

**Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (an MPO)  
February 4, 2010 Meeting Minutes**

---

**1. Roll Call**

*Members present:* Paul Skidmore, Steve King, Chuck Kamp, Al Matano, Duane Hinz, Mark Opitz, Mark Clear, Robin Schmidt

*Members absent:* Eileen Bruskewitz, Joe Chase, Ken Harwood, Jerry Mandli, Chris Schmidt, John Vesperman,

*Staff present:* Bill Schaefer, Bob Pike

Matano introduced new board member Mark Clear who is replacing Joe Clausius due to a shuffling of City of Madison committee assignments.

**2. Approval of November 4, 2009 Meeting Minutes**

Moved by Kamp, seconded by Opitz, to approve the November meeting minutes. Clear abstained.

**3. Approval of December 22, 2009 Special Meeting Minutes**

Moved by King, seconded by Opitz, to approve the December special meeting minutes. Clear abstained.

**4. Communications**

Schaefer said the following communications were included in the meeting packet:

- Letter dated December 9, 2009 from WisDOT Secretary Busalacchi approving the 2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).
- Letter dated December 23, 2009 approving Amendment #7 to the 2009-2013 TIP. Schaefer noted that at the time of the special meeting the 2010-2014 TIP hadn't been approved by U.S. DOT and incorporated into the State TIP so the resolution amended both the 2009 and 2010 TIPs.
- Letter dated January 13, 2010 from U.S. DOT to WisDOT Secretary Busalacchi approving the 2010-2013 State TIP and incorporating the MPO TIPs by reference.
- Letter dated January 5, 2010 from Sandy Beaupre, WisDOT Planning Director, approving the Madison Area 2010 MPO work program and approving the FHWA and WisDOT funding for the work program. Schaefer mentioned that the FTA funding approval letter is received later.
- Email from Lisa MacKinnon, Project Coordinator for the Clean Air Coalition, regarding the U.S. EPA's proposed new, more stringent standard for ozone pollution. Schaefer said Dane County is just below the standard and could become designated non-attainment depending upon the threshold that the EPA ultimately sets. A non-attainment designation would impose additional transportation planning and programming requirements on the MPO.

Schaefer reviewed the following additional communications that were handed out:

- Letter dated January 13, 2010 from the WisDOT Secretary Busalacchi approving the Amendment #1 to the 2010-2014 TIP.
- Letters dated January 14 and 15, 2010 from WisDOT SW Region seeking comments for inclusion in the environmental document to be prepared for the Fish Hatchery Road/Beltline interchange project. Schaefer said WisDOT is looking at two alternatives for the alignment and relocation of the frontage road on the north side of the Beltline. WisDOT decided to add an alternative for the frontage road because the realignment of the frontage road requires purchasing the Perkin's restaurant property. With the new alternative the existing frontage road would be cul-de-saced and a new street connection added between Emil Street and the frontage road. The improvements to the interchange itself are the same for both of these alternatives. Schaefer said he didn't think the frontage road issue was one meriting comment by the MPO.

Matano said the frontage road was of interest to bicyclists and that it might merit comment by the MPO.

- Letter dated January 28, 2010 from KL Engineering seeking comments for consideration in designing the improvements for the reconstruction of University Avenue from Segoe Road to Allen Boulevard. Schaefer said the project is receiving STP Urban funding and includes the addition of a raised median, intersection improvements, bike lanes, sidewalk, and potentially a bike path in addition to reconstruction of the street. Schaefer said he didn't see a need for the MPO to comment, except perhaps a short letter of support for the project and the pedestrian and bicycle improvements.

R. Schmidt asked if the Board typically responded to such requests for comment or if members should just comment as individuals. Matano said the Board has typically relied on staff to prepare a letter of comment if deemed appropriate. It was suggested to put possible comment letters on the Fish Hatchery Road interchange and University Avenue projects on the agenda for the next meeting and the Board could then decide whether it wanted to submit a formal communication. Matano asked Schaefer to do that and suggested members forward any comments to Schaefer before the next meeting. Schaefer said he would see if any more information was available on the projects and, if so, pass that on to the Board. Opitz suggested that in the future when communications like this are received that have a short time period for response that staff discuss them with the Board Chair and decide whether to add them to the agenda as an action item.

- Email dated February 3, 2010 from Royce Williams regarding the Milwaukee-Madison passenger rail service project and the issue of the location of the Madison station location.

