1. **Roll Call**


*Members Absent:* R. Ferrell, D. Phillips, J. Guo

*Staff Present:* B. Schaefer

*Others Present:* A. Matano

2. **Approval of July 22, 2009 Meeting Minutes**

Stoebig moved, Williams seconded, to approve the July 22 meeting minutes. Motion carried.

3. **Review and Recommendation on Draft 2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

Schaefer handed out and reviewed an updated Addition/Correction sheet dated 9/16/09. He said all of them were relatively minor, such as cost changes, and many of the City of Madison projects involved locally funded projects. Williams asked if the University Avenue (Segoe to Shorewood) project included addition of bus pull outs. Schaefer said it is a pavement replacement project and he didn’t think the curb and gutter was being replaced, but he would check on this. Schaefer said a public hearing on the TIP was held at the MPO Board’s last meeting. A few people provided comments. The general theme was support for the use of STP-Urban funds for ped/bike safety education and ridesharing, the bicycle projects, and the roadway preservation projects, but concern or opposition to some of the roadway capacity expansion projects. Williams commented that the intercity bus terminal should be added. He said some people have a misconception about the TIP that it is a plan, but it is a coordinated listing of projects with programmed funding. Some non-programmed projects are included as “illustrative” projects if, for example, the sponsor has or plans to apply for federal funding. Schaefer said there are no proposed changes to the draft STP-Urban priority project listings.

Moved for discussion purposes by Sundquist, seconded by Hiniker, to recommend approval of the Draft 2010-2014 TIP with the changes listed in the Addition/Correction sheet dated 9/16/09.

Sundquist asked what the role of the committee is with respect to the TIP if it is just a list of projects. Schaefer responded that in addition to approving the STP-Urban projects the MPO must ensure that the projects with federal funding are consistent with the regional transportation plan. The MPO can comment on projects submitted by WisDOT or local units of government and also has the authority to veto projects (i.e., not approve them for inclusion in the TIP). However, the MPO has rarely exercised that authority. He mentioned the one recent example of the USH 151/CTH C and Reiner Road interchange project where the MPO took it out of the TIP, but reinserted it at the next meeting. Sundquist asked about the next opportunity to comment on the regional transportation plan, and Schaefer said an interim update was planned to be done next year. There was also some discussion about proposals for the federal transportation reauthorization legislation that would increase the authority and responsibilities of MPOs.

Motion to recommend approval of the Draft 2010-2014 TIP carried.

4. **Update on Status of Discussions Regarding Creation of a Regional Transit Authority in Dane County**

Schaefer noted that the RTA legislation has been distributed and discussed at the last meeting. He said there are ongoing discussions about creation of an RTA in Dane County and it appears that an
interagency steering committee is going to be set up. There are many strategic issues to consider: whether to create an RTA before holding the referendum (without any staff or funding) or wait until after the referendum; the timing and scope of the referendum and how it will be worded; and the public information campaign needed prior to the referendum. He said a public informational meeting for local officials was being planned. Matano, who is involved in that effort, provided some details. He said it would be held Saturday morning on September 26 at the Lyman Anderson Agriculture and Conservation Center on the southeast side. Paul Larousse, Director of the National Transit Institute, would make a presentation on RTAs and an attorney with the State Legislative Council would provide information on the RTA law. There would then be a written question and answer period with a moderator. Matano said that the plan right now was to introduce a resolution creating the RTA soon. Stoebig asked the geographic scope of the RTA resolution. He said the county only has authority to hold a countywide referendum. Schaefer said one of the arguments for creating the RTA now was that the RTA could then hold the referendum and have it cover only the RTA area. Williams asked about the status of the RTA resolution introduced by Sup. Bruskewitz that called for a referendum this spring, and Matano said it didn’t have the votes to pass. Bartol noted that many people see the RTA and rail as being tied together. Clearly, creation of a sales tax is a necessary condition to receiving FTA funding for rail service. An issue regarding the referendum is whether to have separate questions regarding the RTA and rail. Sundquist commented that there are many issues like that. Gjerde announced that the League of Women Voters was holding a public meeting on the RTA with three panel speakers on October 7.

5. **Review of Transit Development Plan Update Materials**

Schaefer said a review group has been set up for development of the plan. The group has been expanded to include additional staff from some of the suburban communities. This was done after it was decided to add to the scope of the planning effort development of service and financial scenarios should an RTA be created with additional funding. Schaefer first reviewed the draft transit goals and service design guidelines and performance standards document. He said the document expands upon the existing design guidelines and performance standards Metro uses. Rider commented that perhaps bicycle load might be added to passenger load as a performance standard. Schaefer said use of the bike racks would need to be surveyed manually, but that is something that could possibly be added or # of times a bicyclist wasn’t able to board because the rack was full. Stoebig commented that perhaps “transit stop” should be used versus bus stop. Schaefer said the document was focused on bus service. If rail service was added, additional rail-related guidelines and standards would need to be added. Williams commented that “on demand” should be added in reference to heaters on page ten. He mentioned that technology is being developed to allow lighting in cases where there is no access to the electrical grid. Schaefer then reviewed the draft criteria for evaluating potential service improvements. Bartol commented that he wasn’t certain if the criteria were intended to evaluate bus service improvement only, but if they were intended to evaluate rail service as well a community benefit criterion should be added for land use/economic development benefits. Schaefer said the primary purpose was to evaluate bus service improvements, but the point is a good one. If used for evaluating rail versus bus service improvements, another criterion would probably need to be added related to increasing comfort or convenience. Williams commented that access to intermodal facilities should be added under the first community benefit criterion. Schaefer said he would add that to the list. Schaefer then reviewed the analysis of those areas/roadway segments with service not currently meeting the draft service design guidelines. He said failure to meet the guidelines in every specific case didn’t mean that service improvement should be prioritized, but this was one important factor in prioritizing improvements. He said the maps illustrating bus service frequency by route network segment and then reviewed data on commuting to the central Madison area. Williams asked why the Village of De Forest was excluded from the table. Schaefer said that was a good point and he would add that data.
6. **Committee Member Reports**
   Williams announced that the next Madison Area Bus Advocates meeting was October 12 and Dave Eveland from Metro would be speaking on Metro’s ITS applications.

7. **Staff Reports**
   Schaefer distributed a copy of the MPO Board resolution approving the amendment to the Regional Transportation Plan for the interim Verona Road and West Beltline Interchange improvements along with diagrams illustrating the roadway and pedestrian/bicycle facilities. He also noted the future agenda items, including the work program which would be on the next meeting agenda.

8. **Next Meeting Dates**
   Wednesday, November 18 and Wednesday, January 20, 2010

9. **Adjournment**
   The meeting was adjourned at 6:50 p.m.

*Minutes recorded by Bill Schaefer*