Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (an MPO)
February 5, 2014 Meeting Minutes

1. Roll Call

   **Members present:** David Ahrens, Judd Blau, Mark Clear, Ken Golden, Jeff Gust, Steve King, Jerry Mandli (arrived during item #5), Al Matano, Mark Opitz, Chris Schmidt, Robin Schmidt

   **Members absent:** Chuck Kamp, Paul Lawrence, Ed Minihan

   **MPO Staff present:** Bill Schaefer, Mike Cechvala

2. Approval of November 13, 2013 Meeting Minutes

   Moved by R. Schmidt seconded by Opitz, to approve the November 13, 2013 meeting minutes. Motion carried with King abstaining.

3. Communications

   - WisDOT letter approving the 2014-2018 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
   - MPO letter of comment signed by Chair Matano on Wisconsin Rail Plan 2030.
   - WisDOT SW Region letter and attached Frequently Asked Questions document regarding the STH 138 (Oregon to Stoughton) Corridor study.

   Schaefer said the STH 138 study is a safety and operations study looking at access management and safety issues, but not capacity expansion. The STH 138 corridor was considered as an alternative to USH 51 for a capacity expansion as part of the USH 51 study, but was rejected. R. Schmidt asked if this was related to the planned new Wal-Mart. Gust said no, that traffic is increasing on STH 138 and the purpose of this study is to develop a plan for maintaining mobility in the existing corridor. Schaefer said a roundabout is already planned for construction at the STH 138/USH 51 intersection near the Wal-Mart location. Gust added the developer was building another roundabout to serve the development.

   Matano mentioned the letter from Mayor Soglin to WisDOT regarding the Stoughton Road study that was also at members’ places. Schaefer said he had distributed that as an informational item related to item #12.

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

   None

5. Resolution TPB No. 85 Approving the Program Management and Recipient Coordination Plan for the Section 5310 (Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities) Program for the Madison Urbanized Area

   Schaefer provided some background on the issue. The Madison area receives a direct allocation of funding under the Section 5310 program. The MPO approved a resolution in November that recommended Metro be the designated recipient of the funds, but that the MPO prepare the program management plan and select projects for funding. The program management plan documents this division of responsibilities between Metro and the MPO for administering this program. It also covers other topics such as the process for selecting projects and compliance by the sub-recipients of funding with federal requirements. Schaefer noted it was decided to continue to fund the two current projects this year and consider implementing a competitive process for project selection next year. The two continuing projects are Dane County’s mobility management program and Metro’s in-person paratransit eligibility assessment program. Schaefer said MPO staff worked closely with Metro staff in developing the document and also received comments from WisDOT. Following MPO approval, the plan will be submitted to FTA. The City of Madison will also need to approve the plan and the application to FTA for funding the 2014 projects.
R. Schmidt asked whether the Dane County Specialized Transportation Commission would have an opportunity for input. Schaefer said the commission could be informed of the document, but didn’t have a role other than approving the county’s application for funding. The City of Madison needed to approve the plan because of Metro’s role as the designated recipient of funding. Cechvala added that the proposed arrangement for administration of the program and the decision not to pursue a competitive project selection process was discussed with the commission and the committee that oversaw development of the Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Plan. R. Schmidt suggested putting it on the agenda for a future commission meeting.

Schaefer mentioned that former Supervisor Tom Stoebig, who was on that committee, suggested coordinating the paratransit eligibility assessments and the mobility training programs with the county’s Aging and Disability Resource Center (ADRC). Golden said he discussed this issue with Crystal Martin, Metro’s Paratransit Manager, when the ADRC was opening. The conclusion was there would be no efficiencies with the center doing the assessments because the evaluation is so different than the other evaluations and resource connection work that the ADRC performs. He said Cashin and Martin work closely together so he felt if there was an efficiency and customer convenience from having the ADRC involved that would have been pursued.

Golden commented that there was an inconsistency in the document between the eligible Section 5310 activities and the program goals. The goals references transit dependent persons and not just elderly and those with disabilities. Schaefer agreed. He said the goals and objectives were taken from the coordination plan, which was more inclusive. He said they needed to be modified to be consistent with the eligible program activities.

Moved by R. Schmidt, seconded by Golden to approve the Program Management and Recipient Coordination Plan for the Section 5310 (Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities) Program for the Madison Urbanized Area with modification recommended by Golden to the program goals and objectives to make them consistent with the eligible projects under the Section 5310 program. Motion carried.