## **5. Public Comment (for items *not* on MPO Agenda)**

Royce Williams, 2437 Fox Ave., Madison, expressed concern about how the MPO fit into the governmental structure of the City of Madison. He said he was dismayed that the job announcement for the MPO Planning Manager was written as an official unit of the city planning department rather than as MPO Director and that there was no description of the MPO. He said the MPO is an independent organization and the MPO Director should report to the MPO Board. He suggested that after the City Human Services staff screens out unqualified applicants that the MPO Board should be involved in further screening of the applicants. He said the Board should then conduct the interviews for the finalists. Following the hiring of the director, he suggested there needs to be further discussion about the relationship of the MPO to the city.

R. Schmidt asked if position description in the job announcement was the same as when Bob McDonald was hired. McDonald, who was in attendance, responded that the position description was modified but not with respect to the reference to the MPO. R. Schmidt asked Matano if he had been contacted about the Board participating in the hiring process. Matano said he had contacted Brad Murphy, the Planning Division Director, but hadn't heard back from him. He said C. Schmidt had also contacted Murphy.

King moved, Hinz seconded, to suspend the rules to ask Bob McDonald some questions related to the issue. Clear and Skidmore called a point of order since the issue was not on the agenda. Matano overruled, saying that Board members were just seeking information from McDonald who would not be at the next meeting.

King asked McDonald if he had read the position description for the new MPO Planning Manager and McDonald indicated he had. King asked McDonald to respond to the comments by Royce Williams. McDonald said the intergovernmental agreement re-designating the MPO specifies that the City of Madison will provide staff to the MPO. Therefore, from a purely administrative standpoint the City of Madison has the authority to hire and fire staff. If there are legal or personnel issues, they go through the City of Madison Human Resources Department because MPO staff are City of Madison staff. At the same time MPO staff serve at the pleasure of the MPO Board. The rules of the City of Madison are followed with regard to contracting, resolutions, etc. However, the MPO Board must

first authorize the City to enter into agreements or contracts. The MPO Board is the policy body and the City of Madison is the administrative agent for the MPO. The MPO manager position must fit into the city's staff structure so the position is both manager of the Transportation Services section of the City Planning Division and Director of the MPO. King asked McDonald if he thought the position description was a fairly accurate reflection of the role he filled. McDonald said yes. He said the description didn't go into great detail about the MPO, but most applicants would know about the MPO or research it. Clear said his understanding then is that the MPO Board reserves the right to accept or reject a staff person. McDonald answered that this was a possibility. Beyond that there is the issue of the work program, which is tied to the budget. An interesting question would arise if there was a conflict between the work program, which the MPO Board approves, and the budget, which the city approves. He said the Madison MPO is different than RPCs that have the MPO function as they have their own way of raising funds and their own budget and staff. Skidmore asked when the intergovernmental agreement was up for review, and McDonald said the agreement was signed when the MPO was re-designated in the spring of 2008. R. Schmidt noted the balance between the supervision of the MPO Planning Manager by the Board and the supervision by the City Planning Division Director. She asked McDonald whether that delicate balance had worked effectively. McDonald answered that it had worked well. He said the City of Madison Mayor and Common Council had never interfered or placed pressure on MPO staff to take a particular position on an issue. He said Brad Murphy, the Planning Division Director, and Mark Olinger, the Planning Department Director, have also never interfered with the MPO or MPO staff function. The MPO staff are separately housed from the rest of the city planning division staff to reflect that separation. It was suggested that the issue be put on the agenda for the next meeting for discussion.

[Note: R. Schmidt moved, Clear seconded, to move up item #9 before item #6. Motion carried.]

## **6. Status Report on Dane County Regional Transit Authority (RTA)**

Schaefer said the cover sheet for the item listed eight of the nine appointments that had been made at that time. The last appointment by the Governor has now been made and it is Darrell Bazzell, who is a Vice Chancellor at UW-Madison. He said it was his understanding that the first meeting of the RTA Board was being planned for late February.

R. Schmidt asked about the relationship of the MPO Board to the RTA. Matano said a formal relationship hadn't been developed yet. R. Schmidt asked if the MPO Board needed to take any action to initiate that relationship and establishing protocols for how the MPO would work with the RTA. It was suggested to put this issue on the agenda for the board's next meeting. Opitz, who is one of the RTA Board appointees, said that he was not seeking re-election to the County Board and would therefore have to resign from the MPO Board after the April meeting.

