Madison Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)
February 2, 2005 Meeting Minutes

1. Roll Call
   Members present: Kris Euclide, Chan Stroman, John Volker, Robbie Webber, Al Matano, Eileen Bruskewitz, Bob Dye, Lisa MacKinnon, Rose Phetteplace, Laura Rose
   Members absent: Ken Golden
   Staff present: Bob McDonald, Bill Schaefer, Bob Pike

   McDonald and Board members welcomed new appointee Stroman, and Stroman introduced herself.

2. Approval of November 3, 2004 Meeting Minutes
   Moved by Webber, seconded by Matano, to approve November meeting minutes. Motion carried.

3. Communications
   • Memo from Golden to Kathleen Falk, Dave Cieslewicz, John Volker, and Gerry Derr, inviting them to attend Madison Area MPO Board meeting of February 2, 2005 to participate in the discussion of possible changes in the structure of representation on the Board.
   • Letter from Sandra Beaupre, WisDOT Bureau of Planning Director, approving the 2005 MPO work program and authorizing work to proceed on transportation planning activities designated for funding.
   • Letter from WisDOT Secretary Frank Busalacchi approving the 2005-2008 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Urbanized Area.

4. Public Comment (for items not on MPO Agenda)
   None

5. Consideration of Resolution MPO No. 46, Amendment #1 to the 2005-2009 Transportation Improvement Program for the Dane County Area
   McDonald said the amendment was a technical one, which would add WisDOT ID numbers for the railroad surface crossing and railroad signals work to be done as part of the Southwest Bike Path (Phase IV “Missing Link” Path) project. Moved by Matano, seconded by Bruskewitz, to approve Resolution MPO No. 46. Motion carried.

6. Report of MPO Restructure Subcommittee Regarding Possible Changes to Representation on the Madison Area MPO Board and Open Discussion with Appointing Authorities and/or their Representatives
   Euclide mentioned the board members who served on the subcommittee, and noted that the minutes of the two meetings were included in the packet. She said the subcommittee identified the three main issues as: (1) Should a change be made?; (2) If so, what approaches should be considered?; and (3) What opportunities for public input should be provided? She said the main purpose of tonight’s meeting was to receive input from representatives of the appointing authorities. Further opportunity for public input would be provided.

   Jeanne Hoffman, representing the City of Madison Mayor, spoke and suggested that the MPO Board take its time in considering the issue. She said the board should look at issues beyond just population distribution. Transportation has impacts on different populations in different ways. As an example, lower-income populations have at times been adversely affected by transportation decisions that have limited people’s options for mobility and accessibility. Other factors that should be considered include the number of roadway miles in each jurisdiction and the local investment in transportation that each jurisdiction makes. The City of Madison and Dane County both make large investments in transportation facilities and programs. The fact that the Madison Mayor and the County Executive are
the highest elected officials in the MPO area should also be considered. Volker questioned how all of the things Hoffman mentioned could be factored in some kind of sensible way. Hoffman said she hadn’t thought it out fully, but figured various data could be examined on a census tract level. In response to a question from Rose, Hoffman said the Mayor hadn’t taken a position on any of the possible board restructure scenarios. Bruskewitz pointed out that numerous cities and villages were added to the MPO area. She said that while the downtown/campus area has a high concentration of employment, it still makes up less than 30% of employment in the region. She wondered whether the City of Madison had any plans for how to get people from the suburban communities into the city.

For example, there is a need for bus service from these communities to the downtown/campus area. Hoffman said the City of Madison has additional employment areas besides downtown. She added that there are a variety of ways for the MPO to work with the city on regional transportation issues and this is happening. Bruskewitz asked if the City of Madison had plans for bringing the cities and villages now in the MPO area into the city’s transportation planning processes. Hoffman said she would consider that and sought input from the MPO Board.

Topf Wells, representing the County Executive, spoke and opened his remarks by saying that issues of representation are often the most difficult that a local government or public entity must address. He said he would present the County Executive’s perspective on the issue and her position. He first presented some statistics related to the amount of transportation infrastructure that the county owns or is responsible for in some way (e.g., 140 centerline miles of roads, 48 miles of railroad track, the airport, 25 miles of bike lanes or trails). Based upon this fact alone, the county deserves an ample number of representatives on the board. When areas are annexed, the county generally maintains jurisdiction of the county roadway. The county also has responsibility for maintaining both county and state roadways. He mentioned the county has a $60,000 annual grant program for local units of government for bicycle facility improvements and bicycle safety programs. He said that he was very involved in the negotiations over the structure of the MPO when it was created. The number of county appointments was a key issue and the County Executive felt three was the minimum number she could accept. While transportation decisions affect the ability of local communities to grow and serve their citizens, transportation decisions also have impacts on neighboring jurisdictions in obvious ways. This leads to the next point, which is the importance of having a strong regional perspective on the board in addition to the perspective of the different communities within the MPO area. The county is the entity that can supply a regional perspective. Finally, it is important to have a balanced board that will critically review transportation projects and make tough decisions. He said the County Executive is nervous about changing the composition of the board and thinks the current representation is balanced and fair. If the MPO reaches the decision that there should be additional representation from the small cities and villages, the County Executive could agree to changing one of her appointments from a City of Madison resident to a smaller city/village resident. She has concerns about reducing the number of her appointments or adding more members to the board.