6. Resolution TPB No. 86 Approving Amendment #1 to the 2014-2018 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Area and Dane County

Schaefer reviewed the projects included in the TIP amendment, explaining the reasons for the proposed cost/funding and/or schedule changes. He said the change in the project scope for the City of Madison Mineral Point Road/Midvale intersection project was just a change to the description from reconstruction to recondition with no cost change. The increase in STP-Urban funding for the East Johnson reconstruction project was the result of negotiations with WisDOT regarding the MPO’s funding allocation. The allocation was originally reduced to account for the MPO planning program project, but that was deleted due to the increase in Planning funds. WisDOT agreed to credit the MPO this funding, but required it be spent this fiscal year. Therefore, East Johnson was the only project the funding could be used for. It is above and beyond the funding currently shown in the TIP. He said the amendment also adds the Dane County and Metro Section 5310 projects just discussed. He referred to the Program of Projects document in the packet that provides more information about the different components of the two projects. That document gets submitted to FTA with the application for funding.

Golden said he understood the funding for Union Cab’s accessible taxi service had to be dropped because it wasn’t eligible for funding because it wasn’t a shared ride service. He asked if that would impact the company’s ability or intention of continuing to provide the service. If so, the Madison Transit & Parking Commission might need to address this issue in order to maintain compliance with the ADA. Schaefer said staff would follow up and send a communication to the TPC if there was a threat to the continued provision of that service. Golden also mentioned the possible neighborhood concerns regarding the Mineral Point/Midvale intersection project. C. Schmidt said the preliminary design doesn’t involve taking any land or moving sidewalks and has support of the neighborhood.
Moved by Golden, seconded by C. Schmidt to approve Amendment #1 to the 2014-2018 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Area and Dane County. Motion carried.


Schaefer said the Transportation Alternatives program was a new program that consolidated the former Enhancements and Safe Routes to School programs. Larger MPOs such as Madison receive a direct sub-allocation of funding. There is a separate pot of money that WisDOT will administer that is available for projects anywhere in the state. The larger MPOs can develop their own policies and project selection criteria. However, WisDOT is requiring consistency for some policies such as the minimum project cost since they will be administering the program for all projects. Staff has prepared a draft document that outlines the proposed policies and criteria for the MPO to use in selecting projects for funding. The policies noted are those that differ from the ones that WisDOT will be using. The document reflects changes recommended by the MPO’s technical and citizen advisory committees. Schaefer reviewed the draft document.

Golden complimented staff on the document. He suggested changing the title of the Cost Effectiveness category to Cost Benefit because that is more accurate based on the description. Golden also suggested consideration of awarding bonus points for cases where community participation added value or reduced the cost of a project such as providing landscaping for a path. Blau said he liked the concept, but did not see it as practical because of the difficulty of planning such an effort at the time of project application. It would be easy for communities to say they would do that. Matano said there could be a requirement for a formal “friends” group or neighborhood association. R. Schmidt commented that she like the concept, but thought it should be part of the Cost Benefit criterion. Schaefer said he agreed with Blau on the difficulty of organizing such a commitment at the time of project application, but if included he preferred it be part of the Cost Benefit criterion. Schaefer mentioned another situation where a community had already built part of a project and was only asking for funds to complete it. He thought credit should be given for that as well. C. Schmidt said he also liked the idea, but it ran counter to the goal of targeting projects in environmental justice areas since they typically don’t have the capacity to organize these efforts.

Moved by Blau, seconded by Golden, to amend the Cost Effectiveness category by renaming it Cost Benefit, and to add a criterion under it for in-kind or other local contributions to a project. Motion carried.

Moved by Golden, seconded by R. Schmidt to approve as amended. Motion carried.

8. **Consideration of Appointments to the MPO Advisory Committee for the Bicycle Transportation Plan for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County**

Schaefer said an update to the comprehensive regional bicycle transportation plan completed in 2000 was underway. Updates have been made to bikeways component of the plan as part of regional transportation plan updates, but a comprehensive update is needed. An advisory committee is being created to oversee the effort. It consists mostly of staff, but also includes some policy representatives as well. Clear and Matano both volunteered to represent the board and Opitz is on the committee as the City of Middleton representative. Schaefer said a kickoff meeting of the committee was already held, but staff was seeking any input on the committee makeup and approval of the membership.

