1. Roll Call

Members present: Mark Clear, Chuck Kamp, Steve King, Jerry Mandli, Al Matano, Ed Minihan, Mark Opitz, Robin Schmidt

Members absent: Ken Dahl, Ken Golden, Jeff Gust, Paul Lawrence, Chris Schmidt

MPO Staff present: Bill Schaefer, Mike Cechvala

2. Approval of November 7, 2012 Meeting Minutes

Moved by Minihan, seconded by R. Schmidt, to approve the November 7, 2012 meeting minutes. Motion carried.

3. Communications

- Letter from Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) staff on behalf of USDOT approving the Madison Area TPB (MPO) Work Program. [In packet]
- Letter from WisDOT also approving the MPO Work Program and FHWA and WisDOT funding for 2013, also referencing the MPO’s FTA and STP-Urban funding. [Handed out]

Schaefer noted that the FTA funding is approved later in the year.

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

None

5. Resolution TPB No. 70 Regarding Amendment #1 to the 2013-2017 Transportation Improvement Program for the Madison Area and Dane County

Schaefer said the requested TIP amendment included minor changes to a number of projects, mostly relatively small changes in cost/funding or the schedule. For a couple projects, the scope was modified. The only new projects were three minor WisDOT projects for signing and pavement marking on various state highways. Schaefer noted the project changes were listed on the agenda and in the resolution. The attached project listings provide more detailed information. Some of project revisions could have been handled by a simple administrative modification, but were included in the amendment since that was already being processed.

Matano lamented the delay in the Lower Yahara River Trail Phase 1 project. Schaefer said construction would start in 2014, but now not finish until 2015. Minihan provided some historical information on the Dyerson Road Bridge (over the Yahara River). The project to replace the bridge is being delayed to 2014 or 2015. He said the reason for the delay was the bids came in very high due to the uncertainty about the cost given the type of structure. R. Schmidt asked if there was a common reason for delays in projects. Schaefer said he didn’t think so. There are many reasons for project delays, including environmental or real estate acquisition issues, changes in the scope of the project, budget issues, and others. Mandli mentioned archaeological investigations as another reason for delays. Matano said he thought the delay for the bicycle trail project was engineering issues as it is a challenging project close to the rail corridor with a new bridge over Mud Lake.

Moved by Kamp, seconded by Opitz, to approve Resolution TPB No. 70 Regarding Amendment #1 to the 2013-2017 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Area & Dane County. Motion carried.
6. Presentation on Service Change and Other Recommendations in the Draft 2013-2017 Transit Development Plan

Schaefer said the draft Transit Development Plan (TDP) report was almost finished. A preliminary draft report and executive summary were reviewed with the TDP committee at its last meeting. A revised executive summary incorporating comments from the committee was handed out. Schaefer reviewed the summary, which explains the scope of the TDP, lists goals that guided the TDP, mentions some of the significant issues facing the transit system, provides background information on current transit services and Metro costs and revenues, and highlights some of the key recommendations. One of the key issues addressed besides improvements to the fixed-route system is bus stop spacing in the central Madison area. An analysis was done of bus stop spacing and the TDP recommends Metro implement a stop consolidation program. It is pointed out that implementation of all or most of the service change recommendations within the 5+ year period would likely require a new funding source. The TDP is adopted by both the City of Madison as the major transit operator and the MPO. The complete draft report will be distributed to the MPO Board before the next meeting for approval to release for public comment. The city approval process will be initiated then as well. The schedule calls for city approval in late March and MPO approval in early April.

Cechvala reviewed some of the more significant recommendations in the full draft report. Under Facilities Development, recommendations included developing a more comprehensive bus stop inventory and using that to help prioritize improvements. He elaborated on the bus stop consolidation recommendation. Schaefer pointed out that the timing of the issue was good with the planned Johnson Street reconstruction project where this could be implemented. Stops enhancements, including curb extensions, could be used to offset the negative reaction of closing some stops. Matano suggested re-ordering the recommendations in that section to correspond with the presentation and Cechvala agreed. Opitz suggested including the addition of real-time information to additional high ridership stops to the recommendation on improving schedule information and moving that to Passenger Information and Marketing. It was agreed to do so. Kamp said Metro has received requests for real-time bus arrival times on the UW campus even though most of the students have smart phones. Longer range planning recommendations included increasing the capacity of the bus garage, planning for implementation of BRT, and expanding park-and-ride facilities. There was discussion of the many informal, naturally occurring park-and-ride locations. Kamp said Metro has attempted to work with businesses to establish formal lots, but the businesses have often not been cooperative. An example was the Swiss Colony lot by the East Transfer Point. He said limited capital funding is also a reason new lots haven’t been added other than the one at the North Transfer Point. However, he said it would be nice to add some more formal park-and-ride facilities even though many of the informal ones work pretty well now. Kamp said he thought the TDP did a nice job of pointing to some practical directions to continue to improve the transit system. Clear mentioned there were also many informal park-and-bike locations and it would be nice to formalize some of those.

Cechvala finished reviewing the general recommendations, which included continuing efforts to reach agreement on a new finance and governance structure, such as an RTA, for regional transit service. Kamp mentioned that all of Metro’s peer systems that are used by WisDOT for comparison purposes are either regional transit authorities or regional transit districts. The current structure of a municipal system contracting with local partners requires spending much time on micro-budget issues. Having a regional funding structure encourages regional planning and regional operations coordination. Cechvala reviewed some of the specific service improvement recommendations. He said the proposed suburban commuter express service routes were refined, working with local staff. Other recommendations included establishing an express stop pattern for commuter routes on East Washington and University Avenue and improving service frequency between the West Transfer Point and the Square. Matano asked about the division of labor between the MPO and Metro, noting the specific nature of the service recommendations. Schaefer said the MPO is the lead agency on the TDP, but works closely with Metro staff. The TDP provides the framework and then Metro uses that as a guide for making decisions on annual service changes. This TDP also provides an excellent framework for an RTA plan if another RTA is created. Kamp agreed, noting that when the former RTA was meeting there was a desire for summary information, but also a desire for information on specific route improvements that would
be implemented if the RTA was funded. Schaefer mentioned that an appendix will be included with more detailed information on the service recommendations. Kamp commented on how much Metro staff enjoyed working with MPO staff on the TDP and the good working relationship. Mandli mentioned that the Wisconsin Commission on Transportation Policy and Finance report recommends passage of RTA enabling legislation. One of the reasons was the many comments from young people who wanted more transportation options.

