

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

April 20, 2011

Madison Municipal Building, Room LL-130

5:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call

Members Present: R. Ferrell, C. Gjerde, G. Hull, D. Newton, J. Rider, T. Stoebig, K. White, R. Williams

Members Absent: F. Bartol, J. Guo, E. Sundquist

Staff Present: B. Schaefer

2. Approval of January 19, 2011 Meeting Minutes

Rider moved, Williams seconded, to approve the January 19, 2011 meeting minutes. Motion carried.

3. Presentation on Growth Forecasts and Allocation for the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

Schaefer said MPO staff had finished the final draft of the Year 2035 growth forecasts by urban service area/municipality and the allocation of that growth down to the traffic analysis zone (TAZ) level for use in the regional travel model. He noted that tables with the USA/municipal forecasts were included in the meeting packet. He said the forecast methodology used was the same as that used for the 2030 plan. He noted that while the plan horizon year was only being extended out five years that because of a new revised higher county population forecast by the WisDOA Demographic Services Center almost fifteen years worth of additional growth was being added compared to the current plan. He said the employment forecast was again made using a labor supply analysis that assumed an increase in commuting from adjacent counties. He said recent Census data from 2006-2008 showed that commuting to Dane County had increased from 30,000 to 40,000, which supports that assumption. To allocate the growth down to the TAZ level, the MPO updated its composite land use plans map and collected building permit data since 2000. He showed the composite plans map with the TAZs overlaid on it, and pointed out some of the new local plans. He also showed the updated activity/employment centers map. He noted that a table was included in the packet showing the allocations for the City of Madison peripheral neighborhood plans and the percentage build out of those plans.

Rider asked how potential transportation improvements, including improved transit service, were factored into the land use allocation and travel forecasting process. Schaefer said the growth allocation is based on land use plans, which do assume roadway improvements. The allocation does factor programmed projects as well. For example, the USH 51 project in the DeForest area will likely result in more commercial development in that corridor. Most of the other roadway projects won't have a significant impact on regional growth patterns. An exception might be the North Mendota Parkway. Potential fixed guideway transit improvements (Transport 2020 plus future extensions) and bus service extensions were included as part of the transportation network for the 2030 Plan and will be for this plan update as well. The impacts in terms of traffic forecasts are mostly in the isthmus area. It doesn't significantly affect traffic in peripheral areas where roadway capacity projects would be considered.

4. Update on the Congestion Management Process Project

Schaefer emphasized that the CMP was an ongoing process, not a plan. The process involves ongoing measurement of how the transportation system is performing, identification of congested facilities/locations/modes, selection of congestion management strategies/projects, and evaluation of such strategies after implementation. He noted that the definition of congestion includes not just motor vehicle traffic on the street, but overcrowded buses and multi-use paths as well. The process is supposed to be integrated with the overall transportation planning and programming process. There are no required performance measures or targets, and the federal rules do not set standards for how congestion fits in with other regional priorities such as system preservation and quality of life. He

reviewed a proposed typology of congestion for different facilities and modes based on the congestion sources and therefore solutions. He then reviewed the proposed short-term and potential long-term performance measures. For example, while volume-to-capacity ratio and associated level of service (LOS) will continue to be used for roadway congestion, the goal is to evolve to using “travel time index” as well, at least for the freeway system. That is the ratio of peak to off-peak or free flow travel time. This is something the public can understand much better than LOS. Transit measures include on-time performance and bus passenger loading. Schaefer said he also suggested using service frequency. For pedestrians and bicyclists, the measure would be counts/volumes, but evolve to a level of service calculation. Schaefer said quantitative data isn’t available in some cases, such as the level of service for all local arterial intersections. Therefore, qualitative data will be used initially. MPO staff met with City of Madison Traffic Engineering staff and Metro Transit staff to identify problem intersections. The identified intersections and congested corridors based on traffic counts will be the focus of the CMP efforts. Schaefer reviewed some of the congestion management strategies, which will be identified for each corridor. They will be a combination of program strategies and more specific project concepts. A major policy decision for the MPO will be setting the performance targets. Generally the goal now for roadway congestion is LOS D, but a different lower standard might be set for the core Madison area and suburban community core areas where capacity is constrained. The on-time performance target for transit is another example. The next steps for the project are to complete the identification of congested locations, refine the strategies, and define the targets.

Rider commented on congestion cost and asked whether that data was available from the institute that estimates that information for the largest metro areas. Schaefer said the data was calculated for Madison. He said he didn’t think that would be a regular CMP measure, but something that might be calculated periodically in the future. Newton asked if this was the first time for implementation of the CMP. Schaefer said yes, although some aspects are currently being done. He said the new process could be viewed as a short or mid-term component of the RTP. Newton commented that perhaps the CMP might be able to help assess the impact of BRT or rail transit on congestion in the future.

5. Review of Draft Schedule and Public Participation Effort for the Congestion Management Process (CMP) and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update

Schaefer said the target date for the consultants to complete a draft of the CMP report is May 31. One or two public meetings would be held on it and the RTP update in June with a hearing in July and adoption in August. The target timeframe for completion of a draft RTP update report is September. Three meetings would be held that month with a hearing in October and adoption in November. He said adoption of the RTP update could be delayed until December or even January if necessary, but staff hoped to have it completed and adopted in November.

6. Resolution TPB No. 51 Regarding Amendment #3 to the 2011-2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

Schaefer said the amendment was mainly to add two planning/design projects for the proposed reconstruction and expansion to six lanes of Interstate 39/90 from Madison to the Illinois State Line. A project is also being added to construct roundabouts at the CTH MM/USH 14 ramp terminals.

7. Committee Member Reports

None.

8. Staff Reports

Schaefer said the MPO was still short two planners after the planner recently hired decided to return to her previous job for personal reasons. This will make it a major challenge to get the RTP update completed by November, but staff is committed to meeting the schedule. It will mean that staff will need to postpone further work on the Transit Development Plan update. He said a new updated county

bike map would be back from the printer in the next couple of days. The MPO Board approved revisions to the MPO's rules and operating procedures, but one more small change needs to be made to address a legal issue. Schaefer handed out 2010 Census population data for the larger communities in the MPO planning area. He also reviewed the upcoming agenda items.

10. Next Meeting Date

Schaefer said the next meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, May 18. The agenda will include a presentation on the USH 51 (McFarland to Stoughton) Study.

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:40 p.m.

Minutes recorded by Bill Schaefer