Blau commented on the lack of any representatives from some of the smaller communities. Schaefer said he had sought volunteers from all of the communities represented on the MPO’s technical committee. There would also be other opportunities for input. Matano commented that he didn’t like the committee being made up of mostly staff persons given the large bicycling community with many knowledgeable individuals. Golden suggested creating a separate citizen or policy advisory committee. Clear said some of the people on the current list might wish to serve on the other committee.

Moved by Golden, seconded by Clear to approve the committee but ask staff to create draft list of members for a second policy advisory committee. Motion withdrawn.
Moved by Clear, seconded by Golden, to defer the item to the next meeting.

9. Presentation on Madison Metro Bus Size Study

Cechvala provided some history on the project. Metro Transit received a grant to hire a consultant to conduct the study. MPO staff agreed to serve as project manager, in part to ensure an objective analysis since Metro staff had previously stated they didn’t think it made sense to utilize small buses. Nelson Nygaard from Seattle was hired and the study is now wrapping up. The study report will be going through the city committees and some opportunities will be provided for comments, including posting fliers on the buses. Cechvala provided information on the vehicles that were considered and the analysis conducted, which included a peak passenger loading survey, use of an annualized cost and fuel use model to determine the cost of using different sized buses, and a facilities review that looked at necessary modifications to the bus garage, transfer points, and other bus stops with larger buses. He reviewed the routes that were candidates for use of larger and smaller buses. Most of the routes that were candidates for large buses are in the BRT corridors with the exception of some Middleton routes and Route 38, but those are commuter routes that only operate during peak periods. The two routes that were the strongest candidates for use of larger buses all day were Routes 2 and 80, the main UW campus route. If all of the routes were included, a total of 40 large buses might be needed, including spares. On the other hand, only about 5-6 small buses could be employed with the current route system, perhaps double that if route changes were made. However, the changes would increase transfers.

Cechvala reviewed the cost impact estimates showing the annualized capital and operating cost. Even with just the 13 large bus scenario (Routes 2 and 80), the cost is significant at about $650,000. He then went over the main conclusions. Metro should continue planning for diversification of the fleet in the future, particularly the addition of larger buses. However, a new satellite bus garage facility will be needed first with the current one over capacity. Also, the decision on whether to move forward with bus rapid transit and the timeframe for that will have a significant impact on this issue.

R. Schmidt asked what weight was placed in the analysis on buses that were more than half empty. Cechvala said the focus was on the maximum load point. For consideration of a small bus, it was decided that no more than 10% of the trips should overload a small bus. Golden commented that the fleet diversification issue raises a whole host of other issues. For example, related to the bus garage there is the issue of whether to have one or two garages and where to locate a second garage if that is the decision. Creation on an RTA might result in additional regional bus service, which impacts fleet decisions. There are also major fiscal issues. He said it was still good to have a plan even though some of things will impact it in the future. Ahrens asked if the potential additional ridership and revenue from use of larger buses was considered. Cechvala said that particularly in the case of the UW campus route, the capacity is limiting ridership. However, the potential increased ridership and revenue was not evaluated since it would be very difficult to predict. In the case of the campus route, it is free so there would be no additional passenger revenue.

10. Review and Discussion on Draft Scope of Work for Regional Intelligent Transportation System Strategic Plan

Schaefer said staff was working on putting together the RFP to hire a consultant to prepare a regional ITS plan. The MPO will be working closely with the City of Madison Traffic Engineering Division and Parking Utility, which are covering half of the local share cost for the project. He said ITS covers a broad range of advanced technologies and other operations management techniques to improve the safety and efficiency of the transportation system. This plan will be multi-modal and complement the plan WisDOT has already put together for the freeway system. Schaefer referred to the draft scope of work for the study. He said it would be comprehensive, starting with development of ITS goals, an inventory, and identification of needs, followed by development of a implementation or deployment plan prioritizing projects.

Golden asked if it was intended to implement the Congestion Management Process, and Schaefer said yes. Gust commented that it was a good idea. He has found it very helpful for the state system to have a plan so ITS components can be incorporated into projects. Mandli commented on the need to work out relationships
between local agencies and WisDOT. Schaefer agreed that was an important part of the study, including communication of information on incidents and other things.

11. Review and Discussion on Draft Roadway Functional Classification Map and Associated Changes to the Madison Urbanized Area Boundary

Schaefer noted the draft map was in the packet. It is a joint WisDOT and MPO effort with WisDOT taking the lead. WisDOT has developed classification criteria consistent with FHWA guidelines. The system is designed to classify the network in terms of the function of a roadway in providing mobility, connectivity, and accessibility. Criteria included traffic volumes, land uses that are served, and spacing of the different types of facilities. He said one of the issues is that the system doesn’t account for the current land use in a corridor or the community context. For instance, there are some roadways that are proposed to be reclassified to minor arterials that go through mostly single-family residential areas. He highlighted a couple of those. Schaefer said the answer to that is to have a supplemental classification system that accounts for that. Schaefer said MPO staff has taken the lead in getting input from local staff. There is general agreement or at least acceptance of the current version of the proposed draft map.