7. Update on Designation of 2010 Adjusted Madison Urban Area and MPO Planning Area Boundaries

Schaefer said MPO staff had worked with WisDOT staff to develop a preliminary draft map of the new 2010 urban area and MPO planning area boundaries, and staff was in the process of getting feedback from local staff. After each decennial census, MPOs are responsible for working with the state and local officials to set new boundaries for the urban area and planning area. The planning area boundary is the area within which the federal metropolitan transportation planning requirements apply. For example, federally funded projects must be in the MPO long-range transportation plan and approved by the MPO for inclusion in the TIP. The urban area boundary must include the census-defined urbanized area, but expands on that to smooth out irregular boundary lines, provide for continuity of transportation routes, and include areas expected to develop in the next ten years. The urban area boundary has significance for transportation planning and funding. It affects the functional classification of roadways and their eligibility for federal funding. For example, projects must be in the urban area to be eligible for STP-Urban funding. Therefore, it is advantageous to include potential collector streets in the developed area and planned collectors in developing areas.

Schaefer said that WisDOT drafted some guidelines for setting the urban area boundaries. One of them was to generally include all of an incorporated area with limited exceptions – Fitchburg as a former town being one exception. Another was to maintain continuity of streets in either being in or out of the urban area, but not going back and forth. As a result of these and other guidelines the proposed urban area is fairly large and does include some areas that probably won’t develop even in ten years. He reviewed some specific examples such as the CTH T corridor. Mandli commented that by being in the urban area he thought roadway projects would be required to follow a more strict design standard. Schaefer said the higher design standard and more involved environmental review process applied if there was federal funding regardless of whether the project was in the urban area.

Schaefer said the planning area was set to include areas anticipated to develop within the 20+ year planning period and important transportation routes. He pointed out that the Village of Oregon is shown as a potential addition to the planning area even though the village isn’t in the urban area. He said it made sense from a planning perspective to include Oregon because the boundary is so close and Stoughton is in. However, projects in Oregon wouldn’t be eligible for STP-Urban funding. If included, the village would have a voice in representation on the MPO Board. Clear asked if the village had an opinion, and Schaefer said he didn’t know, but would be contacting village staff and officials to see. Opitz commented that if Oregon were added it would make sense to include all of the City of Fitchburg. Schaefer agreed. He said the boundaries were drawn using census geography for ease of data collection. The planning area uses traffic analysis zones, which follow census geography and major roadways.

Kamp asked if staff could calculate the increase in acreage in the 2010 urbanized area compared to the 2000 area and also the percentage of the urbanized area that is served by Metro or another transit system. He also asked for information on the number of new municipalities that were either in or partially in the new proposed planning area. Schaefer said that information could be provided.

Schaefer said the map would be reviewed with the MPO technical committee, and a revised version would be presented to the board at the next meeting for approval to release for comment and review. Action on the boundaries would then be scheduled for March. The map would then be sent to WisDOT and FHWA for their approval. After that the functional classification of the roadways will be updated.
8. **Update on Transit Corridor (BRT) Study and Related TOD Market Study**

Schaefer said the consultant team was in the process preparing the cost and ridership estimates and other information. MPO staff has been working with them on things such as the bus operating plan and transit signal priority analysis. Preliminary results will be presented to the study committee on January 31. Complete results will be presented to the committee and to the MPO Board on March 6. A second public information meeting is scheduled for April 11 and the final report would be finished later that month. Schaefer handed out and reviewed with the board an informal outline of the report. The report would be 40-60 pages with technical appendices. The goal of the document is to provide objective information to the public and decision-makers about the feasibility of BRT and identify next steps for further dialogue and planning and potential implementation of a starter line. It will be pointed out that the system studied is a long-range plan and wouldn’t be built all at once.

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

Schaefer said he didn’t have much to report on the EIS studies. The Stoughton Road study was the one moving along pretty quickly with development of revised improvement alternatives for different segments of the corridor. A public meeting would be scheduled in the next couple of months and he said he’d arrange a presentation to the MPO Board at one of the next couple of meetings.

10. **Discussion of Future Work Items**

Schaefer mentioned that the Metro bus size study was getting started. MPO staff was providing information to the consultant that had been selected. A kickoff meeting of the study committee was scheduled for the following week. Other items had either been covered or there wasn’t anything new to report.

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

R. Schmidt announced that the next meeting of the new County Transit Subcommittee was scheduled for January 23, and the focus of the meeting would be to discuss the current funding structure for transit.

Schaefer announced that a new planner/travel modeler had been hired. His name was David Kanning and he had a land use planning background, but was shifting to transportation planning and was in the process of obtaining a master’s degree in Engineering. He said Jill Replinger, the staff graphic designer/planning technician, was retiring February 1 and so that position would need to be filled.

The next meeting will be held February 6, 2013 at 7:00 p.m. at the Madison Water Utility Building, 119 E. Olin Ave., Room A-B.

12. **Adjournment**

Moved by King, seconded by Clear, to adjourn. Motion carried. The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:30 PM.