1. Roll Call

*Members present:* David Ahrens, Mark Clear, Steve Flottmeyer, Ken Golden, Tim Gruber, Chuck Kamp, Al Matano, Ed Minihan (arrived during Item 5), Robin Schmidt (arrived during Item 5), Steve Stocker

*Members absent:* Steve King, Jerry Mandli, Mark Opitz

*MPO Staff present:* David Kanning, Bill Schaefer

2. Approval of December 7, 2016 Meeting Minutes

Moved by Kamp, seconded by Stocker, to approve the December 7, 2016 meeting minutes. Motion carried with Golden abstaining.

3. Communications

- Letter from WisDOT and FHWA approving the 2016 Work Program amendment, extending the time allowed to complete the household travel mail survey.
- Letters from WisDOT and USDOT approving the MPO’s 2017 Work Program and associated federal and state funding.
- Letter from WisDOT approving the MPO’s 2017-2021 TIP.

4. Public Comment (for items not on MPO Agenda)

None

5. Resolution TPB No. 125 Approving Amendment #1 to the 2017-2021 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

Schaefer provided a summary of the amendment request and noted that five of the projects involve adding median beam/cable guards or thrie guards. Ahrens and Matano asked why there were so many guardrail projects in this amendment. Flottmeyer said that these projects are part of recently approved Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) applications, and that WisDOT prefers to deliver and construct them within a two-year time frame. The applications were approved late last year. Ahrens questioned the need for the guardrails. Schaefer said that in order to be eligible for HSIP funding there must be a documented crash history that the project is designed to address. Golden asked how much these safety projects cost. Schaefer said that they range from $83,000 to $1,280,000. Matano asked for a definition of “thrie-beam guardrail”. Schaefer said that it relates to the shape of the median, and Flottmeyer further explained that the thrie beam guardrail has three waves, and is the new standard.

Golden questioned the need for the guardrail projects. Ahrens asked if the funds for these projects were specifically earmarked for safety. Schaefer confirmed that the funding for these projects could only be used for safety projects that met program eligibility requirements. Schmidt asked if other projects would receive funding if these projects were not approved. Flottmeyer said that safety funds would be used elsewhere in the state if these projects were not approved. He stated that there is a need for these projects; they went through a rigorous safety application review process. Ahrens asked if the process was competitive. Flottmeyer confirmed that these projects competed against other projects in the state for funding. Golden asked Flottmeyer if he had knowledge about the Beltline’s crash history. Flottmeyer said that he would have to review the application to provide an answer.
Golden suggested separating out the guardrail projects and referring them to the next meeting so that WisDOT could provide information to justify the projects. Schaefer said that the TIP will not be able to be amended again until the April meeting because the Regional Transportation Plan won’t be approved until then. The 5-year update is due in March, but we will be a month late. Because of this, Schaefer suggested the board approve the amendment since the projects could always be deleted from the TIP if the board wasn’t convinced of the need for the projects after receiving a presentation from WisDOT staff at the March or April meeting. Golden said that this was acceptable to him.

Schaefer mentioned that MPO staff planned to examine crash rates on the local arterial system this year as part of a safety planning project. The study will primarily examine crashes outside the City of Madison since Madison Traffic Engineering has the staff and resources to study crashes within city limits; other local communities do not have the staff resources. The purpose of the study will be to (1) identify high crash intersections and corridors and (2) work with the local communities to identify potential safety countermeasures, so they have an opportunity to apply for local safety funds.

Clear asked if there had been any discussion about moving the East Johnson Street project to a different year so it does not conflict with the opening of the Public Market. Schaefer said that he wasn’t aware of this potential conflict, but that there are issues with moving projects that are receiving federal STP-Urban funds. He said City Engineering staff had not contacted MPO staff about changing the project schedule. Clear said that he would contact Rob Phillips and the council members representing that area to discuss the issue.

Moved by Kamp, seconded by Clear, to approve the amendment to the 2017-2021 TIP. Moved by Golden, seconded by Ahrens, to separate the guardrail projects and refer them to the next meeting. Motion carried to approve without the guardrail projects. Golden then withdrew the motion to refer the guardrail projects. Moved by Schmidt, seconded by Stocker, to approve the guardrail projects as part of the 2017-2021 TIP amendment. Motion carried with Golden abstaining.


