Madison Area Transportation Planning Board
Citizen Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes

City-County Building, 210 MLK Jr. Blvd.
September 19, 2018 Room 103A 5:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call

Members Absent: M. Jones, T. Stoebig, T. Wilson
Staff Present: W. Schaefer, D. Kanning

2. Approval of July 18, 2018 Meeting Minutes

Moved by Clark, seconded by Rider, to approve the July 18, 2018 meeting minutes. Motion carried.

3. Staff Reports

- **Work Plan to Improve Travel Model and Other Planning Tools**
  Schaefer reported that MATPB has hired a consultant to develop a multi-year plan to improve the regional travel model, other GIS based planning tools, and data to support them. A staff group will meet in mid-October to discuss the consultant’s recommendations.

- **2019 MATPB Work Program**
  Schaefer said that staff is preparing the 2019 MATPB Work Program, and will be meeting with WisDOT staff in October to discuss it. Williams asked about the status of Madison’s BRT project. Schaefer said that it is not underway yet but will be soon.

- **MATPB-CARPC Workgroup**
  Schaefer said that the MATPB-CARPC Workgroup would be meeting this Thursday evening to discuss work coordination efforts and a draft report with some recommendations for short-term actions and ideas for longer term actions to better integrate the planning efforts of the two agencies. The draft report would then be presented to both agencies.

- **MPO Board Appointments**
  Schaefer reported that the Policy Board has two new Madison appointees, City of Madison Council Members Allen Arntsen and Zach Wood, and two new County Executive appointees, Kelly Danner and Sun Prairie Mayor Paul Esser.

- **MPO/RPC/DOT Conference**
  Schaefer reported that the MPO/RPC/DOT conference, held last week and hosted by MATPB, was a success. Conference presentations are posted on the MATPB website.
4. **Review and Recommendation on Draft 2019-2023 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Metropolitan Area and Dane County**

Schaefer discussed the recent news story that questioned whether WisDOT was improperly holding onto federal STBG-Urban funds intended for MATPB and other MPOs in the state. He said that WisDOT delayed moving forward with the STBG-Urban program last year since they were looking at restructuring the program. As part of roll out of the program this year WisDOT said it was eliminating 2018 and going with a 4-year vs. 5-year program, which made it seem WisDOT was withholding a year’s worth of funding. FHWA is investigating and has requested that WisDOT provide documentation of funding allocated and approved for MPO projects. FHWA is working to calculate how much funding should be passed through to the MPOs. Schaefer said an additional related issue is that two projects came in under budget by a total of $2 million last year. WisDOT said that money couldn’t be reallocated to other projects or even used for the projects under budget. FHWA has said this funding should not account towards MATPB’s required allocation so at least that money should be made available to the MATPB.

Clark explained how WisDOT used to manage local projects in a way to prevent MPOs from losing funds due to cost savings or changes in project schedules. He also explained WisDOT’s role in managing projects. Williams remarked that MPOs with a population greater than 200,000 are supposed to get funding directly from the federal government. Schaefer clarified that the funding is actually supposed to go to WisDOT, which makes the funding available for MPOs. Ryder asked how the additional funding, if provided, would be allocated. Schaefer said that the funding would be used first for approved STBG-Urban projects that are short on funding. If funding is still available, that funding and the additional year’s worth of the funding would be awarded to new projects as part of the application cycle next year. Ryder asked about the status of the safety educator position. Schaefer reported that FHWA has informed WisDOT that they cannot prohibit MATPB from using federal STBG-Urban funds for ped/bike program funding, nor can they line item veto individual projects from a TIP or TIP Amendment.

Schaefer reviewed the Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) – Urban priority projects and highlighted some of the other major pedestrian/bicycle and roadway projects in the draft TIP. He highlighted that the University Avenue (Shorewood Blvd. to University Bay Dr.) reconstruction project as the new major STBG-Urban project being added with construction scheduled in 2021. Schaefer described the limits and phasing of the West Beltline Path project. Ryder remarked that there are two property owners in the area of West Towne Mall from which property is needed for the path. He noted that property cannot be condemned for ped/bike paths, thus putting on hold that segment of the path. Schaefer presented the plans for the CTH M path. Richard discussed the potential locations for this path. She also said that Century Avenue (CTH M) may not be constructed due to jurisdictional issues with Dane County that have not been resolved. Williams commented that a new intercity bus terminal should be included. He noted that the City of Rockford, Illinois just constructed a new transit center, and that it is embarrassing for Madison not to have a facility. Schaefer said that MATPB cannot sponsor projects.
Moved by Richard, seconded by Rider, to recommend approval of the 2019-2023 TIP with the proposed changes reviewed, including the Section 5310 projects to be funded. Motion carried.