## **7. Presentation on Draft Conceptual Transit Improvement Scenarios for the RTA**

Schaefer said that as part of the Transit Development Plan (TDP) some service improvement and financial scenarios are being developed for consideration by the RTA Board. Due to this expanded scope, the TDP Committee was expanded to include representatives from most of the larger communities surrounding Madison. A list of the expanded committee membership was included in the packet. Schaefer said the packet included a number of materials related to the RTA service scenarios, but he planned to just review with the Board the first document that outlines the three draft conceptual transit service improvement scenarios that the TDP committee has approved. The committee is now in the process of fleshing out the details of these scenarios. The first scenario ("A") includes bus and demand response service improvements. The bus service improvements would include increased frequency on some routes, increased service span in some cases, new or restructured service to address issues in particular corridors such as long travel times, and extension of service to some peripheral neighborhoods. Some limited-stop express commuter service would be added from the transfer points to and in some cases through the downtown/UW campus area as well as some new express commuter service from some of the surrounding communities that don't currently have bus service. Some midday service to a transfer point or other location would also be

added from some of the suburban communities such as Sun Prairie. To serve intra-community trips for areas without local bus service demand responsive service (shared-ride taxi) would be provided. The Cities of Sun Prairie and Stoughton currently have such service. Schaefer said some information on a potential concept for how this service might be structured was included in the packet. The taxi service would provide intra-community service and also get persons to a connection point where they could access the bus system. Finally, Scenario A might also include some improvements to the specialized transportation services and programs for seniors and persons with a disability. The Scenario A improvements would be carried forward and included as part of scenarios B and C, but some modifications would be made to complement the improvements in them. Scenario B consists of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) improvements in some corridors. He explained the definition of BRT service, but said it is essentially bus service made to operate like and have the convenience of rail service. Scenario C consists of starter rail service—either the recommended Transport 2020 alternative or some modified or scaled down version of that. It could also include some of the BRT service in non-rail corridors. Schaefer said staff is collectively working out the details of the scenarios starting with A and MPO staff will present more information on them in the future.

In response to a question regarding the purpose of developing the service scenarios, Schaefer said the purposes were twofold. First, the scenarios will be presented to the RTA Board for their consideration in putting together the conceptual service plan to take out to the voters prior to the sales tax referendum. Second, some of the improvements will be identified as recommendations for the TDP in the “business as usual” funding scenario without the RTA. Matano asked to have the MPO Board members copied on the notices for the TDP committee meetings and Schaefer said he’d do that.

#### **8. Presentation on Preliminary Draft 2035 Population, Household, and Employment Forecasts for the Interim Update of the Regional Transportation Plan**

Schaefer said staff was starting work on the interim update of the Regional Transportation Plan 2030. The 2030 Plan was approved in 2006 with a supplement added in 2007. The deadline for completion of the plan update is November 2011, although it is expected that it will be done before then. The planning horizon year will be extended from 2030 to 2035. Therefore, the socioeconomic data forecasts of population, households, and employment must be extended out five years and that growth allocated down to the small traffic analysis zone (TAZ) level for traffic forecasting purposes. The forecasts are first made at the county and urban sewer service area (USA)/municipal level and then allocated down to the TAZ level from there. Schaefer said he wanted to review with the board the county and USA/municipal forecasts before staff got too far along with the TAZ level allocation work to make sure the board was comfortable with the methodology and the forecasts. Staff is proposing to use the same methodology that was used for the 2030 plan. For population, the State Department of Administration’s (DOA) countywide forecast will be used as a control total. In 2008, DOA updated its population forecast and extended it out to 2035. The new forecast, which was based on 2000 Census data and population estimates through 2005, increases the 2030 population by 44,000 with another 29,400 increase by 2035. As last time, the Regional Planning Commission’s (RPC) population forecasts for urban sewer service areas will be used, but with a minor adjustment to increase the forecast for the central urban service area by about 3,500 with a proportionate decrease in the rural area. This gets the municipal forecasts for the Cities of Madison, Middleton, and Fitchburg closer to the DOA municipal forecasts. For employment, the countywide forecast is based on a labor supply forecast that is based on the DOA’s population-by-age forecast and assumes an increase in the labor force participation rate and an increase in commuting from adjacent counties. At the USA/municipal level, the employment forecasts are based largely on the population forecast, but with some relatively minor adjustments in some cases to account for recent trends, community land use plans, etc. Schaefer pointed to the tables showing the population and employment forecasts by USA/municipality. He noted the tables show the data for 1990, 2000, and the 2009 population forecast. One can see the 2035 forecasts represent in most every case a continuation of past trends.