Schaefer said that there had been no substantive changes to the set of recommendations since the last meeting. The major projects map was renamed “Major Roadway and High Capacity Transit Improvement Projects & Studies,” and the entire USH 51 corridor was shown as a major project rather than just the section from STH 138 to CTH B, which is planned to be expanded to a 4-lane divided urban cross-section. If approved as a major project, the whole corridor would be done with intersection improvements planned throughout the rest of the corridor. Schaefer stated that at the Regional Transportation Plan Committee meeting yesterday Tom Wilson from Westport said CTH Q had already been expanded to four lanes between Woodland Drive and Meffert Road. Schaefer said that the project will be removed from the plan accordingly.

Schaefer said that the packet also included the following other maps: roadway functional classification system; park-and-ride lots; major bicycle facilities; and transit network. He noted the existing maintenance facility was added to the transit map. The draft plan addresses the need to renovate the facility and to add a new satellite facility. Schaefer said that one of the committee members suggested realigning one of the transit routes between Madison and Waunakee, which made sense. Schaefer stated that staff still needed to add Kamp’s recommendation about Family Care to the recommendations section. He asked the board to provide any comments they had on the recommendations or facility plan maps.

Golden noted that the park-and-ride lots are all proposed in heavily congested areas. He suggested exploring the idea of adding park-and-ride lots in places that intercept people earlier in their rides, away from congestion. For example, it might be beneficial to have a park-and-ride lot on Mineral Point Road west of Pleasant View Road, where it is less congested, in addition to the proposed location where a BRT stop is shown. Schaefer said that adding a lot farther west would likely require the addition of express bus service. Golden agreed, and said this should be explored. Golden said that several of the lots will function as park-and-pool lots, rather than park-and-ride lots, since they are not served by transit. He suggested adding a recommendation to explore the feasibility of serving the park-and-pool lots with transit.
Ahrens asked about the Beltline, Interstate 39/90/94, and Beltline-Interstate 39/90 interchange studies. Schaefer said that the Beltline-Interstate interchange is included in the plan as a project. The scope of improvements and funding for the potential Beltline and Interstate (Madison to Portage) projects is uncertain, so they are included in the plan as studies only for now. Staff will be meeting with WisDOT staff to come to agreement on how the Stoughton Road project should be addressed in the plan.

Kamp suggested adding other local governments as implementing parties under Public Transit recommendation 1A. He asked whether the 1-5 year time frame for this recommendation would allow for operation by 2021 since the city’s budget includes operating funds in that year for BRT. Schaefer confirmed that is the plan for the initial project. He said once the alternatives study is completed, the initial project is identified, and funding for the satellite garage is identified, the BRT and garage projects will be added to the plan through an amendment. Kamp suggested (1) adding private providers and non profits as implementing parties to Transit recommendation 5A-D; (2) changing the timeframe for Transit recommendation 9C (implementing an RTA) to 1-5+ years; and (3) adding non profits as an implementing party to Specialized Transportation recommendation 2A. Clear suggested adding City of Madison’s Disability Rights Commission.

Clear asked if there was any ongoing work on the accessible taxi issue. Golden said no work has been done on this by the ADA Transit committee. Kamp said that Mayor Soglin was interested in learning whether private companies can use STP-Urban funding. Schaefer said that private companies are not eligible. Kamp said that Golden worked with Dane County on setting up $1.5 million in funding for transit capital projects, but the county attorneys said the county could not legally fund such projects. Golden said that he is on the City’s ADA Transit committee, and that this issue was on the committee’s meeting agenda about a year ago.

Schaefer said that the time frame for initiating planning for the intercity bus terminal will be changed from 15+ years to 5 to 15 years. Clear said that the intercity bus terminal is intended to be included in the plans for the reconstruction of the Lake Street parking garage. Schaefer said that is correct, but the schedule for garage project has been moved outside the 6-year capital budget.

7. Review Financial Analysis for the Regional Transportation Plan 2050

Schaefer provided an overview of the financial analysis done for the plan. The purpose is to demonstrate that all recommended projects can be funded while still preserving existing infrastructure. Schaefer said that he included information about the state transportation fund solvency study. He described how staff estimated future funding for roadway and Metro Transit projects, and noted that a table lists the funding for the various categories. It was assumed that the current level of spending on the local system will maintain current roadway preservation trends, which is a slow deterioration of the system. Additional funding would be needed to maintain current pavement conditions. For state highway system, pavement conditions have improved in recent years, but the statewide study showed a need for additional funding. The MPO will continue to monitor the trend in pavement conditions. Schaefer said that staff estimated the capital costs to implement the recommended transit system and the increase in service hours required. Additional funding, most likely through a new funding source, would be needed to implement the system vision.