5. **Review of Madison Metro Area Data for Federal Transportation System Performance Measures and Recommendation on Setting of MPO Targets**

Schaefer described the federally required transportation system management process, which requires state DOTs and MPOs to establish performance targets for the federal measures created that are related to national goals. State DOTs and MPOs must then track performance over time to see if the targets are being met or progress is at least being made. MPOs must also evaluate how their Regional Transportation Plans and TIPs, when updated, will help achieve the targets. MPOs have the option to support state DOT targets or develop their own targets. Schaefer said staff will almost certainly recommend that MATPB simply support the state targets. There is no advantage for MATPB to establish its own targets as there are no funding consequences at the MPO level if targets are not met. WisDOT controls most of the funding. The value is more in reporting on progress and hopefully using the performance measure targets to inform project programming.

Schaefer reviewed statewide and Madison area data for the federal measures and the targets set by WisDOT. He mentioned some of the staff concerns about the federal measures and the data, including the initial pavement quality data. Clark asked who collected the pavement data. Schaefer said that WisDOT collected the data as part of the National Highway Performance Reporting System. Clark asked how the travel time data was collected. Schaefer said it was privately collected with GPS and location services apps and possibly cellular phone signals. A company called Inrix has the contract with FHWA now. Williams asked why Campus Drive and the Johnson/Gorham corridor do not appear on the map. Schaefer said that data isn’t currently available for those roadways. That is something MATPB staff has been trying to get corrected. Williams asked why there were no transit performance measures. Schaefer said that there are transit safety measures and transit asset management measures, but nothing related to transit service reliability or ridership. MATPB includes those as regional measures though. Williams said that transit can help alleviate congestion. Schaefer agreed, and said that non-attainment areas are required to measure this.

6. **Presentation on Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress Mapping and Network Analysis**

Holloway reviewed MATPB’s work on the Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) analysis and accessibility on the low-stress network. After reviewing the methodology behind the LTS analysis he showed maps detailing job accessibility via the low-stress network within 30 minutes from census blocks in the Madison area and additional jobs that would be accessible within 30 minutes on the low-stress network if all roads were low-stress. The places that show the most potential for improvement in 30-minute job accessibility are primarily located on Madison’s south and west sides, along with the northern part of Fitchburg. Low-income and minority residents are largely clustered in areas that lack good low-stress job accessibility.

Holloway then described the methodology behind MATPB’s analysis of low-stress destination accessibility and showed a series of maps detailing low-stress destination accessibility in the
Madison metropolitan area. Low-stress destination accessibility is highest in central portions of Madison and Cities of Monona and Middleton. The central portions of other cities and villages in the metro area also show relatively high accessibility. As with job accessibility, minority and low-income residents tend to live in areas with lower accessibility to destinations via the low-stress network.

Holloway compared maps of the west side of Madison and downtown Sun Prairie showing overall low-stress destination accessibility versus relative access (based exclusively on the proportion of all destinations reachable by the low-stress network, without regard to destination type). While the west side of Madison rated highly in overall accessibility, it did not rate as well on relative accessibility. Sun Prairie showed the opposite pattern, rating highly in relative accessibility and lower in overall accessibility. These comparisons were shown to illustrate the way that overall and relative accessibility can be used together to identify places where improvements to the low-stress network can most effectively increase accessibility.

Holloway then displayed a map showing key gaps in the path network and barriers (high stress roads) which inhibit low-stress accessibility in the Madison metropolitan area. He then described and demonstrated MATPB’s Low-Stress Bike Route Finder.

Clark remarked that the Bicycle Level of Traffic Scores reminded him of the Walkability scores used in the real estate field. Communities can boost their scores by investing in new paths.

7. Committee Member Reports
None

8. Next Meeting Date
The next meeting will be Wednesday, November 14, 2018.

9. Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Notes were recorded by W. Schaefer and D. Kanning.