McDonald mentioned that one idea floated at the last subcommittee meeting was to have the cities and villages supply a list of candidates to the County Executive for the appointment, and asked Wells if that had been considered. Wells said the County Executive would not accept that proposal. The County Executive wants to appoint people who bring a regional perspective to the board. Bruskewitz asked if the County Executive was doing anything to make more regional transportation available. Wells responded that the county supports the transit system through its human services budget. He said the region is at a difficult juncture in trying to determine what is the highest priority in expanding the public transit system—a regional rail system with express buses or a downtown area trolley system. The County Executive and the Mayor of Madison are both working very hard to obtain federal money for systems that would greatly enhance transit service. Hoffman added that Metro contracts with other communities and is currently negotiating with the City of Verona. Preliminary discussions have also taken place with the City of Sun Prairie. Volker said the expansion of transit service to other communities supports the argument for increasing the representation of the small cities and villages. Matano asked about the county’s potential role in the high-speed rail initiative.
Wells responded that the county had designed its terminal expansion and runway projects to accommodate a rail station, and is working with other partners in bringing high-speed rail to the Madison area. Phetteplace asked whether the County Executive would have different criteria for appointing a person who resided in a small city/village (i.e., he/she represented a small city/village perspective). Wells said the County Executive tries to appoint people who have an interest and knowledge of transportation issues and bring a broader regional perspective.

Pat Cannon, City of Sun Prairie Administrator and Treasurer of the Dane County Cities & Villages Association (DCCVA) spoke. He said the small cities and villages saw the issue as one of fairness based upon the principle of one person, one vote. Communities do not have a choice whether or not to be part of the MPO. He said Sun Prairie is not a “small” community with a population of 25,000, and the city handles transportation issues no differently than Madison. In order to work together, we need communication between all groups. He said he has been part of the discussions about forming a Council of Governments (COG), and it comes down to bringing the right people together for discussion. If you want the cooperation of the outlying communities then you need to make sure that we’re fairly represented at the table. MacKinnon asked if it is a matter of representation, would the proposal to change the residency requirement of one of the County Executive’s appointments address your concerns? Cannon said the proposal works in some respects, but the communities would like some input on the appointment. He noted that the Madison Mayor has five direct appointments. In response to a question from Bruskewitz, Cannon said the DCCVA would solicit input and provide an opportunity to vote on an appointment to all communities regardless of whether the community was a dues paying member of the association or not. Volker added that at their last meeting the DCCVA voted unanimously in favor of adding a direct appointment to the board for the cities and villages.

McDonald distributed a handout regarding the representation and composition of other MPOs in the state. He noted there were major differences in their structures and pointed to a few examples. Webber asked who decides whether WisDOT has a representative on an MPO. Dwight McComb from Federal Highway said current regulations, adopted after ISTEA, require that any new or restructured MPO include a WisDOT representative. MPOs formed prior to that (before ’91) were grandfathered in.

7. Review of Presentation for First Round of Public Meetings on the Update of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)
McDonald reviewed the presentation and materials that would be available for the upcoming meetings on the RTP update. He said the meeting announcement, agenda, and RTP project summary had also been translated into Spanish. The meeting announcement flyer (in both English and Spanish) will be posted at community centers throughout the metropolitan area. Interpretation will be available at meetings by request. Webber suggested the presentation be put on the Web site. In response to a question, McDonald said the presentation would be translated into Spanish only upon request. Euclide suggested board members e-mail McDonald with their comments on the RTP meeting materials and the meetings they plan to attend.

8. Review of Boards, Handouts, and Meeting Locations to Receive Public Input in Identifying Key Transportation Goals and Issues in the Region
McDonald displayed the presentation boards to be used for the RTP meetings, and explained how staff would be soliciting and receiving public comment. Webber and MacKinnon suggested adding a presentation board on pedestrian travel and McDonald agreed to do that. Bruskewitz suggested trying to limit the transportation jargon as much as possible. Euclide suggested board members e-mail McDonald with further suggestions and comments regarding the materials.
9. **Status Report on Creating a Citizen Advisory Committee for the Regional Transportation Plan Update**

McDonald presented a list of affiliations and some names for the committee. He said he hadn’t received much feedback from the board, so he planned to start seeking persons to fill some of the slots on the committee. Phetteplace suggested adding a representative from the freight industry and a commuter point of view, for example a representative from AAA.

10. **Status Report by MPO Board Members on Projects Potentially Involving the MPO**

- Transport 2020 Implementation Task Force: Euclide reported that an RFP was being prepared for a draft EIS and preliminary engineering, the next step in the process. The next Task Force meeting is scheduled for February 28.

11. **Discussion of Future Work Items**

- Initial Discussion of RTP Alternatives for Plan Update
- Mid-West Regional Rail
- Report of MPO Restructure Subcommittee Regarding Possible Changes to Representation on the Madison Area MPO Board
- Status Report on Creating a Citizen Advisory Committee for the Regional Transportation Plan Update

12. **Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings**

McDonald distributed to the board a draft letter addressed to Representative Tammy Baldwin expressing support for the Transport 2020 project and the East Washington Avenue/Starkweather Creek Pedestrian/Bicycle Bridge and seeking assistance with efforts to obtain authorization and federal funding for the projects. The City of Madison Mayor’s office requested that the MPO submit the letter by Friday, February 4. McDonald asked the board to review the letter and comment as soon as possible for the Friday release date. The letter will be signed by Golden.

Next meeting of MPO: Wednesday, March 2 at 5 p.m., City-County Building, Court Room 2D

13. **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 6:25 p.m.