Schmidt suggested adding a chart that would show the yearly revenues that could be generated by a ¼ and ½ percent sales tax should there be legislation that authorizes local RTAs. The revenue could be compared to the cost to operate Metro Transit. The chart could also perhaps show road project cost reductions as a result of reducing traffic demand through better integrated transit. Stocker asked for a cost estimate for the estimated 63% increase in revenue service hours needed to implement the transit plan. Schaefer said that staff could translate that into dollars.

Golden asked about the inflation factor used in the analysis. Schaefer said that WisDOT directed MPO staff to use a 2% annual increase in both project costs and funding. Golden expressed concern that transportation-
related expenses, such as the cost to purchase buses, have exceeded the inflation rate. He also expressed concern about assuming a 2% percent increase in funding given the current state budget situation. Schaefer agreed that the 2% annual increase in project costs was optimistic. The inflationary increase in funding assumes the state budget situation gets resolved in the future. Golden said he was confused by the analysis of federal and state funding for roadways. Schaefer said there is a table showing average annual federal/state and local funding for state highways and local roadways. The federal/state funding data was provided by WisDOT. The local funding for local roadways was calculated by taking the total funding from the WisDOR data and subtracting the federal/state funding.

Kamp suggested including a chart that identifies Metro Transit’s current needs versus current funding and with potential new funding via a sales tax or vehicle registration fee. Schmidt thought a chart showing the revenue from a county vs. city wide wheel tax would be helpful. Schmidt said that she would like to have the board discuss at a future meeting whether the MPO should pass a resolution that encourages state legislators to consider RTA enabling legislation while they’re in session to help address transportation funding problems. Clear suggested adding this as a future work item.

Kamp asked how the plan will address capacity issues for the different transportation modes, including transit. Schaefer said that the plan addresses capacity issues for roadways and the need to spend more money for preservation purposes. It does not specifically address transit capacity issues, but work has been done to identify transit costs. A conclusion will be added to the financial analysis chapter that describes unmet needs and the current state of funding. Golden asked how many buses Metro Transit will need to purchase per year, starting in 2050, to maintain its fleet. Kamp said that Metro Transit would need to purchase 20 to 21 buses a year to maintain its fleet in 2050. Some would need to be articulated buses. Kamp said the eventual goal is to have 285 buses in its fleet, of which 40 to 60 would be articulated.

8. Review of Interstate 39/90 and Beltline Interchange Detailed Study Alternatives and Consideration of Potential Letter of Comment

Schaefer said WisDOT separated the Beltline interchange from the rest of the Interstate expansion project to address changes in the limits of the project, impacts, and changes in design of the interchange from when the EIS for the Interstate project was completed. Schaefer said FHWA and WisDOT went through a process to develop and evaluate design alternatives for the interchange, and are now proposing to move forward two of the five full-build alternatives for further more detailed analysis. A letter was sent out to participating agencies seeking comments on the design alternatives being proposed to move forward. Schaefer briefly described the low-build and full-build alternatives evaluated. WisDOT has dismissed the low-build alternative and three of the five full-build alternatives. The two being carried forward include one with the smallest footprint and least environmental impact and another that has a larger footprint but meets the most criteria for safety, traffic operations and other factors.

Matano said that the interchange designs are difficult to follow. Schaefer agreed and said that he had asked WisDOT staff to provide a presentation on the alternatives; however, they thought it would be more appropriate to provide a presentation this spring or early summer. Schmidt asked if the board could ask for a 30-day or 60-day extension to comment on the alternatives. Golden said that WisDOT should provide a presentation if they are serious about wanting the board’s input. Golden said that the board has previously talked about land conservation as being an important factor. Schaefer said that one of the final alternatives being examined keeps the existing interchange’s footprint. Gruber asked if a cost estimate has been developed. Schaefer said that WisDOT is developing an updated planning level estimate. The project will cost at least $400 million, and is being designed so it can be phased over time. The last phase would be the conversion of USH 12/18 to a freeway with an interchange at CTH AB.

Moved by Schmidt, seconded by Golden, to request that staff write a letter to WisDOT asking for an extension of time to comment and requesting that WisDOT staff make a presentation on the interchange design alternatives at a future meeting. Motion carried with Flottmeyer abstaining.
9. Update on Modification to Membership and Voting Structure of the MPO Technical Coordinating Committee

Schaefer described the existing and proposed membership and voting structure of the MPO technical committee. The purpose of the modification is to address recurring quorum issues. Schmidt asked why the City of Sun Prairie wasn’t paired with another city. Schaefer said that there is an odd number of suburban communities so Sun Prairie wasn’t paired because it is the largest suburb. Kamp asked if MPO staff contacted members who have been contributing to the quorum problem. Schaefer said that he has contacted members who attend infrequently. They have good intentions about attending regularly, but do not various reasons. Golden asked if the voting status of any member is impacted by whether or not their community contributes to the local match. Schaefer said that the voting status of members is not affected by this.