R. Schmidt asked if Schaefer was comfortable with the numbers. Schaefer said yes. He said the employment forecasts are the most difficult and he could see perhaps some change being made in

those forecasts. Matano asked about the 2009 population estimate. Schaefer said DOA prepares those estimates and he wasn't sure what methodology the agency used.

**9. Consideration of Resolution TPB No. 36 Commending Robert McDonald, Former Transportation Planning Manager for the MPO, on his Retirement after 34 Years of Dedicated Public Planning Service**

Opitz moved, R. Schmidt seconded, to approve TPB Resolution No. 36. Matano then read the resolution.

McDonald thanked everyone and said he had assistance from many people, including previous boards, staff, friends, and other political leaders within the community. He added that he was very proud of the board, which was changed substantially after the second re-designation in 2008. The board was almost immediately faced with many decisions, including support for a potential sales tax for the RTA. The board also had to adopt all of the plans, etc. of the previous board. He said the board has come a long way and wished the board the best in maintaining the level of excellence in transportation planning for the region. He said the board would be guided well by existing staff. Skidmore complimented McDonald on his leadership and the preparation and presentation of materials to the board. Others agreed.

Motion to approve TPB Resolution No. 36 carried.

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

- **Transport 2020 Implementation Task Force**

Matano said he talked to Dave Trowbridge who thought there might be one more committee meeting at some point to wrap things up.

- **USH 51 (USH 12/18 to I 90/94/39) Corridor and USH 51 (McFarland to Stoughton) Corridor Studies**

Schaefer said the study is currently on hold and there is nothing new to report. He mentioned that the MPO Board needed to appoint a new representative to the policy advisory committee for the study and said he would put that on the agenda for the next meeting.

- **USH 51 (McFarland to Stoughton)**

Schaefer reported on a technical advisory committee meeting he had attended. The consultants reviewed some changes to the alternatives being considered that were made in response to comments received during the series of meetings held last summer. The USH 51 expansion alternative was changed with a roundabout now being proposed at the USH 51/CTH B intersection rather than an interchange. Some changes were also made in the alignment of the USH 51 expansion to reduce impacts. The other major change concerns the "bypass" of Stoughton. Some additional alignment alternatives have been added for the bypass on the east side of Stoughton, which would be designed as 45-mph street. A study is also being done on the indirect and cumulative impacts of the different alternatives.

Matano asked if anyone had heard anything about the North Mendota Parkway, which isn't on the list. Opitz said the last committee meeting was in September when the committee voted on a final recommendation. Since then the Towns of Springfield and Westport met to discuss a revision to the map of the recommended roadway corridor. He said the revision is minor, eliminating a quarter section north of CTH K and adjacent to CTH Q that wasn't needed. He thought the other communities would be agreeable to this. He said he planned to introduce a county board resolution soon endorsing the committee's recommendations. R. Schmidt asked if there was a final report, and Opitz said no. There are a series of maps and the resolution would summarize the recommendations. The boundaries of the natural resource area were adopted as part of the county parks and open space plan already. Hinz asked if the corridor would be officially mapped, and Opitz said yes once it is finalized. He said some additional work was needed in the Town of Springfield where WisDOT was asked for some assistance.

Matano mentioned that Wisconsin had received federal funding for the Milwaukee-Madison rail service, raising the issue of the Madison station location. He asked that the issue be put on the board's agenda for the next meeting. Schaefer said he was attempting to get information on the process for selecting the Madison station location. He said an environmental study was required and would be the avenue for input on the issue. WisDOT is open to looking at alternative station locations.

#### **11. Discussion of Future Work Items**

- 2009 Federal Certification Review of the MPO

Schaefer said he had heard that FWHA staff would be sending MPO staff a draft report to review soon and that they might be ready to present the report at the March meeting.

- Transit Development Plan (TDP)
- MPO Congestion Management Process

Schaefer said this would be one of the issues in the federal certification report. Staff will present some information on this to the MPO Board in the next couple of months.

- Five-year Interim Update of the Regional Transportation Plan 2030

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

Matano raised the question of whether the 7:00 p.m. time for board meetings was still ideal. R. Schmidt suggested waiting until the new appointments are made this spring to address the issue. Kamp suggested reviewing the meeting location again too because even though the meeting space is nice the transit service isn't that convenient.

#### **13. Adjournment**

R. Schmidt moved, King seconded to adjourn. Motion carried.