Minutes of the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board
Citizen Advisory Committee

April 15, 2009 Madison Municipal Building, Room LL-120 5:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call


   Members Absent: F. Bartol, S. Hiniker, E. Sundquist, C. Wittke

   Staff Present: R. McDonald, B. Schaefer

2. Approval of February 18 Meeting Minutes

   Phillips moved, Hull seconded, to approve the February meeting minutes. Motion carried.


   Schaefer reviewed the key provisions of the Act and the process for selection of state and local projects, referring to materials that FHWA and WisDOT staff had prepared. He said WisDOT was responsible for the state’s implementation of the transportation programs and had developed procedures and criteria for doing this. Stoebig asked about the Monona Drive project and Schaefer said it probably would not be eligible for funding since it already has programmed funding for 2009. WisDOT has ruled that projects with funding this year aren’t eligible because of the difficulties in trying to line up substitute projects in order to meet the Act’s requirement that stimulus funds not supplant already programmed funding. In response to a question from Ferrell, Schaefer said the MPO would decide which projects are funded with STP-Urban funding. For Transportation Enhancements (TE) projects, the MPO will score and rank projects in the Madison area for consideration by WisDOT. For all projects, WisDOT will be screening them to determine that they meet all of eligibility requirements, including the required timelines for completion of design and construction. Schaefer noted that funding amounts for highways, transit, and other programs. He said WisDOT is applying for funding available for high-speed rail projects to improve service in the Milwaukee to Chicago corridor—which is their first priority—and also to initiate service in the Milwaukee to Madison corridor. McDonald said Wisconsin was in a good position to receive funding because the EIS is done and state money is available to supplement the federal funding. Discussion followed on high-speed rail and the potential location of the Madison station(s). Schaefer said the usual federal rules apply, including the program eligibility requirements. Williams said he read that ARRA funding can be flexed and doesn’t have to be spent on highway projects. Schaefer said this statement probably refers to the fact that Surface Transportation Program (STP) funding, which is distributed to areas based upon population, can be used for a wide array of projects.

   Schaefer said 50% of the funding apportioned to the State must be obligated (i.e., funding approved by FHWA) by June 30, 2009. Most of this funding was obligated as part of the selection of initial projects. For funding sub-allocated to local units of government, all of the funding must be obligated by March 2010. If States don’t obligate funds by the deadlines, the funding is redistributed to other states that have obligated all of their funding. In Wisconsin, WisDOT has sub-allocated 30% of the funding to local units of government. Around 67% was apportioned for State projects and 3% is required to be set aside for TE projects. Around $9.7 million was sub-allocated to the Madison area and $16 million is available for TE projects. WisDOT solicited an initial round of project applications, but very few local projects could meet the tight timeline (bid letting by this May). The two Madison area projects that were approved were the Aberg Avenue ped/bike overpass and CTH N (Yahara River) Bridge. Among the state projects selected was the Interstate 94 (I-39/90 to CTH N)
expansion. A second solicitation is underway now for projects to be constructed in 2010 with engineering plans due by December 1. Projects that could be let by June/July and constructed this year are also eligible, but all of the Madison area projects submitted thus far are for 2010 construction.

4. **Review of Partial List of Madison Area Projects Submitted for ARRA Funding Under Surface Transportation Program (STP) – Urban**

Schaefer reviewed the applications that the MPO had received copies of thus far for STP-Urban funding. He said staff has reviewed these and assigned a preliminary score for them, but has not ranked them. Staff will wait until they have a final list of screened projects to assign rankings. He mentioned three STP-Urban projects that will probably be determined to be ineligible for funding: Monona Drive Phase 1 reconstruction because it has programmed 2009 funding already; and relocated Lacy Road/USH 14 interchange and Main St./USH 151 interchange because these are state highways. Staff distributed a preliminary draft of the scoring of the STP-Urban projects. Schaefer said the two highest scoring projects are the Mineral Point Road/Pleasant View Road intersection and CTH M/Valley View Road intersection projects. Both involve extension of Pleasant View Road with the two projects together completing the extension from Mineral Point Road to CTH M. Some committee members questioned whether the roundabouts planned at these intersections would operate effectively. Gao asked why none of the STP-Urban projects had received points under the External Impacts section. She said the addition of bike lanes on some of the roadways would promote a shift to bicycle trips. McDonald said External Impacts section points are primarily for TDM or TSM projects. While it is true the bike lanes would promote a mode shift, the scoring system already includes a criterion for multi-modal projects and another for the degree of use of the alternative modes (e.g., bike lanes). Giving points under the External Impacts section as well would be double-counting in a sense. Schaefer said it was anticipated the Board would approve the scoring and ranking of STP-Urban and TE projects at its June meeting. MPO staff will review a final draft of the scoring and ranking of projects with the committee at its May meeting and will seek a recommendation from the committee at that time.

5. **Review of Partial List of Madison Area Projects Submitted for ARRA Funding Under the Transportation Enhancements Program**

Schaefer reviewed the applications that the MPO had received for TE funding and distributed a preliminary draft of the scoring of the projects. He said the highest scoring TE project was the Beltline ped/bike overpass for the planned Cannonball Trail. The next highest scoring projects were the Badger State Trail and Lower Yahara River Trail Phase 1. Schaefer said the Badger State Trail already had 80% federal funding. If funded, there was some concern that it would reduce the funding for the Madison area. Gjerde suggested that the availability of alternative funding be added as a criterion. McDonald said it wouldn’t be appropriate to change the criteria now, but the Policy Board could factor this in when the Board ranks the projects. The Board isn’t required to follow the scores exactly in ranking the projects.

6. **Review and Recommendation on Proposed Changes to the Charge of the MPO Citizen Advisory Committee and Interaction with the MPO Policy Board**

Schaefer said staff had drafted some additional changes to the document based on the discussion at the last meeting. He reviewed the new proposed changes. Regarding committee member terms, staff decided to keep it simple by requiring the Board to reaffirm all appointments every two years starting in July. Regarding interaction with the MPO Board, MPO Board minutes will be included in the packet for the committee and committee minutes will be included in the MPO Board packet, if available. The committee may provide a written or oral report to the Board as needed. The Board may
select a liaison between the Board and committee. Al Matano attended the last committee meeting and volunteered to serve as the liaison.

Hull asked if there was anything about committee member attendance. Schaefer responded that staff decided to keep it informal. If a member were chronically absent, staff would contact the member to see if he/she was still interested in serving on the committee and able to do so. Williams expressed concern about the new Board members being reappointed before the Board reaffirmed the committee members. McDonald reported on the progress on that and said he thought most would be reappointed by July. The process for appointing the small cities and village’s representative may take longer.

Phillips moved, Hull seconded, to recommend approval of the revised charge of the committee, including its interaction with the MPO Policy Board. Motion carried.

7. Committee Member Reports
   Item deferred.

8. Staff Reports and Announcements
   Schaefer said a copy of the TIP Amendment #3 resolution, which included the initial ARRA roadway and bicycle and Metro Transit projects, was at member’s places. The annual request for STP-Urban project applications and a list of other projects for the TIP update was sent out. He also noted the future agenda items.

9. Next Meeting Dates
   Wednesday, May 20, and July 22, 2009

10. Adjournment
    The meeting was adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Minutes recorded by Bill Schaefer