10. Discussion Regarding Joint Meeting with the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission

Matano said that he had some new potential dates for a future joint meeting of the MPO and Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (CARPC). Schaefer offered to create a Doodle poll for the meeting. He said that staff is currently scheduling the final series of public meetings for the RTP, and the potential joint meeting dates do not appear to conflict with them.

11. Status Report on Studies and Plans Involving the TPB

Schmidt suggested developing a resolution or a letter to the chairs of the transportation committees in the legislature that would describe the benefits of allowing local governments to establish RTAs. With this authority, the state would not have to raise taxes for projects desired by local communities. Local governments could decide how they wish to fund local road and transit projects. Schaefer asked Schmidt if she was referring to a general authority, rather than solely a transit authority. Schmidt said she was referring to a general transportation authority. Schaefer said that the City of Madison recently introduced a resolution that addresses the RTA authority issue, outlining key aspects of potential legislation that the city would support. Schmidt asked if the MPO could review the City resolution and then develop its own resolution. Schmidt said that this seems like an appropriate time to broach the topic, since the legislature is currently debating the budget.

Gruber reported that the City of Madison has a resolution currently being reviewed by various committees that states a preference for an urban: boulevard cross-section for Stoughton Road rather than a freeway conversion. Gruber said that East Washington Avenue is an urban boulevard, and carries about the same amount of traffic as Stoughton Road. Schaefer commented that there are some significant differences, including the fact that Stoughton Road is a significant freight corridor and carries much more truck traffic. Schaefer reported that WisDOT recently held public meetings on the Interstate 39/90/94 study regarding different corridor alternatives being evaluated, including off-corridor ones. He said there is not community support for those alternatives. Schaefer said it is likely the off-corridor alternatives will be dismissed. Schaefer said that the Madison in Motion plan is going through the City approval process.

12. Discussion of Future Work Items

Schaefer said that staff is in the process of scheduling the final set of public meetings for the RTP. They will be scheduled for the end of February or early March. The next board meeting will be held on March 1 in downtown Madison. The official public hearing on the RTP will take place that evening. Action on the RTP is anticipated at the April meeting.

Schaefer said that a 40% response rate has been achieved for the household travel survey. The UW Survey Center sent a reminder in January to the households that had not responded yet, and some additional surveys were returned. A second wave of surveys will be sent out to different households in the spring. He also reported that the RFP for the next phase of BRT study has been delayed due to issues surrounding the three-
party agreement between the county, city, and WisDOT that was executed to oversee the former rail study with funding from the state. Additional federal funding was later obtained. The agreement may be amended.

13. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings

Schaefer said the MPO is hiring two new planning staff: Coleen Hoesly, who is coming from WisDOT Southwest Region and Bill Holloway, who is coming from the State Smart Transportation Initiative at the University of Wisconsin. They will be starting in mid-February.

Matano said that he is interested in attending a conference on bike-friendly places. The $450 registration fee will be waived if four elected officials from the same area sign up together. Clear asked Matano if he found out about the conference through the Madison Bikes Facebook group. Matano confirmed that he saw it on that Facebook page.

Gruber announced that State Smart Transportation Initiative staff will give a presentation to the Common Council at 5:30 pm on February 28th. David Dryer has been invited to participate in the meeting. Gruber said it is on the idea of freeways and boulevards within the city. Case studies of freeway removal from other cities will be examined. Matano said that the Congress of New Urbanism just sent an email that describes ten specific freeways nationwide that are slated for demolition.

Schaefer said that he reserved a room for Wednesday, March 1 in the City-County Building for the next Policy Board meeting. That is Ash Wednesday. The City of Madison does not prohibit the scheduling of meetings on Ash Wednesday; however Dane County does. He asked if there was concern about the March 1 meeting by board members, and there wasn’t so Matano said the next board meeting will remain as scheduled.

The next meeting will be held Wednesday, March 1, 2017 at 6:30 p.m. at the City-County Building, 210 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd., Room 351.

14. Adjournment

Moved by Golden, seconded by Kamp, to adjourn. Motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 8:32 pm.