with this. Schaefer said he hopes that over time the CMP will add value to the planning process and help prioritize projects for funding (e.g., TSM projects such as intersection improvements). Schaefer said more information on the project will be provided in the future.

7. Committee Member Reports

Williams suggested including the email addresses of committee members on the MPO’s website. Schaefer said he thought that issue was discussed and it was the consensus of the committee not to put personal contact information on the website, but perhaps that was just the phone number. It was suggested that perhaps a group address could be created. Schaefer said he could look into that.

8. Staff Reports

Schaefer mentioned that the process for hiring the new MPO transportation planning manager was underway. He said the MPO Board would have a role in the process and the issue was on the agenda of the next MPO Board meeting. He noted the list of future agenda items.

9. Next Meeting Dates

Wednesday, March 17 and Wednesday, May 19, 2010

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Minutes recorded by Bill Schaefer