Ahrens asked about the significance of the functional classification. Schaefer said it is used for planning purposes such as in the regional travel model. It could also affect the design of the roadway if federal funding were used for a project. While the criteria would generally be the same for a collector and an arterial, an exception would be more difficult to get for an arterial. Schaefer said the City of Madison classified some streets differently because they use theirs for some policy purposes such as eligibility for traffic calming devices. He added that it is unlikely federal funding would be used for the roadways mentioned. The classification also has potential funding implications.

Schaefer highlighted a couple of significant classification changes that will require an expansion of the urban area boundary. The first is the proposed upgrade of Pleasant View Road north of Mineral Point to a principal arterial. The second is CTH K (CTH M to USH 12), which is also proposed to be upgraded to a principal arterial. CTH K is currently shown as a collector because it is outside the urban area and thus requires use of different criteria for rural areas. The traffic volume on the roadway is very high, about 13,000, so even though the roadway is not in an urban developed area it is being used for urban commuter traffic. Schaefer said that MPO action on the functional classification map and urban area boundary changes wouldn’t occur for a few months because of required traffic counts and forecasts needed for some of the proposed new collectors. However, he wanted to review the map with the board now to ensure there were no concerns.

Opitz said he supported the change for CTH K. He said it recognizes the travel patterns out there today. Blau agreed, saying he avoids CTH K because of the high traffic volumes. Gust mentioned the programmed project to add a dual left at the CTH K/USH 12 intersection. Golden suggested consideration of a STP Urban funding set aside for critical sidewalk improvements due to the fact it so difficult politically to get them done due to local assessment policies. Blau said Deforest pays for 100% of sidewalk improvements.

12. Discussion on WisDOT Plans for Verona Road (USH 18/151) and Corridor Studies of Stoughton Road (USH 51) and USH 51 (McFarland to Stoughton)

Matano said he asked staff to put this item on the agenda to allow board discussion of these projects and their cumulative impact rather than just taking them up one by one. He said there wasn’t time tonight, but hoped the board could have this discussion at a future meeting. The Beltline study was also supposed to be included. Further discussion was deferred.

13. Status Report by Madison Area TPB Members on Other Projects Involving the TPB

Schaefer reported that the consultant for the Beltline study was working to model the traffic impacts of the major roadway and transit strategies developed. For the Interstate 39/90 study, the consultant was analyzing the traffic impacts of the potential interchange locations and results from that would be available soon.
Regarding the City of Madison Transportation Master Plan, there was a kick-off meeting in December that several board members attended. A second land use visioning meeting is planned for the spring. MPO staff has been working with City of Madison staff to develop a bicycle facility geodatabase for the plan. MPO staff would maintain the database and expand it countywide. MPO staff also completed an update of the sidewalk inventory for the City of Madison as well as other communities in the county.

14. Discussion of Future Work Items

Gust mentioned that he heard the City of Madison was no longer interested in hosting the server for the MPO’s online rideshare program. He wanted to be sure the program would be maintained. Schaefer said it would continue. A meeting has been set up to discuss the issue and the possibility of the state hosting the server for our program as well as the one for the rest of the state.

Schaefer mentioned that staff was working on revisions to the MPO’s STP-Urban project scoring criteria. A preliminary draft would be reviewed with the technical committee at their next meeting and then reviewed with the board. The goal was to finalize the changes for the next cycle of applications this summer.

15. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings

Schaefer said he wanted to verify with the board that the 7 p.m. meeting time was still the most convenient for everyone. The 7 p.m. time was set to avoid meeting conflicts of members who are no longer on the board. Ahrens said that was the City of Madison’s Board of Public Works, but that was usually over by 6 p.m. After some discussion, there was consensus to move up the meeting time to 6:30 p.m.

The next meeting will be held Wednesday, March 5, 2014 at 6:30 p.m. at the Madison Water Utility Building, 119 E. Olin Ave., Rooms A-B.

16. Adjournment

Moved by Opitz, seconded by R. Schmidt to adjourn. Motion carried. The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:05 PM.